

# Standard



## A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

## IN THIS ISSUE

## **Meditation:**

In Submission To Government

## **Editorials:**

An Insider's Viewpoint
Developments In New Zealand
Pella's Good Example

## Feature:

Crisis In The Southern Presbyterian Church

Signs of the Times:

"Pray For Peace"

In His Fear:

The Pilgrim And The Bible

CONTENTS.
Meditation — In Submission To Government
Editorials — An Insider's Viewpoint
Feature — Crisis In The Southern Presbyterian Church (1)
The Signs of the Times – "Pray For Peace"
Studies in Baptism — The Mode Of The One Baptism
The Day of Shadows — Leaving And Cleaving
Contending for the Faith — The Doctrine of Atonement
The Strength of Youth — Commanded To Bear Children
Book Reviews — Apostolic History And The Gospel
News From Our Churches192

CONTENTS.

#### THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly during June, July and August. Published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association, Inc.

Second Class Postage Paid at Grand Rapids, Mich.

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

Department Editors: Mr. Donald Doezema, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman Hanko, Rev. Robert C. Harbach, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. Jay Kortering, Rev. George C. Lubbers, Rev. Marinus Schipper, Rev. Gise J. Van Baren, Rev. Herman Veldman, Rev. Bernard Woudenberg

Editorial Office: Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

1842 Plymouth Terrace, S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

Church News Editor: Mr. Donald Doezema

1904 Plymouth Terrace, S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

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

Business Office: The Standard Bearer,

Mr. H. Vander Wal, Bus. Mgr.

P.O. Box 6064

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

Subscription Policy: Subscription price, \$7.00 per year. Unless a definite request for discontinuance is received, it is assumed that the subscriber wishes the subscription to continue without the formality of a renewal order and he will be billed for renewal. If you have a change of address, please notify the Business Office as early as possible in order to avoid the inconvenience of delayed delivery. Include your Zip Code.

Advertising Policy: The Standard Bearer does not accept commercial advertising of any kind. Announcements of church and school events. anniversaries, obituaries, and sympathy resolutions will be placed for a \$3.00 fee. These should be sent to the Business Office and should be accompanied by the \$3.00 fee. Deadline for announcements is the 1st or the 15th of the month, previous to publication on the 15th or the 1st respectively.

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

## Meditation

# In Submission To Government

Rev. M. Schipper

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God."

I Peter 2:13-16.

gentiles!

Having your conversation honest among the epistle, and it must be borne constantly in mind. Proceeding now to apply this truth, that we are to walk That is the main exhortation in this section of the honestly in every department of life, the apostle calls

respect to the government which is over us.

Not to the world is this exhortation directed, but to the church, to the elect strangers; who are in the world, told in Romans 13:1-4. "Let every soul be subject but not of it.

world, is characterized by lawlessness. Rioting and violence have become in our time a way of life. Disrespect for authority, and open rebellion and revolution are not a peculiarity one finds only in our own country, but this situation obtains in all nations and in every part of the world. This is understandable, for when men will not reckon with the law of God, neither will they honor the ordinances of men.

But, as we said, the apostle is not directing the words of our text to those lawless in the world. Rather he is writing to the members of Christ's church. He has in mind those who are under the rule of Christ, Whose is all authority, power, and dominion in heaven and on earth. He directs the words of our text to those who are the citizens of a heavenly kingdom, yea, whose citizenship is in heaven, though temporarily they are required to be pilgrims and strangers in this world, and therefore also for a time must needs be in subjection to the rulers of this world. And, we hasten to add, in subjection to a government which, at the time of the writing of this epistle, was thoroughly antichristian.

And the question arises: but why should these heavenly citizens be exhorted to be in submission to these worldly governments? Perhaps this was the question which lived in the souls of them to whom Peter is writing, along with several other questions. If Christ is King supreme, would it not be sinful on our part to honor any other king or governor? If the government which imposes its rule over us is antichristian, should we not oppose it with all that is in us? If Christ has made us free from the law by His own obedience, are we not free from all laws? If the government persecutes us who are the children of God, is it not then an ungodly government whose laws we need not respect? Perhaps these and many more questions resided in the hearts of those to whom the apostle is writing. And with one sweep of the pen the apostle answers in the text: Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.

Submit yourselves . . .!

Whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well!

Shall we be able to understand this Scriptural mandate, it is necessary, first of all, that we have a clear, Scriptural idea of what government is.

It is a principle of the Word of God that all government is of God. It makes no difference what the form of government may be, whether it is a monarchy, a ment has authority only in the public sphere, it is the

attention to what our conversation is to be with democracy, or a dictatorship that is in power. The powers that be are ordained of God, not of man.

Most instructive in this connection is what we are unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of The world of Peter's day, as well as the present God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

> There are three elements in this passage that are emphasized: "there is no power but of God," "the powers that be are ordained of God," and, "whoever is in power is God's minister." And we would remind you that the government, the power which the apostle had in mind, was the power of Rome, of which Caesar was the ruler.

> Jesus, when confronted by Pontius Pilate, who was Caesar's governor, and who boasted that he had power to crucify Him or set Him free, did not hesitate to say to him: "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above."

> And Daniel in his prophecy (2:21) declares: "And he (i.e., God) changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings, and setteth up kings."

> Clearly all these passages teach that both the king and his government are of the Lord. It is He that sets kings on their thrones, and it is He that takes them down from their thrones, in order to put others in their place.

> How contrary to this principle is the modern conception of government! Today, the majority in our own country follow the philosophy that "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people" implies that the government is of man. In fact the term "democracy," which means literally "the rule of the people," also has come to imply that the government is determined by and has its origin in man. It should be plain from the Scripture passages cited above that this idea of government is contrary to the Word of God.

> Moreover, still speaking of the idea of government, it should also be established that, though the government is by divine appointment, it is nevertheless limited in its sphere of authority. By this we mean that the government is not divinely intended to rule over everything. It should have no jurisdiction in our private affairs. Nor should it have anything to say in the church. Church and State should remain sovereign each in its own sphere.

> And to this must be added that, whereas the govern-

divine intention that it shall maintain the law of God. All the laws which the government enacts and enforces should find their basis in the Decalogue with its two tables. And for the enforcement of this authority God has given the government sword power, according to which it is to punish the evil doer, and to bless and protect the good.

There is also one more thought which should be injected here, and that is: God has exalted Christ to be King over all kings, dominions, and powers. Of this He was deeply conscious when He said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." It is He, by divine right, Who places kings and rulers on their thrones, and through the governments of the world He rules over and over-rules all, so that they do His good pleasure. Though they generally do not recognize Him, and still more generally stand in open rebellion against Him, — for "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed," — they nevertheless are obliged to be His ministers, and do Him service.

It is especially this last thought that the apostle has in mind when he exhorts his readers to "submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake."

Bearing in mind that the government may be and often is antichristian, such as it was when the apostle wrote these words, then the principle will be in reverse. Then the good, which should be praised and protected by the government, will be persecuted for their well-doing; while the evil-doers, whom the government should punish, will be condoned, exonerated, and praised. Precisely what happened to Christ will happen also to the children of God. He Who did nothing but good, was maltreated, persecuted, and put to death by those in authority. And the Lord Jesus forewarned us that what they did to Him they will also do to us.

What then? Should we rebel?

Should we flee somewhere to form an underground movement, train guerrilla bands that will be bent on destroying those in authority? Should we start a revolutionary movement that will cast out those in power, and that will put in office those whom we will be reasonably sure will legislate on Christian principles?

The apostle answers all these questions with: Submit yourselves!

Mark well, he does not say: "obey!"

O, indeed, where it is possible to obey the government without violating any of our Christian principles, then obedience must be the rule of the day. Obedience is implicit in submission, yea, the very heart of it. But obedience and submission are always to be governed by our relationship to God and to Christ. We obey our parents, not simply because they are our parents who are older, wiser, and stronger than we, but for God's sake. We obey the government also only for God's sake. When we obey the government, we do so to show that we are in obeisance to Christ Who is our Lord. On

the other hand, when the government or whoever is in authority over us commands us to do that which is contrary to the law of God, which would make us to be disobedient to Christ, - then we must disobey, while we remain in submission. A beautiful illustration of this we find in Daniel 3, where the friends of Daniel were required to bow before the image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up. Not only did these obedient children of God refuse to obey the king, but they signified their willingness to submit to the punishment the king had threatened for disobedience. Willingly they gave themselves over to the fire of the furnace. This is submission, which is obedience to God. The apostle Peter, when confronted by the authorities because he taught in the Name of Jesus (Acts 5), answered them: "We ought to obey God rather than men." But before he was let go, he suffered severe beating by the authorities. This was submission, which is obedience to God.

Let it be established, then, that strict obedience to all authority is impossible, when that authority commands us to be disobedient to God and His Christ. But submission is always necessary. Then we honor authority, in loving obedience to God and to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The reason for this submission is two-fold. In the first place, "for the Lord's sake." We must remember that we obey Christ when we are in submission to human ordinances; and we are also in obedience to Christ when we disobey the human ordinance which is contary to His will. We are to serve the Lord Christ, and seek the honor of His Name. In the second place, "we put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." Also here we are to remember that the world of ungodly men, whether in the government or not, does not understand why the child of God does what he does. When the children of God disobey the authority, the world expects them to be revolutionaries. But when the child of God does not become a revolutionary, yea, rather gives himself over to the consequences of his disobedience, suffers willingly the inflicted punishment, then he puts the ignorant foolish to silence.

But why should the elect strangers be exhorted to be in submission to the government? If they truly love God, and know that they stand in loving service to their King, Christ Jesus; will they not then spontaneously do what the apostle urges in this exhortation?

There are especially two reasons why this exhortation is necessary. The first is the danger of antinomism. This is suggested in the last part of the text when the apostle writes: "as free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God." The antinomist is one who believes he is free, free from the law. Piously he points to the doctrine of justification, according to which Christ has fulfilled all obedience to the divine law for us, so that we are freed

from the dictates of the law. We are now under grace, so he says. Therefore any attempt to live in conformity to the law is to deny the justifying grace of Christ. Consequently these apparently pious people live as they please, with no respect for the law of God or of man. They live under the slogan, "Not under the law, but under grace." These antinominian sects have given the church no end of trouble, and also a bad name. The apostle would agree with them as to the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free, only he adds: "use not your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness." He means to say, your liberty does not give you license to do as you please; but your liberty is also bound by law. True liberty is the freedom to walk in the light of the law, which you could not do when you were the slaves of sin. We are not to perform the law in order to be saved, but we honor the law because we are saved. And since the laws of government, and the government

which imposes the law is ordained of God, therefore you are to live in submission to it.

