

Clarion

The Canadian Reformed Magazine
Volume 51, No. 6, March 15, 2002




Numbers

10:1-10

**K. Schilder:
1890-1952**

INSIDERS



By J. De Jong



The Good Fight – K. Schilder: 1890-1952


The month of March commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of the death of the Dutch Reformed theologian and churchman, K. Schilder. A half century after his death, he still continues to occupy the minds of scholars, preachers and Christian apologists in Holland and abroad. He was one of the more articulate and controversial theologians of the twentieth century in the Netherlands. In many ways his writings, although showing the mark of their time, continue to inspire and hold relevance for the times in which we live. Particularly the last ten years have seen a modest but steady interest in Schilder's theological views and his social and ecclesiastical impact.

Schilder was ordered not to participate in any publishing or journalistic activity.

One of the more detailed studies on Schilder in recent years is a two-volume dissertation by Dr. Jan Ridderbos, a nephew to the more well-known Dr. J. Ridderbos who master-minded the doctrinal standpoint of the synods of the Reformed churches in Holland during the years of the second World War.¹ The younger Ridderbos, a minister in Haren, the Netherlands, sought to write an objective survey of Schilder's role in the churches during the stormy thirties and forties. His two volume work, entitled *Struggle on Two Fronts*, is a noteworthy thesis. A brief consideration of Ridderbos' approach may be a way for us to be reminded of Schilder's significance and abiding relevance for the life of the Reformed churches today.

Struggle on two fronts

Ridderbos is specifically concerned about Schilder's struggle with national socialism, and this forms the dominant theme of his dissertation. However, wrapped up in this struggle was the ecclesiastical struggle resulting in the schism of 1944. Simply stated, Ridderbos' thesis is that the struggle on these two fronts was closely related for Schilder. He suggests that while the struggle on the political front was extremely important in Schilder's early years as a professor, the struggle on the ecclesiastical front took centre stage once the



K. Schilder (1890-1952)

occupation of Holland had set in. After that, Schilder does not really speak out on political and social issues anymore.

The thesis can be briefly expanded upon as follows. After Schilder's imprisonment and release in 1939, Ridderbos suggests that he was less inclined to speak out on the political and social scene. Besides, he was under the strictest orders not to be involved in any journalistic activity. Ridderbos is uncertain whether this refers to strictly political journalism, or any writing across the board. However, the paper

The principles of blood, soil and race ultimately had deep pagan roots, and behind the ideology was the principle of the deification of the state.

Schilder edited, *De Reformatie*, was under a publication ban. Later, when it was learned that the SD was seeking to arrest him again, Schilder went "underground," that is, he went into hiding. In Ridderbos' view the decision to "go underground" led to an insular and polemical mentality on

Schilder's part that pitted him against the ruling elite of the theologians in the Reformed churches. His home of refuge served as a defence haven around which he increasingly fortified himself in an isolated and unbending position. Hence, the suggestion of Ridderbos is clear: the stress of the war time situation, and the retreat to a hidden address with an assumed alias all led to a warrior's disposition in which Schilder appeared to be carrying on a more or less personal vendetta against the theologians, and against the ecclesiastical hierarchy that did not agree with what were seen as his sharp and polemical views.

The fight for freedom

Space does not permit us to enter into detail concerning Ridderbos' arguments or to interact with all the facts that he brings forward. He certainly went on a long hunt to gather all his information! However, globally speaking, the results are meagre relative to the volume of facts and material presented. Did we not all know that the struggles on the two fronts were related? Isn't it an obvious hypothesis to suggest a relationship between the struggle on two fronts?

What's inside?

It is the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Prof. Dr. K. Schilder. The Lord our God used Dr. Schilder in an amazing way for the gathering, defending and preserving of his church. Schilder's writings continue to inspire and educate us to this day. While not suggesting that everything Schilder did was perfect, Dr. J. De Jong, in his editorial, demonstrates something of the remarkable and faithful work of this faithful servant.

A doctrine that is very dear to us is that children of believing parents are in the covenant and they are to receive the sign and seal of the covenant which is baptism. Sadly, there are many objections to this doctrine. This is no small matter. Rev. P. G. Feenstra examines the subject of infant baptism and demonstrates that it is God's will that infants be baptized.

We have in this issue the fourth installment of Dr. F.G. Oosterhoff on the discussion of faith and science. Rev. J. VanRiestchoten shares some of his thoughts and concerns about the need for ministers in the smaller congregations and house congregations. We also have a report from MERF, our column, *Ray of Sunshine*, a book review and a letter to the editor.

In the column, *Education Matters*, Keith Sikkema reports on an address of Dr. R. Faber at a Teachers' Convention. The address deals with education in the time of the Reformation. We hope to include the full text of this address in a future issue of *Clarion*.

In keeping with the time of year, we have a meditation by Rev. R. Schouten on how Satan played into the hands of God by driving Jesus Christ to the cross. What Satan saw as his victory was actually his defeat.

Last but not least, we have a new metrical version on Psalm 19 by Dr. William Helder. It is a pleasure to receive such installments from our brother.

RA



Published biweekly by Premier Printing Ltd., Winnipeg, MB

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Editor: J. Visscher

Managing Editor: R. Aasman

Coeditors: J. De Jong, N.H. Gootjes, Cl. Stam

ADDRESS FOR EDITORIAL MATTERS:

CLARION

26 Inverness Crescent, St. Albert, AB T8N 5J3

Fax: (780) 418-1506 E-Mail: raasman@canrc.org

ADDRESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

(subscriptions, advertisements, etc.):

CLARION, Premier Printing Ltd.

One Beghin Avenue

Winnipeg, MB, Canada R2J 3X5

Phone: (204) 663-9000 Fax: (204) 663-9202

Email: clarion@premier.mb.ca

World Wide Web address: premier.mb.ca/clarion.html

SUBSCRIPTION RATES FOR 2002

	Regular Mail	Air Mail
Canada*	\$39.50*	\$65.00*
U.S.A. U.S. Funds	\$42.00	\$54.00
International	\$64.00	\$97.00



*Including 7% GST – No. 890967359RT

Advertisements: \$12.50 per column inch

We acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Canada, through the Publication Assistance Program (PAP), toward our mailing costs.

Cancellation Agreement

Unless a written subscription cancellation is received we assume you wish to continue to subscribe. You will be invoiced prior to the subscription renewal date.

Agreement No. 1377531

Publications Mail Registration No. 09907

ISSN 0383-0438

Copyright © Premier Printing Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part may be reproduced in any manner without permission in writing from the publisher, except brief quotations used in connection with a review in a magazine or newspaper.

Useful Link: www.canrc.org

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial – The Good Fight – K. Schilder: 1890-1952	
— J. De Jong	126
Treasures, New and Old — R. Schouten	130
Living by the Doctrines of Scripture – Baptism is for children of believers — P.G. Feenstra	131
Psalm 19 — William Helder	133
Faith and Science in the Reformed Tradition (4)	
— F.G. Oosterhoff.....	134
Book Review — W.L. Bredenhof	137
Ray of Sunshine — Mrs. Corinne Gelms and Mrs. Erna Nordeman	138
A Special Celebration at Cornerstone, Hamilton	
— H. Nienhuis	139
Letter to the Editor	140
Press Release – Classis Ontario South	141
Our Little Magazine — Aunt Betty	142

The problem arises in the way Ridderbos has related the struggles on two fronts. The suggestive reasoning is itself almost an affront. For example, without proof he suggests that while Schilder constantly appealed to both his publication ban and his being in hiding as the reason why he could not appear to defend his case before the Synod of Utrecht in 1943, he did find the opportunity to leave his hiding place and fulfill speaking engagements throughout the country. However, this assertion is out of place, and simply not true. It was not until the end of the occupation that Schilder dared to take on a few speaking engagements to deal with the issues of the ecclesiastical conflict. But in the early period of his "underground life," he consistently remained in hiding except for very occasional excursions. Ridderbos also suggests that while writing on political issues was *verboden* for Schilder, he could have interacted more openly with his colleagues on the ecclesiastical issues. He hints that Schilder was erroneously hiding behind the publication ban. But is not the text of the publication order clear? Schilder was ordered not to participate in *any* publishing or journalistic activity.²

The irritations caused by Schilder's attacks on the Nazi philosophy as well as the leading supporters of the NSB, led the theologians of the ruling and influential caste to discredit Schilder's theological ideas.

