

A Reformed  
Semi-Monthly  
Magazine

---

# THE STANDARD BEARER

---

*It is noteworthy that as Christ and the apostles "turned the world upside down" by spreading the revolutionary gospel message, they were variously accused of forbidding payment of taxes (Luke 23:2), insurrection (Luke 23:5), civil disobedience (Acts 16:20, 21), treason (Acts 17:7), and public dissension (Acts 24:5). When brought before the magistrates, their plea always was: not guilty; the charges are false. If indicted, will our plea be the same today?*

See "Evangelicals Resort to Civil Disobedience"

— page 298

# Contents

April 1, 1989

Meditation — Rev. James D. Slopsema <b>TOUCH ME NOT</b>	291
<b>EDITORIALLY SPEAKING . . . — Prof. David J. Engelsma</b>	293
Editorial — Prof. David J. Engelsma <b>CONDITIONAL SUBMISSION?</b>	293
<b>LETTERS</b>	295
Contribution — Mr. John Clarke <b>RUTHERFORD AND RESISTANCE</b>	296
Guest Article — Mr. James Lanting <b>EVANGELICALS RESORT TO CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE</b>	298
In His Fear — Rev. Arie denHartog <b>LOVING THE LORD OUR GOD WITH OUR WHOLE BEING (2)</b>	301
All Around Us — Rev. Gise J. VanBaren <b>JANSSEN CONTROVERSY RE-EXAMINED</b>	303
<b>EDITORIAL REVIEW OF 1988</b>	304
Guided Into All Truth — Rev. Charles J. Terpstra <b>ATHANASIUS AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY (2)</b>	305
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b>	308
<b>NEWS FROM OUR CHURCHES — Mr. Benjamin Wigger</b>	309
<b>REPORT OF CLASSIS WEST — Rev. Ronald H. Hanko</b>	310

## Inside this issue . . .

As the script on the cover page suggests, there is in this issue some further attention paid to the matter of our submission to civil authority. That comes in response to questions prompted by previous articles and editorials on the subject, specifically to the matter of non-resistance. As the writer of the lines on the cover points out, the questions of when and how the Christian *must* refuse to obey the powers that be are, "knotty" ones which have "always plagued the church." The principles may seem ever so simple, but the application of them to real life situations appears often to present all kinds of vexing practical problems. One of our Michigan readers, in "Letters," asks about several of them. And, as you may remember, other questions were raised by a reader from Northern Ireland. It is to the latter that our editor directs his attention again in this issue's editorial. It seems to us that, in view of the fact that clear thinking with regard to the Christian's calling towards the civil government is uncommon in our day, our editor does well not to leave the issue till it's perfectly clear in the minds of our readers where we stand and why. □ -D.D.

## THE STANDARD BEARER

ISSN 0362-4692

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.

### EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Editor-in-chief: Prof. David J. Engelsma  
Managing Editor: Prof. Robert D. Decker  
Editors' Assistant: Mr. Don Doezeema

### DEPARTMENT EDITORS

Rev. Ronald Cammenga, Prof. Robert Decker, Rev. Arie denHartog, Rev. Russell Dykstra, Rev. Barry Gritters, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman Hanko, Rev. Ronald Hanko, Rev. John Heys, Rev. Jason Kortering, Rev. George Lubbers, Rev. James Slopsema, Rev. Charles Terpstra, Rev. Gise VanBaren, Mr. Benjamin Wigger.

### EDITORIAL OFFICE

The Standard Bearer  
4949 Ivanrest  
Grandville, Michigan 49418

### CHURCH NEWS EDITOR

Mr. Ben Wigger  
6597 - 40th Ave.  
Hudsonville, Michigan 49426

### 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, and must be signed. Copy deadlines are the first and the fifteenth of the month. All communications relative to the contents should be sent to the editorial office.

### REPRINT POLICY

Permission is hereby granted for the reprinting of articles in our magazine by other publications, provided: a) that such reprinted articles are reproduced in full; b) that proper acknowledgement is made; c) that a copy of the periodical in which such reprint appears is sent to our editorial office.

### BUSINESS OFFICE

The Standard Bearer  
Mr. H. Vander Wal  
P.O. Box 6064  
Grand Rapids, MI  
49516  
PH: (616) 243-2953

### NEW ZEALAND OFFICE

The Standard Bearer  
c/o Protestant Reformed  
Church  
B. Van Herk  
66 Fraser St.  
Wainuiomata, New Zealand

### SUBSCRIPTION POLICY

Subscription price, \$12.00 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 and 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.

16mm microfilm, 35mm microfilm and 105mm microfiche, and article copies are available through University Microfilms International.



---

## Meditation

Rev. James Slopsema

# Touch Me Not

---

*But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre.*

*And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.*

*And they say to her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*

*And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.*

*Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God.*

*John 20:11-17*

During the forty days between His resurrection and ascension into heaven, Jesus appeared to His disciples ten times.

The purpose of these appearances was twofold. First, Jesus proved to His disciples through these appearances that He had indeed risen from the dead. But Jesus also used these appearances to instruct His disciples concerning the nature and significance of His resurrection.

Having commemorated Jesus' resurrection just a short while ago, we consider Jesus' first appearance. This is His appearance to Mary Magdalene on the very morning of His resurrection.

The particular significance of this appearance of Jesus is to be found in Jesus' words to Mary, "Touch me not."

\* \* \* \* \*

Early Sunday morning a small group of women leave Jerusalem. There is Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of Jesus, Salome the mother of James and John, Joanna, and other women whose names are not mentioned.

Their purpose is to visit the sepulchre of Jesus. On Friday they had witnessed it all. They had seen their beloved Master condemned to death. They had seen Him die on the cross. They had followed Joseph and Nicodemus to the sepulchre where the body of Jesus had been laid. And now they return to the sepulchre to anoint Jesus' body.

As they approach the sepulchre, the women discover that the great stone covering the entrance to the sepulchre had been rolled away. Mary Magdalene immediately assumes that someone had stolen the body of Jesus. While the other women proceed to the sepulchre to hear the first Easter sermon, Mary returns to Jerusalem to inform the disciples of her "find." Upon hearing Mary's report, both Peter and John rush to the sepulchre, see the empty tomb, and leave, all before Mary is able to return.

Now Mary Magdalene is at the sepulchre alone. And Jesus, her beloved Lord, suddenly appears to her. She reaches out to grasp Him. But He pulls back and tells her, "Touch me not . . ."

How strange this command of Jesus seems to be!

Touch me not.

Certainly this command seems strange when we consider who Mary Magdalene is. From Scripture we learn that Mary

---

Rev. Slopsema is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Walker, Michigan.



Magdalene hails from the city of Magdala. That's why she is called Mary *Magdalene*. It was from this same Mary that Jesus had cast out seven demons. In loving gratitude Mary had become one of Jesus' devoted followers. With various other women she had ministered to Jesus out of her own substance (Luke 8:1-3). Faithfully and carefully she had provided for Jesus' earthly needs and comforts.

Now, seeing her beloved Master alive from the dead, Mary reaches out to Him. She will cling to Him.

But Jesus tells her not to touch him.

How strange!

Were Mary some stranger, or an enemy of the Lord, we could understand this command. But Mary is a devoted disciple who had ministered to His needs . . .

This command of Jesus to Mary also appears strange in light of the terrible sorrow Mary had that has now been changed into joy.

Mary's sorrow had known no bounds. Mary, with the other disciples, had not anticipated the death of Jesus. Nor had they understood it. Neither therefore did they anticipate Jesus' resurrection. To them Jesus' death on Friday had been the shattering of all dreams and hopes. Mary and the others had been left both stunned and confused.

And, coming to the sepulchre this Sunday morning, Mary found her grief intensified by the fact that someone had evidently stolen Jesus' body. So great was her sorrow that she didn't even appear to notice that angels were present and that she had communicated with heavenly messengers. In her grief she was preoccupied with only one thing, finding the body of her beloved Master.

But now Jesus stands before her. The one she had mistaken for the gardener is her beloved Lord. Unexplainably He is no longer dead, but alive. Suddenly her great sorrow has been changed into ecstatic joy. Her beloved Jesus is back! She reaches out to grasp Him.

But He rebuffs her.

Touch me not.

How strange!

Certainly Jesus understands the grief she had known and the great joy that now floods her soul.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is good reason for Jesus' command to Mary not to touch Him.

This reason is to be found in the very nature of Jesus' resurrection. Jesus' resurrection was a resurrection into the heavenly. This had not been the case with resurrections prior to this. Several individuals had been raised from the dead both in the Old Testament and the New Testament. Jesus Himself had raised three different individuals from the dead. The most recent had been Lazarus, about one month before Jesus' own resurrection.

But all these resurrections had been merely a return back to this life. The resurrected bodies of those raised before were still of the earth earthy. They were still flesh and blood. They were still subject to death so that in every instance those raised from the dead died again. And right along with all this was the fact that after their resurrections those raised from the dead were able to resume all the earthly relationships they had enjoyed before. Being a return to this life, the resurrection had changed nothing for them.

But the resurrection of Jesus was different. His resurrection was not a return but an advancement.

Through His resurrection Jesus' body was glorified and made heavenly. That which had been sown in corruption had been raised in incorruption. That which had been sown in dishonor had been raised in glory. Weakness had been changed into power. The natural had become spiritual.

But this tremendous change effected by Jesus' resurrection spelled an end to the previous relationship Jesus had enjoyed with His disciples. Jesus was now heavenly. His disciples, Mary Magdalene included, were still of the earth earthy. It was impossible, therefore, for the old relationship to continue. The previous relationship enjoyed by Jesus and His disciples was forever severed by Jesus' resurrection.

And especially Mary Magdalene needed to be taught this truth.

Upon seeing the risen Jesus, Mary reaches out to cling to Him. None of the other disciples do that when Jesus appears to them later on. In fact Thomas, who insisted on putting his finger through the nail holes before he could believe the resurrection, refrains when Jesus does appear to him. None reach out to grasp Jesus, except Mary Magdalene. For she more than the rest fails to understand that Jesus' resurrection has destroyed the old relationships. Mary expects that everything will be the same as before. Jesus is back from the dead. She will be able to follow Him and administer to His needs as before. Nothing is changed.

