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God's People, A Separate People

Should we isolate ourselves from the world completely, dress differently, etc.? If not, how should we be separate?

These questions were presented to the undersigned along with the request for an article for Beacon Lights on the Meaning of Being a Separate People.

The subject is one worthy of our attention not only because of the instruction that may be obtained by a consideration of it, but also because it affords opportunity to declare our position over against those who have accused and still do accuse us of an anabaptistic world-flight.

There are many texts in Scripture which teach us that God's people are a separate people. The Church was a separate people from the very beginning of the history of the human race. In a geographic sense, even, this was true of the Church from the early pages of Holy Writ. Adam and Eve and Seth with their descendants lived geographically as a separate people. This was not due to any command of God specifically to separate from the ungodly. It was rather due to the fact that Cain separated as a fugitive and a vagabond and built a city in Nod. And the Church lived, we may believe, as close to Paradise as she could and found no interest in moving away. For that garden still symbolized God's presence even though man might not and could not walk the way to the midst of the garden anymore.

Israel was definitely and clearly told by God to live geographically distinct from the heathen nations; and He also prepared a place for Israel to live in such physical isolation. We may read in Numbers 23:9b, "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." In Deuteronomy 33:28 we read, "Israel then shall dwell in safety alone . . ."

But in the New Testament times this is not the case; nor should it be the case. The believers scattered at the time of persecution and were not forbidden to do so at all. Peter writes to them and never once admonishes them to gather in the land of Palestine as the only place where they can properly serve God. He writes, "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you and peace be multiplied," I Peter 1:1, 2. He writes to scattered strangers. But he does not mean that they are strangers because they are scattered. Though these to whom he writes are scattered far and wide into these nations, we may believe that they were known
to their neighbours and that in all these places there were those who were known also to Peter. One does not sit down and write a letter to strangers in the literal, physical sense of the word. This letter must have been sent by Peter to definite individuals. Even our modern postal departments could not send a letter that was simply labeled, "To the strangers scattered in Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Washington and California." No, Peter speaks of those who are spiritual strangers, for he speaks of those who are elect according to the foreknowledge of God through sanctification. That election and sanctification makes them to be spiritual strangers.

Paul writes to the church at Corinth, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing: and I will receive you. And I will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty," II Corinthians 6:14-18. Here we find the definite command of God to be a separate people. But there we also find, as well as in I Peter 1:1, 2, that this separation is a spiritual one.

Physical separation from sin is impossible. Where we go we take the old man of sin along. Whether we go into the monastery or to some deserted island, we will not flee the world. Our flesh belongs to the world, and we take it along wherever we go. Besides, Israel's geographic and physical isolation did not keep sin out of Israel. The Church that continued to live by the way to Paradise did not constitute a people that was free from sin. There is no value in world flight. Our calling is world-fight. Spiritually we must oppose the world. Spiritually we must separate from the world.

Does that mean that there is no physical separation at all? Does that mean that there is no physical leaving alone and behind anything of the world? Not at all! The very question submitted as to whether we should dress differently than the world indicates a consciousness that there may be some realms where physical isolation or separation is necessary. In some instances, yes, we must dress differently. For when dress (or let us say the scantiness of it and sometimes the style and fashion of it) expresses and is meant to express an ethical, spiritual thought or suggestion that is corrupt, it has no agreement with the temple of God, our bodies. And in the age wherein we live when clothing fashions are designed by and are in the hands of carnally minded men whose only purpose is to appeal to and satisfy the adulterous lust of mankind, we are sure that you will agree that in the matter of dress there is a physical distinctiveness and separation that is demanded of us. There are certain things in dress from which we must be physically separated in the sense that we may not wear them and so walk not with the world in this wickedness. Otherwise color, material or the like in which there is no ethical content do not distinguish one as a child of God. We need not be garbed in black and wear only the very cheapest of fabrics. If we must choose a color befitting a child of God — and we do not need to, for the color and material of the clothing do not express dedication and love to God — then let it not be black, the color of death, but by all means let it be white, the color of victory. Can I serve and glorify God in a certain garb? then I may wear it. If I serve the base desires and lusts of men with it, then my calling is to separate from it and cast it fa
from me. Righteousness has no fellowship with unrighteousness.

In the few lines allotted us for this article, we have no room to go into detail and give a list of what we may use and possess and what we should cast from us and from which we should live a separate life. Nor is this necessary. We can simply put down the principle, and you can apply it to all in your own life: Whosoever is not of faith is sin, Romans 14:23b. Indeed it is not an act of faith to put on a pair of shoes, to eat a bag of peanuts or any such act, and yet these need not be sin. We say "need not" realizing in the unbeliever these always are. But if we deny our faith by these deeds, if doing them militates against our faith, we do sin in them. Some things, thus as movie attendance, can never be anything but sin, can never be an act of faith. But in those things which in themselves have no ethical content, we do sin when the performance of them militates against our faith. When we put those shoes on in order to get ready for the movie, in order to perform any act that denies and militates against faith in God, it is sin.

Let that principle guide us when we seek entertainment and let it tell us from what we must separate ourselves. Let it be clearly before our minds when we seek a profession or employment. With the world we surely may and must often work. But professions which demand of us that we deny our faith and which can be performed only by lying, deceit and by profession of unbelief, and toil that may be gotten only by membership in organizations with corrupt principles certainly are areas wherein we may not be found; and a physical separation from these is required. Another thing, no child of believing parents ought to be found in the classroom of the world for instruction. We certainly have a calling there to have separate schools, Christian schools. Our children must physically separate from the world to go to separate schools to be

(Continued on page 9)
Do you hear the speech of the trees, of the birds, and of the sun? Do the stars and moon talk to you, so that you understand them? A great danger that we must guard against, as we live in this machine age of speed and transition, is to become deaf to nature. This is easily done, and unless we put forth a definite effort to listen, we may fail to hear a most wonderful tale.

Take a walk with me, not necessarily to the woods with her sylvan array of majesty and somber meditation, but down your street, in your own backyard and neighborhood. Look about and listen closely to the millions of creatures speaking to you. Hear the bird as she earnestly puts forth all her effort to sing her song. See the squirrel, the ants, and the hundreds of seemingly insignificant insects. Look at the trees, the shrubs, the ground, and the sun. What do they say? Listen—"The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth forth His handiwork." All of nature speaks, because nature is the speech of God. God has revealed Himself in nature, the work of His creation.