Even Ridderbos' suggestion that Schilder dropped all reference to the struggle on the political front after he went "underground" is erroneous. Schilder worked for the defence of the decision of Synod Amsterdam regarding membership on the NSB, the Dutch fascist party, at the Synod of 1939-1943, and in more ways continued to speak out where he could against the unlawful political aggression in the country as well.³ But given the new circumstances in the ecclesiastical scene, most of his energies were consumed by the church conflict.

The two sectors

While rejecting Ridderbos' unfounded suggestion above, we can, I believe, readily accept his view that there is a close relationship between the struggle on two fronts. Indeed, the relationship is much more intense than Ridderbos has suggested, and my remarks here are intended to briefly expand on that relationship. The conclusion can only be tentative; it would take more time and investigation to confirm my point of view. But there is evidence pointing in this direction – ironically supplied by Ridderbos himself!

The facts that Ridderbos introduces show convincingly that Schilder's initial battle on the political and social front led to his alienation and estrangement from what Ridderbos calls the Reformed elite of the day. The elite, in particular V. Hepp and H.H. Kuyper, were essentially pro-German. They followed the tracks of the senior Kuyper, for whom the Germanic stock represented a worthy and noble people, the ambassadors of learning, culture and science around the world. The elite was definitely more partial to the national socialist movement than many "lay members" of the churches.

Schilder began to voice his objections against the national socialist philosophy very early in his career as a professor. He had studied in Erlangen and had seen the rise of the movement first hand in the German cities he visited as he conducted his dissertation research. "Troops every where!" he would write home, "crowds massing together, cheering the leaders!" It was then no surprise that in 1936 he published the brochure *Not an Inch!* (Dutch: *Geen Duimbreed!*) In this booklet he exposed the roots of Nazi ideology, pointing to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, combined with the pagan Germanic myths uncovered by R. Wagner in his operas and other musical compositions. And behind all this was the stark rationalism of the philosopher G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831). The principles of blood, soil and race ultimately had deep pagan roots, and behind the ideology was the principle of the deification of the state.

The Reformed elite was not enamoured with the strong stand that Schilder took. H.H. Kuyper publicly warned him that he should not make himself a martyr. He suggested that some degree of caution would be in order in dealing with the new public authorities. Both Hepp and Kuyper were known for their pro-Nazi positions, and some of their public statements were not received with favour. They did not mince their words or hide their irritation at the position Schilder took. Even less acceptable to them was the widespread support that Schilder's position received among the church membership.

It was only after Schilder's initial publications and ecclesiastical input on the political and social front that the Reformed elite began to turn their ammunition against the specifically theological and confessional positions of Schilder and his supporters. The irritations caused by Schilder's attacks on the Nazi philosophy as well as the leading supporters of the NSB, led the theologians of the ruling and influential caste to discredit Schilder's theological ideas.

Several authors have shown that Schilder's views with regard to covenant and baptism were by no means fixed or etched in stone in the late thirties. He was going through a development, and never spoke out sharply against the Kuyperian view of covenant and baptism during these earlier years. Even his standpoint on the church-political side of the issues was evolving through his interaction with his colleague, Dr. S. Greijdanus, among others. Schilder, for example, never spoke out critically against the church-political side of Assen 1926 the way Rev. J. van Lonkhuyzen and Prof. Greijdanus did. One cannot claim that Schilder's positions on covenant and baptism were fixed with certainty as the war broke out.

He joined in not because he wanted to, but because he had to.

Then, however, the pressure was put on, and the war years became the catalyst for the ruling caste to corner the irritant, to see if he could in any way be curtailed or removed. No one really wanted a schism or a personal vendetta. But the sharper and biblically based views on the antithesis and the call of the church to be separate in the world as propounded by Schilder clashed with the more compromising position that Kuyper's successors had adopted, especially manifested in their alignment with Kuyper's theory of the plurality of the church and common grace.

The two fronts together

How then may one assess Schilder's battle on two fronts? It was his stand on the social and political issues that served as a catalyst to light the fire of the ecclesiastical struggle. And when the turn to the ecclesiastical issues was forced through on the ecclesiastical agendas, Schilder, although initially reluctant for battle, locked forces and joined in. He joined in not because *he wanted to*, but because *he had to*. He had appealed for delay with respect to the discussion on the doctrinal differences, but the elite, with the rising stars that supported it, knew of no holds barred. It was a struggle in which Schilder did not isolate himself, as Ridderbos suggests, but one in which he was forced into isolation and then finally suspended and deposed as the contemporary church's greatest villain.

One struggle

What Ridderbos failed to see is that Schilder's struggle was throughout *one struggle*. There were two fronts, but there is one faith covering all of life. Life is religion! – the new perspectives in the Calvinist philosophy of the day taught the same rule. Life is one; it is a whole. Therefore when the battle opened on the political and social front, it could not stop there, but had to be carried over into the ecclesiastical sphere when the opposing elite drove the issues in that direction. The Christian life is a unity, is it not? It was a freedom struggle, beginning with the encroaching forces of Nazism, ending with a protest against the encroaching forces of hierarchy as pressed on him and others by his own countrymen and brothers – those initially and even later more doggedly partial to the national socialist influence in Europe.

Did Schilder have his weaknesses? Was he sometimes entangled by his own polemical disposition? Let's just say

that he was human like anyone else. But his impact cannot be ignored: his unrelenting commitment to the freedom of the churches in a free land – that marked his struggle. "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race" says Paul just before his death. In his time and place and with all his attending weaknesses, Schilder fought the same battle for the good of the church. That legacy still lives among God's people today – in our land as well. It is not the legacy of human strength or human boasting; rather it is the legacy of the mercy and grace of God who in his kindness takes pity on his people, guards them from the snare of bondage and death, and sets them free to serve Him with joy all their days. Schilder was in the deepest sense of the term, an apologist for *Christian freedom* in all of life – the freedom to serve a God who even in the middle of the deepest struggles visits his people with mercy, strength, healing and peace.

¹Jan Ridderbos, *Strijd op twee fronten. Schilder en de gereformeerde 'elite' in de jaren 1933-1945 tussen aanpassing, collaboratie en verzet op kerkelijk en politiek terrain*. 2 volumes, J.H. Kok, Kampen, 1994

²The text stated; ". . .jede schriftstellerische oder journalistische Tätigkeit."

³Prof. J. Kamphuis documented this position in four articles written to correct a similar position taken by the Dutch historian of the war period, Dr. L. De Jong. See J. Kamphuis, "Noodzakelijk protest I-IV" *De Reformatie*, Vol. 48, (1972-1973) pp. 78ff.



Dr. J. De Jong is principal and professor of Diaconology and Ecclesiology at the Theological College of the Canadian Reformed Churches in Hamilton, Ontario.



Wartburg Castle, Germany

By R. Schouten

Satan's self-destruction

"The evening meal was being served and the devil had already prompted Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, to betray Jesus" John 13:2. "As soon as Judas took the bread, Satan entered into him" John 13:27.

Reading John 13 leads us to ask the question: "Why did Satan seek to use Judas to speed Christ's journey to the cross?" If the cross meant the victory of God over Satan, why would Satan hasten his own demise?

The answer to this question is that Satan did *not*, in fact, realize that the cross would be his undoing. It is true that the devil and his demons *did* know that Jesus was the Son of God. When Christ encountered persons possessed by demons, they confessed Him to be the Holy One, the Son of God (see e.g., Luke 4:34). However, their questions addressed to the Lord Jesus revealed that they did not know *why* He had come. They said things like: "What do you want with us, Son of God? Have you come here to torture us before the appointed time?" (Matt 8:29).


Thus, what we see in John 13 is the irony of Satan using his evil influence to bring about his own destruction. Because of his fury and hatred against Jesus the King, he orchestrates the events that lead to Christ's suffering and death on the cross. Judas has become disillusioned because the Lord Jesus is not following the expected way to royal glory. Instead of embracing applause and power, Christ is following a self-chosen path of service that will end in death. Because Judas cannot fathom the way of self-denial, he separates himself from the cause of Jesus of Nazareth.