But Mary must be taught.

Touch me not . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

Through the resurrection Jesus enters into a new relationship with His disciples.

Certainly Jesus' death and resurrection did not sever all ties between Jesus and His disciples.



Then Jesus would cease to be their Savior. And it would have been better that Jesus had never died. Not *all* relation is severed through Jesus' resurrection; only the *former* relation is severed.

And in the place of the old there arises a new relationship. For through His resurrection Jesus becomes the brother of His disciples.

Notice what Jesus tells Mary Magdalene. Referring to the disciples, Jesus says to Mary, "Go tell my *brethren* . . . ." And then Mary is given instruction also to tell the disciples, "I ascend to my Father and your Father . . . ."

Before His resurrection Jesus called His disciples His friends. But now His disciples are His brethren. And together they are all the sons of God, Who is their Father.

This is the salvation of the church.

For a son is an heir.

Jesus, the only begotten Son of God, is *the* heir of God. For Him God the Father has a glorious inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away. This is the inheritance of eternal life and glory in heaven. This inheritance comes to Jesus on the

basis of His perfect obedience and death on the cross.

But through Jesus' resurrection we too become sons and daughters of God.

And Jesus, being our eldest brother, shares with us the inheritance He receives through His own resurrection and ascension into glory.

How glorious the resurrection of our Lord!

As sons of God we give humble thanks.

And we look for the return of our eldest brother from heaven to take us to our glorious inheritance. □

---

## Editorially speaking . . .

---

The Rev. George C. Lubbers, emeritus minister in the Protestant Reformed Churches, has just published *The Bible Versus Millennial Teachings: An Exegetical Critique*, a 424-page defense of the Reformed doctrine of the last things against both post-millennialism (particularly in

its present-day form as "theonomy") and pre-millennialism. A review of the book appears elsewhere in this issue. It suffices here only to state that the work is a treasure-house of Biblical exegesis and of insight into the realities of the Kingdom of Heaven. The book can be

ordered from the author at 2074 Cranbrook Dr. NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49505 for \$13.95 plus \$1.25 for mailing. Copies of his commentary on Galatians, *Freeborn Sons of Sarah*, and of his commentary on Hebrews, *The Glory of the True Tabernacle*, are also available. □  
-DJE

---

## Editorial

---

# Conditional Submission?

---

In the February 15, 1989 issue of this magazine appeared a letter out of strife-torn Northern Ireland referring to the views on the Christian's calling towards the civil government of the Scottish

Presbyterian, Samuel Rutherford. This letter asked whether the teaching of Rutherford is in harmony with the teaching of John Calvin, or whether it is "a departure from the Reformed Faith

and Scripture itself and therefore to be exposed and repudiated as error?" In response to our request, our correspondent has written a summary of Rutherford's beliefs on this matter,



which we publish in this issue under the heading, "Rutherford and Resistance." The article sets forth in brief the contents of the book in which Rutherford propounded his political theory, the famed *Lex, Rex, or the Law and the Prince*.

Because Rutherford's position on the calling of the Christian towards the state is by this time the prevailing position, not only of Presbyterian and Reformed people, but also of evangelicals of every stripe and because this position is spiritually perilous to believers in times peculiarly suited to make Rutherford's position appealing to believers, an examination of this position, as our correspondent has requested, will be profitable for us all. We will be assuming, and not restating, the doctrine of the state that was developed by many writers in the special issue of December 1, 1988 that occasioned the request, and that was enlarged upon in two subsequent editorials on "Another Look at Nonresistance." We remain convinced that this doctrine of the state is, in the main, the Reformed teaching, based squarely on the inspired Scriptures.

Rutherford's position, which is that also of many Presbyterians, Reformed, and evangelicals, is that the Christian has the perfect right to revolt against the rulers of the nation under certain circumstances. It is not merely Rutherford's position that the believer is required at times to refuse to obey the rulers (which no one denies); but it is his teaching that the Christian may take up arms against the existing government in order to overthrow it and set up a new government. The calling to submit is conditional. The condition is that the rulers faithfully carry out their duty. When the magistrates become unfaithful to their duty, ruling unjustly and

tyrannically, the Christian is released from his obligation to submit and may freely resist the officials of the state.

Presbyterian men and women put this doctrine into practice. Rutherford issued *Lex, Rex* (in which this teaching was set forth) in the heat of the conflict between Scottish Presbyterianism and the tyrannical Stuart kings. Encouraged by the license given them in this book, Presbyterians declared themselves free from the authority of the kings and parliaments of their country; fought against the king's officers and armies with the decidedly carnal weapons of bullet and steel; and refused to pay taxes. When the Presbyterian preacher, James Renwick, was on trial for his life in 1688, he was asked if he acknowledged King James II to be his lawful sovereign. He answered, "No! I own all authority that has its prescriptions and limitations from the Word of God . . . ." To the question whether he had taught that it was unlawful to pay taxes to the king and his government, Renwick replied that "it was unlawful so to do" (that is, pay taxes to such a king and such a government) (Jock Purves, *Fair Sunshine*, pp. 111, 112). Presbyterians resisted the higher powers. Not all did, as Purves reminds us in his delightful little study of the Scottish "Covenanters," as the Presbyterians of that day are called, for many bore their persecution at the hands of the wicked, tyrannical, and anti-Christian Stuart kings patiently. But some revolted. And they did so because they believed that submission to government was conditional. For this belief, Samuel Rutherford was largely responsible.

Rutherford's position in *Lex, Rex* is erroneous.

It has already been shown in a previous editorial that this position is violently in conflict with the teaching of John Calvin.

Rutherford, like his fellow-countryman, John Knox, rejected Calvin's teaching as to the unconditional nature of the believer's calling to submit to the state.

This departure from Calvin is serious because Calvin faithfully gave the teaching of the Word of God.

The error is, first, that Rutherford supposes the source of the state, and its authority, to be the people. There is very little difference between his view and the modern view that holds that government is the result of a compact between the ruler and the ruled, so that whenever the ruler fails to keep his end of the bargain, the ruled have every right to withhold their submission, and rebel. Scripture, however, teaches that the source of government is God. Not only government in general, but every existing government — whatever government there may be — has been set up in authority by God. "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). Even when it is the case that God uses election by the people to put rulers in office, as is the case in our own country, the source of these rulers' authority is not the people, but God. Besides, the notion that government is due to a "social compact" is a pure fiction, historically. God established government in the headship of Adam, quite independently of any agreement of wife Eve or of the posterity of Adam. Government through democratic process has been very rare in history, and is relatively recent. Were the Roman Caesars of the apostles' time chosen by popular vote? Did the Christians addressed by the first epistle of Peter suppose that the royal power of the kings



whom they were called to honor in reality lay in them? Did our Lord teach that Pilate's authority came to him from below (the people) or from above (God), in John 19:11?

This error about the source of the state's authority is basic. If

the "royal power is three ways in the people," as Rutherford, and many today, teach, submission by the citizens is indeed conditional. I would go further and say that, in this case, submission depends upon the whims of the people. For the ruler is nothing

but a creature of the people. But if the source of the state is God, submission depends, not upon the will of the people, but upon the will of God. (to be continued) □

-DJE

## Letters

### Nonresistance? Yes!

I read and re-read your editorials in the January 15 and February 1 issues of *The Standard Bearer*, "Another Look at Nonresistance." These editorials on the thought of Calvin and Luther are excellent. In the January 15 issue, you mentioned your special issue of December 1, 1988 on this subject. Since my first issue of your wonderful magazine started with the December 15, 1988 issue, could you send me a copy of the December 1, 1988 issue, since I am very interested in this subject of nonresistance. I am enclosing \$1.00 . . . .

William England  
Westville, New Jersey

### Response

The issue you request is on the way.

We remind our readers that copies of the special issue of December 1, 1988, "The Reformed Faith on Civil Government," are still available from the Business Manager at \$1.00 per copy. -Ed.

### Nonresistance? No!

I am not a member of the PRC, but I do subscribe to *The Standard Bearer* and do appreciate the fine magazine. However, there are articles that provoke questions; and this is the case with your editorials on "Another Look at Nonresistance" (January 15 and February 1, 1989). There are instances in the Bible of resistance that have God's blessing — the midwives in Egypt; Rahab; and the anointing of David by Samuel. If the American Revolution was unjustifiable, the present government of the United States must be illegal. The Christian's problem is not revolution, but slavish submission to all government mandates. Does the Christian owe unqualified obedience and submission to government? I believe that severe persecution is in the offing and Christians should be prepared by their ministers for this.

Howard E. VanManen  
Grand Rapids, MI

### Response

There is a difference between obedience and submission. Obedience is doing what an authority commands. Submission is the heartfelt acknowledgment of the

right of some authority to govern, by virtue of the will of God. Unqualified obedience is owed to no human. One sometimes must disobey a rightful authority, whether civil government, parents, or husband. One must disobey when the authority commands him to sin against God. The Bible teaches this in Acts 5:29: "We ought to obey God rather than men." Unconditional submission, however, is owed to all authorities placed over us by God. We must respect them as "gods" (Psalm 82:1, 6); as "the minister of God" (Romans 13:4); and as God's hand over us (Heid. Cat., Q. 104). We must subject ourselves to them as we do to the Lord Jesus Himself (Ephesians 5:22). We may never revolt, using force to resist their rule or to destroy them. Such submission for God's sake is not the shameful act of slaves, but the glorious exercise of their freedom by the children of God. God's sons and daughters are free to obey the Lord Jesus; are free to suffer in well-doing; are free from the tyranny of rebellion against authority that holds most of mankind in bondage. Why is submission always "slavish submission"? Was Jesus' conduct before Pilate "slavish submission"?