All revelation is the speech of God to the creature. God has revealed Himself by two means, viz. Scripture and creation. Nature is the word of God. God expresses Himself in nature. Especially in nature itself, that is the plant and animal kingdoms, we have a picture of the glory and magnitude of our God. A godly saint once told me that of all that exists in the world today, surely nature is least tainted with sin. Yet, even that nature groans to await deliverance. It has a story to tell us, because God uses nature as a means, a tool, to speak to us.

That speech of God is not to be neglected. Nature, as a revelation of God, has power to condemn all those who do not listen to her speech. The word of God in nature is significant. Romans 1:20, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." The speech of God in nature is meaningful to those who understand the Scripture. The Scripture is the chief means by which we know God. The Bible relates to us the whole plan of God. Through the written Word of God, we understand the meaning of nature. As Calvin stated it, "We understand nature through the spectacles of the Word of God." Without the Bible we are not able to hear that speech of God. Yet, His speech is there. Man, even though he does not hear it of himself because of his inability through sin, is accountable for that speech of God.

God has given us the Bible, in order that through it we may understand His purpose for all things, including nature. If man does not listen to the written Word and willfully disobeys it, hence making himself unable to hear the word of God in nature, God justly punishes him. That is the promise of God. To those who listen to His Word, both written in the Bible and uttered in nature, He will also give to them by His Spirit, the promises that are contained in them. Likewise to those who do not hear the speech of God in neither the written Word nor in nature, God will justly condemn to eternal condemnation.

Thus nature speaks, and by the grace o.
God with the written Word engrafted in our hearts, we hear that speech. The darkness of night speaks of the terrible guilt of our sin, yet the rising of the sun comforts us for it assures us that our sins are washed away through the merit of the "dayspring from on high." The whiteness of the snow reminds us of the purity of God, how he demands holiness and hates corruption. The moon speaks of the faithfulness of God, because the moon, who receives her light from the sun, confirms the truth that the sun is present even though we do not see it. The stars and the infinite number of grains of sand remind us of the host of the covenant. The lightning and thunder speak of the power of our God. All nature, as a united whole, indicates to us the all sustaining hand of God. God controls all things and He works in all things so that they speak of His glory. Isa. 45:7, "I form the light and create darkness: I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things."

All of nature glorifies our God. Man, who was created in the image of God, has the capacity to glorify his Creator. Through regeneration, man's capacity is filled with the glory he radiates to his Creator. All of nature, the plants and animals whether great or small, glorify God through man as head of creation. Man with his capacity to reflect the glory which God has given to all creation, reflects that glory to the Creator. God is glorified in His creation which is glorious in itself, and which glory is returned unto the Giver of all glory through man.

Unless we hear that Word of God in nature through faith, nature itself will testify against us in the day of days. God speaks, and let us listen with diligence to His Word. Truly, there is no reason why we should not have a song of gladness in our heart as redeemed children of God for "All nature sings and round Him rings the beauty of the spheres."

J.K.

FEDERATION BOARD REPORT

Your Federation Board has held three meetings since our last convention. In our September meeting a committee was appointed to draw up a list of topics from our library file for society after-recess programs. This list was completed and is now in the hands of the secretaries of our various societies. It is the hope of the Board that, since the organization of the library is now completed, the young people make use of it.

Once again the Board planned a Reformation Day Mass Meeting for the societies in and around Grand Rapids. Rev. McCollam gave a very interesting and informative speech. Arn. Dykstra from our Hudsonville Church favored us with a vocal solo and Jim Jonker and Mary Pastoor favored us with an organ and piano duet. The after recess section of the program was climaxed with a debate on the topic: Resolved, that revolution under tyrannical government is principally right. Cornie Bykerk and Lam Lubbers debated on the affirmative with Bob Decker and Jake Kuiper on the negative. The judges announced that the negative won the debate.

The Board also decided to have our copies of The Standard Bearer bound for use in the library.

We are looking for any proposals which you might wish to present at the coming convention. Proposals should be in the hands of the secretary not later than the first of April.

RUTH DYKSTRA, Secretary
It would seem as if it were very foolish to be a member of our Protestant Reformed Churches. I can well understand why the world about us and even many of the denominations which to a greater or lesser extent have strayed from the truth would come to such a conclusion. There is certainly not much future in having one's membership papers in any of our congregations—not much future from a natural point of view.

Consider that we are very small in number. We were not very large to begin with, and our numbers have been greatly reduced in the recent controversy of our churches. The result is that there are very few denominations, if any at all, who are as small as we are. It is not very pleasant to belong to such a small church group. Besides, the result of being so small is that we have very little financial power and material possessions. The existing churches of today are rich in material wealth. With their people contributing far less than our people contribute, they nevertheless have sufficient to engage in vast building projects to erect beautiful church edifices, hospitals, schools, institutions for the aged, etc. They have the means to engage in large and extensive missionary campaigns and supply the funds necessary to send men and women into all parts of the globe. But it is a constant struggle for us to support our schools, help our needy churches, and pay the expenses of ordinary and necessary denominational life. There is also the fact that our churches are not liberally minded with respect to all the problems of life which daily confront the saints. They are not given to approval of union membership, divorce, approval of every means of entertainment which the world and the church world so readily condones and approves. The result is that the circle of the activities of the saints becomes very small. We are deprived of many jobs, often the best; we are not ready to grow numerically by letting into the church all kinds of people who defy and deny the principles of Christian conduct; we insist on a godly walk of life as a criterion of church membership. The result of all this is that we grow smaller as churches; we become materially poorer; we are more and more isolated in our church life. We are very firm in insisting that the one indispensable condition of relationships with other denominations is a pure confession of the truth. We are not ready to compromise and soften the confession which we have made for the sake of broader and more diversified contact with others. We insist that such relationships must be on the basis of the Word of God only. And the outcome is that we remain small and our isolation grows, for there are not many who like to hear the truth any more in our day and age. A pure confession is branded as bigotry and narrow-mindedness. Toleration and compromise are the watch words of the church world today.

This all tends to make us a very odd group of people in the eyes of those outside our fellowship. It is no wonder, to my mind, that men look askance at us. It is the height of folly to be a member of that denomination—the height of folly from
natural point of view. It is foolishness in the extreme to be constantly fighting against all the current of modern life in business, social life, and the church world. And it is no wonder that many complain that to belong to such a denomination as ours is certainly asking too much sacrifice, and placing too heavy demands upon them. We ought not to be surprised therefore, that membership in our churches for those who are outside does not appear to be very attractive. And we ought not to be filled with amazement when some of those who are in our churches decide to leave and join other groups who are more liberal and openminded, more tolerant and like other churches, and who hold in their hands a great deal more influence in all of our complex life in this day and age.