Satan seizes the moment to take hold of the mind and heart of Judas. Satan possessed Judas for the express purpose of inciting him to betray Jesus and so bring about the crucifixion. The evil one naively believed that putting

Jesus to death was the way to do away with the Son of God who had come to establish the kingdom of God. What Satan could not have imagined is that his apparent victory was in fact, God's decisive victory over him. Satan and the rulers of the age did not see the saving wisdom and the redemptive power of the cross. "If they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor 2:8).

Thus, the seething hatred of the prince of darkness plays into the hands of God. Even the wrath of the powers of evil must serve God's redemptive purposes. It is through the shedding of his blood that the Lion of Judah conquers. Unexpectedly for Satan, the Lion is a sacrificial Lamb (Rev 5:5, 6). Christ defeated God's great enemy not by killing him but by letting Himself be killed. On the cross, the seed of the woman was bruised but the head of the serpent was crushed. Through suffering

and death, the ruler of the world was cast out (John 12:31).

How did the cross conquer Satan? It did so by taking away his legal grounds to accuse us. Satan's power over the people of the world is derived from the guilt of their sin. It is our sin that generates the destructive lordship of Satan over the world. Now that Christ has paid, in full, the penalty for sin, Satan's power over all who believe is broken forever. By faith in Christ, we may share in his victory. Through the precious blood of Jesus, we've been set free from all the power of the devil (Lord's Day 1). In our ongoing struggle against "the spiritual hosts of wickedness," we overcome by keeping our faith focussed on the sacrifice of Jesus. In this sacrifice is our victory and our eternal freedom. 

Rev. R.A. Schouten is minister of the Canadian Reformed Church at Abbotsford, British Columbia.



Baptism is for children of believers

By P.G. Feenstra

Baptism of infants challenged

The doctrine of infant baptism has been and continues to be the subject of disagreement and division among Christians. Some find the arguments of those who deny infant baptism to be rather convincing. The New Testament does not give a direct command to baptize children.

Baptizing children of believers underlines the gospel of God's sovereign grace in Jesus Christ.

Objections to infant baptism are not new. The Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century taught that prior to being baptized you should be able to give a testimony of how you have experienced God's love in your life. Baptism becomes the visible evidence that you have accepted Jesus as your personal Saviour. It is the outward symbol of the Christian life which should only be given to those who show evidence of having begun the Christian life; of having been regenerated and born again (Wayne Grudem, Systematic Theology).

Infant baptism is a confessional matter

Denying infant baptism is not a minor point or a non-essential. Both the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism deliberately draw our attention to the importance of maintaining the doctrine of infant baptism. With Article 34 of the Belgic Confession we confess, "We believe, therefore, that anyone who aspires to eternal life ought to be baptized only once. Baptism should never be repeated, for we cannot be born twice. Moreover, baptism

benefits us not only when the water is on us and we receive it, but throughout our whole life. For that reason we reject the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with a single baptism received only once, and who also condemn the baptism of the little children of believers."

In the Heidelberg Catechism we are asked, "Should infants, too, be baptized?" The answer is familiar, "Yes. Infants as well as adults belong to God's covenant and congregation. Through Christ's blood the redemption from sin and the Holy Spirit, who works faith, are promised to them no less than to adults. Therefore, by baptism, as sign of the covenant, they must be grafted in the Christian church and distinguished from the children of unbelievers. This was done in the old covenant by circumcision, in place of which baptism was instituted in the new covenant."

Infant baptism is not an isolated doctrine

The doctrine of infant baptism is not isolated from other teachings of Scripture. Baptizing children of believers underlines the gospel of God's sovereign grace in Jesus Christ, highlights the doctrine of the covenant the Lord established with believers and their children, and stresses our position as people of God – as those who are sanctified in Christ (1 Cor 7:14) and called to live holy and blameless lives. Where infant baptism is disputed, the manner in which we are saved is brought into question: Is it an act of God whereby He sovereignly and graciously makes us alive through Christ's redemption or can we, through the exercising of our free will, decide to accept Christ into our lives? Is baptism a symbol of beginning the Christian life and therefore only for those who make a credible pro-

fession of faith, or is it a sign of God's faithfulness to us?

Infant baptism and God's sovereign grace

Baptism neither causes regeneration (Roman Catholics) nor symbolizes the fact that inward regeneration has occurred (Baptists). No one, adults or children, should be baptized because of their faith in God and commitment to the Christian life. Baptism is administered because of the gospel of God's sovereign grace in Jesus Christ which is received through faith. The LORD has ordained and chosen to work his salvation by showing his faithfulness to believers and their children. Both the Old and New Testament are unmistakably clear on this. The Lord proclaims his sovereign grace to believers and their children (Ps 102:28; 105:5, 6, 8; 112:1, 2).

The Lord establishes his covenant with believers and their children.

In Isaiah 59:20, 21 the prophet first tells of the salvation which will come for the people God has chosen, "The Redeemer will come to Zion, to those in Jacob who repent of their sins." But then the prophet shows how this applies to the children too: "'As for me, this is my covenant with them,' says the LORD. 'My Spirit, who is on you, and my words that I have put in your mouth will not depart from your mouth, or from the mouths of your children, or from the mouths of their descendants from this time on and forever,' says the LORD." Redemption from sin and the Holy Spirit, who works faith, is promised to them no less than to adults.

The Lord in his sovereign grace chooses whom He wills and where He wills. He chose Cornelius and the Philippian jailer. Christ adds them to his church. And when the gospel of grace was made known to them, they and their children were baptized just as Abraham and his family were circumcised. We read in Acts 16:32, 33, "Then they spoke the word of the Lord to him and to all the others in his house. At that hour of the night the jailer took them and washed their wounds; then immediately he and all his family were baptized." The Lord in his sovereign good pleasure grants children of believers the same promises of the gospel as their parents. They, too, are promised the washing away of sins and the daily renewal of life. As Peter stated in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, "The promise is for you and your children . . ." (Acts 2:39). God binds himself to us and our children. He establishes a relation with believers and their children. He gives the sign and seal of what He promises in the sacrament of holy baptism.

Infant baptism and the covenant

The Lord establishes his covenant with believers and their children. When the LORD established his covenant with Abraham, He not only initiated it but also determined who would be included in it. Thus we read in Genesis 17:7, "I will establish my covenant as an everlasting covenant between me and you and your descendants after you for the generations to come, to be your God and the God of your descendants after you." As a sign of this covenant the LORD commanded that baby boys be circumcised when they were eight days old (Gen 17:12,13). In infant baptism "nothing more of present effectiveness must be required than to confirm and ratify the covenant made with them by the Lord. The remaining significance of this sacrament will afterward follow at such time as God himself foresees." (John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* Book IV.16.22).

Throughout our life we may ask God to continue showing us the covenant faithfulness He displayed to us the moment we arrived into the world. Since the LORD is loyal and committed to the covenant He established with us no one is hindered in coming to Him with prayers and supplication. He hears the cry of the lonely and afflicted. Those who are without a true friend or companion on this earth can pray, "Heal the sorrows of my heart and regard my life as precious" (Psalm 25, *Book of Praise*).

Baptism and circumcision

Those who deny infant baptism suggest that there is no connection between baptism and circumcision. They argue that circumcision had no spiritual meaning for the people of Israel but only marked them as members of the nation of Israel. Baptism cannot be placed on a equal level with circumcision because baptism's significance is entirely spiritual and circumcision material.

Nevertheless, already in the Old Testament the spiritual meaning of circumcision is also emphasized. Circumcision is more than a sign of national unity. Israel is told to remove sin from their hearts in the language of circumcision (Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4). Furthermore, the Lord commanded Abraham and his household to be circumcised when He established his covenant of grace with him. Abraham's circumcision spoke of spiritual blessings. His circumcision was a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised (Rom 4:9-13).

Colossians 2:11, 12 is the classic New Testament text demonstrating how baptism replaces circumcision as the sign of the covenant.

Abraham was declared righteous, not through any act of his own. God makes Abraham's way straight and allows him to walk before Him because the Messiah is coming. He will wash away Abraham's sins. The same sign, sealing what was promised to Abraham, is given to the children. A child, at eight days old, does not have faith but receives the seal of the righteousness that comes by faith.

Colossians 2:11,12 is the classic New Testament text demonstrating how baptism replaces circumcision as the sign of the covenant. We were circumcised in Christ with a circumcision made without hands so that being buried with Him in baptism we also be raised with Him to walk in the newness of life.