When the persecution of the last days breaks out, it must not have been provoked by the revolutionary behavior of those who call themselves Christians, lest we suffer as evildoers (I Peter 4:15). In case there are fiery spirits among the saints who are ready to reach for their pistols and shotguns when the state persecutes, the Word of the Lord Jesus must be heard, "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matthew 26:52). I hope that all Reformed pastors are giving this instruction to their congregations, because this is preparation for the persecution. -Ed.

## Letters

I am interested in your meditation in this week's *Standard Bearer* ("Hannah," February 15, 1989). I do pray that many more young men will be called into the ministry in Reformed churches.

It's true we need godly mothers willing to pray that God will grant them such children, but there's another mission element we need to pray for: godly men who are real men and real fathers and teachers to their boys so that the young men will have examples worth emulating of men who truly respect the office of pastor and the idea of serving the church as shepherd or under-shepherd. A book I would recommend to all — men and women — to stimulate thinking in this

regard is *Missing from Action: Vanishing Manhood in America* by Weldon M. Hardenbrook (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, c. 1987), 191 pp. It lacks the Reformed perspective and may be a bit simplistic in its historical approach, but there is a message in this book which we need to consider, especially if we want to know how women's lib and its predecessor movements have wreaked havoc on the men and boys of our generation. The price of \$14.95 for a slim hardback is outrageous, but worth the money for its content. Perhaps it is available now in paperback. I don't know.

Natalie Jefferson  
Mount Vernon, NY □

## Contribution

Mr. John Clarke

# Rutherford and Resistance

Samuel Rutherford was the leading theologian in Scotland during the first half of the 17th century. To most of us he is probably best known by his letters, said by Spurgeon to be "the nearest thing to inspiration which can be found in all the writings of mere men." But this is not his only work. He wrote extensively

*Mr. John Clarke is an Ulster Presbyterian, a son of the Scottish Covenanters. He and his family are members of the Reformed Covenant Fellowship of Larne, Northern Ireland, which is requesting a missionary from the PRC.*

against Arminianism and as a defender of Presbyterian church government. His fame was soon established. He was made Professor of Divinity of St. Andrews and was more than once invited to serve as a Professor of Theology at Utrecht. As one of the Scottish Divines who took part in the Westminster Assembly he had a prominent and active role in drawing up the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

His great treatise on civil government, entitled *Lex, Rex, or the Law and the Prince*, was published in 1644. Its publication

was occasioned by the appearance of a book by John Maxwell, an Episcopalian, who contended for the right of kings to rule independently of parliaments and people, and required of the people passive obedience in the most absolute and unqualified terms. This belief in the absolutism of the divine right of kings was held and practised by the Stuart kings who ruled throughout most of the 17th century in Scotland.

The opposition expressed against this belief by Rutherford was not the first in Scottish Presbyterianism. Almost a cen-



tury before, John Knox's memorable reply to the question put to him by Queen Mary, "Think you that the subjects having the power may resist their princes?" was this: "If princes exceed their power, no doubt they may be resisted, even by power. For no greater honour is to be given to kings than God has commanded to be given to father and mother. But the father may be struck with a frenzy, in which he would slay his children. Now, Madam, if the children arise, join together, apprehend their father, take the sword from him, bind his hands, keep him in prison till the frenzy is over, think you, Madam, that the children do any wrong? Even so, Madam, it is with princes that would murder the children of God that are subject to them."

Nor was it the last to be published on this subject amongst Scottish Presbyterians. It was followed in 1687 by Alexander Shield's book, *A Hind Let Loose*, which can be ranked almost with Rutherford's own as a study in political science, and is in line with the thinking of Rutherford and the early Scottish Reformers.

Although Rutherford's arguments are particularly directed toward the form of government that existed in his day, namely a monarchy, the principles he expounds have a much wider application. Through forty-four chapters, or "Questions," Rutherford develops his argument. The book itself, according to Dr. Hume Brown, is "tediously pedantic," and the reading of it for us today is not without difficulty. Nevertheless, the reader who perseveres will find a work of real power, and amidst the minute details will discover the passion of a man who has a great love for liberty.

At the outset Rutherford states the source of all government. Government is established not

only by divine law but also by "natural law." This law does not exist by itself but is the result of God's having made human beings with the desire to join together and provide themselves with government. Rutherford insists that all men are born free, and that by birth one does not have authority over others. "No man cometh out of the womb with a diadem on his head or a sceptre in his hand." The authority to rule must come from the people as a whole since it is to them that God has given this authority by nature. He accepts that the authority of the king is a trust originating with God, but he insists that it reaches the king by the suffrages of the people. He asks, "Whence is it that this man rather than that man is crowned king? and whence is it — from God immediately and only — or is it from the people also and their free choice? For the pastor and the doctor's office is from Christ only, but that John rather than Thomas be the doctor or the pastor is from the will and choice of men. The royal power is three ways in the people: 1) Radically and virtually, as in the first subject. 2) *Collative vel communicatue*, by way of free donation, they giving it to this man, not to that man that he may rule over them. 3) *Limitate* — they giving it so as these three acts remain with the people (1) that they may measure it out by ounce weights, so much royal power, no more and no less, (2) so as they may limit, moderate, and set banks and marches to the exercise, (3) that they give it out, *conditionate*, upon this and that condition, that they may take it again to themselves what they gave out upon condition if the condition be violated."

In support of this position that the people make the king he quotes such scriptures as I Kings, chapter 16 where the people

make Omri king and not Zimri, and Deuteronomy 17:15ff. The king having been chosen, there exists between the people and the king a covenant (II Sam. 5:3) which imposes certain obligations on both ruler and people. In answering the question, what happens if the king fails to fulfill his obligations and becomes a tyrant, we discover Rutherford's views on resistance. Here, having regard for the due process of law, Rutherford, like Calvin, places the leadership of resistance in the hands of the lesser magistrates, they being "vicars" of God just as much as the king. Central also to Rutherford's view of resistance is the importance of the Law: *Lex est Rex*. To the sovereignty of law, as agreeable to God's Word, king and people must be subject. He states, "A king essentially is a living law, an absolute man is a creature they call a tyrant, and no lawful king." To the question, who shall be judge between the king and the people when the people allege that the king is a tyrant, he replies, "There is a court of necessity no less than a court of justice and the fundamental laws must then speak; and it is with the people in this extremity as if they had no ruler."

He believes in the justice of a defensive war against a king by his own subjects. He says, "If it be natural for one man to defend himself against the personal invasion of a prince, then it is natural and warranted to ten thousand, and to a whole kingdom, and what reason to defraud a kingdom of the benefits of self defence more than one man." When the king acts as a tyrant he is acting contrary to his God-given power; and since such an abuse of power is not from God, it may be resisted. Hence Rutherford distinguishes between a ruler who is of God and a particular



exercise of power that is not of God. He says, "That power which is contrary to law, and is evil and tyrannical, can tie none to subjection."

In his explanation of Romans 13 he contends that this passage refers to the office of magistrate (the magistrate *in abstracto*), i.e., to a person using his power lawfully. When a king acts unlawfully, he is not a "higher power," but is acting as an ordinary man. The lawful ruler is not to be resisted because he is not a terror to the good works but to the evil; but that ruler who persecutes the church becomes in these acts a terror to good works, and therefore the reason in the text proves that a man who does these things against the office is to be resisted. We are only to be subject to the power and royal authority *in abstracto*, in so far as, according to his office, he is not a terror to good works, but to evil.

In answering the question as to whether or not a kingdom may lawfully be purchased by the sole

title of conquest, he asserts, "Mere conquest by the sword, without the consent of the people, is no just title to the crown." He accepts however that, "This title by conquest, through the people's after consent, may be turned into a just title."

Having looked briefly at some of Rutherford's main arguments in his treatise, we conclude with a short analysis of the impact of his work. It was received with great excitement by the Scottish General Assembly. "Every member," says Guthrie, "had in his hand the book lately published by Mr. Samuel Rutherford which was so idolized that whereas Buchanan's treatise, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, was looked upon as an oracle, this coming forth, it was slighted as not anti-monarchical enough and Rutherford's *Lex, Rex* only thought authentic." The principles taught in *Lex, Rex* were those that undergirded the Puritan revolution in England. So this book is their best theoretical vindication. It became the

political textbook of the covenanters and its arguments are their justification for their taking up arms against the king. It helped to lay the basis for the establishing of the constitutional monarchy in Britain; and the bringing over of William of Orange was the practical outworking of the principles of *Lex, Rex*. It has been said, "The principles of this book, however obnoxious they may be to the devotees of arbitrary power and passive obedience, are substantially the principles on which all government is founded and without which the civil magistrate would become a curse rather than a blessing to a country."

"It is reported," writes Howie, "that when King Charles saw *Lex, Rex* he said, it would scarcely ever get an answer, nor did it ever get any except what the Parliament in 1661 gave it, when they caused it to be burned at the Cross of Edinburgh by the hands of the hangman." □

Guest Article  
Mr. James Lanting

## Evangelicals Resort to Civil Disobedience

Mr. Lanting, a member of South Holland Protestant Reformed Church, is a practicing attorney.

"Queen Mary. 'Yea, but none of these men [Moses, Daniel, the Apostles] raised the sword against their princes.'

John Knox. 'Yet, Madam, ye cannot deny that they resisted, for those who obey not the commandments that are given, in some sort resist.'

Queen Mary. 'But yet, they resisted not by the sword.'

John Knox. 'God, Madam, had not given them the power and the means.'

Queen Mary. 'Think ye that subjects, having the power, may resist their princes?'

John Knox. 'If their princes exceed their bounds, Madam, no



doubt they may be resisted, even by power.'

*At these words, the Queen stood as it were amazed, more than a quarter of an hour."*

John Knox, *The History of the Reformation in Scotland*.

Evangelical Christians have patiently protested abortion-on-demand for fifteen years now and yet the bloody atrocities against the helpless unborn continue unabated. And this mass murder not only is sanctioned by our government, but in many cases the abortions are paid for by our tax dollars. May Christians tolerate (fund?) this holocaust any longer?