If we are inclined to take an earthly and natural viewpoint, this is bound to be the conclusion. If our perspective is life here below, I do not doubt but that we will arrive at no other conclusion.

But this is not the viewpoint which we ought to take. For it is decidedly limited. Standing in this creation and looking at all things from the aspect of this present time is a very limited perspective. We cannot see all things from the point of view of this earth. We cannot observe the reality of matters only in this way. Our eyes and ears may very well deceive us and give us a distorted picture of things. Our natural perception of things is not the true perception and not in keeping with the true nature of reality. Our impressions from this vantage point will certainly be all wrong.

There is a higher, a more sublime viewpoint which we must take if we are to understand the true value of belonging to the Protestant Reformed Churches. There is a higher plane upon which we must stand if we are to determine the true answer to our question and find the object of our quest. There is another perspective that we must take, another observation point from which we must cast our eye upon these problems. This viewpoint is the viewpoint of faith. If we take this viewpoint, then we will certainly gain quite another conception of things. For all that faith sees is quite contrary to what we perceive with our natural sense. The conclusions of faith are quite different from any conclusions we may try to form in any other way.

When we observe our churches, and consider the question of membership in them from this high and lofty vantage point, what is it that we see?

The first thing that we see is a church that has remained faithful to the truth of the Word of God. Always in the past, God has led His church into the truth by the Spirit of Jesus Christ. And as this church has been led into the truth, the heritage of the truth has grown richer and richer. We stand in that same line of the church of all ages. We need not doubt this. It is simply a fact. From the time of the apostles, the line of the true church has run through Augustine, Luther, Calvin, the fathers of Dordrecht and countless others until the present day. And although others may claim to stand also in that line, it can very easily be shown that this is not the case at all. Our spiritual genealogy contains the names of the great fathers of the Reformed truth. And others have denied their genealogy in fact if they cling to it in word. I do not say this to boast in any accomplishment which we have made apart from God, for the simple fact of the matter is that God has graciously seen fit to preserve us thus far in this way. For this we ought to be daily grateful.

But it is this fact that makes the entire difference. Some of the implications of this are worth mentioning, but this will have to wait for a future article.

H. HANKO
"I believe in the Holy Ghost."

Such is the concise but highly significant declaration of the faith of the church concerning the Holy Spirit. Explaining this the Heidelberg Catechism significantly points out that it means: "First, that He is true and co-eternal God with the Father and the Son; secondly, that He is also given me, to make me by a true faith, partaker of Christ and all His benefits, that He may comfort me and abide with me forever."

Likewise does the Belgic Confession speak of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit in the following beautiful expression: "We believe and confess also, that the Holy Ghost, from eternity proceeds from the Father and Son; and therefore neither is made, created, nor begotten, but only proceedeth from both; Who in order is the third Person of the Holy Trinity; of one and the same essence, majesty and glory with the Father, and the Son; and therefore is the true and eternal God, as the Holy Scriptures teach us."

The Creed of Nicea briefly summarizes the truth in this statement: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets."

Many important doctrines of our faith are contained in these expressions. Others, if not directly expressed, are certainly implied. It will not serve our present purpose to attempt to elaborate upon or explain detailedly these fundamental truths in this brief writing. Since this is not necessary in the present connection, we will assume that our readers are acquainted with them and proceed merely to state some of them over-against prevailing heresies that unceasingly attack the bulwarks of truth.

It seems as though a certain cloud of mysteriousness that envelopes the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has lent itself to numerous errors. The church has somewhat shirked from the task of developing fully the truth in this respect since the matters to be dealt with are oft regarded as profoundly difficult and extend far beyond the scope of simple comprehension. The enemies of the truth readily capitalize upon this reluctance and hasten to spread abroad their perverted conceptions which are more easily understood, and, consequently, more generally accepted.

The modernist does not hide his aversion to the truth concerning the personality of the Holy Spirit. Ignoring the plain truth that throughout Scripture personal names, acts, virtues and powers are ascribed to Him, he proceeds to reason that since Spirit means literally wind or breath, therefore, the Spirit is only a mystical influence or power.

From earliest times there have been those who have attempted to destroy the Godhead by denying the truth of the Trinity, reducing the Holy Spirit to the equivalent of the human spirit. They are ready to agree with your confession of faith in the Holy Spirit provided that by this you mean that in the same sense that you can and do speak of the spirit of man, you can ascribe to God a spirit. There is no essential difference between God and man. Any differences that may exist are only those of degree. God is only a higher developed being.

Over the question of the procession of the Spirit within the Godhead, the early
Eastern and Western Church struggled bitterly. The former denied while the latter maintained the double procession and the result was a schism of great magnitude.

Add then to all of this the indisputable truth that the third Person of the Divine Being co-equal and co-eternal with God, is also the Spirit of Christ, given unto the church to make her through faith partaker of Christ and all His benefits. He is the Spirit of regeneration, of life, of sanctification. He applies unto us that which we have in Christ. He is very GOD! Remember this and then turn the dial of your radio and listen from every quarter to the endless repetition of the denial of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit, when men, purporting to be Gospel-preachers, talk about the matter of salvation. Some openly admit that His power is not equal to that of man whom He earnestly seeks to save. The Spirit of God is inferior! Others reduce His will to an absurdity, ignoring obviously the fact that the Divine Will which is the will of the Spirit is positively Sovereign and can never be endangered with frustration. And then you can hear those who even have the audacity to claim adherence to the Reformed Confessions quoted above, prating about the Holy Spirit Who in the Gospel is gracious to all, offering salvation indiscriminately. The poor pauper! The humble and impotent beggar! In no way is the Spirit mocked more than when He is spoken of as the Spirit of salvation!

All error is sin!

Especially serious then is it when that error directly involves God, His majesty and honor. God cannot be mocked with impurity!

Horrible are the inevitable consequences of any form of denial of God. To deny the deity of the Spirit is to destroy the truth concerning the Trinity and this in turn deletes the beautiful, rich and significant covenant idea that pervades all of Scripture and is of such momentous practical significance to the child of God. To deny the personality of the Holy Spirit is to reduce God to a brute force. When then these errors are committed, the practical result is that GOD, according to truth, is lost and substituted by an idol of the vain and foolish imagination of man.