The LORD God decides *who* will receive the sign of the covenant and *when* they will receive it. That decision is not left up to us. Circumcision was not based on Abraham's faith or on what he experienced in his relation

with the Lord. This ceremony displayed the riches of God's grace for his covenant people.

Children belong to Christ's church

Children of believers belong, with their parents, to the congregation and church of God. When Joel is commanded by the Lord to call a congregational meeting he is to include the children, even nursing infants (Joel 2), because they belong to the Lord. Children are part of Christ's sheep. Just as a shepherd does not throw out the lambs from the fold, Christ, the loving Shepherd, gathers his lambs into the sheepfold and grants them the same promises and benefits as the adults. Since children belong to the covenant and congregation of Christ they ought to be baptized.

The argument, "Nowhere in the New Testament do you find a text stating infants should be baptized" starts from the wrong premise. A more pertinent question, in line with what both Old and New Testament Scriptures reveal, would be, "Where in the New Testament are we told that infants should not be baptized?" To the contrary, Christ continues to acknowledge children as part of his flock. He tells Peter to feed His lambs (John 21). In his letters to various churches, Paul addresses the children as well as the parents, considering both to be members of the churches (Eph 6:1-3; Col 3:20).

Parental responsibility

Parents have a duty to teach their children to know the significance of their baptism. This is why they vow to instruct their children, and to have them instructed in the doctrine of salvation. Knowing why children must receive the sign and seal of God's covenant in baptism ought to be the driving force behind what parents do for their children and how they educate and discipline them. Parents will not allow their children to soak up the thinking of the world. Instead they will do everything they possibly can to teach them to know the ways of the Lord.

Knowing what the Lord gives in baptism, parents and fellow congregational members will do everything to expose the children to the good news of salvation in Christ. As John Calvin correctly concludes, "For when we consider that immediately from birth God takes and acknowledges them as his children, we feel a strong stimulus to instruct them in an earnest fear of God and observance of the law" (Book IV.16.32). The children must learn to

use their baptism. This is why fathers and mothers have an obligation to take their children to church where they can hear the voice of the Holy Spirit and the message of forgiveness in Christ's blood. Parents will encourage their children to read the Bible, to study their catechism and learn Christian doctrine. It becomes a high priority for all adults

to see to it that the children of the church grasp that their life from beginning to end is directed by the grace of the Lord. "How sweet it is to godly minds to be assured, not only by word, but by sight, that they obtain so much favour with the Heavenly Father that their offspring are within his care . . . Accordingly, unless we wish spitefully

to obscure God's goodness, let us offer our infants to him, for he gives them a place among those of his family and household, that is, the members of his church" (Book IV.16.32). C

Rev. P.G. Feenstra is minister of the Canadian Reformed Church at Owen Sound, Ontario.

Psalm 19

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. The spacious heavens declare
God's glory everywhere;
The skies proclaim His might.
The knowledge they display
Day echoes forth to day
And night makes known to night.
They use no speech or word,
Yet everywhere is heard
The voice of all creation.
The truth that it expounds
Throughout the world resounds
And reaches every nation.</p> | <p>4. The fear of God is clean
And, free from sin and stain,
Forever will endure.
His judgments all express
Unfailing righteousness;
The LORD'S decrees are sure.
They far exceed in worth
The finest gold on earth:
His precious testimony!
It sweeter is by far
Than all that's sweet and pure
In combs that drip with honey.</p> |
| <p>2. God in the firmament
Pitched for the sun a tent,
The canopy of night.
From there it like a groom
With great rejoicing comes
Arrayed in glorious light.
Like one who runs a race
With strong and eager pace,
Across the vault of heaven
The sun its path completes.
So piercing is its heat
That it leaves nothing hidden.</p> | <p>5. Your servant, who has heard
The warnings of Your word,
To them pays heed, O LORD.
Those walking in Your way,
Who Your commands obey,
Will win a great reward.
But, LORD, who can perceive
What errors one may have
Unwittingly committed?
O cleanse me! Let me be
Of secret failings free,
Of hidden faults acquitted.</p> |
| <p>3. God's law is sound and whole;
It will revive the soul,
For it new strength supplies.
His testimony sure,
Trustworthy evermore,
Will make the simple wise.
His precepts plainly show
How right they are, and so
The heart they cheer and brighten.
The LORD'S commandments pure
Shine forth with radiance clear
And so the eyes enlighten.</p> | <p>6. O LORD, from wilful ways
Preserve me all my days:
The rule of sin prevent.
Then I shall blameless be,
From grave offences free,
And wholly innocent.
O hear me as I pray:
Let what my tongue may say
And what my heart may ponder
Be pleasing in Your sight,
O LORD so great in might,
My champion and defender!</p> |

Melody: Geneva, 1542/1543
Metrical version by William Helder, 2002

Dr. William Helder is a teacher at Guido de Brès High School in Hamilton, Ontario.

Faith and Science in the Reformed Tradition (4)

By F.G. Oosterhoff

Religion as evolutionary

The sciences were not the only branches of scholarship in the nineteenth century to undergo rapid expansion. Much was also done in areas such as economics, sociology, psychology, history, and biblical studies. The work in these fields, like that in the sciences proper, was influenced by the prevailing worldview. In practically all cases attempts were made to follow a method that was based on the scientific one. In many cases there was also a tendency to explain the object of investigation in developmental terms.

Bavinck gave attention to the critical approach to biblical studies, particularly to those of the Old Testament. A leader in that field was the contemporary German scholar Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), who won international fame by attempting to interpret the Old Testament along evolutionary lines. This meant that Israel's culture as well as its religion had developed from simple beginnings to ever increasing complexity and sophistication. Because in his theory animism and polytheism were more "primitive" than monotheism, Wellhausen concluded that all religions in their early stages had been animistic and/or polytheistic, and that only in course of time developments took place toward monotheism. This applied to Israel's faith. The earlier books of the Old Testament, in Wellhausen's interpretation, assumed the existence of many gods; it was not until a late period, in the eighth century, that prophets arose who proclaimed that there was only one, universal, omnipotent God.

To clinch their argument about the evolution of religion, critics pointed to the religious practices of still existing backward nations. It was done on the assumption that all cultures and reli-

gions develop in an identical manner, but at vastly different rates, and that today's backward nations were still in the first stages of cultural and cultic development. Consequently, the low form of religion found among them was similar to humanity's original religion and therefore served as proof that in advanced cultures religious development had indeed been from low to high, from simple to complex.

Many scholars admitted that when theorizing about the origin of man, of his language, his religion, his ethics, and so on, they were moving into the area of prehistory, where they had to satisfy themselves with guesses and assumptions.

Other aspects of the Old Testament were similarly interpreted from an evolutionary point of view. A few examples will have to suffice. According to the generally accepted chronology, Abraham and the other patriarchs lived around 2000-1700 B.C. The Wellhausen school, however, said that this was far too early a date for civilized individuals (as the Old Testament described the patriarchs) to have been around. They must therefore be the product of legend or fiction. Israelite history did not really begin until Moses and the Exodus; the entire period before the Exodus was still a time of barbarism. And not even Moses and his contemporaries had fully outgrown their primitive heritage. Theirs was not only a period of belief in a multiplicity

of gods, culturally and ethically also it was still a backward time. The high moral standards as expressed, for example, in the Ten Commandments could not have originated in the times of the Exodus, but must again be moved forward to the eighth century, or even to post-exilic times, that is, to the period following the return of Ezra around 450 B.C. In short, ethical monotheism – the characteristic that, according to the critics, distinguished Israel's religion from that of other nations – was a very late development.

Bavinck's response

Although Wellhausen's scheme seemed persuasive to many, not all of it, as soon appeared, could stand up under scholarly scrutiny. Already during Wellhausen's lifetime it became clear that many of his data were inaccurate, and also that his presuppositions strongly influenced, and all too often determined, his choice of evidence. As to the idea that the Old Testament teaches polytheism, for example, Wellhausen's critics pointed out that in his description of the Israelite faith he gave attention only to the religion of the masses, where lapses into paganism were indeed frequent. From the very beginning of Israel's history, however, there had been people who upheld the Mosaic teachings and the worship of Yahweh, the one and only God, and who attempted to draw the masses away from their apostasy. Their work is mentioned throughout the Old Testament, but because these data did not fit Wellhausen's framework, they were ignored. Attention was also drawn to the tendency of evolutionists to date customs, rituals, laws, and so on, according to the age of the document in which they found them, all the while overlooking

the obvious fact that old material can and does appear in later documents.