But there is more. In the second place, as we already suggested, there is always the reality of antichristian government. It was there when Peter transcribed our text; and Scripture assures us that it is also future reality. What then? Shall Christians unite to overthrow such a government? When the government shall insist that you cannot buy or sell without the mark of the beast, shall we rush to obtain that mark lest we perish from the earth? The answers to these questions are negative.

Positively we shall honor Christ by being in submission to that evil government; and while we take the consequences of disobedience, death if necessary, we will commit our cause to Christ Who will surely justify us in the day when He shall judge also the government for all the ungodly deeds they have committed.

## Editorials

# An Insider's Viewpoint

Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

Elsewhere in this issue our readers will discover the name of one who has not written for our *Standard Bearer* heretofore. And this requires an introduction and an explanation. I am referring to the *Feature* article from the pen of Dr. John Richard de Witt.

My personal acquaintance with Dr. de Witt goes back several years, to the time when I visited with him at my father's home not long before the latter's death. Prior to that time, I knew of him from his writings in connection with an ecclesiastical battle in the Reformed Church in America, when he was pastor of the Sixth Reformed Church of Passaic, New Jersey, about the historicity of the first chapters of Genesis. Over the years we have become better acquainted with one another through correspondence and through following one another's writings. A few years ago Dr. de Witt sojourned in the Netherlands and in England while studying and doing research for his doctor's degree. His doctoral thesis was a study of "The Westminster Assembly and the Divine Right of Church Government," which we reviewed at the time of its publication. An interesting historical footnote is the fact that while he was in England, Dr. de Witt served as assistant pastor of Grove Chapel, where the late Rev. Henry Atherton (of the Sovereign Grace Union) had been pastor, and where the late Rev. Herman Hoeksema once preached.

At present Dr. de Witt is pastor of the Williamsburg Presbyterian Church, Kingstree, South Carolina. This

accounts for my reference to an insider's viewpoint. Because the crisis in the Southern Presbyterian denomination is very much in the news and has received much journalistic attention since the announcement of an organized movement for a "continuing" Presbyterian Church (Prof. Hanko has repeatedly called attention to Southern Presbyterian developments in "All Around Us"), it was thought that an informative and critical analysis from a reliable "insider" would be instructive and helpful to our readers. Knowing Dr. de Witt as a man who is devoted to the Reformed faith and also as one who is sympathetic toward our Protestant Reformed position, I requested him to write on this subject for our Standard Bearer. When I sent him this request, I emphasized that our magazine is free, i.e., free from any ecclesiastical binding and open to the expression of Reformed opinion, and that he should therefore feel free to express himself frankly. Dr. de Witt has graciously consented to write for us, and, I believe, has acquitted himself well in so doing. His interesting contribution will appear in two consecutive installments. I would suggest that if any of our readers have comments or questions, these should be withheld until the second article has appeared.

I do not think I am breaking any confidences if I quote a few lines from a personal letter from friend de Witt. He wrote me in a letter accompanying his articles: "I have gone a good deal further than a mere reporting of the situation, and on that account I have

hope that this material may be of interest to your readers. Certainly we should value your prayers, and the prayers of your people, for us in our present struggle." And again: "The first article gives the broad lines of the battle; the second attempts an analysis. You will see that I have been quite frank. Some of my brethren might possibly find what I have to say too open and too frank. But nothing is to be gained by

hiding the facts. And our great interest must be the furtherance of the gospel."

We wish to assure Dr. de Witt that our prayers certainly arise to the throne of grace in behalf of all God's people as they "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." We also take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks for his contributions on the "Crisis in the Southern Presbyterian Church."

# **Developments In New Zealand (3)**

Last time we called attention to the fact that the Synod of the Reformed Churches of New Zealand was derelict in its duty to maintain purity of doctrine when it deliberately declined the proper request of the Appeal to express disapproval of the doctrinal errors of Dr. Runia. The Synod did this, you will recall, on the excuse that Dr. Runia was leaving for the Netherlands.

This was, remember, a very crucial point of the Appeal. And it was — and this is more important — a very crucial *test* for the Reformed Churches of New Zealand.

The real test for a church is not so much whether she seems to give approval in a positive sense to certain truths. Especially if the language is careful enough, there are many who will assent to various truths even though they are not in actual agreement. Undoubtedly there often is a degree of mental reservation and dishonesty in such assent. And frequently the language of ecclesiastical decisions is broad enough and vague enough to afford room to those who are not really in agreement. But whatever may be the reason, this is not the point now. The real test comes when a church is confronted by the necessity and the calling to condemn errors repugnant to the truth. This is undoubtedly also one of the reasons why the Formula of Subscription requires of officebearers that they themselves reject error and that they are "disposed to refute and contradict" errors and "to exert ourselves in keeping the Church free from such errors."

This was all the more crucial in this particular instance because it was a known fact that there were those in the Reformed Churches of New Zealand who were in sympathy with Dr. Runia's views and who had defended them. They would, of course, have been "on the spot" if Synod had addressed itself directly to Runia's errors.

It was a political maneuver, therefore, when the Synod passed the motion to by-pass that issue on the alibi that Dr. Runia was departing.

But we suggested last time, too, that the Synod did not really fail to declare itself on these matters and that it is not true that the Synod took no position, or even a neutral position. For over the signature of the Stated Clerk, D.G. Vanderpyl, and in behalf of the Reformed Churches of New Zealand, there was sent to Dr. Runia not only a warm letter of farewell, but a letter of glowing tribute. Here is some of the language of that letter, which I received by tape-recording: "We thank the Lord for having given you to us, for what you have been to our churches as a teacher of so many who now serve our churches as ministers of the Word and sacraments, as editor of Trowel and Sword, as proclaimer of God's Word in Christ, and as a champion of the Reformed faith in the evangelical world of Australasia. We thank you for your clear and forthright work. There have been misunderstandings. There has not always been wholehearted agreement on all points. But we wish to say that we are convinced that you have tried to serve our Lord according to His Word."

And Dr. Runia got the point. For here is his response, as quoted from the bulletin of the Reformed Church of Christchurch, New Zealand: "I cannot tell you how much Mrs. Runia and I have appreciated this letter. In the past some New Zealand brethren have issued serious accusations asserting that my theology was a great danger for the Reformed Churches in Australasia. As you may remember, last year I sent a letter to all the sessions repudiating these accusations. I am very happy indeed that before we leave Australia you have expressed your confidence in me and your appreciation for my work."

It is very plain, therefore:

- 1) That the Reformed Churches of New Zealand were unwilling to condemn the teachings of Runia.
- 2) That the Reformed Churches of New Zealand do not consider that Runia has taught anything which would prevent them from calling him a champion of the Reformed faith.
- 3) That in spite of any positive decisions taken by the Synod, the Reformed Churches of New Zealand are wide open for all who teach and defend the same errors which Runia taught on the various matters touched on in the Appeal.

In addition to this, as we shall see next time, D.V., the Synod very unjustly refused to do anything about the discipline cases of three officebearers who opposed Dr. Runia and who belong to the Reformed and Presbyterian Fellowship of Australasia. In other words, the Synod is guilty of persecuting men who defend the

truth and oppose the lie.

And this is very serious in the light of what our Confession teaches about the marks of the true church.

# Pella's Good Example

Not long ago the secretary of our Theological School Committee, who is also treasurer of our Theological School Building Fund, telephoned me with some encouraging news.

The news was this: our Pella congregation has completed its drive (by means of a series of collections) for the Theological School Building Fund, and has contributed a total of \$1039.50. Consulting the latest statistics available to me at this writing, I find that this averages a little better than \$100 per family.

Up to this time, for various reasons, I have restrained myself from writing about this subject. But when I received this news, I could restrain myself no longer.

This is indeed encouraging news. Pella is one of our smaller congregations. She has been through a period of severe struggle ever since the crisis of 1953, and only recently has she revived and grown somewhat in numbers, to the point where she once more has her own pastor and her own church property. And now Pella is the first of our churches to complete a concerted drive for our Theological School Building, and to do so, too, in royal fashion. I like to believe — and I am certain that this is correct, too — that this is a warm expression of love and devotion on Pella's part toward the cause of our Theological School. Not only does this deserve public acknowledgement and thanks to our Pella congregation, but also it is a cause for gratitude to our God.

And it is a good example!

And it is an example which should provoke all our consistories and congregations to emulation!

I am surely revealing no secrets when I write that on the whole there has been a very lethargic and lackadai-sical attitude and response toward this drive for funds up to this time. We are far, very far, from our goal of new and adequate facilities for our seminary. Nor am I revealing any tales, I think, when I say that a not inconsiderable cloud of criticism has in some cases been allowed to obscure this project and thus to hinder this drive. I could write much about this. And I could also write much about the sore need our school has in this respect. And then I would not hesitate to say that our school is indeed suffering because of the lack of adequate facilities; nor would I hesitate to say that the need for these facilities is far greater and far more urgent than many seem to realize. Our school is pres-

ently handicapped, and its growth and progress will be even more handicapped in the near future if our churches do not act soon. About all this I could write at length; but I will refrain at this time.

I only want to call attention to Pella's worthy example, and to say that when all the dust of criticism concerning such things as the manner of the School Committee's drive and the location of the new building (which, by the way, can be changed by proper procedure and by synodical decision) — the following facts remain:

- 1) Our churches in common, through their synod, have decided upon this project. They did so initially 25 years ago. They did so more recently almost 4 years ago. And they also decided to finance our new school building by a drive and by voluntary contributions, rather than by assessments. This is a solemn commitment of our churches.
- 2) Not only is it true, in general, that all our churches are responsible in common for the care of the seminary and are also very directly dependent upon the seminary; but it is also a fact that there is not one of our churches which does not benefit greatly and constantly from the seminary. All our ministers, old and young, are graduates of the seminary. Abundant have been the mercies of our God upon the churches through our school. This thought alone should provoke us to an outpouring of gratitude to God which will find concrete expression in such royal support as Pella has shown.
- 3) There is not one of our consistories which, with a little concerted effort, cannot do what Pella's consistory has done. Whether this effort be in the form of soliciting or in the form of a series of collections is of no moment. What is important is that the consistories must give leadership and guidance and must kindle the enthusiasm of love and devotion.
- 4) There is not one of our congregations which cannot do what Pella's congregation has done. There may be some differences of degree, true. But if our seminary has the love of our churches and I believe that it has the love then let us all give as we are able.

There is sufficient time before Synod meets to accomplish enough so that we can go ahead next summer, the Lord willing. At our next Synod the Theological School Committee has been mandated to submit final plans for approval. There are five months

left before Synod meets. By that time we can - if we try - collect at least enough funds to enable Synod to give the go-ahead.