No longer can the beautiful confession, “I believe in the Holy Spirit,” be made in truth! This, too is then substituted by the modernistic confession, “I believe in man,” and the essential part of all religion proceeding from this confession is no longer that the praise and glory of God is manifest throughout life, but rather “character must be built, personality developed, social rehabilitation sought for the betterment of mankind, etc.”

Such religion is vain!

Its essence is the perverted idea that man is his own savior and it is the denial of the truth:

“Not by might, nor by power, but by my SPIRIT, saith the Lord of hosts.” Zech. 4:6.

G. VANDEN BERG

God’s People, a Separate People
(Continued from page 3)

taught in the way of God’s precepts. And many other such instances can be cited. These are sufficient; and if we live close to the Word of God we will know when to separate physically and when to abstain from the things of the world.

But there is a positive side, which, when carried out, will solve many of our problems of separation from the world. Confess Christ, reveal your faith in Him, walk spiritually different from the world; and the world will separate from you, will mock, taunt and persecute you. You will not be welcome in their midst. That is why Peter calls the believers, “strangers,” in his first Epistle. Our calling is to separate spiritually and to testify openly of Christ. The world, then, will avoid you. Confess openly by your behaviour, speech and dress; and you will find the problems of a separate life in the physical sense much easier to determine and to endure. — REV. J. A. HEYS
(Heretofore we have considered the dispute leading up to this council of Jerusalem. We next began to consider the council itself. And thus far we have considered the membership of the council. We continue from this point.)

B. Deliberations of the Council, vss. 6-21.

1. In general:
   a. What does the first part of vs. 7 indicate?
      1) Were Peter, Paul and Barnabas, and James the only ones who spoke?
      2) Or was there a much more lengthy deliberation of this question, and a considerable difference of opinion?
   b. Why, then, does the record tell us only of the speeches of Peter, Paul and Barnabas, and James?

2. Peter’s address:
   a. What is the main line of Peter’s argumentation?
   b. To what incident does he refer in order to prove his point? Is this important?
   c. Points to be noticed in Peter’s argumentation:
      1) Why does Peter emphasize that the Gentiles believed, vs. 7?
      2) What, for Peter, is the undeniable proof that God put no difference between Jew and Gentile believers?
      3) Why does Peter refer to God here as the One who knoweth the hearts?
      4) How does Peter explain this proven lack of difference from an internal point of view, vs. 9? What is meant by “purifying their hearts by faith”? And why does he refer at all to this matter of purification? And further, why does he emphasize that this purification is by faith?
   d. What is his negative conclusion in vs. 10?
      1) What is meant here by “tempting God”?
      2) What is the unbearable yoke to which he refers?
      3) Why does he refer to it as an unbearable yoke?
   e. What is his positive conclusion, vs. 11?
      1) To whom does this method of salvation refer, Gentiles only, or both Jews and Gentiles?
      2) Upon what basis can he say that both are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus?
      3) How does this statement compare with the teaching of those who had taught the brethren at Antioch, vs. 1?
      4) Why does Peter here refer to both Jews and Gentiles? Was not the question one which concerned the Gentiles only?
3. Paul and Barnabas take part, vs. 12.
   a. To what do Paul and Barnabas refer in their address of the council?
   b. What had this to do with the question being considered?
      1) What had Paul and Barnabas preached, the necessity of circumcision, or not?
      2) What function did the miracles and wonders wrought among the Gentiles have in relation to this preaching?
      3) What conclusion, then, must be drawn from the fact that God had wrought these miracles and wonders among the Gentiles through Paul and Barnabas?
   c. Thus far, what is true of both the addresses given?
      1) What are the brethren seeking to establish? Are they merely in search of a solution to a problem, or must it be said that they are trying to determine what is the will of God in this matter?
      2) And how do both Peter and Paul and Barnabas go about this? Is it a matter of human opinion and argument, or do they seek objective proof of what is the will of God?

4. James, vss. 13-21:
   a. Who is this James, and what was his standing in the council?
   b. How does his method differ from that of Peter and the two missionaries, Paul and Barnabas?
   c. Why does he follow this method of referring to the O.T. Scriptures?
      1) To what O.T. passage does he refer?
      2) What accounts for the difference between James' version and that found in the O.T.?
      3) What is another rendering of vs. 18?
   d. Why does James refer to Peter Simeon, but not to Paul and Barnabas?
   e. What does James prove from the O.T. Scriptures?
   f. What is his sentence?
      1) What is the negative part of the sentence, vs. 19? What is meant by this? How were they not to be troubled?
      2) What is the positive part of the sentence? vs. 20.
         a) What is the meaning of each of the stipulations mentioned?
         b) Do all these prohibitions have the same rank? Which one is based on the moral law? Why is it especially mentioned, while other requirements of the moral law are not mentioned?
         c) Are the remaining three prohibitions based directly on the ceremonial law?
         d) Does this sentence constitute a compromise? Does it mean that the ceremonial law is partly valid and partly of no force for the Gentiles? If not, why are the Gentiles to observe these regulations? Is there anything wrong as such with meat offered to idols, blood, and things strangled?
   g. What is the force of vs. 21?
      1) Does James mean that even if the Christian church does not maintain the law of Moses, there will still be plenty of people who do maintain it in the synagogues?
2) Or does he mean to refer to the fact that the items mentioned in vs. 20 are matters of particular offense to the Jewish Christians because of the fact that ever since the dispersion they have been brought up in these regulations in the synagogues?

C. The Decision: vss. 22-29.
1. Did the congregation also have a part in making the decision? If so, what was that part? vs. 22.
2. With whose judgment did the decision as such agree? Compare vss. 28, 29 with 19, 20.
3. What is the meaning of “it seemed good to the Holy Ghost”?
   a. How did they know this seemed good to the Holy Ghost?
   b. Does the “and to us” denote a measure of cooperation between the Holy Ghost and the church? If not, what is the relation between the two?
4. How was the decision to be conveyed to the Antioch church?
   a. Why is it put in writing?
   b. Why are Silas and Barnabas sent as spokesmen? What was their function?
   c. Why could not this matter be entrusted to Paul and Barnabas?
5. Concerning the address and greeting:
   a. Why are not the Jewish Christians included in the letter?
   b. Did not the principle of the non-necessity of circumcision apply for them as well as the Gentiles?
   c. How in the greeting does the letter express the unity of the saints Jerusalem with the Gentile Christians?
   d. Is the decision strictly limited to those of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia?
6. Further judgment of the council concerning the Antioch problem:
   a. What is their judgment concerning those who had taught the necessity of circumcision?
   b. How does the council express its approval of Paul and Barnabas?