Yet another point of criticism was the evolutionists' assumption that early is necessarily primitive. The realization that the school had been misguided also in this respect was in large part the result of new work in archaeology, ancient history, and the history of religions. Archaeologists and historians provided evidence of the existence of high civilizations in the Middle East, both in Egypt and Mesopotamia (Babylonia and Assyria), during and even long before the time of the patriarchs. They also made clear that, as the Old Testament teaches, the patriarchs were in contact with Mesopotamia. The Old Testament portrayal of Abraham, himself of Mesopotamian origin, as a civilized individual was therefore not at all in conflict with the data of secular history.

Bavinck was among the scholars who drew attention to the discrepancies between Wellhausen's interpretation and the conclusions of archaeologists and historians.¹ In his critique, although he made use of the findings of historians and archaeologists, Bavinck took his point of departure in the Bible. From Scripture, he wrote, we learn that true knowledge of God was revealed to mankind at the beginning of history. This knowledge was corrupted as a result of the Fall, and eventually belief in the one universal God made room for polytheism. The confusion of speech at Babel and the dispersion of the nations no doubt aided that development: after the dispersion each ethnic group adopted and named its own god. At first monotheism may have continued within each group. But when the knowledge of the God of revelation declined still further, it can have been only a step for the nations to recognize besides the one national god a plethora of other deities, which would act as intermediaries between man and the supreme god. The same development would have taken place in Israel, had not God intervened by his electing grace and special revelation.

The evolutionary theory of religion, Bavinck argued, was not only unscriptural, it also lacked historical support. He added that this was beginning to be recognized in his days. Many scholars admitted that when theorizing about the origin of man, of his language, his religion, his ethics, and so on, they were moving into the area of prehistory, where they had to satisfy

themselves with guesses and assumptions. Evolutionists had ignored that fact. They had also been mistaken, Bavinck said, in reasoning by analogy from the religions of modern "primitive" nations to the character of religion in the distant past. For the idea that the nations in question are closer to the original state of humanity than are more civilized peoples is only an assumption; it has not been proven and cannot be proven. During the many centuries of their existence, the cultures and religions of these backward nations must have undergone at least some change. We in fact have every right to believe that we encounter among them not simply the absence of positive evolution, but the presence of its opposite, namely devolution and degeneration.

No one can take seriously the suggestion that evil and corruption are the origin of good, or that the lie gives birth to truth. How then can anyone truly believe that idolatry and superstition and the evil practices that so often go with them can have created the true religion? Without God and his revelation one cannot explain the origin and nature of religion.

Bavinck came with other historical arguments. He drew attention to the fact that many pagan nations have traditions of a golden age in the distant past, of a lost paradise, and of man being God's creature and of God's generation. Many of these traditions also speak of a God who is the cause of all that exists, of an ordered creation, of the existence of the invisible, of the struggle of good against evil, of the distinction between truth and falsehood, of immortality, a future judgment, and rewards and punishments in a future life. These traditions cannot be explained by theories according to which man evolved from the animal and religion from superstition and idolatry. To say that they can be so explained, Bavinck argued, is not only to be in conflict with whatever historical evidence we have, it also goes against common sense and logic. No

one can take seriously the suggestion that evil and corruption are the origin of good, or that the lie gives birth to truth. How then can anyone truly believe that idolatry and superstition and the evil practices that so often go with them can have created the true religion? "Without God," he concluded, "without the acknowledgement of his existence, of his revelation, and of his knowability, one cannot explain the origin and nature of religion."²

Christianity as derivative

Wellhausen's way of interpreting the Bible was not the only one available to radical biblical critics. There were other approaches. Among them was the one advanced by the school of the history of religions, which originated in the late nineteenth century and for some forty years came close to dominating the field of New Testament studies.

This school, which was again of German origin, agreed with Wellhausen about the evolutionary nature of religious traditions. It was not so much concerned, however, with the origin of religion as a universal phenomenon as with the comparative study of religions. Specifically, it tried to use the data of these studies to account for the origin and character of the biblical faith. Although Judaism and Christianity had risen to the highest levels, they were, according to the historians of religion, to a greater or lesser extent derivative and syncretistic. That is, they were products of, or largely built upon, ancient Hebrew and ancient pagan traditions and myths.

The school of the history of religions has lost a good deal of influence since the early twentieth century, but its theories have not been abandoned among all biblical critics, nor have they failed to influence the general public. Well into the past century one could meet the ideas, in more or less attenuated form, at secular schools and universities, for example in courses on ancient history and comparative religions. It is therefore worth our while to give some attention to these ideas and to Bavinck's response.

Although historians of religion attempted to explain both the Old and the New Testament with reference to pagan influences and sources, their work on the New Testament is probably best known. Anyone who studies that work will agree that there are similarities between the traditions in question and the Gospel account. This applies, for

example, to the widespread quest for deliverance in New Testament times. The Hellenistic age – that is the period beginning with the conquests of Alexander the Great just before 300 B.C. – was a time of great insecurity in the Graeco-Roman world, an insecurity that was a result of many years of warfare and political unrest, of extremes in wealth and poverty, and also of rapid political, social, and cultural change. Alexander's conquests, and later the expansion of Rome, had erased ancient boundaries, replaced local governments with foreign and frequently repressive ones, and created a society wherein a variety of cultures, traditions, and religions were thrown together. The magnitude and rapidity of the changes contributed to a feeling that the times were out of joint and that for the world to survive a cosmic renewal was necessary. This widespread conviction explains the fact that throughout the Roman Empire predictions multiplied about the coming of a saviour.

For some this saviour would be a divine being; for others he would merely be a political leader. It seems that a combination of the two ideas occurs in the work of the Roman poet Virgil (70-19 B.C.). In one of his poems, the famous Fourth Eclogue, which dates from about 40 B.C., Virgil spoke of the birth of a divine son who would regenerate all things and bring to Rome and the world a golden age of peace and justice. Well into the eighteenth century, Christians believed that Virgil had predicted the coming of Christ. They venerated him, with Balaam, as a "prophet of the Gentiles" and often called the poem in question the Messianic Eclogue.

Modern scholars tend to believe that Virgil was influenced by both pagan myths and Old Testament prophecy. In his days many Jews, uprooted since dispersion and exile, lived in Rome and spread their teachings. The Old Testament had already been translated into Greek, and gentiles were becoming acquainted with the messianic expectations of the Jews. Some gentiles in fact had become proselytes. Virgil may therefore well have known about biblical prophecy and used it to give symbolic expression to the longing for a saviour. But at the same time, scholars believe, he probably used both Old Testament prophecy and pagan myth to glorify a Roman political leader – perhaps Mark Antony, or else Octavian, the future Caesar Augustus. To deify po-

litical leaders, and to speak of them in messianic terms, was common in his days. From Alexander the Great onward, Hellenistic emperors, influenced by oriental practices, had demanded and received divine honours. Roman emperors would follow their example. To call a king or emperor *soter* (saviour) was routine practice in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

Bavinck explained the similarities and parallels between pagan traditions and the Gospel as originating in God's promises after the Fall. Although among the pagans the memories of this original revelation had been sorely corrupted, he concluded that "in its most beautiful and noblest expressions [paganism] points to Christianity."

More important for the critics than the deification of emperors were the expectations of the coming of a supernatural saviour. Egypt, Greece, and several mid-eastern countries had myths of a god or goddess who died and rose again. Usually these myths formed the basis of nature religions, with the deities in question symbolizing natural processes such as the setting and rising of the sun, or the progression of the seasons from the death of winter to the renewal of life in the spring. Often, however, the myths were also associated with ideas of deliverance beyond the boundaries of nature. They spoke of a god who died and rose to redeem humanity, who offered delivery from sin, and who won for his followers immortality. The ideas of purification, redemption, regeneration, and unity with the godhead were symbolized by what appeared to be parallels of the Christian sacraments, namely baptism and the celebration of a communal meal. These beliefs and practices were popularized by the so-called mystery religions, which enjoyed immense popularity throughout the Graeco-Roman world in New Testament times. Although these mystery religions often displayed the degenerate practices of other pagan cults, in

some cases they seem to have led to a more spiritual and ethical type of piety among their adherents.