Many state officials continue to prosecute parents who are "home schooling" their children, alleging violation of restrictive teacher certification laws. Church schools and day-care centers are being padlocked by local officials for violation of zoning, building code, or licensure laws. Should Christians allow these violations of religious freedom to continue?

Many Christians in Central America, South America, and other continents are being persecuted and exploited by evil dictatorships and corrupt military regimes. Should they passively allow such repression to persist?

#### **A Call to Civil Disobedience**

The surprising answer given to these questions by many Christian leaders today is: the time has arrived for Christians everywhere to "take to the streets." Liberation theology aside, many evangelical Christian writers in this country are now promoting the traditional tactics of civil disobedience to combat evil and injustice in governments. In his book, *The Christian Manifesto*, the late Francis Schaeffer states that "if there is no place for civil disobedience, then the government has been made autonomous." This book has been wide-

ly promoted by Rev. Jerry Falwell and others who suggest: "Buy it for your friends who hide behind Romans 13." Rutherford Institute president John Whitehead in his popular book, *The Second American Revolution*, also calls Christians to civil disobedience to stem the tide of the "ever growing power and unconstitutionality of the federal government." Gary North and David Chilton of the theonomic Reconstructionist movement promote a confrontational theology wherein a "full scale Christian counter-offensive" is now necessary to overthrow secular humanism. Their bold motto is: "Christ or chaos, God's law or tyranny."

#### **Taking to the Streets**

Many Christians are heeding these "calls to action." On the left of the religious spectrum, many have been arrested for violating trespass laws at South African embassies while protesting apartheid. Other Christians involved in the Sanctuary Movement have been jailed for illegally harboring Central American refugees. And still others have chained themselves to fences or gates at military installations to protest nuclear armaments.

Civil disobedience has recently become *de rigueur* for the Religious Right also. Evangelical leaders James Kennedy, Pat Robertson, and Jerry Falwell have all endorsed Randall Terry's "Operation Rescue" movement, a confrontational pro-life group gaining recent notoriety because of the arrests of hundreds of its members in Atlanta, Georgia. More extreme groups have fire-bombed "abortuaries" and even kidnapped abortion clinic employees. Other extremists on the Religious Right have organized "tax protest" movements, refusing to report income or pay income taxes. Many of these tax protestors attend seminars and

"camps" to learn tax evasion techniques and "survival tactics" against the "satanic I.R.S."

#### **The Call to Revolution?**

Although some Christian activists (such as Randall Terry) urge non-violent passive disobedience, other evangelical writers are suggesting something quite different: organized resistance and overthrow of evil governments by force. "There comes a time," writes John Whitehead, "when force, even physical force, is appropriate. When all avenues to flight and protest have closed, force in the defensive posture is appropriate."

Charles Colson, in his latest and widely acclaimed book, *Kingdoms in Conflict*, boldly advocates revolution:

*When all recourse to do civic obedience has been exhausted and the evil of the state is so entrenched as to be impenetrable, then the Christian may be justified in organizing to overthrow the state.*

As an illustration of such a commendable overthrow of government by Christians, Colson cites the "February Revolution" in Manila when Cory Aquino, with the indispensable assistance of the powerful Roman Catholic Cardinal Sin, overthrew the evil tyranny of Marcos. But what circumstances would justify a Christian's (the church's?) participation in such a political revolution?

*While no one could ever develop a rigid formula, it seems to me that the combination of the Marcos regime's refusal to allow free elections, the suspension of civil liberties, the massive corruption of the governmental process, the trampling of human rights and Marcos' own blasphemous pretensions, gave the church a mandate to act. A courageous cardinal, the Philippine church, and two million ordinary citizens opened a light in the dark canopy that envelopes so much of planet earth. Through their civil disobedience and resistance to evil, the Kingdom of God has been made visible.*



## Civil Disobedience and the Reformed Calvinist Tradition

The knotty questions of when and how Christians must “obey God rather than men” have always plagued the church. Nor does there appear to be a consensus of opinion on this matter among leaders in the Reformed and Presbyterian tradition. For example, Luther, Calvin, and John Knox had disparate views on civil disobedience.

Luther insisted that the state is “God’s minister and servant of wrath” to punish evil and promote good. Accordingly, he warned, disobedience is a terrible sin, unless rulers “would compel a subject to do something contrary to the will of God or hinder him from doing what God commands.” In those instances only, the obligation to obey ceases. Such disobedience, however, must always be passive, submissive, and without resistance. The only other alternative, insisted Luther, is exile.

Calvin likewise wrote that “private individuals” must tolerate and obey even “unjust magistrates” who may “cruelly torment” or “greedily despoil” their subjects, since “it is not for us to remedy such evils.” But on the other hand, Calvin surprisingly allowed for revolutionary action by the “magistrates of the people” who have not only the right but the duty to “withstand” an evil king.

John Knox, the feisty Scottish Reformer, went even further by declaring that whenever wicked and cruel rulers “exceed the bounds” of their God-given authority, the duty of obedience ceases and the tormented Christian may rise up and overthrow his wicked rulers by force. The dreadfully persecuted Scottish Covenanters of the 17th Century, emboldened by the writings of Knox and his follower Samuel Rutherford (1660-1661), took up

arms and launched a revolution “For Christ’s Crown and the Covenant.” Other reformers, however, embarrassed by Knox’s and Rutherford’s writings, deplored the armed resistance of the beleaguered Covenanters.

## Some Reflections on Civil Disobedience

Although the contemporary evangelical Christian is apt to be confused by the bewildering array of voices suggesting that we must now resort to civil disobedience and even organized forceful overthrow of governments, each believer must calmly and carefully assess this recent trend. The following distinctions and remarks may be helpful.

First, surely the distinction between civil disobedience and civil rebellion is being ignored by many evangelicals today. It is one thing to claim that at times the citizens of Christ’s Kingdom will “obey God rather than men”; it is something quite different to suggest that we may overthrow the evil government we are constrained to disobey. The crucial scriptural passages are, of course, Romans 13:1-7 and I Peter 2:13-17. Those who follow Knox and Rutherford and suggest that Paul and Peter *implicitly* intended exceptions to submission (e.g., when the government is perniciously evil), have the difficult if not impossible burden of explaining why the apostles used such *explicit* “exceptionless” language while writing in the historical context of the evil, blasphemous Roman Empire. The tragic end of the Scottish Covenanters should perhaps be reason enough to convince Whitehead, Colson, and others of the sobering import of Jesus’ words to Peter regarding the destiny of those who “live by the sword.”

Secondly, Luther’s strikingly simple formula may be the best: obedience unless (1) one is *com-*

*elled* to do something contrary to God’s revealed will or (2) *hindered* from doing what God commands. This remarkably straightforward and workable guide perhaps condemns much civil disobedience today. For example, because the mothers, doctors, and the government are independent, moral agents responsible for abortion, Operation Rescue members are not “compelled” or “hindered” in the requisite way by the abortion laws they are protesting. The same could be said of the Sanctuary Movement and other similar activist causes.

Thirdly, Lynn Buzzard and Paula Campbell point out in their fine book *Holy Disobedience* (Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1984), that perhaps the only morally defensible and biblical form of civil disobedience is direct, individual, non-cooperation. Much disobedience today is “indirect” — protestors breach laws other than the one they are protesting (e.g., violating trespass laws to protest abortion). Moreover, most disobedience is not individual, but highly organized into large groups of hundreds or even thousands of participants acting in concert. Finally, civil disobedience often goes beyond passive non-compliance and drifts into areas of confrontational, illegal demonstrations. Accordingly, civil disobedience is then used as a political weapon or public crusade where the protest itself may become the source of meaning, “a religious high, a glorious tantrum” for the participants.

Fourthly, Buzzard and Campbell also remind us that the individual conscience is “an indispensable but inadequate guide to moral judgment.” Accordingly, the individual conscience alone is an insufficient basis for civil disobedience. Because “no scripture is of private interpretation,” before an individual decides, for



example, to stop paying his income taxes to an unjust government, he is duty-bound to find authoritative decisions, creeds, or confessions of the historic church that substantiate his subjective views. The alternative is moral chaos in the church world (and society).

Finally, it is absolutely crucial for Christians to grasp the profound biblical concept of "submission." True "submission" to worldly governments does not entail silence, apathy, resigna-

tion, or even thoughtless obedience. On the other hand, as Buzzard and Campbell remark, vibrant biblical submission emerges from a conviction that the meek, the helpless, the poor, and the oppressed have their heart set, not on earthly kingdoms or governments, but on a much deeper reality, a kingdom always unaffected by traditional tactics of civil disobedience and rebellion.

It is noteworthy that as Christ and the apostles "turned the world upside down" by spreading the revolutionary gospel message, they were variously accused of forbidding payment of taxes (Luke 23:2), insurrection (Luke 23:5), civil disobedience (Acts 16:20, 21), treason (Acts 17:7), and public dissension (Acts 24:5). When brought before the magistrates, their plea always was: not guilty; the charges are false. If indicted, will our plea be the same today? □

# Loving the Lord Our God with Our Whole Being (2)

## *In His Fear*

*Rev. Arie denHartog*

The law of God requires that we love the Lord our God with our whole being. There can be no division in us. This is impossible. All imagination that we can love God with only part of our being is proven to be false by the summary of the law. We are to love God with all our heart and all our soul and all our mind and all our strength. It is well for us to consider each of those four "alls," that we might know the depths and perfection of the love which God requires of us.

We must love God first of all with all our heart. Our heart is the spiritual center of all our affections. Out of our heart are all the issues of life. Through our heart we receive the wonder of the love of God towards us and respond in love to God. True love for God is a hearty love. Without the heart love is cold and formal and only superficial. Many times God complains against His people that they do not love Him with their hearts. They pretend by outward expressions and rituals that they love God, but all the while that they are engaged in religious exercise their heart is far from God. Therefore God is burdened and grieved by all their offerings and sacrifices. In fact, they are loathsome to Him. When we

worship and serve God we must do so with all our heart. All our affections must go out to God.