III. EXECUTION OF THE DECISION, vss. 30-35.
A. As Such:
1. Was the letter delivered only to the Gentiles, as per its address, or to the entire multitude?
2. What was the effect upon the church at Antioch?
B. Further Details:
1. Why did Silas and Judas remain for a while? What did they do? Was their labor especially necessary, seeing that Paul and Barnabas also returned to Antioch?
2. What does it mean that “they were let go in peace”?
3. Did Silas go?
4. What did Paul and Barnabas do at this time?
5. What impression does vs. 35 give of the size and labors of the Antioch church?
C. General question: Of what significance is this narrative of the Council at Jerusalem for the church today?

H.C.I
THE COLOR OF ANIMALS

The coloration of animals has long been a matter of controversy between the two groups of biologists, the naturalists and the physiologists. The naturalist has maintained that coloration in animals is entirely purposeful and that colors and color patterns of animals are produced by some directive force or forces for purposes of security. The physiologists have insisted that all coloration is physiological and that its production, deposition, distribution, and selection have little to do with rendering any special service to animals and little or no connection with extraneous factors. More recently biologists have recognized certain valid claims of both groups.

In general we can say that color is a tremendous subject with chemical, physical, physiological, and behavioristic phases. A discussion of this topic is significant at this time of the year because animals which are exposed to the elements of nature exhibit changes in their appearance as the weather gradually turns from cold to warm.

All of us have seen the green caterpillar and many have undoubtedly wondered why they were green. Green caterpillars usually get their color from the foliage they eat. The larva of the cabbage butterfly is green; but in the adult the color has been found to be due to the presence of water-soluble uric acid in the scales on the wings. In the pupal stage, the rate of metabolism is high; and considerable waste is produced. Urea is a characteristic waste product of animal metabolism; and since there is no anal opening for the discharge of fecal substances in the pupa, some of the urea is secondarily utilized by the developing butterfly. The wing scales of the butterfly are hollow, flattened sacs; and the chemical substances are deposited in them. These substances or pigments give to the scales their colors.

We can observe therefore that coloration of the cabbage butterfly is due to its environment and the chemical changes which occur because of this environment.

It has been suggested by some that variations in color of animals may be due to physical factors, such as light, humidity, temperature, and disease. It has been found that Luna moths kept in glass-covered cases exposed to sunlight usually become pale in a few months. Black beetles, however, usually emerge from their pupal cases with a light tan color which is darkened by the action of atmospheric oxygen on the freshly formed chitin of the exoskeleton (exterior skeleton) of the beetle.

Much more could be written about the relations between color and climate, but the naturalist is primarily interested in color from the viewpoint of the human observer who sees an organism in its natural haunts.

Because of the extreme difficulty in describing colors due to the variability of the individual conception of them, biologists have established an international code of colors for world-wide application. The three classifications which we shall discuss are concealing coloration, aggressive coloration, and mimicry and protective resemblance.

Concealing coloration. Concealing coloration is discussed first because this seems to be most common type of coloration. Concealing coloration includes those colors and color patterns which resemble the background or at least part of it. They make their possessors inconspicuous and therefore
enable them to escape observation by their enemies. Green caterpillars on green plants; ruffled grouse and quail among dead leaves; the whip-poor-will on a dead log; green katydids among green plants; the leaf-like wings of the praying mantis; the white coats of weasels in winter; the rough, warty, dirt-colored skin of the ground toad; the green back of the green frog, resting on the surface of an algae filled pond; and many others are examples to illustrate how the color patterns of animals make them difficult to see. A few animals like the chameleons (lizards) and flounders (a fish) can change their colors to match or mimic their surroundings. Flounders can imitate the pattern as well as the color of their background. If the flounder is placed on a checker-board, it attempts to reproduce the arrangement of the squares on its body.

Aggressive coloration. This type of coloration is possessed by animals which are predators in their habits but which usually lack the ability to overtake their victims by pursuit. They usually lie in wait for their victims to approach within reach of their seizing apparatus. Leaf mantises, which are poor fliers and slow crawlers, are excellent examples of aggressive coloration. Certain decorator crabs will pluck sponges, kelp, or sea anemones and hold them in their claws before them. They are thus able to advance on their victims behind a protective screen of harmless organisms.

Mimicry and protective resemblance. In this group are those animals which have a coloration similar to some other animal generally avoided by predators, or to parts of plants. The caterpillar of the brimstone moth resembles a twig broken off at the end; and when disturbed, it will extend one end of its body at an angle similar to that of the twigs on the plant. The body form of an insect called the walking stick also mimics the stem of plants. The viceroy butterfly mimics the inedible but beautiful monarch butterfly. This mimicry is so close that birds avoid the viceroy, as they avoid the monarch butterfly. Birds do not eat the monarch butterfly because the monarch feeds on the leaves of the milk-weed plant which are presumably very bitter to the taste.

There are other color devices in evidence in nature such as the warning device of the skunk, the signal markings of the white-tailed deer, and the courtship colors of birds; but these all reveal the providential father-hand of God as he controls all things. We do not recognize some blind, all-controlling force but we confess and believe that all things work together for the fulfilling of the good pleasure of Jehovah God.

When we observe all these things, we say with our church fathers in the Belgic Confession, Article XIII:

This Doctrine (Divine Providence, AL) affords us unspeakable consolation, since we are taught thereby that nothing can befall us (or the whole universe, AL) by chance, but by the direction of our most gracious and heavenly Father; who watches over us with a paternal care, keeping all creatures so under his power, that not a hair of our head (for they are all numbered), nor a sparrow, can fall to the ground, without the will of our Father, in whom we do entirely trust...

A. Lammers
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SCIENCE IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES

The purpose in teaching science, as in every other subject, is to give the child, through observation, a true knowledge and better understanding of God's wonderful creation.

An authorized definition of science is a systematized knowledge based on accurate observation, regarding universal laws, theories, general principles or known facts.

After reading this definition, you will probably wonder how the young first grader can derive any good from a science course based on theories, universal laws and general principles. Elementary science (1-3) is really a course that contains few scientific principles but includes many experiences based upon observations. Thus, science in the elementary grades is better classified as Nature Study.