Dreams and memories

The mushrooming of these mystery religions, and the similarities between their teachings and those of Christianity, are indeed striking, and it is not surprising that biblical critics referred to these findings in order to challenge the uniqueness of the biblical faith. Yet it is not difficult to show that here, too, presuppositions influenced interpretation, and that careful study can prove the historians in question to have failed to make their point. Bavinck was among the scholars who engaged in such study and provided arguments.

Bavinck admitted the similarities between the New Testament message and many aspects of the mystery religions, but he denied that these religions had influenced the New Testament account. If Christianity had indeed been formed by pagan traditions as transmitted by the mystery religions, he wrote, then these traditions should have been influential with Paul, John, and indeed the entire Christian community. But there was no proof whatsoever that this was the case. The faith of the Christian church focused on the person of Christ and was hostile to all pagan religiosity. Its Scripture was the Old Testament. The fact that the New Testament uses terms (such as saviour, renewal, regeneration, and so on) which were common among the Greeks and Romans was no proof of cultural influence: the authors of the New Testament had no choice but to use the language of their time and culture. The terms did not necessarily have the same meaning as they had for the contemporaries of these authors.³

The question still remains, of course, how one is then to explain the similarities and parallels. Can they perhaps be seen as preparing the way for Christianity? Early Christian authors (such as Tertullian and Justin Martyr) did not think so. They and their contemporaries were convinced that the pagan sacraments were, in the words of author Stephen Neill, "a diabolical parody of the Christian rites, directly inspired by the evil spirits in order to lead the faithful astray. At no time," Neill writes, "have the fathers a good word to say for the mysteries; never once do they suggest that they were in some way a preparation for the Christian Gospel, or that they expressed in some dim way universal human aspirations to

which the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the true answer."⁴

As Bavinck already suggested, and as later critics have made abundantly clear, several of the pagan rites were indeed borrowed from Christianity. There were also practices and beliefs in the Hellenistic cults, however, that clearly pre-dated the New Testament era. The myth of a dying and rising god is one of them. The explanation offered by the early church is therefore insufficient. Nor has it remained the only one among Christians. Readers of C. S. Lewis may remember that he was among those who dealt with the question of the similarities, and that he explained the traditions of a dying and rising god in terms of what he called "dreams" – vague memories of promises of good things, made in a distant past. Following this reasoning, one could argue that the attention the mystery religions gave to such "dreams" was indeed one of the means God used in preparing the Mediterranean world for Christ's coming in the flesh.

And Lewis's opinion is not unique. His explanation is similar to the conclusion of Bavinck, who saw the expectation of a saviour as originating in God's promises given after the Fall,

for example in Genesis 3:15. Although among the pagans the memories of this original revelation had been sorely corrupted, Bavinck concluded that "in its most beautiful and noblest expressions [paganism] points to Christianity." And this, he added, is not surprising, for Jesus Christ is not only the Messiah of the Jews, but "the Desire of all Nations."⁵

Bavinck gave similar explanations of the parallels that exist between pagan traditions and the Old Testament, a topic to which he devoted even more attention than to the critics' treatment of the New Testament era. That aspect of his work, however, will have to be left for another occasion. We will end the present series with a concluding article on the work of Kuyper and Bavinck, giving attention, among other things, to some of the practical implications of that work, for example in the field of Christian education.

NOTES

¹For his critique see, *inter alia*, Bavinck's *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, I, 286-91; II, 490-99; as well as his *Wijsbegeerte der Openbaring* (Bavinck's



Called by the church at Toronto, Ontario for mission work in Papua, New Guinea and by the church at Armadale, WA for mission work in Papua, New Guinea:

Rev. Th.E. Lodder

of Taber, Alberta.

Stone Lectures, delivered in 1908 at Princeton, New Jersey; Kampen: Kok, 1908), pp. 151-60.

²Bavinck, *GD*, I, 290.

³*Ibid.*, IV, 16.

⁴Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 157.

⁵Bavinck, *GD*, III, 217. 

Dr. F.G. Oosterhoff is a retired principal of Guido de Brès Christian High School in Hamilton, Ontario.

BOOK REVIEW



By W. L. Bredenhof

***The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God*, D.A. Carson. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2000, 93 pages, softcover.**


When it comes to evangelism, there are few topics as hot in Reformed circles as the love of God. How do we reconcile God's love with God's sovereignty? How can we do justice both to his love and his wrath? Is there any sense in which we can or should tell unbelievers that God loves them?

Questions like these motivated my purchase of this book. The name of D.A. Carson associated with this topic was a second factor. Carson is a New Testament professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He has written many books and several helpful commentaries. Carson is sympathetic to


many of the concerns of Reformed believers (he quotes from Herman Bavinck and Charles Hodge) and appears Calvinistic in his doctrine of salvation. He recognizes and criticizes many of the weaknesses of American evangelicalism, also in this book. Moreover, he is a very careful scholar.

His care is evident in this concise treatment of an issue that vexes many. Strong opinions are found everywhere, but seldom does one find the balance that Carson strikes. He not only acknowledges but also meaningfully tackles the Scripture passages which speak of God's wrath towards unrepentant sinners. He exposes as baseless clichés such as "God's love is unconditional" and "God loves the sinner, but hates the sin." At the same time, he takes on those who would flee the plain meaning of "world" in John 3:16 and would some-

how interpret that to mean "God's elect." For such a short book, a lot of ground is covered!

Though I can urge its purchase upon those who share a passion for sharing God's love in Christ, I do so with one reservation. Carson's argument for telling unbelievers that God loves them is not convincing. He shows that in some sense this is true. But he does not demonstrate that this was the tack taken by the apostles or the early church. Nor does he show that the sense in which God loves unbelievers can be adequately expressed to those who are outside of Christ. Excepting that point, readers will find that Carson makes a difficult doctrine a bit easier. 

Rev. W.L. Bredenhof is missionary in Fort Babine, British Columbia.



By Mrs. Corinne Gelms and Mrs. Erna Nordeman

“Keep your lives free from the love of money and be content with what you have, because God has said ‘Never will I leave you; never will I forsake you’.”
Hebrews 13:5

Dear Brothers and Sisters:

This Bible verse is not an easy one to live by. In this broken world we see materialism all around us. People are never happy with what they have. They always desire to have more. This is especially true when their neighbors have better things. “If only we could have money for this or that,” can all too often creep into people’s minds.

How is it for us as God’s people? Are we not also guilty of this same sin? Do we not also look with jealousy at others who we think have it so much better than us? Sometimes we might think: why are they always so happy, and have so much money and good health, and why are they are so well behaved? Why is it not like that for me?

The Lord shows us clearly in the Bible that He does not want us to think this way. He says, “Be content with what you have.” We cannot find deep contentment in our own. We need the Word of God and his Holy Spirit to guide us.

Christian contentment is a firm assurance that the Lord has supplied us with all we need to love and serve Him. It also implies that we trust that the Lord will continue to care for us according to our needs. Our needs are not what we think that we need. Our needs are determined by the tasks the Lord assigns to us. The Lord’s prayer also says it very clearly for us: “Give us this day our daily bread.” When we pray, it should be for our needs that day, and not for tomorrow. We have to be content with what God gives us today.

By living daily out of God’s hand it helps us not to be greedy and selfish. In Luke 12:15 Jesus tells the people, “Watch out! Be on your guard against all kinds of greed; a man’s life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions.” To live daily out of his hand will keep us away from the path of discontentment. It also teaches us to be patient in adversity, and thankful in prosperity. We can trust his covenant promises that He will never leave us.

Remember the apostle Paul. He could say, “I have learned in whatever state I am to be content.” Note that Paul says “I learned.” It did not come over night. He learned to be content by trusting and having faith in Christ Jesus, our Saviour and Lord.

The basis for our contentment is God’s grace and love. You will never be content unless you have learned to find rest in our Lord and Saviour. Contentment and

thankfulness work together. If you have not learned to be content, you will never be truly thankful.

Trust in your God at all times. Then we will be able to serve Him with what He entrusted to us, whether it be much or a little. If we keep our eyes fixed on Jesus, we will learn to be content!