Look in a concordance and see how often the Word of God speaks about the heart of man. By nature that heart of man is desperately wicked so that no man can know it. Through the wonder of regeneration God has given us a new heart. God says in His law, "give me thine heart." True religion before God is one of the heart. If we set our hearts on anyone or anything other than or besides God, we have made unto ourselves an idol. This is strictly forbidden. When we do this we rob God of the love that we owe to Him alone. God is jealous for all the love of our heart.

*Rev. denHartog is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Randolph, Wisconsin.*



We must love God with all our soul. The soul is deeper than the heart. The heart is an organ of the soul. The soul is the seat of our life and the center of our person. God made man to be a personal, living soul. This distinguishes man from animals. Though the Bible sometimes also speaks of the soul of animals, there is a difference. There is no animal that is a personal and living soul. Through the soul man stands in personal relationship to God. It is only because of the fact that God created man with a soul as well as a body that man can know that God is, and have fellowship and communion with God. We stand before God with our soul. Through our souls we know and love God personally. In the wonder of salvation God has redeemed our souls. Both our body and soul were affected by the fall. Both the body and soul of the wicked shall be destroyed in hell. Therefore the judgment is so terrible for the ungodly. But God has redeemed our soul from hell. When our bodies at the end of our earthly pilgrimage will be placed in the grave our soul will go to God.

There are many mysteries involved in all of this that are beyond our understanding. Because God has redeemed our soul from hell we must love Him with all our soul. When we love God with all our soul our whole inner being and person go out to Him. When we love God with our souls we love Him personally. Soul love is deeper than mere emotions and feelings. We love God with all our soul when we love Him first of all personally for all that He is in Himself. Love for God may not be first of all love for ourselves. We do not love God first of all because of what He has done for us. That is selfish love. Then we love ourselves above God. We love God in the depths of our soul when

we delight in Him for all that He is in His blessed and holy being. We love God with our whole soul when our only desire is to exist for Him and for His glory. Through our souls we have fellowship and communion with God. To love God with all our soul means that this fellowship and communion is the greatest purpose and delight of our whole life.

We must love God with all our mind. Our mind is not only the faculty of our reason and intellect but also includes our consciousness. God made us intelligent, rational beings. That is another great wonder of the creation of man. We cannot of course separate one faculty from the other. God made man soul and body. God made man a personal, moral, rational being. Through our minds we can know and understand who and what God is. Because of the fall, man's mind is darkened. Therefore he no longer knows God rightly. Sinful man uses his mind in enmity against God, seeking by all means to deny that God is and to deny the truth about God. Evil men devise all kinds of worldly philosophies to deny that God is and to deny His work of creation and salvation. Through the wonder of regeneration by the Spirit of God our minds are renewed and enlightened. Through the Spirit-filled and sanctified mind we can once again truly know God. We can know God through His own revelation in His Word and in His creation and providence.

Love for God involves our mind. It is not mindless emotion and feeling. The latter is the teaching of many of the modern-day charismatics. These imagine that true love for God ignores doctrine and truth. Doctrine is not of great importance to them. But true love for God means that we love the truth about God

which He has revealed to us. It means that we love the true doctrine about God. We receive and know that doctrine through our sanctified mind. We love God with all our mind when all the powers of our intellect are directed towards knowing Him truly in all of His wonderful self-revelation to us. Through our mind the truth of God enters our heart and soul. We love God with our whole mind when our mind is constantly occupied with the knowledge of God. We seek that knowledge not only when we are engaged in the science of theology and in the study of God's Word, though that is of course of primary importance, but we seek the knowledge of God in all of His creation, in every discipline of learning. When learning and science lead us away from God, then we have violated the great commandment to love God. All our study must lead us to God to see His glory and to delight in Him and in His truth.

Loving God with all our mind means also that God lives in our consciousness. It means that we are always consciously thinking of Him. It means that all our thoughts are controlled by the consciousness that He is, that He is God, and that He is the source and standard of all truth. To pass a whole day without ever thinking about God is a very serious violation of the great commandment to love God. We love God with all our mind when God is central to all the plans and purposes of our life, when there is nothing that we consider independently from God and the truth that is in and from God. Love for God must so rule our minds that we do nothing without regard for that love. We love God with all our mind when our meditation is upon Him. We love God with all our mind when we use our mind to order the



whole of our life that we might live it all in obedience to Him and for His glory.

We must love God with all our strength. God gives us all our strength. We have no strength that does not come from Him. We must return all our strength to God in love. The whole of our life goes forth constantly through God-given strength. We must love God in all that goes forth from us in our daily lives. Love for God is not fulfilled merely in passive meditation on God through all the day. We have an occupation and calling to perform. God Himself has given us that occupation. That is not only true for the minister and missionary. That is true for all of us. God gave us our abilities and talents in order that we might fulfill our daily occupations in the world. By God's strength we must be faithful fathers and mothers. By His strength we must live as children and young people in such a way that we prepare ourselves for our adult life. By His strength we must perform our occupation as doctors and lawyers, as farmers and merchants, as employers and employees or whatever our occupation might be. By the strength which God Himself gives us we must so con-

duct ourselves in these occupations that we live in obedience to His Word and bring glory to His name. Laziness is a sin against this great requirement of love for God. We may not refuse to employ our talents and energies in our daily occupations.

An even greater sin is the misuse of our strength. We may not use the strength that God gives us for our own glory and advantage. We may not use that strength in rebellion against God and in a life of sin and wickedness. That is what the ungodly man does daily. For all of this he will come into judgment.

In a special way we must use our talents and energies in the church and kingdom of God. We have by the grace of God been made citizens of that kingdom and members of His church. We must be ready to forsake all the things of this world in order that we might be servants of the Lord in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. We sin grievously against the great commandment to love God when we refuse to serve God in His church and kingdom and when we refuse to give our God-given talents for the promotion and welfare of that kingdom on earth. Many who call themselves Christians fail to see the

greatness and seriousness of serving the Lord in His church and kingdom. Our Lord in the parable of the talents teaches us how displeased the Lord is with His wicked and slothful servants who hide their talents in the ground because they refuse to serve the Lord God in love.

The more carefully we consider the great commandment of the law of God the more we realize how very far short we fall of what it requires. In fact we say in our hearts how impossible it is to love God with our whole being. Only the angels in heaven can live that way. But the love of God in our hearts causes us to desire to love God perfectly. We cannot be satisfied until we love the Lord our God with our all. We strive all the days of our life here on earth to love Him more perfectly. Finally we shall lay aside our old sinful nature and all enmity against God in us shall be destroyed in the grave. Then all that separates us from God shall be removed. We shall enter into the realm of the blessed. Never again will anything distract us from perfect love for God. There we shall fulfill through all eternity the blessed purpose for which we were created and redeemed. □

*All Around Us*  
Rev. Gise VanBaren

## Janssen Controversy Re-examined Editorial Review of 1988

*Rev. VanBaren is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hudsonville, Michigan.*

### Janssen Controversy Re-examined

"CTS in Focus," a paper published by Calvin Theological

Seminary, reports on an address by Dr. David Holwerda given this past September 8 at the seminary chapel. According to the article:



Dr. David Holwerda explored questions about interpreting Scripture. He chose as his subject Dr. Ralph Janssen, an Old Testament professor who was deposed in 1922. Holwerda, whose speech marked his appointment as Professor of New Testament with tenure in 1987, asked if the views of both Janssen and his opponents influence the present reading of Scripture. He concluded that they do, and showed how they account for different ways of reading the Bible in the church then and now.

... After surveying events surrounding the Janssen controversy, Professor Holwerda dealt with key issues in it. Regarding miracles, Janssen argued with Abraham Kuyper that "grace never creates a single new reality" and that his opponents held an Anabaptistic, unacceptable dualism between nature and grace. On revelation, Janssen argued for more dependence of biblical authors on earlier sources than Herman Bavinck, whom he cited in his defense, would allow. He also defined theology as a critical search for truth, which made his opponents very apprehensive. They criticized him particularly for what he left unsaid and for depending too simply on human reason. They accused Janssen of not integrating faith and reason. Janssen countered that while not always expressing it, he proceeded from a Reformed standpoint and that he took seriously the doctrine of common grace.

The last section of Professor Holwerda's address sorted out the issues in the controversy that remain for us today. The address will be published in its entirety in a forthcoming issue of *The Calvin Theological Journal*.

The "they" in the above article included especially the late Rev. Herman Hoeksema. The question of the reality of miracles as well as the issue of common grace was involved in the controversy. Reference to this event is made in the (out-of-print) book, "The History of the Protestant Reformed Churches in America."

One can await with interest the printing of this entire ad-

dress. No doubt Holwerda is correct in concluding that this controversy does account "for the different ways of reading the Bible in the church then and now."

I wonder to what extent Holwerda and his associates at Calvin Seminary agree with the position of Janssen who was deposed by the Christian Reformed Church in 1922.

## Editorial Review of 1988

The editor of *The Banner*, December 26, 1988, presents an interesting review of the past year's events as these took place in the world as well as in the church. Two of the various points which he made should be of concern and interest to our readers:

*Yet we did not make an all-out effort to win our neighbors and the world for Christ. We were pre-occupied with internal bickering. And we will be judged for that.*

*Our bickering mainly concerns two matters: the role of women in the church and the understanding of the biblical account of creation.*

*For the past fifteen years we have discussed whether women may hold church offices, and we have decided that women may be eligible for the deacon's office only. But in 1989 we should have another report on what the Bible means by "headship" in male-female relations.*

*The teaching of three science professors at Calvin College — who say that the universe is very old and that we should learn the history of its formation from a careful study of God's creation rather than just from Genesis 1 and 2 — came under much scrutiny and attack during this year. The attack ended (but didn't really) with the appointment of a study committee that should report to Synod 1991.*

*The Banner attempted to take the heat off Calvin by sending the following inquiry to science teachers at all other CRC-supported Christian colleges: "What do you say to your class about how and when of the formation of our planet and the universe?"*

*But the colleges' administrators prevented The Banner from getting a reply. One college did send us carefully phrased and rather lengthy statements.*

*I do not believe that we could find two science teachers at our colleges who teach the stuff that is taught by the "creation scientists" of the San Diego Institute: a six-times-twenty-four-hour formation of everything and a 6,000-to-8,000-year-old earth. Whatever such folks cannot explain they blame on the flood.*

The second comment of interest to us is what the editor has to say about past issues of *The Standard Bearer*. It is somewhat strange that the editor bases conclusions on what he read merely in the index — but perhaps he has the ability of determining the contents of articles simply by reading the titles.