As the school doors open, nature study begins. Eager youngsters come with handfuls of squirming caterpillars, pretty leaves, bird nests, rocks, crayfish and even frogs and tadpoles. In fall there are enough flies around which serve as good specimens for observation and discussion.

The teaching of nature study will early endow the child with the ability to perceive color, form and music. Fall is the time in which trees change color and take on a new form as the leaves drop. The songful birds leave to find homes in warmer regions.

Winter has many possibilities for nature study. Footprints in the snow can be the beginning of a unit on animals, their homes, the food they eat and how these animals affect our lives.

Spring ushers in another phase of nature study. The return of warm weather brings about floods, overflowing rivers and creeks. Our songful friends return, and now is the time to find out who they are, where they live and what they eat. It is an opportune time for a unit on birds and bird life.

It is not only the earthly creation that the child begins to observe. He notices the wonders of the heavens: the sun, moon and stars. God made the sun not only to shine by day, but the sun is needed for food growth. The moon and stars were created to give us light by night. The study of these great lights usually brings up the question of day and night and the rotation of the earth, and also the discussion of the four seasons.

A classroom filled with plants and some animals provides an interesting atmosphere for children. Much of the naughtiness in the classroom is a result of lack of interest, and having to remain quiet for too long a period. A child that is finished with his work and has nothing to do, can often spend a lot of time quietly watching the goldfish, the tadpole or even a friendly pet someone has brought to school. The child will be interested in learning because he can observe.

Nature Study or Elementary Science is more than an aid to classroom discipline, it teaches the child to love nature. This love is not developed through drill or daily routine lessons. A nature study lesson is most valuable and interesting if taught as a result of some recent classroom experience.

Children enjoy a nature study lesson about some animal or plant they have found and brought to school. This does not mean that the teacher never plans a nature study or science lesson. There is definitely an organized study in elementary science, for the teacher leads the children to observe the various things in nature that she wants to observe.
the children to learn about and understand. In elementary science the children work on their own unit by bringing specimens or examples to class for observation and discussion.

After the children have learned about birds, animals, and food, they climax the study of science or nature study by taking a trip to the museum, a hike through the woods on a warm spring day, or even spend a day at the zoo to watch God's creatures in their natural habitat.

Children stand with awe and amazement as they observe God's creation. The new knowledge of nature serves as a better understanding of the world in which they live and have a place. The young child learns how all things serve God and His Kingdom.

DOLORES MENSCH

REDLANDS YOUNG PEOPLE'S NEWS

Our Young People's Society has enjoyed two major events in this past half year. They were the Christmas singspiration and an outing.

We sponsored a Christmas singspiration on the evening of Dec. 22, following the church service. The group sang several carols and psalters. As a special number, Iona Mantel sang a solo, "The New-born King" accompanied by her sister Mary Ann. The Ladies' Aid trio also gave a number called "Silent Night." The men's quartet favored us with the number, "Fairest Lord Jesus." The group singing was led by Mr. E. Gritters. Everyone enjoyed the evening very much.

The Young People also had an outing on the evening of December 19. We went up in the mountains to a place called Blue Jay, where there is an ice skating rink. We fell quite often since it was the first time on skates for many of us. But we all enjoyed the evening, playing various games. After we were rather tired, we went down the mountain and had refreshments. Our president, Mr. K. Feenstra, and his wife accompanied us.

Our Society meets every Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock. We are studying the book of Hebrews, chapter 3 at present. Not having our own church building we meet at the homes of the various members.

Regional Staff Reporter
RUTH KUIPER

COMBINED MEETING

The young people of Oak Lawn and South Holland have been, for some time now, holding combined society meetings once every two months. We alternate with holding them at the two churches. Such was the meeting we held on January 26.

We opened with the singing of several Psalter numbers and prayer by the chairman of the evening, Rev. Vanden Berg. An interesting discussion followed on the parable of the "Ten Virgins." After a short recess we began our program. The first number was an essay by Ruth Poortenga entitled "Why Protestant Reformed Education?" A vocal duet followed by Eileen and Alice Van Baren. They sang, "Following Jesus." We then had a reading by Don Haak and a Bible quiz by Albert Buiter. The last number was another vocal duet. This one was by Emma Rutgers and Patheresa Ipema. They sang a Psalter number and were accompanied by Grace Ipema at the piano. Our meeting closed with the singing of a Psalter number and prayer by Henry Lenting.

We find that these combined meetings give us a chance to become more acquainted with young people of the other church. They are also instructive as all society meetings should be. Why not try a combined meeting with your neighboring Protestant Reformed Church if you don't already do so?

RUTH Pootenga
Regional Staff Reporter
The church group or denomination known as Christian Science is not unknown to us or the rest of the church world. This is due to their unique beliefs as to physical suffering in the world, and no doubt to the fact that they maintain an extensive program of informing the world as to their beliefs and the powers of their belief or religion. Most of all their teachings are known from some cases of Christian Scientists who in the face of some dread disease refuse all medical help to cure them, rather depending on Christian Science practitioners to cure them. As a result of these cases the belief receives wide attention in the daily newspapers and news reports.

Before going into a discussion of the beliefs and basis of Christian Science it would be well to give some of the history and organization of the denomination, this material giving much to the understanding and valuation of the movement.

Christian Science is a system of metaphysical or spiritual healing based upon the discovery by Mary Baker Eddy in 1866 of what she termed “the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love.” In 1875 Mrs. Eddy completed and published the first edition of Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, in which her discovery is fully set forth. This book and the King James Version of the Bible constitute the basic textbooks of the Christian Science religion.

In 1879 Mrs. Eddy established a church called the Church of Christ, Scientist. The Church was reorganized in 1892 as a voluntary religious association known as the First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston. This is the mother church of the Christian Science Movement, of which there are as of June 1949, 2,993 branches throughout the world, and 100 college organizations.

The mother church and its branches hold Sunday services and Wednesday evening meetings, both conducted by the First Reader. The Sunday services include a Lesson-Sermon, read by the First and Second Readers, consisting of alternate groups of Bible passages and correlative selections from Science and Health, so arranged as to explain various aspects of the subject of the Lesson-Sermon. The Wednesday evening meeting includes a period given over to testimonies of healing through Christian Science. As of June 1945 there were 10,806 Christian Science practitioners listed in the Christian Science Journal, devoting their entire time to healing the sick through prayer, and aiding in meeting the spiritual needs of students of Christian Science.