*Be still! What God in his good pleasure
To you in wisdom may impart
Is given you in perfect measure;
Thus be content within your heart.
To Him who chose us for His own
Our needs and wants are surely known.*

Hymn 48:3

Birthdays in April:

2: DEREK KOK will turn 32

464 Dunnville Street, Box 4, Arthur, ON N0G 1A0

19: MARINUS FOEKENS will be 50

4-290 Forest Street, Chatham, ON N7L 2A9

23: ARLENE DEWIT will turn 41

c/o P. DeWit, Barnston Island, Surrey, BC V3T 4W2

29: BRYCE BERENDS will be 27

4130 Ashby Drive, Beamsville, ON LOR 1B9

Congratulations to you all on your birthday! May our heavenly Father continue to surround you in this new year with much health and happiness as you continue in his service. May you continue to turn to Him each and every day through all of life’s circumstances. Keep your hope and trust in Him.

Till next month:

Mrs. Corinne Gelms and Mrs. Erna Nordeman
Mailing correspondence:
548 Kemp Road East
RR 2 Beamsville, ON LOR 1B2
1-905-563-0380

Parents and caregivers: Can you please send us your change of address if you have someone in the birthday list, if there are changes within the last twelve months. Thanks!

A Special Celebration at Cornerstone, Hamilton

By Henry Nienhuis

How often can you say that you have heard a fifty-year-old sermon read to you from the pulpit? Moreover, how often does it happen that the reader of the sermon wrote it himself, albeit in a different language, and delivered it fifty years ago on the occasion of his inaugural service as minister of the Word? And to make the situation even more special, how often does it happen that a fiftieth anniversary date falls on the same day of the week as fifty years ago? That was the special celebration that the Cornerstone congregation was privileged to witness on Sunday, January 20, 2002.

As he ascended the pulpit, the minister looked a little frail, his complexion quite pale. No wonder. Dr. Jelle Faber, minister of the Word, had been ill for quite some time. The concern of the consistory was evident on their faces as they walked in and sat down at their designated place. Dr. Faber had been hospitalized for internal bleeding; a very critical time during which he even had to wear a Tiger Cat football helmet. If you are wondering how that came to be, you must ask him and not me. Nevertheless we are all thankful to the Lord that He has spared the life of our beloved professor. That many loved him was evident by the number of guests who also came to hear the fifty-year-old sermon.

The reading was from Exodus 34:29-35 and 2 Corinthians 3:7-4:6; the text was taken from 2 Corinthians 4:5-6. The theme and points:

The Herald of God's Kingdom proclaims, "Jesus Christ is Lord!"

1. The creator of the herald's ministry,
2. The contents of the herald's message,
3. The contours of the herald's modesty.


There was much tension between the apostle Paul and the people of Corinth. They stated that he was arrogant and made himself the object of his preaching. Passages from the first letter seem to give support: "my preaching – I care very little – I wish that all men were like me – I work harder than all these men." However, in the text we see that Paul denounces these accusations: "we do not preach ourselves." The verb "preach" can be seen as "to evangelize: the bringer of good tidings," or as in our text, "to proclaim" which illustrates the authority of the preacher: he is a herald, an ambassador. A herald proclaims what the king has to say. Paul became a herald of God's kingdom and therefore he emphasizes, "I don't preach myself, but God's mercy." Paul elaborates by saying that "we do not distort the word of God." It is not man's own ideas that are presented because the truth speaks especially of the glory of Christ. Through Christ God made his light shine. We as children of the Lord

should not be afraid to let our light shine as well. Although Christians do not go for a holy war, we may proclaim the Lord in every area of life, whether in the boardroom or in the bedroom, on the floor of a factory or in the fields of a farm. We should not be ashamed to show that we are Christians.

We see in the text that Paul is taken up completely by God's mercy: "we preach Jesus as Lord and ourselves as servants." Here Dr. Faber spoke about the beautiful office of minister of the Word. He urged young people, who dearly loved the Lord, to enter the ministry. The relationship between minister and congregation was explained that if you love the bridegroom you should also love the bride, for Jesus sake. Jesus came not to be served, but to serve. A minister should therefore reflect the image of Christ and serve the congregation rather than expect to be served.

The sermon was a fitting testimony of the work of Dr. Faber in Cornerstone. He came to Hamilton in 1969,


Dr. Jelle Faber



and from that time to 1990 he served as principal and professor at our Theological College. For some six years he also served as chairman of the Cornerstone consistory. For many years he taught catechism and profession of faith classes. Many of his former students will attest to his good teaching abilities and interesting lessons. For a long time he served as chairman of the Education Committee at Guido de Brès High School and he was also instrumental in the establishment of Timo-

thy Elementary School. So much more can be said about his willingness to serve rather than to be served. His love for the Lord and for his congregation was always evident.

We want to thank the Lord for all that He has given Cornerstone Church in Dr. and Mrs. J. Faber. Just a few days before he was installed as minister, the couple was married in the Lord. We therefore also congratulate them on their fiftieth wedding anniversary, and wish them the Lord's

blessing for the future. In order to give all an opportunity to congratulate the couple, the Cornerstone congregation and guests enjoyed a coffee social. The congratulatory line snaked through the Guido De Brès gymnasium, reminiscent of a similar line fifty years ago. The couple looked a little older, but the handshake and the words exchanged were just as strong. May the Lord continue to grant them strength and make their pathway safe (Ps 18:32). 

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Please mail, e-mail or fax letters for publication to the editorial address. They should be 300 words or less. Those published may be edited for style or length. Please include address and phone number.

Dear Editor:

Re: "Distinguished from the Children of Unbelievers"

I read Rev. J. Ludwig's assessment of Campfire! (*Clarion*, Jan. 4, 2002) with disappointment. Although I appreciated the open and honest way he presented his opinions, I had difficulty with his view of the material in the Teenweek chapel book. Rev. Ludwig quoted the opening lines from the last day of the devotional *The Armor of God*, and labeled it as belonging to "the evangelical mold of Billy Graham."

As the author of this book and a member of the Campfire! Chapel Committee for the past three years, I am convinced the quote was taken entirely out of context, and the charges made against it were unwarranted and hurtful. During this week we focussed on Ephesians 6:10-24, in which the teens learned about each of the pieces of armour with which they are equipped in order to maintain the antithesis between the church and the world. That a Christian is constantly at war was made very clear from the beginning. Each day the teens were pointed toward the gift of grace (Eph 2:8, 9), and brought back to the realization that they must be completely dependent on Christ. The last day dealt with Ephesians 6:23, 24, and was intended as

a challenge to the teens to take what they had learned and apply it in their lives at home, away from camp. Have you decided . . . how you are going to live? Will you make the decision to put on the armor of God? These were the questions asked of them – questions meant to motivate the teens when they were faced with challenges that require them to make daily decisions. For Scripture demands us all to make decisions about the way we are going to live (Deut 30:19, 20; Josh 24:14, 15; Luke 10:42; John 7:17).

Within its context, I do not believe this warrants a likening to Billy Graham and an Arminian style. The other criticism is that the book "contains an individualistic thrust and an emphasis on personal commitment to Jesus without an eye to the covenant or to the communion of saints." Here a one-sided view is presented, and a false dilemma is created. The communion of saints, after all, is made up of *individuals* who have a *personal commitment* to Jesus Christ.

Elsewhere in his article, Rev. Ludwig quotes the apostle James and writes: "'whoever . . . wants to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God.'" (4:4) Campfire! encourages children to do exactly that." Being directly involved with Campfire!, I found this comment particularly harsh. I had to ask myself: does

he really mean that we encourage children to become *enemies of God*? That we *want* them to become friends of the world? I would hope Rev. Ludwig would realize, especially when reviewing *The Armor of God*, that this is not our aim. For why tell teens to fight the world if we desire the opposite?

All this is not to say that these programs are in any way perfect; on the contrary, criticism is much needed and very helpful when it is done in the proper way. *Sola fide*, *sola gratia* and *sola scriptura* are the basic tenets of the Reformed faith that we, as authors, struggle to bring out in each devotional. That is why each book also undergoes a stringent editing process, in which, at least twice, reputable members of the congregation make critiques.

We must all adopt a spirit of humility when we consider the unsearchable and inscrutable ways of God (Rom 11:33), and together work for the promotion of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. The theme text of Campfire! encompasses this attitude: "Unless the Lord build the house, those who build it labour in vain" (Ps 127:1). May He continue to receive all glory in our work for Him.