Let us imitate Pella's worthy example! Let us go forward in faith and in dedication!

## Feature

# Crisis In The Southern Presbyterian Church (1)

Dr. John Richard de Witt

Few churches in this country have as rich a history as the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or the Southern Presbyterian Church. It has combined within itself the great Presbyterian tradition of Scotland and the New World and also the distinctive tenacity with which many in the southern states have clung to the faith of their fathers. Readers will perhaps be aware of the fact that the PCUS (as I shall call it henceforth) has therefore remained much longer true to the Scriptures than its northern sister denomination, now known as the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (hereafter the UPUSA) from which it broke away at the beginning of the Civil War in 1861. Likewise few denominations in America have produced theologians more distinguished than J. H. Thornwell of South Carolina and R. L. Dabney of Virginia, both of whom were unimpeachable adherents of the Reformed faith and whose works repay reading to this day. Even a cursory look at such a volume as that published by the church's highest court in 1897 to mark the 250th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly will show to what an extent the PCUS was committed, and continued to be committed, to the historic position of the Reformed Churches. In some respects it was, of course, unlike those denominations which trace their origins to the Netherlands, to Germany, or to some other European country. That goes without saying. At the time of the Synod of Dort itself there were nuances of opinion amongst genuinely Reformed theologians, and some of the practices of the various churches differed quite widely. For centuries the Scottish Church, for example, eschewed the use of organs or any instrumental music and any other songs of praise than the Psalms of the Old Testament; it also abolished the observance of religious holidays, and persisted in doing so till fairly recent times. In my own congregation in South Carolina, while Easter is now observed, and the Sundays immediately preceding Christmas are given over to reflection upon the advent of our Lord, yet there is no Christmas service, and neither Ascension Day nor Pentecost is remembered at all. This is not due to carelessness, but to the residual operation of a viewpoint reaching all the way back to the Reformation itself – a viewpoint not shared by all the Reformed

Churches, but one resting upon a principle common to them all: that of the regulatory character of the Word of God. Or as it is expressed in the Belgic Confession: "Since the whole manner of worship which God requires of us is written in them at large, it is unlawful for any one, though an Apostle, to teach otherwise than we are now taught in the Holy Scriptures." (Art. VII) And again: "We reject all human inventions, and all laws which man would introduce into the worship of God, thereby to bind and compel the conscience in any manner whatever." (Art. XXXII)

But that long history of Reformed orthodoxy is at the present time imperilled. Some are arguing indeed that it is already so decayed as to be irretrievably lost. and that the PCUS has ceased to be a Reformed Church in any real sense of the word. It is still very much so constitutionally and confessionally, though even there some important changes have been introduced which show the extent to which the church has deviated from its own historic position, a position still largely reflected in the documents upon which the organization of the denomination is based. Thus, for example, in 1964 the ordination of women as elders and ministers was formally enacted. The list of apostasies in the life and practice of the church as a whole, however, is long and grievous. These have recently been documented in The Presbyterian Journal, the weekly magazine supported and read by conservatives in the church (issue of Oct. 13, 1971). To give only a sampling of what has taken place, in 1961 the General Assembly refused to revise the chapter in the Westminster Confession on predestination, but declared that "in its judgment the doctrine of foreordination to everlasting death as formulated in the Confession is not an adequate statement of the Christian faith." In 1966 the Assembly decided to enter into the Consultation on Church Union (COCU). In 1969 committees were authorized to prepare a new confession of faith and to draw up a plan of union with the UPUSA (the Northern Church), hunger was given "top priority" in the mission of the church, evolution supported as compatible with Genesis, ordinary business for the first time conducted on the Lord's Day. In 1970 the Assembly approved abortion

for "economic reasons," among others, authorized youth delegates to future Assemblies, etc. In addition the presses of the church pour forth a flood of materials in which the biblical position has been abandoned for some shoddy modern substitute, and the denomination has been permeated with the poison of theological confusion and unbelief. The catalogue of departures from the official faith and practice of the church could be extended on any of the levels of the church courts almost without end. One is referred here to the full coverage of these things in the issue of The Presbyterian Journal cited above.

At the same time it should be stated very clearly that a strong conservative minority has remained active in the church, and that the situation is not so unrelievedly dark and dreary as these official actions and trends would seem to indicate. There are many evangelical congregations, even some presbyteries (i.e., classes) with a considerable orthodox majority, and at least two of the synods can upon occasion muster a fair sized conservative preponderance of votes. My own presbytery, for example, is still clearly conservative, and the bulk of the congregations want nothing to do with the new movements which have captured the seats of power on higher ecclesiastical levels. And while the four denominational seminaries (Union at Richmond, Louisville, Austin, and Columbia) are all predominantly on the other side, none of them cleaving any longer to a Reformed or even evangelical point of view, a new seminary - Reformed Theological Seminary at Jackson, Mississippi, founded to serve the PCUS but outside its control – now exists and is growing rapidly, with nearly a hundred students preparing for the ministry. It promises much good for the future, and is certainly far closer to the historic Reformed faith than any of the official seminaries has been for many a long year.

In addition, four organizations have been called into being by the struggle of the past several decades against the incursions of liberalism in its various forms. The first and oldest of them is The Presbyterian Journal, which lays claim to being the "circulation leader among independent publications in the Presbyterian-Reformed world," a claim which there is no reason to doubt. Tens of thousands of readers are every week kept informed on conditions in the PCUS and elsewhere, are instructed in the doctrines of the Word of God, and are being provided with guidance for the battle in the years ahead. Along with the Journal and working closely with those associated in the publishing of it are Concerned Presbyterians, an organization of Presbyterian laymen, Presbyterian Churchmen United, a group of ministers and sessions (i.e., consistories), and the Presbyterian Evangelistic Fellowship, which now also has a missionary arm in its Executive Commission on Overseas Evangelism.

and have been able in some degree to give point and direction to the mounting conservative protest against the prostitution of the gospel which has gained the upper hand in the church as a whole. The high point of the efforts of these groups – and of another organization of moderates calling themselves the Covenant Fellowship of Presbyterians – was reached at the meeting of the General Assembly this past year, 1971, when it was decided by a vote of only 213 to 189 that the church would remain in the National Council of Churches, and the decision to effect a radical (and, it is said, gerrymandered) restructuring of the synods of the denomination passed by a mere ten votes, 217 to 207. Nothing like this strength in terms of numbers has been known at the Assembly in a long while, but so large a minority was achieved only after much arduous work, and many believe that it represented the maximum possible effort, the high watermark of conservative capability in the PCUS. And even though the conservative protest against the leftward march of the denomination was so very much in evidence, the liberal majority pressed right on with its own program, paying little or no heed to the great number of openly dissatisfied and disturbed people among the constituency of the church.

In any case, as if our problems were not already sufficiently grave and the prospects for continuing a Reformed witness in the present situation within the PCUS dim enough, we are now confronted with another issue which vastly outweighs everything else that we have been called upon to face in the past. Though voting has not yet begun in any form, yet it seems certain that in a very few years' time the PCUS and the UPUSA, the southern and northern branches of the Presbyterian Church which separated at the outbreak of the Civil War, will be brought together again. A joint committee of twenty-six has been entrusted with the preparation of a plan of union, a "study draft" of which is already in hand, and which may be voted upon as early as 1973. There is every likelihood that by 1974 or 1975 our denomination will be merged into the United Presbyterian Church. And a considerable number of ministers and congregations who find it possible now to work in the Southern Church because of its essential constitutional and confessional soundness - and also because of the large measure of autonomy which is still reserved to the local churches, in many departments of church life left free from outside interference – are convinced that it will be impossible to have any part at all in the new united denomination which must result from such an amalgamation. I say "new united denomination" because while the two great branches of American Presbyterianism were at the outset very much alike, though not without their differences, yet the passage of time and the more rapid pace with which liberalism captured the citadels of These all co-operate very cordially with one another power in the Northern Church have so changed the

faces of the two bodies as to make them even at the present time in some fundamental respects quite dissimilar.

It will be remembered that it was the Northern Church which in 1929 brought about the re-organization of Princeton Seminary – till that time a bastion of Reformed orthodoxy – which made it necessary for J. Gresham Machen and others in conscience to leave. It was the Northern Church which in 1935 actually deposed Machen from the ministry for his part in the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, established to provide an alternative to the rising modernism in denominational missionary work. It was that same denomination which in the 1960's formulated and adopted the Confession of 1967 and virtually surrendered all binding obligation to adhere to any confession of faith at all. It was an agency of that very church which contributed \$10,000.00 to the Angela Davis defense fund. It is that church which time and again has persisted in trampling upon the moral and spiritual and theological heritage of the whole Christian Church. And it is with that church that the majority among the leadership in the PCUS are bent upon uniting.

One hopes and prays that this will not come about. Not, of course, because there is anything wrong in the nature of the case with church union. Sometimes conservatives, Reformed Christians among them, speak as though church union were something reprehensible, with which Bible believers ought to have nothing to do. In the New Testament the church is conceived of as one, one in spirit (one in the "Spirit"), but also one in organization. The organic unity of the church presupposes an external, an organizational unity as well. Other issues are involved here, however; and therefore, while one must be for the unity of Christians – while one longs for and rejoices in the unity of Christians within the one Church of Christ! - yet one cannot tolerate the union of denominations upon any other basis than that of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism. There is the great question of truth which is at issue here. And it cannot, it will not be ignored.

Indeed, one hopes earnestly that the union of the PCUS and the UPUSA will not come about, and that revival will be granted to the church, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. We recognize the great, crying necessity for a new reformation and for the quickening movement of the Holy Spirit of God. We abhor schism, shun separation, groan for the manifestation of the power of God in the preaching of the gospel of Christ. And we believe further that God can still reverse the present course of events, and restore to us the years that the locust has eaten. There are still those who cling to the doctrines of Paul and Augustine and Calvin and Knox and Thornwell, and who believe that they constitute the only acceptable basis for co-operation and ecclesiastical structure and organization.

But though we take that point of view, yet we realize at the same time that as responsible Christians we have to deal with the situation as we find it, and that it is required of us to make good use of the time the Lord has given us to ensure the continuation of a Reformed and evangelical witness in the historic area of the Southern Church. Some amongst us in the providence of God are doing just that. On the annual "Journal Day," held every summer in support of the work of The Presbyterian Journal, the announcement was made this past August 11 of the formation of a Steering Committee composed of some twelve members from the four conservative organizations mentioned above. This Steering Committee, the chairman of which is the Rev. Donald B. Patterson, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Jackson, Miss., has been "charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing a plan for continuation of a Presbyterian Church loyal to the Scriptures and the Reformed faith." In his address Mr. Patterson declared: "We resolutely set our faces in a new direction. We shall, with God's help, preserve for future generations the witness of our historic faith, that faith once delivered to the saints." The committee is now at work throughout the church, amid denunciations, threats, insinuations, lowering reprisals, and also disappointing defections on the part of some of whom it had been hoped that they would hold firm.