The Church of Christ, Scientist, is governed by the Manual of the Mother Church by Mary Baker Eddy, which contains church bylaws covering the various phases of the church’s activities. The provisions of these bylaws are carried out under the direction of the Christian Science Board of Directors, a self-perpetuating board of five members, which also transacts the business of the Mother Church and defines its policies under the Manual.

Among the publications of the church are: The Christian Science Journal, a monthly publication listing all Christian Science Churches and Societies; the Christian Science Sentinel is a weekly periodical containing articles about Christian Science as well as verified testimonials of healing; the Christian Science Monitor, an international daily newspaper, published in Boston, which presents news of international importance and significance as well as such local news as is pertinent to the various editions in which the paper is issued. It contains each day one article concerning the practical application of the Christian Science religion.

The religious teachings of Christian Science are summarized in the following tenets, which are found in the Church Manual, 89th Edition.

1. As adherents of Truth, we take the in-
spired Word of the Bible as our sufficient
guide to eternal Life.

"2. We acknowledge and adore one su-
preme and infinite God. We acknowledge
His Son, one Christ; the Holy Ghost or
divine Comforter; and man in God's image
and likeness.

"3. We acknowledge Jesus' atonement as
the evidence of divine, efficacious Love, un-
folding man's unity with God through
Christ Jesus the Wayshower; and we ac-
knowledge that man is saved through
Christ, through Truth, Life, and Love as
demonstrated by the Galilean Prophet in
healing the sick and overcoming sin and
death.

"4. We acknowledge that the crucifixion
of Jesus and his resurrection served to up-
lift faith to understand eternal Life, even
the alliness of Soul, Spirit, and the nothing-
ness of matter.

"5. And we solemnly promise to watch, and
pray for that Mind to be in us which was
in Christ Jesus; to do unto others as we
would have them do unto us; and be merci-
ful, just, and pure."

Perhaps the thing that would help the
most in understanding the movement of the
Christian Science belief would be a detailed
account of the life of its founder, Mary
Baker Eddy. Because of the limit of time
and space such an account can not be given
in this article. For those who wish to read
an account of the founder of this belief and
the history of the early life of the church I
would suggest the book Christian Science,
The Faith and Its Founder.

The life of Mary Baker Eddy is not that
of a devout Christian who developed her
beliefs through much study and labor. In
fact the first 50 years of her life are rather
unimportant. She was born and raised in
New England during the middle of the 19th
century. As was typical of those days she
was taught the contents of the Bible and
from her later works it seems that she was
quite familiar with its contents. During her
early adult life she was constantly afflicted
with ill health and as a result tried many
cures for her troubles. In time she was led
to try a new type of treatment that was
just coming into fashion at that time, that
of the treatment of disease by hypnotism
or mesmerism as it was known in those
days. As a result of this treatment she was
cured of her many ailments, becoming a
devoted disciple of the theory of the mental
causation of physical troubles. Spending
much time with her "physician" a certain
Geo. A. Quimby, she soon began to teach
this new way of treating disease to all
interested students. During this time she
was also busy writing her book Science and
Health with Key to the Scriptures. It was
her claim to have received this information
that is contained in this book directly from
God, as inspired material. She also claimed
that this new revelation came to her during
a supposedly fatal illness, from which she
miraculously recovered, although there is
evidence to show otherwise. This revela-
tion was that what is called sickness, dis-
case, sin manifest themselves in what ap-
pears to be, and is called, matter; but as sin,
sickness and disease are contrary to the
being and character of God and would con-
tradict Him in His wholeness or allness,
then matter is actually a fiction, and disease,
sickness, sin, must be deemed as non-exist-
ing.

This may all sound like a lot of philoso-
phical talk that has little to do with the
Word of God and the teachings contained
in it. In essence that is exactly what Chris-
tian Science is; in my estimation it is en-
titled to neither the name Christian nor any
rightful connection to the teachings of
Christ. The belief that matter is non-
existent but is only a product of the mind
is as old as the history of philosophy. The
 Teachings of this general theory can be
found in many different periods of history
and its general development can be traced
through many different schools of philoso-
phy. What Mrs. Eddy has done is not only
to teach this belief as a philosophice' "

(Continued on page 21)
Originally, as most of us must know, the Old Testament Scriptures were written in the Hebrew language. As early as the year 300 B.C. all the books had been written, gathered and, by the careful judgment and general consensus of the church herself compiled into what we now know as the O.T. Canon.

The New Testament was written originally in the Greek language. It was some time after the year 100 A.D. before these 27 books were all gathered and in the same way of prayerful examination and careful judgment combined into what we now know as the N.T. Canon.

Since then and as the church of Jesus Christ extended its borders into all nations and peoples there have been numerous translations of the Bible, of course. In fact, well over 400 including our English language. Not only was the Bible translated into our own language, but we have several versions and more are in the making.

The earliest translation of any kind is known as the Septuagint Version. This was a Greek translation of the O.T. Hebrew, the fruit of some seventy scholars from Alexandria, which was completed in the year 277 B.C., hence the name “Septuagint” meaning seventy. Long before the first advent of Christ many Jews had already been dispersed among the nations of that time. Gradually these Jews had adopted the Greek language and either entirely or in part they had forgotten their own Hebrew. Hence the need of this Greek translation of the O.T. Canon.

As time marched on and the white horse of the Apocalypse (the Gospel) galloped farther and wider over the earth other translations became necessary, of course. In time Greek supremacy gave way to Roman dominion and toward the close of the second century after Christ the Latin language had quite well superseded the Greek. Consequently the need was felt for a Latin translation and thus the Vulgate Version came into the world. This Vulgate was the only Bible in Europe for a long, long time. It was all in handwriting, of course, and consequently Bibles were very expensive and scarce. In our age, wherein Bibles are available in unlimited quantities it is quite difficult to imagine, that there was a time when the written Word of God was within reach only of a few of the world’s wealthy and elite.

In this article we are interested primarily in our English versions of the Scriptures. The first translation of the entire Bible into English did not see the light until the year 1382 A.D. and is known as the Wycliffe Bible. Before this snatches of the Scriptures had been translated, but no more. Since the Hebrew and Greek originals were not yet available, at least to Wycliffe, this great English reformer made his translation from the Latin Vulgate. It was a translation from a translation, therefore. This gigantic task took this man of God some 22 years to complete. Since printing had not yet been developed, all had to be done by hand. You can imagine the immensity of the work. Many copies were made, but each took some ten months to write. The written Word of God was precious in those days.