With Christian greetings,
Joanna deJong,
Hamilton, Ontario



Press Release of Classis Ontario South, December 12, 2001, held in Smithville, Ontario.

On behalf of the Church at Kerwood, the Rev. J.G. Slaa called the meeting to order. He welcomed the delegates and spoke a special word of welcome to the Rev. J. Ferguson, representative of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Rev. H. Moes, representative of Classis Southern Ontario of the United Reformed Churches. After we sang and read Psalm 133, Rev. Slaa spoke some words reflecting on various aspects of the Psalm which speaks about the unity we have in our Lord Jesus Christ. Although classis is dividing into two classes on January 1, 2002 – Classes Niagara and Ontario West – yet we continue to experience the unity we have in Christ Jesus. As we continue to be faithful in following the Lord, we will continue to enjoy his blessings.

Classis was declared constituted. The officers suggested by the last classis were appointed to serve classis, namely, Rev. H. Versteeg as chairman, Rev. G. Ph. van Popta as vice-chairman, and Rev. J. van Vliet as clerk.

The agenda was adopted.

Question Period Church *ad* Order Article 44 was held. With thankfulness Classis could note that the work of the office-bearers is being continued and the decisions of the broader assemblies are being upheld. Several churches indicated they needed advice on several matters. Classis entered closed session to deal with the several matters of church discipline and advice.

The Rev. H. Moes brought us the greetings of Classis Southern Ontario of the URCNA expressing the hope for closer contact between our respective federations. The Rev. Cl. Stam responded. The Rev. J. Ferguson also addressed classis on behalf of the Presbytery of Ontario and Michigan of the OPC. He expressed thankfulness for the growing relationship between our respective churches and the hope this would continue and prosper. Rev. J.E. Ludwig responded.

The Church at Hamilton requested that changes be made to the "Agreement of Cooperation" between it, the



Clerk: Rev. J. van Vliet (left), chairman: Rev. H. Versteeg (right).

missionary church, and the cooperating churches of Classis Ontario South. The changes sought were:

1. Request Classis to agree that the work of Mission Aid can no longer be separated from the work of Mission and therefore belongs to the churches in common and should be dealt with responsibly. In Maceio, Brazil the Mission Aid is most certainly Aid to Mission and therefore should also be considered ecclesiastical.
2. One minor change be made to the "Agreement of Cooperation" according to Article 6 of the "Agreement of Cooperation."

Article 2.B be changed to the following: The co-operating churches shall share in the cost of the mission work *and also any aid to the mission work* as specified in the approved budgets (the change being an addition of the words in italics – GvP).

After Hamilton's overture was declared admissible, the first requested change was discussed. The following proposal was adopted: *Classis declares that Mission Aid, as it relates to Missionary assistance, be considered an ecclesiastical matter.*

Classis did not accede to the second request because the "Agreement of Cooperation" specifies that it is the meeting of the missionary church together with the supporting churches which is qualified to make changes to the agreement.

The Church at Ancaster, administering church for the Fund for Needy Churches, submitted a report recommending approval be given to the request of the Church at Grand Rapids for financial aid, in the event they should ac-

quire a minister. The recommendation was approved.

On behalf of the church visitors, Rev. D.G.J. Agema reported that the updated guidelines for church visitations are now completed for approval at Classes Niagara and West.

Appointments:

- Convening and hosting Church for Classis Niagara, March 20, the Church at Attercliffe.
- Convening and hosting church for Classis Ontario West, March 27, the Church at Ancaster.
- Church Visitors:
 - Classis Niagara: G. Wieske, D.G.J. Agema with K. Kok as alternate.
 - Classis Ontario West: Cl. Stam and G.Ph. van Popta with H. Versteeg as alternate.
- Fraternal Delegate to Classis Southern Ontario of the URCNA, March 6, D.G.J. Agema.
- Fraternal Delegate to Presbytery Michigan and Ontario of the OPC, Jan. 19, H. Versteeg.
- Deputies for examinations:
 - Classis Ontario West: Cl. Stam and J.E. Ludwig;
 - Classis Niagara: D.G.J. Agema and G. Wieske.

The chairman concluded that there was no need for anyone to be censured. The Acts were adopted and the press release was approved. We sang Hymn 65:1, 2, thanked the Lord in prayer for his guidance and mercy, after which we enjoyed a wonderful lunch prepared by the sisters of the Church at Smithville.

G.Ph. van Popta,
Vice-Chairman, e.t.



By Aunt Betty

Dear Busy Beavers

Are you enjoying school life? Have you got lots of friends in your class? Do you have a really nice teacher, who lets you do all kinds of fun things during school time? I remember when I went to school. We used to do lots of great activities – singing, art, sport, and lots more.

But there are also times when the things your teacher makes you do aren't so much fun. Yet you still have to do them because that is all part of learning. And you have to do them as well as you can because that is what God has asked of you. He knows that there are subjects at school that you can't do so well, but through His Holy Spirit, He helps you to do your very best. Make sure you keep trying your best.

Lots of love, Aunt Betty

Puzzles

Busy Beaver Rhonda Wiersema is a horse lover. She sent the following *Jokes*

You know you are a horse person when:

You call a golf course a piece of wasted pasture land!
Your horse gets more shoes than you do!
You say "Whoa" to your dog!
On rainy days, you spend your time organizing the tack rather than the house!
Your family and friends get cards addressed to them from you and your horse!
You try to move around someone and instead of saying "excuse me," you poke them in the ribs and say "over"!
You can find your boots by their smell!

* * * * *

Horse lover #1 I went riding today.
Horse lover #2: Horseback?
Horse lover #1: Sure. It came back before I did!

Overlap

If we enclose each of the groups below in the correct answer-word to the clue provided, we shall discover a person or a place mentioned in the Bible. The total number of letters in the answer to each clue is shown, but how many letters go in front and how many behind the group given is for you to decide. Here is an example: "U; familiar friend, 3." The answer to the clue, "pal," will "overlap" the "U" to give "Paul."

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. AMS; offspring, 3 | 2. LE; taxi, 3 |
| 3. THIA; small carpets, 4 | 4. MEO; evil, 3 |
| 5. EG, royal beast, 4 | 6. M; deer, 3 |
| 7. ABBA; jail windows, 4 | 8. HOB0; pack of paper, 4 |
| 9. AA; ointment, 4 | 10. B; wading bird, 5 |

They Cried Out

People often "cry out" to someone about something. Match the persons who cried out with what they cried out about.

1. The people when Jesus entered Jerusalem, John 12:13
2. The Israelites before the golden calf was made, Exodus 32:1
3. The crowd at Jesus' trial, Mark 15:13
4. The sons of the prophets to Elisha, 2 Kings 4:40
5. The disciples as Jesus walked on water, Matthew 14:26
6. The people at Jerusalem when Paul gave his testimony, Acts 22:22
7. A man with an unclean spirit, Mark 1:23-24
8. Two blind men, Matthew 20:30
9. Stephen as he was stoned, Acts 7:60
10. David upon hearing tragic news, 2 Samuel 18:33
11. Jesus on the cross, Matthew 27:46
 - a. "O man of God, there is death in the pot!"
 - b. "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"
 - c. "What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us?"
 - d. "Come make us gods who will go before us."
 - e. "Lord, do not hold this sin against them."
 - f. "Lord, Son of David, have mercy on us!"
 - g. "Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the King of Israel!"
 - h. "Rid the earth of him! He's not fit to live!"
 - i. "It's a ghost."
 - j. "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom!"
 - k. "Crucify him!"

PEN PAL WANTED

Irma Vanderlinde would love to have somebody to write to. She is 10 years old. She loves all animals but horses are her favourite. Please write to her at

37523 Maher Road, Abbotsford BC V3G 1W4



FROM THE MAILBOX

Welcome to the Busy Beaver Club, *Kailey Swaving*. It was great to hear from you and tell me about yourself and your family. I notice you are the only girl in the family, with six brothers. Wow! Where do you come in? Doesn't your dog get confused, since you have three names for you him – Dusty, Santa Paws and Wishbone? Why Wishbone? Soccer is a fun game, isn't it. Write again, won't you, Kailey.

Welcome also to *Irma Vanderlinde*. It is a pity when you write to somebody and they don't write back, isn't it. But you can always try again. I will put a little advertisement in Our Little Magazine for you, okay? Bye for now, Irma.