There is in our Book of Church Order a phrase which speaks of the need for promoting the "peace and purity" of the church which, strangely enough, the liberals in the denomination greatly delight to make use of. Time and again conservative movements have been castigated because they endanger the supposed "peace and purity" of the PCUS; and now above all, when a Steering Committee has been delegated the task of laying the groundwork for a continuing church after merger with the UPUSA the outcries are loud and long in which the orthdox who have any part in this effort are denounced for disturbing this same "peace and purity." Yet it is precisely because they believe so much in the doctrines of the gospel and in the confessional and constitutional position of their church, and because they insist that there cannot be peace without purity – that one cannot speak of unity without unity in the truth - that the evangelicals in the denomination have grouped themselves in these organizations and are carrying on the struggle for the faith of the Scriptures. Presbyteries are beginning to warn their constituencies against the four groups behind the Steering Committee on some such ground as an offence against "peace and purity," without any apparent awareness that it is the liberal establishment which has forsaken the Confession of Faith, which has denied the biblical constitution of the church, and which has openly and publicly displayed its hostility for many years toward the fundamental doctrines any believer holds dear and recognizes as indispensable for

the wholeness of his faith and the certainty of his salvation. It is the liberals who are the real offenders against "peace and purity," and we do well to repeat that time and again.

So the battle has been joined. It is a sad thing that one should have to speak of a "battle" in the church, and that one must also come to live in the expectation of a rupture between those who have lived together in a great denomination. But we have not initiated the struggle. Responsibility for wrenching the church loose from her ancient moorings does not rest with us. And

we have not undertaken the movement toward merger with the UPUSA, the merger which will certainly involve the separation of a large part of the church—the liberal part—and their removal to another ecclesiastical connection. We can only attempt to follow the leading of the Word of God, and pray that in the end we shall have the grace to pay whatever price may be required of us if we are to be found faithful and to obey God rather than men.

Next time I hope to say something more in the way of an assessment of the situation.

## The Signs of the Times

# "Pray For Peace"

Rev. G. Van Baren

In our last article we considered the sign of the end: wars and rumors of wars. In that connection, the question arises: what is the attitude of the child of God towards peace on this earth?

That there is a world-desire for peace on this earth seems to be self-evident. There are in our own country many movements which advocate, sometimes vociferously, peace — and often, peace-at-any-price. And how often is not seen today the circle with its inverted and broken cross. It's the "peace sign." One encounters it everywhere. It decorates the clothing of all sorts of people. It adorns many buildings. It is placed upon autos. It has been the "in" thing to display the peace sign. Then there is also the "finger sign," the "V" formed with two of the fingers. It is a sign recognized particularly by the young. Or again, there are the slogans, one of the most crude but prevalent of which is: "Make love, not war."

Again, there have been the formal and official drives for peace on this earth. Nations unite in the United Nations where they find a forum to reveal grievances—rather than resort to war. Nations appear to vie with each other in order to serve as mediators between warring factions. Men are praised for their efforts towards peace—and even receive sizable "prizes" when these efforts are particularly noteworthy or effective.

The whole question of worldly peace faces children of God today. The church no longer lives in that isolation which it had in the past. The passions, the goals, the drives, which are seen in the world, are soon enough reflected in the church too. One sees our young people, especially, give the "peace sign" with their fingers; they draw the "peace symbol" on their papers and books. They also are very free in their use of the word "peace" and its Hebrew equivalent "shalom" when they write their letters.

And who is not for peace? Is this indeed not one endeavor in which the world and the church can join hands? I recall distinctly in my college days already

that many would look askance at any professing the name of Christ who could not "pray for peace" in this world among all men.

#### The plea for peace

That within this world there arises a universal cry for peace is not difficult to understand. The history of this world has been a history of wars. There has been an unmeasured amount of suffering and agony because of wars. Our own generation has known more than its share of war. There is in war the obvious killing and maiming. Not only soldiers are victims in these wars, but civilian populations perhaps suffer even more. These are caught in the cross-fire of two armies. Bombs are dropped on their villages. Parents are killed – with children seeking somehow to sustain their existence by digging through garbage pails (if there are such available). Children are, through violent death, snatched from their parents. Many are cruelly maimed, Soldiers. if they return home at all, might do so without arms or legs. Some are terribly disfigured. The same is true for many of the civilian population. The cruelties of war make one shudder. But even this is not the end. Mass starvation and the spread of many plagues are the fruits of wars too. Thousands die because of malnutrition. Homes have been destroyed, Means of livelihood are taken away.

No wonder that there is a cry arising within this world for a peace that will cover the face of the earth. There is a cry to remove weapons of destruction; to "beat the swords into plowshares." And I can, I think, understand that longing of man who wants to preserve for himself and his family a measure of peace and quiet.

It seems expected that the church would join in this cry for peace. Who, after all, wants war? What is expected, is also done. The church becomes increasingly engaged in the efforts to establish peace. It has its annual "prayer day for peace." (And the Protestant Reformed Churches are looked at askence when any

hear that these churches do not have a "prayer day for peace.") In recent years, many in the church insist that this "prayer for peace" is not sufficient. The church must also do something. Therefore church bodies make ponderous decisions concerning the wrongness of entering into any offensive or defensive nuclear warfare. Decisions are made urging especially the United States to disengage unilaterally in Southeast Asia. Decisions are made concerning the "conscientious objector" to selected wars. And individuals, emphasizing their "Christianity," burn their draft cards; they seek ways to escape the draft. Ah, yes; the church wants "peace" too!

But before entering further into the problem, it is well to consider of what we are speaking when we mention "peace." Within the world, peace might be defined negatively by stating that it is the absence of war. I suspect that one who was pressed to give a positive expression of "peace" would insist that it is brotherhood among men whereby the needs of all would be met. Peace would be some sort of euphoria in man's utopia.

The question which must be answered for us is: what is the Scriptural idea of peace? Scripture does use the word "peace" in that common sense: absence of war. Yet both in the Old and New Testaments it soon becomes evident that the idea of "peace" includes far more than man usually suggests by it. In fact, I would maintain that the Scriptural idea of true peace is at variance with the world's idea of peace.

First, what the world seeks when it speaks of peace is in reality a farce. The peace which the world seeks is a sinful thing. Scripture says that the wicked are hypocritical when they claim to be seeking peace (Jer. 6:14; Ps. 28:3; Is. 57:21). In actual fact, says Scripture, there is *never* peace to the wicked (Is. 48:22; I Thess. 5:3). More yet: the wicked have never known the way of peace — in spite of their claim that they seek it (Rom. 3:17; Is. 59:8). Nor did Jesus come to establish peace here on this earth among all men (Matt. 10:34). And peace remains impossible for the wicked until the root-trouble is removed: their lust (James 4:1-2).

Secondly, the Word reveals what is true peace — a peace which is possible only for the church of Jesus Christ. The only source of all peace is God Himself (Heb. 13:20; Eph. 1:2; I Cor. 14:33; II Thess. 3:16). God is pleased to establish peace (that is, reconciliation to Himself in the way of complete payment for our sins) with His people through Jesus Christ (Eph. 2:14-15; Rom. 5:1; Col. 1:20). This peace is the subject of the preaching (Acts 10:36; Rom. 10:15). That peace reveals itself in the saints through a godly, spiritual walk (Rom. 8:6; Col. 3:15; Gal. 5:22; Heb. 12:14). It is for this spiritual peace upon the church for which we constantly pray — and for nothing else (Ps. 122:6).

## Pray for worldly peace?

Must I not join many others in this world in seeking

earthly peace — and praying for that? To refuse to pray for this sort of peace is considered almost non-Christian. In fact, if one were to maintain that he can not pray for worldly peace, then the alternative is pointed out: he must be praying for wars in this earth. Therefore many Christians join together in praying for worldly peace. Then many Christians consider it a mark of piety to give "peace" signs or sign their letters with "peace" without always distinguishing that sort of peace which they do seek.

I refuse to be placed before such a godless dilemma: pray either for godless wars or for godless peace. Any who would place a Christian before these two choices, seek to compel them to chose the lesser of two evils—and then insist that this must be the subject of our prayers. I can not simply pray for wars as such—for wars are evidences of the evil lusts which fill the hearts of men. Nor can I pray for that hypocritical sort of peace which man seeks today—a peace in which he can concentrate all his endeavors in the service of sin and against God and His Kingdom.

I object, too, when "peace" is placed in some sort of category such as "motherhood." Why, no one is against "motherhood"! How much less ought one to be against "peace"? But this comparison is also extremely misleading. One may emphatically be "for" motherhood — but surely not in the way of violation of God's seventh commandment. So also the Christian is "for" peace — but not such sort of peace which is established contrary to God's holy law. What is done in violation to God's law, must be condemned as being sinful.

Therefore, too, the child of God must beware lest he give even the appearance of joining this world in its evil endeavors. There is simply no place for the world's "peace signs" in the life of the saints. We ought to shun that as the plague. Therefore also, though I can and must pray for peace, I do not desire to join all men on specific days for "prayers for peace." I believe that the peace of this world and the peace which surpasses all understanding are diametrically opposed. When I seek the one, I reject the other. When I seek the peace of my Master, I reject the peace of the Master of darkness (Matt. 6:24).

## Pray for heavenly peace

There is the better way — the only way. One must seek and pray for the peace which surpasses understanding. He must pray that God's peace be established now in the hearts of the elect of God, and that it finally be established in all of its glory and perfection in heaven itself.

When I pray for that peace, I understand that I am praying that all the signs of which Scripture speaks will also be fulfilled. I do not pray "for" war or "for" famine as such. I pray rather that God work all things on this earth that His Word may be fulfilled in all of its details. I pray for grace to submit to that will of God. I can not pray for less. I can not pray that anything may

happen contrary to the revelation of His Word. I can not pray that the signs He has given us concerning the soon-return of Christ be removed. I pray that His will may be done.

I pray that peace may be established in the hearts of all His elect in the way of their regeneration and calling. I pray that God may reconcile His own to Himself and bring them to the consciousness and confession of that reconciliation. That spiritual peace I desire for myself and for all of the saints. And I understand that such peace is contrary to that sort of peace which man

strives to establish.

In praying for peace, I pray, finally, for the peace of the new heavens and the new earth where righteousness dwells. There all wars will be removed — for lust shall be rooted out. There shall be no more sin. Righteousness shall fill that Kingdom. Peace shall dwell there. For God and His people shall dwell together through Jesus Christ in beautiful fellowship and communion.