In course of time this first translation was succeeded by several others. In 1525 A.D. the Tyndale Bible appeared. This version was based on older and original manuscripts and was the first to appear in print. Then came the very important Geneva Bible, prepared by the reformers in Geneva, in the year 1560 A.D. This version showed marked improvements over its predecessors. It was translated directly from the Hebrew and Greek. It was the first Bible to use italics, the first to be divided into verses, the first to omit the apocryphal books to which the Roman Catholics attach so much significance. Besides, because of great forward progress in the printing industry the Bible now began to appear in a form that made it portable and relatively inexpensive. For the
first time in history, the first time since the Word of God began to be written some 3500 years ago, the entire Scriptures were becoming readily accessible to the entire church of Jesus Christ. How wonderful that the providence of God caused printing to be invented and developed just in time to serve the rapid spread of the Word of God to all His people.

Then came the great versions we know today. There are several, but we shall confine ourselves to the principal ones.

Toward the end of the 16th Century an increasing need was felt for a new version of Scripture. The meaning of many English words had changed considerably with time. Moreover, more and more originals were being uncovered and it was felt that the previous translations could well be improved. Accordingly, King James I appointed and authorized 54 scholars to set themselves to this task. Whence the name: King James or Authorized Version. After years of consecrated labors this majestic and much beloved version was finally published in the year 1611 A.D. For nearly 300 years it was THE Bible both in England and our own country. There was little or no talk of other versions.

History, however, goes on and with it come change and development. Certain English words were becoming increasingly obsolete; more and older originals were being found, manuscripts to which earlier translators had no access; scholarship in general had advanced greatly. Again the feeling arose that a new and if possible better version might be desirable. Consequently it was decided to attempt a revision of the King James Version. The task was undertaken by 99 learned men of whom 34 were from our own America. Published in the year 1885 the initial demand for this newest version was stupendous. Even before it was published as many as two million copies had already been ordered. This version became rather popular in England, though not in America. As was to be expected, it did improve on the King James Version in some respects. Certain passages were bound to be more accurate; certain words more up-to-date. In other respects, however, it was not an improvement over the old. This Bible was known simply as the Revised Version.

Closely connected with this Revised Version is the one we know as the American Revised Version. The 34 American scholars mentioned above continued their work, because of differences on certain points between them and their English colleagues. This resulted in the publication of the American Revised in the year 1901. This Bible proved rather popular, also in Reformed circles, until quite recently. Today, however, it is gradually making way for the version about which so much was written a few years ago, the Revised Standard Version. There are other versions not mentioned in this article, but we shall not concern ourselves with them at this time.

What shall we say about this American Revised Version in distinction from the King James? Some of the differences between them are known to most of us. The Revised Version has all the poetic passages in poetic style; the Authorized Version does not. The Revised uses the name “Jehovah” where the King James uses “Lord.” Where the former speaks of “Holy Spirit” the latter has “Holy Ghost.” Space does not permit us to elaborate. It cannot be questioned that in many passages the Revised Version is the more accurate. A serious objection however, is the omission of several passages that do appear in the King James Bible. Such things frighten us. I for one would far rather see a passage retained in the Bible that may not have been in the original, than see one elided that was. As mentioned, however, this version is on the way out, making way for the new Revised Standard Version. And so versions come and go, while our old, sublime, stately and deeply solemn King James Version continues majestically and triumphantly on its way.
the church and hearts of God's people, the Revised Standard? Much criticism has been directed against it, as you may know; some of which, I feel, was exaggerated; some of which no doubt is justifiable. I have done some reading in this version; however, my study of it was not of such a nature that it could entitle me to the status of an authority. When I see how in Isaiah 7:14 the word "virgin" was changed to "young woman" and how in Isaiah 45:7 the word "evil" was changed to "woe", I cannot help but wonder how many other passages were subjected to similar alterations. Admittedly, the men who produced this new translation were more or less avowed modernists. This, of course, is a serious objection. The strong point of this new version would seem to be its simple style and up-to-date language. Many passages seem so much more understandable than before. However, this apparent strength could well be its chief weakness. The question is: how much of all this must be credited to more liberal interpretation and exegesis rather than trustworthy translation? If the former was the case, the fact that these scholars were modern in their conceptions and tendencies becomes doubly serious, of course. All so-called translation is mixed to some extent with interpretation. It is not so that every Hebrew and Greek word has a single, ready-made equivalent in the English. Some foreign words have no precise English equivalent at all. Others have various shades of meaning. It is only by way of intense effort and comparative study of Scripture's passages, that the translator must determine the word that most nearly expresses the original. For that reason it makes so much difference who undertakes this business of translating the infallible Scriptures from one language to another.

How about its use in our circles? I certainly would not recommend that this new version be our only Bible and that we use it in the place of the other versions. However, as a help in our study of the Word of God and to aid our understanding of the Scriptures it may prove very beneficial. Referring to it in your Bible discussions as societies can do no harm, assuming, of course, that you possess and exercise a measure of Christian discretion.

To me, meanwhile, it is most gratifying to know that our King James Version is still the most loved and popular of all. I am happy to hear that all these newer versions have failed thus far to cut in on the sales of the Authorized Version. The Gideons, who distribute so very many Bibles, plan to continue with the King James. Other translations, perhaps, have certain advantages over our King James. To me the latter still excels all the others by so much, that I will venture the prophecy that this world will not see the day that any version of Scripture will ever completely supplant the one that has been so dear to so many for so long: our majestic, beautifully unique and worshipful King James Version.

R. VEIDMAN

Christian Science
(Continued from page 18)

theory but to elevate it to a religious belief, using the miracles of Jesus, the early church, and even the Old Testament miracles as proof of this belief. If the rest of the Bible does not seem to bear out Mrs. Eddy in this teaching, she distorts them or ignores them so that this philosophical belief is made to be the truth of Scripture. To do this she has had to deny many of the basic truths of the Bible such as creation, the Godhead of Christ, the Trinity, the atonement of Christ for the sins of His people, and the realness of sin in the fall of man. Christ is no longer our Savior but becomes, as is stated in the tenets of Christian Science, the wayshower for His people.

Space does not allow for a complete discussion of how the beliefs of this religion completely differ from the teachings, the truth of the Bible; in fact, how in reality they blaspheme God by making God and man one and the same. J. BUTTER
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