*A few weeks ago I was looking at the Standard Bearer, the publication of the Protestant Reformed Church, a 5,000-member denomination that split off from the CRC in the 1920s under the leadership of Herman Hoeksema. The PRC left because we were, Hoeksema said, teaching that we share common ground with unbelievers and were also neglecting the doctrine of double predestination taught in the Canons of Dort.*

*Hoeksema's son, Homer, was the editor of The Standard Bearer for many years. His final editorial was on the topic of creation and evolution. I was paging through the issue that had the index of a year's articles in the magazine. You would be amazed to see how many of these had been written in response to some article in The Banner or a happening in the CRC.*

*What our subscribers hardly read, The Standard Bearer analyzes. Why? Because the right to existence of the Protestant Reformed Church depends on the untruthfulness of the Christian Reformed Church. The more we sin, the better justification they have to be what they are. (I should also say that Homer Hoeksema was a gentleman editor — careful and fair, given his particular frame of mind.)*

*A similar situation is now growing within the CRC . . .*



Well, Mr. Editor, we have done it again. I assure you, however, that though most of your subscribers do not read *The Standard Bearer*, our own readers are both interested in and deeply concerned about those things which take place in the CRC. We still speak of the CRC as our "mother church." Most of our members came originally from the CRC. We have many friends and relatives still in your church.

Our young people not infrequently intermarry.

So, if there ever was a time that our churches needed to write critical articles about the CRC in order to justify our own existence, that is surely not true today anymore. The differences, once measured especially in terms of "common grace," have grown greater over the years.

While we do admire the zeal of the CRC in many areas, we are concerned about its current course. We are concerned both because of many friends and relatives of ours in your church, but also because your church can and does have an effect upon the members of our own churches. And we can also more knowledgeably pray the Lord of the harvest that He turn the CRC again to the "old paths." □

## Guided Into All Truth

Rev. Charles Terpstra

# Athanasius and the Arian Controversy (2)

In our last article we ended with a reference to a letter drawn up to explain the reasons for the deposition of the heretic Arius and his followers in A.D. 321. This letter clearly set forth the errors of the Arians as we described them:

*And the novelties they have invented and put forth contrary to the Scriptures are these following: -God was not always a Father, but there was a time when God was not a Father. The Word of God was not always, but originated from things that were not; for God that is, has made him that was not, of that which was not; wherefore there was a time when He was not; for the Son is a creature and a work. Neither is He like in essence to the Father; neither is He the true and natural Word of the Father; neither is He His true Wisdom; but He is one of the things made and created . . . Where-*

*fore He is by nature subject to change and variation, as are all rational creatures. And the Word is foreign from the essence of the Father, and is alien and separated therefrom . . . (The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. iv, p. 70).*

The threat of this heresy was great, as was pointed out last time, and therefore the Spirit gave to the church a great man — a man great in spiritual knowledge and wisdom, a man great in spiritual stamina and courage, a man great with pen and word — Athanasius. To this sometimes lone warrior of the fourth century we owe much of the church's doctrine concerning the Trinity and concerning Jesus Christ. When this young deacon of the church at Alexandria signed the above-mentioned letter against the Arians (some say he even composed it), it marked the beginning of a life devoted to the defense of these cardinal truths of the Christian faith.

### ATHANASIUS — THE MAN AND HIS LIFE

Athanasius was born about A.D. 296 of wealthy parents in Alexandria, Egypt. While he received a liberal education in the Greek classics, it was especially his spiritual training that left a life-long mark on him. His catechism training was in the sound school of Alexandria, where knowledge of the Scriptures was stressed by his teachers. Theologically, he was deeply influenced by Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, under whom he grew up.

At a very young age he became deacon in the church at Alexandria. He was only about twenty-two when he wrote his first two important works, "Against the Heathen" and "On the Incarnation of the Word" (A.D. 318). He was a mere twenty-five years old when he supported the ouster of Arius in A.D. 321. At the time of the

Rev. Terpstra is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Pella, Iowa.



Council of Nicea in A.D. 325 he was still deacon, but also served as Alexander's secretary, and thus had a great influence on the delegates and on the final statement of this first ecumenical council through his notes and letters written during the forty-two days of deliberations. In A.D. 328 he was elected to the highest office in the Eastern Church, Archbishop of Alexandria, which embraced all of Egypt and Libya. In this position he served off and on (cf. below) until his death in A.D. 373.

Athanasius early took up his pen and the sword of the Spirit against Arius and his heresy. Soon after he assumed the position of archbishop in A.D. 328, he published a brief but clear "Statement of Faith," in which he set forth the orthodox position on Jesus Christ's relation as Son to the Father (we will quote from this later). After the controversy had raged for a period of nearly twenty years, during which time the Arians attacked both the decision of Nicea and Athanasius personally, Athanasius rose to his own defense in his work, "Defence Against the Arians" (c. A.D. 347), and to the defense of the Nicene Creed in the work "Defence of the Nicene Definition" (c. A.D. 351-355). And finally, in his longest and most detailed refutation of Arianism, Athanasius penned his "Four Discourses Against the Arians" (c. A.D. 356-360), in which he gave clear exposition of all the texts the Arians had misinterpreted and twisted with regard to Christ.

Throughout his life, therefore, Athanasius labored and contended earnestly for the faith. And that battle was fought not in the abstract but in face to face confrontation with the enemy. His writings were not produced in some hidden monastery in Egypt, where he was involved in idle speculations on the Trinity;

they were born in the heat of the battle. He wrote so vigorously and so forcefully because he had to struggle with these heretics in the churches of which he was head, and because he saw the danger they presented to the truth of God and to the saints. There were times when he nearly stood alone. The story is told about one such time during the Nicene Council:

*At the fever point of the controversy, when the current appeared to be running strongly against the orthodox school, a certain delegate went to Athanasius and said, 'You are fighting a losing battle. Does Athanasius not know that the whole world is against him?' . . . He said quietly, 'Is the world against Athanasius? Then Athanasius is against the world.' (H.W. Coray in Valiant for the Truth, p. 15).*

That was the epitaph set over Athanasius' life: Athanasius *contra mundum* — "Athanasius against the world."

Such a life-long battle was not without its costs to this pious church father. Just as in every battle for the defense of the faith there are sufferings to be endured, so there were for Athanasius too. To give you some idea of the difficulties Athanasius had to endure in life, I quote again from the book *Valiant For The Truth*, (p. 16):

*Stung by their defeat at Nicea, the Arians counter-attacked with venom. They launched a vitriolic whispering crusade against his character. Athanasius, they said, was guilty of treason, of immorality, of sorcery, of sacrilege; Athanasius was a murderer. Not content with slander, they resorted to every art in the ledger of political maneuvering to destroy him. They had him exiled five times. They hounded him from the Egyptian deserts to Rome . . . In his old age he was forced to flee to a cemetery and take refuge for nearly a year in a sepulcher. In all, he spent in exile twenty of his forty-seven years as head of the Alexandrian episcopacy.*

Truly this man of God could say with Paul when he had finished his course: "I have fought a good fight, . . . I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness . . ." (II Tim. 4:7, 8).

## ATHANASIUS — HIS ORTHODOX POSITION

As we have noted, the fundamental error of Arius was his false view of the relationship between the Father and the Son. By teaching that Jesus Christ was a creature of God with an entirely different being, Arius denied Christ's deity. And by applying the same idea to the Holy Spirit, Arius effectively threw out the truth of the Trinity. But Athanasius set forth the truth concerning the Triune God. He too was concerned for the unity or oneness of God, but he also saw clearly that there are three, distinct Persons in the Godhead. He knew that to separate the Being of God and the three Persons would result in polytheism. He also clearly perceived from the Scriptures that the three Persons are equally divine. Consequently, the truth which he came to see was that of the oneness of God's Being. God's Being is one, and the three Persons share alike in the fulness of this one Being. Hence, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of the *same* essence.

In coming to this understanding Athanasius focused first of all on the proper idea of the relationship between the Father and the Son. He rejected Arius' error that the Son was not eternal but begotten before time as a separate creature. Instead he posited the eternal generation and thus the full deity of the Son. In his "Statement of Faith" Athanasius wrote:

*We believe in one Unbegotten God, Father Almighty . . . And in one Only-begotten Word, Wisdom, Son, begotten of the Father without*



*beginning and eternally; . . . absolutely perfect Son, . . . the true Image of the Father, equal in honour and glory. . . . Very God of very God, . . . Almighty of Almighty. . . . He is then by nature an Offspring, perfect from the Perfect, begotten before all the hills (Prov. 8:25), . . . as Paul also in another place calls Him 'first-born of all creation'. But by calling Him First-born, he shows that He is not a Creature, but Offspring of the Father. For it would be inconsistent with His deity for Him to be called a creature, Nicene Fathers, vol. iv, pp. 84-85.*

Athanasius would allow no compromise on this critical point of the deity of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. The Creed that was produced by the great Council of Nicea in A.D. 325 (which condemned the error of Arius) stated concerning Jesus Christ that He is "the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father . . . ." That last clause was the crucial one. In fact, the whole controversy concerning the deity of Christ centered on one word from that expression — the word *homoousion* in the Greek, which means "of the same substance." The Arians, of course, would never accept that word, for they said that Christ was of a *different* substance from the Father. But there was also a moderate party of Arians, called the semi-Arians, who were willing to say that Christ was *like* the Father in substance. This position was expressed by the Greek word *homoiousion*, "of like substance." You will notice a difference of one letter in these two Greek words. Let us never think that attention to detail in defending the truth is unimportant, for that one letter separated orthodoxy from heresy, truth from error; the former word upheld the full deity of Christ, while the latter word

denied it. For that reason Athanasius would not compromise with the semi-Arians and strenuously defended the Nicene statement in his work "Defence of the Nicene Definition."