No wonder we rejoice even now in the fact that "... The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4:5).

## Studies in Baptism

# The Mode Of The One Baptism

Rev. Robt. C. Harbach

[Editor's Note: An earlier installment of this study appeared under the title, "Various Baptisms Exemplifying One Baptism." Due to space limitations, the last part of that article was omitted. It may, however, very well serve as an introduction to this article. The omitted section was as follows:

The New Testament records eleven cases of baptism, which may be found in Matthew 3, Acts 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, and I Corinthians 1. It is remarkably significant that five of these cases were household (or family) baptisms. For the families of Cornelius, Lydia, the Philippian jailer, Crispus and Stephanus were baptized. We may inject the thought here that if, as our Baptist brethren will be sure to argue, there were no infants in these families, why is it that Baptists do not practice family baptism? Continuing, among these eleven cases of baptism, three of them were purely individual baptisms, the reason being obvious when they are identified as Jesus' baptism, Paul's, and the Ethiopian eunuch's.

What we hope to do, D.V., in the next installment in this series is to begin with the first case of baptism in the New Testament, that of our Lord, indicating how to avoid error in connection with it, and proving that it was not at all by immersion, but rather in perfect harmony with the Old Covenant's "various baptisms."]

The Flood was, for the family of Noah, a baptism: so for the congregation of Israel the passage through the Red Sea, and the clouds pouring out water on the Lord's inheritance in the wilderness was a baptism. Early pictures were these baptisms, continued in the frequent prophecies of the outpouring of the Spirit. The subject as treated in the Reformed standards has both mode and meaning clearly determined. Mode is there expressed by such terms as poured and sprinkled, implying the also accompanying terms expressing meaning, as purging, cleansing and having been washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ. The actual cases of baptism in the New Testament, about eleven in number, so far from being in conflict with all this, will rather be therewith in confident and unshakable agreement.

The Lord's baptism is the first case on record in the New Testament. It is commonly assumed that He was immersed. If the two previous articles are kept in mind, such an idea would be viewed as actually impossible. The Old Testament does not countenance it. Yet a superficial reading of Matthew's account might lead one to presuppose immersion, as also a failure to exegete the passage would. Also one might stick at a minor inaccuracy in our Confession to suppose this. The last statement is not made in any supercilious sitting in judgment of the Reformed fathers and their highly actoomed and all supposes This should be

plain from the article entitled, "Various Baptisms," relative to certain expressions in the Three Forms of Unity and our liturgies. But when the Confession says, "the Son was seen in the water" (Art. IX), it would be more accurate to say that he was "seen by the water." This is especially true when one understands the proper use of prepositions in the Greek New Testament. The same article in the Confession also states that "our Lord was baptized in Jordan." This has the backing of Mark 1:9. But it does not necessarily follow from His being baptized in a certain river area that He "was seen in the water." That He was actually seen in the water is neither a report of an eye-witness, nor a claim of Scripture, explicitly or implicity. No one is ever going to prove that He was in the water, let alone seen in the water. John says he saw the Spirit descending upon Him. From that alone, and so from the manner in which He was baptized with the Holy Ghost, it might be legitimately concluded that also the water of baptism was seen descending upon Him. For there is always something perfectly visible in every case of baptism, and that is, "water . . . is seen on the body of the baptized" (Art. XXXIV). Matthew in his account says, not that, upon being baptized, He went up out of the water (KJV), but went up from the water (Greek).

One of two interesting words in Matthew's account

was not at all in the water, but by the water. Nor is it anywhere stated in Scripture that He was baptized in water, but with water. The difference between these two prepositions must not only be maintained, but also appreciated. The Greek preposition en has reference to place or it has reference to means. When it refers to place, as it does in Matt. 3:6, it is properly translated in. When the idea is that of means or instrument, then it is properly translated with. The KJV is correct in having "with water" and "with the Holy Ghost" (3:11). The ASV is correct at this point only in its margin. Mark states, "John did baptize in the wilderness," "baptized in the river Jordan," denoting place. The KJ translators properly understood Mark's meaning when they translated the same preposition, "with water" and "with the Holy Ghost." These venerable translators show understanding of en as it appears twice in the same place: "in their synagogue . . . a man with an unclean spirit" (1:23). In the synagogue he was, but in the unclean spirit he was not; it was in him! Also we find, "with what judgment ye judge, and with what measure ye mete" (Matt. 7:2). Furthermore, en is quite correctly rendered by, as in "neither by heaven, nor by the earth, neither by thy head" (5:34-36). So it would be perfectly accurate to have, "the Son was seen by the water."

The other interesting word in Matthew 3 is katabainon, descending. As Jesus was baptized with the Holy spirit, the Spirit came descending upon Him, agreeing with the promise, "I will pour out My Spirit." The Lord's baptism with water is perfectly congruent to His baptism with the Spirit. John 1:31-33 (KJV) stands in proof of this. Also this perfectly agrees with Matthew writing, according to the KJV, that He went up out of the water, and with Mark that He was coming up out of the water. For while Matthew uses "apo", from the water, Mark has "ek," which should also be translated from (the water). Much appeal has been made to two other Greek prepositions, ek and eis, to support, practically exclusively, the ideas out of and into, respectively, in order to teach that the baptized went down into the water and came up out of the water, and that in the very act of baptism. But when you examine the usage of eis and ek in Scripture, you find something quite different from this claim. In John 20, Mary Magdalene comes "unto (eis) the tomb" to find the stone removed "from (ek) the tomb." Here it is plain that Mary went to the tomb, not into it, and that the stone was taken from the tomb, not out of it. Then Peter and John "went toward (eis) the tomb" and John "came first to (eis) the tomb . . . yet entered not in." Peter arriving, "entered into the tomb ... Then entered in . . . the other disciple" (vv. 1-8). Here is demonstrated the distinction between "going to" and "going into." By itself, eis means to, expressing motion toward, as in John 20:1,3,4. To express motion into, the preposition is both prefixed to the verb

and added after the verb, as in v. 6, eiselthen eis. (See Acts 9:6,8,17; Matt. 18:3; John 3:5; Mk. 2:1; Mt. 5:20). So then Mark 1:10, 11 ought to be translated, "coming up, from (ek) the water" and "a voice came from (ek) the heavens," as in John 20:1, "from (ek) the sepulchre."

The next case of baptism in the New Testament is that of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Whereas, in the case of Jesus, His baptism with water (the symbol) took place before His baptism with the Spirit (the reality), it is just the reverse with the three thousand souls at Pentecost. They first experienced the real baptism, then received symbolical baptism. That they "were all filled with the Holy Spirit" (2:4) means not that they were somehow put into the Spirit, but the Spirit was put into them (Ezek. 36:27). The Spirit came upon them appearing like cloven tongues of fire, and "sat upon each of them." So the church was "baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 1:5). Then Peter commanded them to be baptized with water, and that baptism also took place (2:38, 41). How it was performed, there is no question. That mode cannot, one way or the other, be determined from these New Testament cases of baptism, is a contention which cannot be maintained in the face of Acts 1:5, 8; 2:3,4,17,18,33,38f. Peter explains the supernatural baptism with the Spirit in the words, "saith God, 'I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh,' and, 'I will pour out in those days of My Spirit." God through Christ "hath shed forth" (poured out; same word as in vv. 17 and 18) the Spirit. When Peter exhorted, "Repent and be baptized" and "they were baptized" (41), it could not have been done any otherwise than as graphically delineated in this whole context and in every place where is found the promise of the outpoured Spirit.

The next case is the baptism of the people of Samaria (Acts 8:12-16). It is remarkable, to say the least, that here where you have baptism water is not mentioned, yet mode is indicated (8:16)! What follows is the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch. Especially verses 38 and 39 are sure to be emphasized, calling attention to "down into the water . . . and . . . up out of the water." The question is who experienced this action? Also, which is first, in the account, the action of going down, or the action of coming up? In answer, we point out that Philip, as commanded, joined the eunuch as he was traveling by chariot in the desert. Running beside the vehicle, he heard the man reading aloud the prophecy of Isaiah. Keeping up with the lumbering chariot, Philip greeted the man with the sudden, "Doubtless so! Yet understandest thou what thou readest?" (Gk.). Then the man desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." Then Philip instructed him in the Scripture he had been reading, Isaiah 53. Likely it is that Philip also gave him some insights into the immediately preceding context,

52:13-15. For since the man requested baptism, we would think naturally the baptism of Isaiah 52:15 would be in mind: "So shall He sprinkle many nations." Philip complying with the request, the man "commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Here three things occurred: (1) they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch: (2) he baptized him, and (3) they came up out of the water. To be carefully noted is the fact that the going down into the water and the coming up out of the water did not constitute the baptism. The baptism took place between the going down and the coming up. Since the going down and the coming up are said of both of them, the words cannot imply immersion, as Philip obviously would not immerse himself along with the eunuch. That both went down, both Philip and

the eunuch, has them now stepping down out of the chariot where casual water immediately confronts them.

For "into (to, eis) the water," compare Matt. 12:41, "they repented at (eis) the preaching of Jonah," Mk. 5:19, "Go home to (eis) thy friends," John 11:31,32,38, "she goeth unto (eis) the grave... she fell down at (eis) his feet ... Jesus ... cometh to (eis) the grave." Also see again John 20:1,3,4,8. For "up out of (ek) the water," compare John 13:4, "He riseth from (ek) supper" and "Mary... seeth the stone taken away from (ek) the sepulchre" (20:1). The stone, not being in the sepulchre, needed not to be removed out of it, simply from it. Both Philip and the eunuch went down to the water, stood at the water, where the baptism was then performed; then came up from the water. Sound exegesis sees neither of them in the water.

## The Day of Shadows

# **Leaving And Cleaving**

Rev. John A. Heys

It has been said that married life demands teamwork.

With this we can agree. Husband and wife must cooperate fully. They must always work together as members of the same "team." Never must they think, will or act as players on an opposing team do, or as individuals with personal goals that militate against the "team" which they represent.

However, let it be clearly understood that in marriage there is no trading of "players" to another "team," as is done so frequently in the world of sports. The husband may not, for a younger, more vivacious "player" trade off his aging wife who shows the effects of bearing his children. The wife is not to separate from her husband whose health is broken and whose finances have diminished to a marked degree. She is not to ask to be traded to another "team" where the financial and social advantages are greater. She is not to do this even though she never literally vowed "for better, for worse, in sickness, in health" to be his wife. They are not to do this even though they no longer love each other in that physical sense that brought them together years before this present state of affairs.

The married are married for life. God said that after He created Eve. Not Adam, not Moses, but God gave this unbreakable law. Reading Genesis 2:21-25 it does not become plain that this is not Adam's word. He is speaking in verse 23, and there he declares, "This is

now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of Man." Then we read, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." It might seem as though this is the continuation of Adam's speech. Were it not for the testimony of Jesus in Matthew 19:4, 5 we would most likely take such a position. But Jesus says, "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother . . . and cleave . . .: and they twain shall be one flesh?" It is God's law that when a man takes a wife he must consider her and deal with her for life as his wife.

The idea is not that a man sins if he does not leave his father and mother to take a wife. Paul, who repeats this principle in Ephesians 5:31 never took a wife. He also has something good to say about single life in I Corinthians 7 when the considerations are spiritual. But the meaning is that once a man has taken a wife, he must leave father and mother and must cleave unto his wife. He may not cleave any longer to father and mother. He must cleave to his wife. He must leave his father and his mother. He may not leave his wife.

And though these words are addressed to the man who takes a wife, the parents of that man (and woman) will also leave that man. In process of time they are going to leave him through the corridor of death. The son may not when this occurs be a young man any more. He may have seen God's word fulfilled in the earthly lives of his parents, that they have seen their "children's children." But leave him these parents will, sooner or later. However from the moment that their children have taken husbands or wives, they, the parents, must leave them alone. It is not easy after ruling them from the days of their birth through some twenty years, more or less, to let go completely and now let them rule themselves and their wives and families. But the wise parents will keep hands off the disciplining of the grandchildren, and they will carefully avoid spoiling their children's children. Surely they will be very careful not to set the grandchildren against their parents. It is not, either, an uncommon thing for parents to encourage their children to come running home after a disagreement or difference of opinion because their parents have shown that they are not as insistent as God is that they be one flesh. The wise and spiritual parent will realize that there is a message for him also in this word of God.

One message implied in the verse is that wise and spiritual parents will warn their children when they give evidences of planning to link themselves as one flesh with those that are spiritually incompatible. Not only will they point out the sin thereof, as pictured very clearly by Paul in II Corinthians 6:14-18. But they will emphasize the truth in Genesis 2:24 that marriage is for life, and that such an unequal yoke will have to be borne for life! They will warn of the consequences for the children that God may be pleased to give them.

Now the leaving and cleaving are controlled by the being one flesh. Married children are not to leave their father and mother in every respect. They are still to cleave to them in love. They must still honor them as their father and mother. And in the twilight of the earthly life of these parents they, the married children, are to gladden them with visits as frequently as is possible, or with letters and phone calls. By that time they ought to be able to appreciate, as they never could before their marriage, what their parents have done for them. They can then also look ahead a bit and consider Jesus' words, "And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye likewise to them." Luke 6:31

Now to cleave unto each other does not simply mean live together, as noble as that may be. They must cleave to each other as one flesh. And that they are one flesh means that they need each other, that they are two parts of one whole that cannot function as it ought without each part serving with the other. Each half, then, must not try to live for itself. In fact, each half must not simply live for the other half. This will become evident as soon as God gives them children. The wife cannot live for the husband, The husband cannot live for the wife. Both must then live for the family. They must leave their fathers and mothers and

cleave to each other for the sake of being one flesh, as well as being one flesh.

Now they are joined together as one flesh not only to bring forth the covenant seed. And the idea surely is that unless they are man and wife they may not live like one flesh. They had better cleave to father and mother then in a son or daughter relation. But they are one flesh in order that they may jointly and fully live as the bride of Christ. Remember that the things of the kingdom happen in parables. Mark 4:11. With our narrow, man-centered, atheistic eyesight the things which we see are the real and only thing. The vine is the vine, the lamb is the lamb. But the Word of God tells us that Christ is The Vine, and all our vines which we see and have classified are but pictures of Him. He is The Lamb, and the creatures we call lambs are but pictures of a more wonderful and higher reality in Him. And, by the way, in Mark 4:11 the word these is in italics, because Jesus actually says, "All things are done in parables." And so our marriage also is not the reality but a picture of that blessed oneness between Christ and His Bride, the Church. Let it in passing also be pointed out that in Christ and His Bride we have an eternal cleaving, a oneness that never ends, in a perfect faithfulness on the part of Christ. And since our marriage is a picture of that oneness, we may not under any circumstances end the cleaving and the being one flesh. We sin when we break that picture. We sin against Christ!

Remember, too, that this word of God is connected up with the creation of Eve, and therefore is presented as a principle before there was any sin in the world. The leaving and cleaving is not an ordinance made necessary by sin, and is not a regulation to restrain sin. It was a divine ordinance that God established for righteous Adam and Eve. They were to cleave to each other and live as one flesh. And it is still the God ordained way for man through all time in order that he may serve God fully with the combined male-female life.

At the same time the text condemns all bigamy. God made one wife for Adam and told him to cleave to her. It is quite true that in Genesis 2:24 God does not lead Moses to say, "And the two shall be one flesh." But He does say this on the occasion of making for man only one wife and in that connection saying that they should be one flesh. And it is one flesh that He here declares that they shall be. What is more that same Spirit did guide Paul in Ephesians 5:31 to say, "... and they two shall be one flesh." And Jesus said the same thing in Matthew 19:5.

Besides, do not all of our own experiences teach us that a man with two wives or more destroys that very idea of *one* flesh? Would it not be a flesh and a half, if he had two wives? And that is not only nonsense but exactly makes living as one flesh impossible. Man and wife can live one life as one flesh. But the other

woman (or man) who is added will see to it that the oneness between the first two is disrupted. That man cannot give all to more than one wife, cannot cooperate fully with two. He will always be holding back something from the one that he gives to the other. And does not Scripture also teach clearly the truth that one man and one wife are one flesh, and anything more destroys the whole picture of Christ and His Bride? What trouble there was for Abraham from the day he took Hagar to stand beside Sarah! What a miserable life Jacob had, what a disruption of the oneness there was between him and his two wives! Let no man say that Scripture does not condemn bigamy. These stories did not need to be recorded in Scripture to give us a full account of the covenant line and for the revelation of Christ as our Saviour. But they are included and in unmistakable language set forth to show that he who violates this principle that they two shall be one flesh is sinning against an unchangeable ordinance of God.

The expression "one flesh" also indicates that this oneness is only for this life. They are not one spirit, but one flesh. Husband and wife do not lose their spiritual identity, nor their own personal spiritual life. But they are one flesh, and that means that being joined as husband and wife, they are such as long as the *flesh* of both of them lives. In the life to come they will be neither male nor female, husband nor wife. They will

no longer be flesh. All shall be the bride of Christ cleaving to Him as a perfect body of varied members, each member in its place functioning with the other members in a perfect service of love.

Let those, then, who contemplate marriage give serious thought to the fact that it is going to be for life. Let them also bear in mind that they are to be one flesh for a full service to Christ in every aspect of their life. They are to be one in body and soul. If for spiritual reasons they already see the impossibility of such a life together, it ought not be entered into, and all plans to do so should be dropped. Our young people ought to seek that other half in the church; and their first consideration should be the prospects for a full sharing of life in the worship and service of Christ. Doctrinal differences can prevent full cleaving with the soul, and produce a fraction of the "one flesh." A marriage that is a four-fifths flesh instead of one flesh is tragic. But so is one that is a nine-tenths flesh instead of one whole flesh.

And those already joined as one flesh find so much need to go to this God Who ordained marriage to pray for the grace of His Son to enable them to live a life that is a true picture of His faithful cleaving to His bride, and to live a life that is indeed *one* flesh, putting aside selfish interests and carnal ambitions that threaten to divide that one flesh into one battle field.

## Contending for the Faith

## The Doctrine of Atonement

THE REFORMATION PERIOD THE SYNOD OF DORDT

Rev. H. Veldman

It is also of interest to read the reaction of the Netherlands professors to the position of the Remonstrants with respect to the atonement of Christ and their own view of the same. These professors were Gomarus, Polyander, Thysius and Walleus. Sybrandus Lubbertus, another professor, read this judgment of his colleagues and expressed his agreement with it.

First of all, these professors, in three propositions, set forth the greatness of the satisfaction of Christ and that this ransom of the cross must be proclaimed to all men without distinction.

I

We confess that the merit and the power of the death and the satisfaction of Christ is so worthy and of such great value, not only because of its completeness but also because of the infinite worthiness of His persons, that the same (a) is not only sufficient to blot

out the sins of all men, even of the greatest, but also to save all the descendants of Adam, even though there were many more, if they but embrace the same with a true faith.

(a) Acts 20:28. God has purchased His Church with His own blood.

Heb. 9:14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

1 Pet. 1:18. Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.

(b) 1 John 1:7. The blood of Christ cleanses us from all sins.

John 3:16. For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Rom. 3:22. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference.

1 Cor. 6:11. And such were some of you (namely idolaters, adulterers, thieves, covetous); but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

#### П

Neither need we doubt but that this has been the meaning and the purpose of God the Father, delivering His Son; and of Christ, delivering Himself; that He should pay such a great ransom. For all that Christ has accomplished by His death, He has done that according to His Father's and His own purpose and design.

a. I seek not My will, but the will of the Father, Who has sent me; John 5:30.

As the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do; John 14:31.

#### Ш

And this has never been denied by those of orthodox sentiment, that to Christian peoples and to all those to whom the Gospel is proclaimed, this same ransom of Christ must be proclaimed as such and without distinction, and offered in the name of Christ, and this seriously and according to the counsel of the Father, in the meantime leaving His hidden judgments to God, Who distributes and appropriates this grace to as many and far as He wills, and to whom He wills.

Acts 13:38, 39. Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.

2 Cor. 5:20. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

b. Acts 11:20, 21. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.

1 Cor. 3:6. I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.

John 3:8. The Spirit bloweth where it listeth.

1 Cor. 12:3. No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.

But if you view the peculiar and particular purpose, and the saving power of the death of Christ, then we declare that Jesus Christ, according to the counsel of the Father and His own, did not die effectually for the reprobates, but only for the elect and who shall believe, namely, in order that He would not only obtain for them the forgiveness of sins and rec-

onciliation with God through His merits, but that He would also impart to them His powerful grace, by which He would actually make us partakers of them.

Having set forth these propositions, the Netherlands professors then proceed to base view upon Scripture and logical reasoning based upon the Scriptures. They quote Matt. 1:21, John 10, Acts 20:28, Eph. 5:25 and Rev. 5:8, 9. Their references to Matt. 1:21 and John 10 are understandable. Interesting is their observation in connection with Rev. 5:8,9: "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Commenting upon this passage, the professors remark that it cannot be said of them for whom Christ died to have been redeemed out of all peoples and nations if the Lord died for all men, head for head.