What is so striking about Athanasius' defense of the deity of Christ, however, is that he was chiefly motivated by a concern for the doctrine of salvation. He understood clearly at the outset of the controversy that salvation was possible only if Jesus Christ was a divine Person. If He is not the essential Son of God but only a mere creature, then salvation is impossible, for we cannot be saved by a mere creature, though he be the first and highest. If salvation is all of God, then He who comes in the flesh to be our Saviour must also be very God. With this in mind Athanasius wrote in one of his "Discourses Against the Arians":

*For if, being a creature, He had become man, man had remained what he was, not joined to God; for how had a work been joined to the Creator by a work? or what succor had come from like to like, when one as well as other needed it? And how, were the Word a creature, had He power to undo God's sentence, and to remit sin . . . ? . . . How then could things originate undo sin? But the Lord is He who has undone it, as He says Himself, 'Unless the Son shall make you free'; and the Son, who made free, has shewn in truth that He is no creature, nor one of things originate, but the proper Word and Image of the Father's Essence . . . . Nicene Fathers, p. 384.*

This shows how crucial the issue of this controversy was; it was a matter of our salvation. This is what the Spirit-led Athanasius understood. We may be thankful that he did. But then this is what you and I must also bear in mind in dealing with modern-day deniers of Christ's deity found among many of the cults (Jehovah's Witnesses, Christian Science, Mormons, etc.) and

among many liberal churches. At stake is salvation itself.

What Athanasius said regarding the deity of the Son he also said regarding the Holy Spirit. Throughout this controversy which centered on the Father and the Son, the doctrine of the Spirit was in the background. Yet the truth concerning the third Person of the Godhead was always involved. For that reason the Nicene Creed included an article on the Spirit (cf. the new *Psalter*), and Athanasius made constant references to this Person throughout his works. However, it was only after the relationship between the Father and the Son was settled that the truth concerning the Spirit could be stated clearly.

And so Athanasius came to assert that the Spirit too was a distinct Person of the Godhead, one in essence with the Father and the Son. This was given creedal expression, some eight years after Athanasius' death, at the second great ecumenical council of Constantinople (A.D. 381). With this council the Trinitarian controversy of the third and fourth centuries came to a close. The Spirit had again led the church into the truth according to the promise of Christ. He had done that using the great evil of Arianism; He had done that using the great good of Athanasius. □

## THE SCRIPTURES

*"Within this awful volume lies  
The mystery of mysteries:  
Happiest they of human race  
To whom their God has given  
grace  
To read, to fear, to hope, to pray,  
To lift the latch, to force the way;  
But better had they ne'er been born  
Who read to doubt, or read to  
scorn."*



---

# Book Reviews

---

**THE BIBLE VERSUS MILLENNIAL TEACHINGS: AN EXEGETICAL CRITIQUE**, by George C. Lubbers; published by the author, 1989; available by mail from the author at 2074 Cranbrook Dr. NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49505; 424 pages; paper; \$13.95 plus \$1.00 for postage (Reviewed by the Editor)

*The Bible Vs. Millennial Teachings: An Exegetical Critique* may well be George C. Lubbers' *magnum opus*. It is a treasure-house of Biblical exegesis and of insight into the realities of the Kingdom of Heaven. Treating eschatology (the Bible's teaching about the last things), the book carries on the Reformed controversy with millennialism, both in its post-millennial and in its pre-millennial forms. Lubbers is especially incisive (and helpful) in his analysis of theonomy, a post-millennial movement calling on Christians to take dominion over the world and presently making waves in Reformed and Presbyterian churches. Facing theonomy's charge that historic Reformed amillennialism is "impotent religion," Lubbers shows from Scripture that the "Christianizing of the world" is not only an empty dream, but also a seriously unbiblical doctrine. Not the enforcing of laws, not even the enforcing of God's Law, is the power of the Kingdom of Heaven, but the preaching of the Gospel of grace; and this Gospel always has its twofold effect: the saving (not the "Christianizing")

of the elect and the hardening of others. The Law is written — potently! — by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those who believe the Gospel, so that they fear God and keep His commandments — powerfully!

The polemic against millennialism is solidly grounded in a positive development of "The Christian Hope of Heaven and Earth," by means of a careful interpretation of Genesis 1-3. The book's value is enhanced by several significant appendices, including expositions of marriage; of the seventy weeks of Daniel 9; and of the passages on Gog and Magog, in Ezekiel and Revelation.

The power of the book in its controversy with millennial teachings and in its instruction of God's people concerning their hope lies in its sound, careful, and rich interpretation of Scripture. It is an "exegetical critique." The student of Scripture will be helped by both an index of subjects and an index of texts explained.

This is a worthy addition to a growing body of Protestant Reformed literature and a significant contribution to the Reformed treatment of the last things.

It is also a very handsome volume. □

**FRANCIS: A CALL TO CONVERSION**, by Duane W.H. Arnold & C. George Fry; Zondervan Publishing House, 1988; 143 pp.

(no price). (Reviewed by Prof. H. Hanko)

Francis of Assisi was an extremely influential and engaging figure in the Middle Ages. Much has been written about him, but little is known of his life. This book, rather well researched, fills in many gaps: insofar as it is a biography, it is an interesting and helpful one.

But the purpose of the authors, both Protestants, is wider than that of sketching a mere biography. Their purpose is best stated in the Foreword:

*So read this book with an open mind and perhaps Francis will open your heart. In an attitude of sharing, rather than argumentation, Protestant brothers and sisters might well find themselves becoming more understanding of Catholics, and Catholic brothers and sisters might well find themselves becoming more understanding of Protestants. It is then, when we embrace one another in the "holy fire" of the Gospel that we will find our hearts eternally melted together in the power of the love of God. It is then that we may truly call ourselves brothers and sisters in our Lord Jesus Christ. It is then that we may more truly understand the vision of Francis of Assisi.*

Francis of Assisi is pictured as the catalyst able to bring together all the branches of Christendom. The Second Part especially deals with this subject under the Headings: Worship, Theology, Society, Destiny.

Interestingly, the book is dedicated to Terry Waite. □



# News From Our Churches

Mr. Benjamin Wigger

March 15, 1989

## MINISTERIAL CALLS

Rev. C. Terpstra accepted the call he received from our South Holland, IL congregation.

The Council of our Peace P.R.C. in Lynnwood, IL presented the following trio for their congregation's prayerful consideration. Revs. K. Hanko, T. Miersma, and K. Koole. At a meeting held February 5, Rev. K. Koole was chosen to receive the call.

The newly organized congregation in Norristown, PA named their first trio, consisting of the Revs. K. Hanko, R. Hanko, and J. Kortering. From that group they extended a call to Rev. K. Hanko, who, of course, served the group in Norristown as missionary until their organization in January.

The saints of Hope P.R.C. in Isabel, SD voted to extend a call to Rev. C. Haak. He was chosen from a trio which included, along with Rev. Haak, the Revs. R. Dykstra and K. Koole.

## CHURCH ACTIVITIES

There was a notice in the bulletin of Peace P.R.C. requesting all those interested in forming a Choral Society to meet briefly after the morning service. The meeting was to determine interest in working on music for an Easter Singspiration.

The congregation of First P.R.C. in Edmonton, Alberta held a Dedication Program for their new church on February 17. A time of fellowship was held after the program.

*Mr. Wigger is an elder in the Protestant Reformed Church of Hudsonville, Michigan.*

This winter has been especially hard on some areas of this country as well as Canada. Flu has reached epidemic proportions in some areas. This must also be true in Edmonton. There was a notice on a recent bulletin that to prevent the spread of colds and other infections, the person who takes care of the crib sheets in the nursery is also requested to take the nursery toys home each week and wash them.

I am afraid that sometimes we who are members of a larger congregation forget the particular difficulties faced by some of our smaller groups. I couldn't help but notice this while looking at a bulletin from our Covenant P.R.C. in Wyckoff, NJ. Their Consistory transferred a number of families from their membership rolls to the newly organized church in Norristown, PA. These families always attended Norristown; but in addition there was one family from Covenant who requested their papers be transferred to Norristown as well. The consistory noted that they were very sad that they were leaving them. For them it means the loss of another family, which in a small congregation such as theirs is very difficult. But continue they must, and continue they will, by the grace of God. Let all of us resolve to remain steadfast here in the church in which Christ has placed us, and be ever closer in love for each other.

The consistory of the Immanuel P.R.C. of Lacombe, Alberta has made several changes in the order of worship. They will begin to sing two new

doxologies in the afternoon service: "Glory Be to the Father" and "May the Grace of Christ the Savior." Also, the first doxology in each service will be sung as a response to the pastor's words, "Our help is in the name of Jehovah, Who made the heavens and the earth." The consistory has also decided that the congregation will recite the Apostles' Creed with the minister, during the prayer as found in the Lord's Supper Form. This is in harmony with the words, "whereof we make confession with our mouths and hearts, saying . . ."

The Young People's Society of our First P.R.C. in Holland, MI sponsored a cross-country skiing and ice-skating party for their congregation.

On February 24 a Potluck Supper was planned for the entire congregation of Kalamazoo P.R.C. in Kalamazoo, MI.

## SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Everyone in the Lynden P.R.C. in Lynden, WA was invited to attend a turkey dinner at the Covenant Christian School. There was volley-ball and films after dinner.

Heritage Christian School in Hudsonville, MI presented their All-School Program on February 23. The theme this year was "The Wonderful Names of our Lord."

Alumni, parents, and supporters of Covenant Christian High in Walker, MI were cordially invited to a "Super Potluck" held on Saturday, February 18 in the gym at Covenant. This potluck was held in connection with Homecoming '89. All proceeds went toward the CCHS Phase I Bldg. Project.



## CONGREGATIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

The 1989 P.R.Y.P. Convention will be held August 14 - 18. Due to limited finances, the young people of the sponsoring church, Hope in Walker, MI wish to lodge out-of-state conventioners in the homes of volunteers from their church.

"Creation or Evolution?" (a special showing of a promotional

film of the Institute of Creation Research, featuring Ken Ham from Australia) was shown at Byron Center P.R.C. in Byron Center, MI on Feb. 21. This was a preview of the Creation Conference to be held on March 17 & 18.

And, just a reminder, the Reformed Witness Hour needs our support. Presently there are two areas of need, new equip-

ment and additional stations. We can support either, as individuals, societies, and/or congregations. Let us all work together to promote the spread of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And a final thought lifted from the bulletin of our Trinity P.R.C. in Houston, TX:

"Holiness is not the way to Christ, but Christ is the way to holiness." -A. Toplady □

Rev. Ronald Hanko

## Report of Classis West

Classis West met on Wednesday, March 1, 1989, in South Holland, Illinois. Classis met in three sessions and finished its business at about 8:30 Wednesday evening.

This was the first Classis at which delegates from the new Congregation of Peace, in Lynwood, Illinois, were present at Classis, and a report was read at Classis of their organization as a new congregation. Their organization was carried out by the South Holland council.

The South Holland council will also have another organization to carry out, now that Classis has granted the request of the Northwest Chicago Mission for organization and appointed South Holland to carry out this pleasant duty. Rev. R. Van Overloop and

some of the members of the Mission were at the meeting of Classis to witness Classis' decision. The members who were present also publicly introduced themselves to the delegates.

Classis, in harmony with a recommendation of the Classical Committee, admonished the Consistories which have not allowed their ministers to fill Classical appointments. It was pointed out at Classis that this practice is contrary to Article 31 of the Church Order.

Classical appointments were scheduled for Hope PRC of Isabel, South Dakota, for the Pella, Iowa, PRC, and for Peace PRC of Lynwood, Illinois.

Two protests concerning a previous decision of Classis on the matter of home-schooling were received by Classis. Classis decided that the September, 1988, Classis erred in entering into the matter and declared that the decision of the previous Classis was null and void. The matter was, therefore, sent back to the Consistory involved.

In connection with these protests, a Committee was appointed

to study the practice of treating minority reports on the floor of Classis in light of the ongoing indecision and disagreement over this matter.

Classis also received an overture from a brother and his Consistory asking that the wording of the Apostles' Creed be changed in future printings of the *Psalter* and that the changes be recommended to the Churches. There were two changes desired: the words "Holy Spirit" being substituted for "Holy Ghost" and "living" for "quick." This overture received the disapproval of Classis on the ground that the words were used throughout our creeds, *Psalter*, and liturgy and there was little point in making the changes in only one place. Classis also decided that the use of these words in the recitation of the Apostles' Creed was best left to the discretion of the local Consistories. Classis, therefore, refused to recommend the changes to the Congregations.

An overture from one of the Consistories in Classis West was also received. This overture dealt with a decision of Classis East

---

*Rev. Hanko is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Houston, Texas.*



proposing a division of the Churches into three Classes. The overture asked that Synod refrain from taking any action on this matter until all the churches had opportunity to study and to speak to the matter. This overture was declared out of order in light of the fact that Synod already has a procedure for changing Classical boundaries that allows all the Churches opportunity to discuss and protest any proposed changes.

Requests for subsidy were received from seven of the churches in Classis West. With one exception these requests were granted for a total of \$123,686.34 in assistance for 1989 and 1990.

Various elections were conducted. Rev. R. Moore was re-appointed to the Classical Committee, Rev. D. Kuiper was elected as delegate *ad examina*, and Revs. R. Moore and G. Lanting as Church Visitors. The ministers chosen as delegates to Synod, 1989, were Revs. A. den Hartog, C. Haak, K. Koole, and D. Kuiper. Elder delegates were Mr. R. Brands, W. Bruinsma, H. Hoekstra, and J. Sugg.

The next meeting of Classis is scheduled for September 6, 1989, in Doon, Iowa.

Rev. Ron Hanko  
Stated Clerk □

## CALL TO ASPIRANTS TO THE MINISTRY

All young men desiring to begin studies for the 1989-90 academic year in the Theological School of the Protestant Reformed Churches should make application at the April 20, 1989 meeting of the Theological School Committee.

### Seminary Students:

A testimonial from the student's consistory that he is a member in full communion, sound in faith and upright in

walk, a certificate of health from a reputable physician, and high school and college transcripts must accompany the application. All applicants to the seminary department must have completed the equivalent of a four-year college education (125 semester hours) and must meet the course requirements for entrance to the seminary department. These entrance requirements are listed in the seminary catalog available from the school.

All seminary department applicants must appear before the Theological School Committee for interview before admission is granted. In the event that a student can not appear at the April 20th meeting, notification of this fact along with a suggested interview date must be given to the secretary of the Theological School Committee before this meeting.

All correspondence should be directed to the Theological School Committee, 4949 Ivanrest Ave., Grandville, Michigan 49418.

Jon Huiskens, Secretary

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Ladies' Society of the Protestant Reformed Church of South Holland wishes to express its sympathy to Mrs. Barney Haak and to Mrs. Art De Jong in the death of their infant granddaughter RUTH JOHANNA DE JONG.

"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. 4:14)

Rev. G. Lanting, President  
Mrs. J. Lenting, Vicar

### NOTICE!!!

Classis East will meet in regular session on Wednesday, May 10, 1989 at the Hudsonville

Protestant Reformed Church. Material to be treated at this session must be in the hands of the Stated Clerk at least three weeks prior to the convening of this session.

Jon J. Huiskens  
Stated Clerk

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Men's Society of the Hope Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sincere Christian sympathy to their members, Mr. Jake Kuiper and Mr. Peter Petroelje, in the death of their sister and sister-in-law, MISS ELSIE KUIPER, on March 3, 1989.

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." (Phil. 1:21)

Dewey Engelsma, Pres.  
Arnold Dykstra, Sec.

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Adult Bible Society of the Doon (Iowa) Protestant Reformed Church expresses Christian sympathy to Mrs. Henrietta Klein in the passing of her beloved husband, MR.

CLARENCE KLEIN on February 18, 1989.

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." (Philippians 1:21)

Rev. R. Dykstra, Pres.  
Mrs. Grace Van Den Top,  
Sec'y.

### ATTENTION TEACHERS!!!

Loveland Prot. Ref. Christian School, Loveland, Colo. is seeking a teacher for the 1989-90 school year. Teaching position open is for grades 4-6. For more information contact Ron Koole (Principal) at school 705 E. 57th, Loveland, Colo. 80537 (303) 667-9289 or to Larry Kooienga (Board Sec'y) 448 E. 12th St., Loveland, Colo. 80537 (303) 669-4662.



### ATTENTION TEACHERS!!!

Hope Christian School of Redlands, CA is seeking to add a teacher to its staff beginning the 1989-90 school year. Teaching assignment would be either grades K and 1, or 2nd - 4th. Those interested may call Ed Karsemeyer (Principal) at school (714-793-1504) or at home (714-793-7166), or Mike Gritters (Secretary of School Board), at (714-739-4439). Applications or resumes should be sent to Hope Christian School, 1309 E. Brockton, Redlands, CA 92374.

### NOTICE!!!

The South Holland Protestant Reformed School is seeking applications for a teaching position at the elementary grade level beginning the 1989/90 school year. Direct all inquiries to:

Lamm Lubbers, Administrator  
16511 South Park Avenue  
South Holland, IL 60473  
(312) 339-6585

or to

James Lanting, Board Sec'y.  
16230 Louis Avenue  
South Holland, IL 60473  
(312) 596-5093

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Ladies Society of the South Holland Protestant Reformed Church expresses Christian love and sympathy to its sister Mrs. Jennie Stouwie and family in the passing of her sister, Mrs. Grace Schutt. "He healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds."

Rev. George Lanting, pres.  
Mrs. Arthur De Jong, secy.

### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Martha Society of the Doon (Iowa) Protestant Reformed Church expresses its Christian sympathy to Mrs. Clarence Klein and to her family in the death of her husband, MR. CLARENCE KLEIN.

"The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?  
The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?"  
(Psalm 27:1)

Rev. R. Dykstra, Pres.  
Nancy Zeutenhorst, Sec'y.

### ATTENTION STUDENTS!!!

The Protestant Reformed Scholarship Committee is accepting applications from future Protestant Reformed teachers and ministers. For an application contact Dirk Westra, 1880 Elizabeth Lane, Jenison, Michigan 49428 (616) 457-0705.

### WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

On April 2, 1989, our parents and grandparents, MR. AND MRS. DONALD DYKSTRA, will celebrate their 65th wedding anniversary. We are thankful to our God for the many years we have enjoyed with them and we pray that the Lord will continue to bless them and keep them in his care.

Tunis and Rose Dykstra  
Albert and Harriet Dykstra  
Arnold and Donna Dykstra  
Don Dykstra  
Rich and Faye Dykstra  
27 grandchildren  
45 great grandchildren  
2 great, great grandchildren

### NOTICE!!!

The Northwest Iowa Protestant Reformed Christian School, of Doon, Iowa, is in need of two lower grade elementary teachers for the 1989-90 school year. Please contact:

Mr. Chester Hunter, Jr.  
(Administrator)  
106 Fifth Ave.  
Doon, IA 51235  
(712) 726-3381

or

Mr. John Mantel  
(Board President)  
R.R. 2, Box 247  
Rock Valley, IA 51247  
(712) 476-5609

### IN MEMORIAM

On February 20, 1989 the Lord took to his heavenly home our beloved husband, father, and grandfather, RICHARD MONSMA, at the age of 76. We rejoice that he is now with his Lord in glory, and pray that we who have, for a little while, been left behind may continue to experience in our sorrow the sustaining grace of our Father in heaven.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Romans 8:1)

Mrs. Richard Monsma  
Richard Gregg and Penny  
Monsma  
Dr. Raymond and Joy Grundy  
Gloria Monsma  
and 5 grandchildren