Secondly, in support for their contention that Christ died only for His own elect, the Netherlands professors observe that Christ died for His own effectually, died for them as their Head; this implies that He died for them in the sense that He delivered them from the guilt of death. In support of this they remark that otherwise it would be impossible for God to condemn and punish them for their sins. This reasoning, too, cannot be refuted. It is surely easily understandable. If Christ died for all men, and He died atoningly, then He paid for the sins of all men. Then God, of course, cannot punish any man for sins committed, inasmuch as they have been blotted out by the blood of the cross. However, this also means that the doctrine of a universal atonement is a contradiction in terms. That Christ died for those who perish means that He did not atone for their sins. And this means that, according to the Arminian conception of the cross of Calvary, nothing really happened upon the cross of Golgotha.

Thirdly, these Netherlands professors make an interesting observation concerning the promises of Holy Writ. They speak of those to whom the promises were committed, namely the promises given in the Old Testament, that Christ would be delivered into death, and that the fruit of it and the saving benefits would accrue through Him to the Congregation. They declare that Christ died effectually only for them and that these promises were committed only to the elect. In support of this they refer to Rom. 9:7-8: "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

We consider this to be a very interesting statement.

We read in Canons III and IV, Art. 8: "As many as are called by the gospel, are unfeignedly called. For God hath most earnestly and truly declared in His Word, what will be acceptable to Him; namely, that all who are called, should comply with the invitation. He. moreover, seriously promises eternal life and rest to as many as shall come to Him, and believe on Him." Now it is true that we read the expression in this article: "should comply with the invitation." However, this can hardly be called a correct translation of this article. A correct translation of this article, according to the Prof. H. C. Hoeksema's article in the Standard Bearer. Vol. 33, page 283, would be: "As many, however, as are called by the Gospel, are seriously called. For God has seriously and most truly shown in His Word, what is pleasing to Him, namely, that the called should come unto Him. He even promises seriously to all those coming to Him and believing rest of soul and eternal life." We have no difficultly seeing the difference between this translation and the article as it appears in the back of our psalter. We may notice that this article speaks of the promises of God, that the Lord seriously promises eternal life and rest to as many as shall come to Him and believe on Him. Is it not very interesting that the Netherlands Professors, in their statement quoted above, maintain that the promises of the Old Testament, involving Christ and His cross and its saving

benefits, are committed only to the elect?

Finally, in support of their contention that Christ died only for the elect, these professors quote several Scriptural passages. They declare, moreover, that, according to the Word of God, Christ never knew the reprobates, Matt. 7 and 25, is not merciful to them but hates them, Rom. 9, and also that the reprobates are all hardened. They also add that these expressions of Holy Writ permit but one interpretation. One may interpret these passages as gently as possible, according to these professors, but they cannot be interpreted in any other way than that Christ died exclusively for the elect.

These professors conclude their opinion by rejecting certain Arminian presentations of the death of Christ. We need not call attention to these Arminian views at this time. They taught, among other things, that Christ did not die specifically for the elect, but only for their good, that the possibility exists that none for whom Christ died would be saved, and that Christ did not arise from the dead for all for whom He died. We will have opportunity to call attention to these errors of the Remonstrants when we treat what the Canons have to teach us in their second head of doctrine. It is clear, however, generally speaking, that the delegates to the Great Synod of Dordt were opposed to any universal conception of the cross and death of Christ.

## The Strength of Youth

# Commanded To Bear Children

Rev. J. Kortering

In our study of the Christian family, we now come to the subject of parenthood. We have considered courtship, marriage, the role of husband and wife, and quite naturally we now should take a look at the place of children within the home thus begun by marriage.

Young people are interested in this subject. Quite often we read in church bulletins that our young people are going to discuss the population explosion, birth control, ecology and overpopulation, etc. There is a place for this subject in this youth rubric as well.

#### CHILDREN NOT WANTED

In the past, we could properly assume that marriage and children were inseparably connected. If a young couple were able to reproduce, they were expected, and they usually desired, to have children. This assumption, however, cannot be made today. There are two reasons.

First, through the technology of modern medicine,

methods have been advanced that will allow a husband and wife to engage in sexual relationship without producing children. These methods have become widely publicized, and the necessary applicances or medication are easily accessible to anyone. As a result of this, having children has entered into the area of volition. True, this has been somewhat true in the past; yet marriage manuals of only a decade ago warn couples that any method of birth control is not entirely reliable, except to abstain entirely from sexual relations. Things are different today.

Secondly, social pressures are placed upon newly-weds not to have children, or at least to have very few. These pressures are many and varied. Under the influence of women's liberation, many women consider bearing children an interference with their personal satisfaction in life. Who wants to get tied down with kids? Who can find fulfillment in doing dishes, preparing meals, changing diapers, getting up nights to

feed a whimpering child? Freedom to these people means being free from children. Similarly, from the husband's point of view, less children means more money for pleasures, more free time, less headaches (at least from the noise of kids). Parents face a great deal of pressure from ecologists and those concerned about the pollution problem, brought on in part from overpopulation. These pressures are tremendous. It used to be that parents with a large family would go shopping and people would smile, "My what a nice family!" Today you might get a scowl, or even the lip, from someone asking why you are contributing to the world's woes with such a tribe. Government pressures are mounting along the same line. Thousands of tax dollars are being used to promote planned parenthood, sex education in the public schools, educating people about the patriotism of restraint. We may even see the day when legal action will be taken to control directly the size of families. Laws are seriously being considered today to grant the government power to take children out of a home that the government thinks cannot provide properly for these children. Why not logically prevent their birth in the first place? The pressure is on.

This general attitude helps us understand the horrible plight of the unwanted child. If married people become so selfish that they don't want children because they are a nuisance, or they "righteously" are determined to prevent the birth of children in support of man's survival upon the earth, what happens if these efforts fail? Suddenly a woman learns of the fact she is expecting a child; she forgot her pill, something went wrong. What about the child? The answer, "Kill it." No, not him or her; kill it! They reason away life and extoll the freedom of abortion. Some do not have the courage for that; they give birth. These children and many others, become the objects of abuse and neglect that is a shame to our nation. Doctors tell us that one of the worst demonstrations of our nation's immorality and depravity is the unwanted child who is abused. Kicked, burned, starved, sometimes beaten to a pulp, the helpless and defenseless child bears the brunt of a generation of people who put that kind of value on children. This happens so often that anyone with a conscience cannot help but wince at the thought. Is it because some people are sick? Basically, it is because America is so depraved that the general value placed upon children, usually unwanted, is brought to its horrible conclusion that that which isn't wanted can be abused as well.

### MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN

Wherein lies the strength for covenant youth? If you are seriously dating, perhaps engaged to be married, you undoubtedly discuss at times what should be your attitude toward children? When you get married, will you want children? Will you determine ahead of time

how many you will agree to have? If you seriously come to some of these conclusions, you will not be alone. This is very common, even among Christian young people. How much must the concern for overpopulation affect the church? Must the church leaders join planned parenthood? If so, the answer will be the usual, but I beg to differ. The reason is not that we laugh at the world's problem of pollution, nor that we bury our heads in the sand as the proverbial ostrich and ignore the social implications of bearing children. The reason is that God tells us to bring forth children. The strength of youth is not in man's judgment, but in God's command. The title of this article is, "Commanded to Bear Children." This is Scriptural.

Let's consider four Scriptural principles that must help us reach a correct conclusion.

First, child bearing is the wifely role designated by God. Consider Gen. 3:16, "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." Paul in his letter to Timothy comments on this. "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety," I Tim 2:14, 15. What does this mean, "She shall be saved in childbearing?" Some are quick to explain that this applies only to the Old Testament women who would find themselves in the line of Abraham and David, thus producing the seed which would ultimately produce Christ the Savior. This is, of course, true. Does this, however, exclude the New Testament women? Again the answer is No; it includes them, for Paul broadens out, "If they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety." This he applies to the New Testament woman. This is true: God uses women as the means to bring forth the covenant seed, and by this activity Christ was born in the fulness of time and Christ will return at the end of time. For a woman to ignore or refuse this role is to reject her salvation and turn her back on God's redemption.

Secondly, the Word of God commands wives to bear children. In Old Testament language, "Be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it," Gen. 9:1. This command came after the flood, and God willed to populate the world once again. We have the same idea expressed in I Tim. 5:14, 15, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. For some are already turned aside after Satan." Timely exhortation, isn't it? Notice carefully that Paul in the Holy Spirit is not saying that it might be nice to have children if you can afford it, or if you like children; but he says, "I will that younger women marry and bear children." This isn't man's opinion, but it is God's Word.

Thirdly, the beauty of marital harmony is demonstrated in the children produced through this union. It is God's will that through the complete union of husband and wife, body, soul, and spirit, children be born as expressions of this true love. The important question is this: can it be called true love (according to the Word of God) if husband and wife want sex without being willing to accept the children God may be pleased to give them through that relationship? Scripture emphasizes that they two shall be one flesh through marriage, Eph. 5:31. This is realized through the complete fusion of life in those married not only, but in a very concrete way, in the children that are born through this union. How can husband and wife say before God that they love each other in the fear of the Lord if they do not want the fruits of this love, namely children? Only one conclusion is evident: refusal to bear children, whether on the part of husband or wife, is selfishness and cannot be construed to express obedience before God.

Closely connected with this is the term the Bible uses to describe the love-life between husband and wife. This is the verb "to know." An example of this is found in Gen. 4:1, "Adam knew Eve his wife and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord." Reference is made in Matt. 1:24, 25 to Joseph, "Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son; and he called his name Jesus." The Good News for Modern Man translates this text. "But he had no sexual relations with her before she gave birth to her son." This is, however, a wrong translation. For a husband to know his wife implies more than to have sexual relations with her; it implies all that love implies; and the sexual aspect is the physical side of it. This "knowledge" in the context of marriage means that husband and wife seek to conform their love-life to the will of God. For them it is not animal passion, it is a conforming of their whole life to the service of God. If it pleases God to grant children through such a union, a Christian woman joins Eve in saying, "I have gotten a man from the Lord."

In the fourth place, the only time the Scripture allows for not having sexual relationship within

marriage is not to avoid having children, but for spiritual reflection. It is interesting to observe that I Cor. 7:3-5 is the supposed Biblical support for the rhythm method of birth control. "Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence; and likewise the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that satan tempt you not for your incontinency." If husband and wife mutually decide to abstain from sexual relationship for the sake of spiritual reflection, this is warranted; only it should not be of long duration. Notice the emphasis is on the spiritual, not the physical. The reason is for God, not to avoid having children.

In conclusion, we may summarize the Scriptural directive this way: if a young man and woman desire to be married, but refuse to bear the responsibilities of bearing children, they sin against God by getting married. Before God, marriage and children go together in the divine plan. Rather, they must desire to have children according to the will of God and seek His guidance upon their love-life.

This distinguishes us from the world. Our relationship to God determines for us our relationship to our fellow man. The children born to covenant parents are not just so many individuals that burden the whole human race; they are by the grace of God the children of the covenant. We place this value upon them, a value that the world of unbelievers and apostates cannot appreciate.

There are ways to deal with the pollution and social ills of our day, but forbidding the birth of covenant children is not one option for the Christian. His approach concentrates upon pointing man to his sin of covetousness and greed as man reveals himself an unworthy steward in God's creation.

Married believers do not view having children as a human choice, rather a divine calling which they are willing to obey if God be pleased to give them the precious seed of the covenant.



Have you ordered our latest? Believers And Their Seed, \$2.95.

The R.F.P.A., Box 2006, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49501-That's the address for good books.

## Book Reviews

# **Apostolic History And The Gospel**

APOSTOLIC HISTORY AND THE GOSPEL (Essays presented to F. F. Bruce), Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971; 378 pp., \$7.95.

It has become increasingly common to commemorate some anniversary of outstanding scholars in the field of Biblical studies with a "festschrift." Such a festschrift is a series of essays written by scholars and presented to the scholar whose anniversary is being acknowledged as a recognition of his labors. This book recognizes the vast learning and notable contributions which F. F. Bruce, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis at the University of Manchester, has made to the field of New Testament studies. There is no question about it that F. F. Bruce deserves this honor which is given to him on his 60th birthday. Twenty-four scholars from all over the world and from many different denominations have contributed to this book.

The book is divided into three sections: the first contains various essays based on the book of Acts; the second deals with subjects relating to Paul and the Pauline epistles; the third section has three essays which consider the Chi-Rho sign, some of the apocryphal Acts and epistles and the implications of Romans 1 for missionary work.

With so many different authors contributing to the book it is not surprising that there is considerable variation in the quality of the essays. Nevertheless, there are sufficient essays of worth to make this book well worth purchasing. It is impossible in this review to comment on each essay separately. But, in my opinion, some of the outstanding essays are the following. "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted

in I Timothy 3:16," by Robert H. Grundy. "Revelation and Tradition in Paul," by G. E. Ladd. This essay alone is almost worth the price of the book. "I Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," by William J. Martin. "The Theme of Romans," by Leon Morris. This essay ends with the following quote:

The point I have been concerned to make in this essay is that (Romans) is not (like the other books of Scripture). God comes more prominently before us in Romans than in any other part of the New Testament (with the possible exception of I John). Elsewhere Paul dwells on Christ and what Christ has done for men. This theme is not absent from Romans; but as long as we concentrate on it to the overlooking of the stress on God, we do not get quite what Paul is saying to us. Romans is a book about God and we must bear the fact in mind in all our interpretation of what it says. Otherwise we shall miss some of the wonderful things it says.

"Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11," by C. F. D. Moule. While we cannot agree with all that the author writes concerning this difficult passage, he points to some very important aspects of the text which are often overlooked. "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," by Bo Reicke. Again we do not agree with the author's conclusions — that Philemon, Colossians and Ephesians were written while Paul was in captivity in Caesarea, while Philippians was written from Rome. But the material the author presents is interesting and important.

The book is very technical and is therefore of value to those who are ministers and teachers. But to them this volume is highly recommended. And we join in congratulations to F. F. Bruce and in acknowledging his many contributions to Scriptural studies.

## The Heart Of The Yale Lectures

THE HEART OF THE YALE LECTURES, Introduction by Ralph G. Turnbull, edited by Batsell Barrett Baxter; Baker Book House, 1971; 332 pp., \$3.95 (paper).

In 1871 Mr. Henry N. Sage donated to Yale College the sum of \$10,000.00 for the purpose of founding a lectureship in the Department of Theology, in the branch of Pastoral Theology which would give opportunity to evangelical ministers to lecture for the seminary students on the subject of preaching. It was to be called "The Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching." Since that time, every year, with a few exceptions, various outstanding ministers have delivered a series of lectures on various aspects of the subject of preaching.

This book is a summary of those lectures which dealt

in whole or in part with the *technique* of preaching. That is, these lectures deal with the formal aspects of preaching, with the aspect of delivery and related topics. The book does not simply quote the lectures as a whole, but organizes the lectures under various headings and gives quotes and comments on different aspects.

The book is divided into three parts: the first deals with the preacher and discusses such subjects as "The Power of Personality," "Qualifications," "Attitudes" — towards self, towards the audience and towards the ministry. The second part deals with the sermon and covers such subjects as "Style," "Delivery," "Setting for the Sermon," "Types of Sermons," "Length of Sermons," "Maturation," etc. The third section deals with the congregation and discusses "Analysis of the Audience," "Approach to the Audience," etc.

The book is a very excellent one. It is filled with a

mass of worthwhile and important material. It takes, for the most part, a properly serious view of preaching and emphasizes the importance of preaching in the Church of Christ. It exposes many weaknesses to which ministers pay insufficient attention. It gives excellent suggestions to improve a minister's delivery of his sermon. It is delightfully humorous in places and discusses matters which all ministers will appreciate. It is almost required reading for anyone who enters the pulpit and can well serve as a textbook in Homiletics.

We urge all our ministers to purchase this book. We have no doubt that it will be of assistance to them and that many hours of enjoyable reading will result from the purchase of this volume.

It is another book in Baker's series on "Notable Books on Preaching." We recommend it to all our Seminary and Pre-seminary students as well.

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Ladies' Society of the Doon Protestant Reformed Church wishes to express its heartfelt sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Ann Miersma, in the passing of her father,

#### MR. JAMES VER HEY.

May our Lord comfort the bereaved family. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose." (Romans 8:28).

Rev. R. Moore, Pres. Mrs. Peter Van Den Top, Sec'y.

## KATHERINE (BRUNSTING) VANDER WERFF.

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Rev. 21:4

Mr. Ed Vander Werff
Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Brunsting
Mr. and Mrs. George Hoekstra
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Karsemeyer
Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Vander Werff
17 grandchildren
4 great-grandchildren

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Consistory and Congregation of the Randolph Protestant Reformed Church hereby expresses their sincere sympathy to Mrs. William Huizenga in the recent loss of her husband

## MR. WILLIAM HUIZENGA.

"But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you. To Him be the glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen." (I Peter 5:10, 11).

> Jacob Regnerus, Pres. Don De Vries, Clerk.

#### IN MEMORIAM

On the 7th of December, 1971, it pleased the Lord to call home unto Himself our beloved wife, mother, step-mother, and grandmother,

#### IN MEMORIAM

On December 12, 1971, it pleased the Lord to call home unto Himself our beloved husband, father and grandfather,

#### WILLIAM HUIZENGA

at the age of 57 years.

"For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." II Cor. 4:17, 18.

Mrs. William Huizenga
Dr. and Mrs. Bernard Huizenga
Beth, Jill, and Jane
Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Tamminga
Mr. and Mrs. James Huizenga
Mr. and Mrs. Allen Huizenga
Mr. Roger Huizenga

## News From Our Churches

The following notice has appeared in several of our church bulletins in the Grand Rapids area: "The Reformed Witness Hour is now open for membership from any of our area Prot. Ref. Churches." The Reformed Witness Hour, as you may recall, had its origin in First Church of Grand Rapids, and is presently under the sponsorship of that church's consistory. As one would expect, the composition of the Radio Committee has long been men and women who were members of First Church. As is evident from the advertisement just quoted, a decision has been made to change that. Not long ago, at the request of First Church, other churches began to assume some of the financial support of the Reformed Witness Hour. Other of our churches, then, are already playing an important part in the radio ministry. It was the feeling of the committee, apparently, that this share in the work ought to be extended to participation in the actual operation of this important project - hence, the invitation to members of area churches to contact the Radio Committee concerning possible membership.

Incidentally, that 45-minute program describing the work of the Reformed Witness Hour is still available for the asking. It includes slides and a tape-recording, presented by a member of the committee who will also be happy to answer any questions concerning the work. The program has been presented four times already, we are told, and has always been well-received. For society after-recess programs, that should be a real winner.

\*\*\*\*\*

There's something of a scarcity of news items for the news column in this issue of the Standard Bearer. That means that I'll have to dip into my little box of material that's reserved for emergencies — in which category this occasion assuredly belongs. The significance of the box, as long as there's something in it, is roughly equivalent to that of the blanket of Charles Schulz's Linus; so, ordinarily, it's opened with some reluctance. But the fact is that I'm happy there's sufficient space this time to include a rather lengthy item concerning the mission work of our little congregation in Lynden, Washington.

The diaconate of First Church in Grand Rapids recently received, from Lynden, a letter of appreciation for a gift from the congregation of First Church, in support of the "Studies in Biblical Doctrine" program of Lynden's congregation. The letter included, also, a short account of the extent of Lynden's efforts. The deacons of First Church felt, and, we think, properly, that the information would be of interest to our people generally. We thank them for supplying a copy

to the News Editor.

After reading what follows, we're sure you'll understand why we decided to quote, in its entirety, the section of Rev. Woudenberg's letter dealing with Lynden's mission activities.

"The work which we are performing here seems to pass through various phases as time goes on. Originally our primary concern was to prepare and develop a program of doctrinal study which could be used both by our own people and by others through the mail. This we did with our study sheets and with tapes, and for a long time we were preoccupied with making contacts and broadening our distribution of these. After that we prepared a series of Bible studies to be translated for use in Indonesia, 50,000 of which are presently being distributed there. Presently, however, while continuing these other programs, we are focusing our attention more on our local area. Each week we are presenting a full hour long Bible Study of the Air on our local Radio station, with opportunity given for remarks and questions from the audience by means of the telephone. In turn, we are also presenting a bi-weekly discussion group for further consideration of these studies with a good number of people attending from various different churches. Also we are holding a weekly Bible study class with a group of young people up in Canada.

"Generally, what we would like to do is to become more and more identified as the voice of sound Reformed doctrine in this area, with a clear indication of the basis of these doctrines in the Scriptures for the sake of those who are unacquainted with them but who do have a loyalty to the Bible. Certainly, it is striking how many of the problems of our day can be dealt with by simply emphasizing one or another part of our doctrinal position while remaining free from the tensions, fears, and conflicts which have become so much a part of our present age. May God give to us the grace to continue to exercise our heritage in this direction.

"We would also like to remind you that, if there are any in your congregation who would like to receive our study sheets or tapes, they are available upon request simply by writing to us at:

> Studies in Biblical Doctrine 8541 Depot Road Lynden, Washington 98264

In the service of sovereign grace, Lynden Protestant Reformed Church Studies in Biblical Doctrine program"