



REFORMED

— PAVILION —

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 13

JULY 6, 2024

*For in the time of trouble he shall hide me in his pavilion:
in the secret of his tabernacle shall he hide me;
he shall set me up upon a rock.*

—Psalm 27:5

CONTENTS

3 MEDITATION
The Rest of the Holy Sabbath

4 LETTER
Mr. John Mantel

10 HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S *BANNER* ARTICLES
Article 65: The New King and His Kingdom (continued)



REFORMED
— PAVILION —

Editor: Rev. Andrew Lanning
From the Ramparts Editor: Dewey Engelsma

See reformedpavilion.com for all contact and subscription information.

And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily...And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the LORD hath said, To morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the LORD: bake that which ye will bake to day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to day; for to day is a sabbath unto the LORD: to day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none.

And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the LORD said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the LORD hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day.

—Exodus 16:5, 22–30

The Rest of the Holy Sabbath

God had prescribed a strict daily rate of manna for the people: one omer per person per day. If the people tried to stockpile extra manna to keep overnight, the manna bred worms and stank. The strict daily rate taught the people that they did not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord. God had said that there would be manna tomorrow, and manna there would be.

However, every single week there was an exception to the strict daily rate. On the sixth day of the week—Friday—the people were to gather a double portion of manna: two omers per person. No manna would be given the seventh day—Saturday. The double portion of the sixth day would last the people for two days. The manna stored up overnight in their jars on Friday would not breed worms nor stink on Saturday but would be fresh and ready to eat. Though the people in their unbelief and disobedience tried to gather on the seventh day as they had on the sixth, God gave no manna the seventh day.

For the forty years that God sent manna to Israel, God sent a double portion on the sixth day. For the forty years that Israel received manna, there was no gathering of manna on the seventh day.

And do you know why God gave no manna on the seventh day? Ah, the reason is truly wonderful! It will make your heart sing with happiness, for it is the glad tidings of the gospel.

God gave no manna for the people to gather on the seventh day because God had designated the seventh day as the day of rest. Can you imagine such a thing as rest for the children of Israel? What a stark difference was God's day of rest from Pharaoh's murderous bondage! In Egypt the people of Israel had no rest at all. Egypt was the iron furnace (Deut. 4:20). Egypt was the house of bondage (Ex. 20:2). All seven days of the week the people sat in darkness and in the shadow of death, bound in affliction and iron (Ps. 107:10). All seven days of the week they sighed and they cried by reason of their bondage.

But now, redeemed by the sovereign grace of God through the blood of the passover lamb, what did Israel have? Rest! Blessed, peaceful, free, refreshing rest! There in the wilderness, with the angels' food raining down upon her from heaven, Israel learned what her life with God would be: rest! For the rest of the sabbath day was a symbol of the eternal rest of heaven.

In giving Israel a sabbath day, God gave his people rest. "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the LORD thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day" (Deut. 5:15).

And that rest is yours through Jesus Christ. Jesus is the passover lamb by which you are redeemed from the iron furnace of sin and death. And Jesus is the bread from heaven by which you are nourished unto everlasting life. In Jesus, then, you have rest with God. "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. 11:28).

Sabbath rest unto the Lord through Christ! Who could imagine such a thing for God's redeemed slaves! Can we refrain from song? "Return unto thy rest, O my soul; for the LORD hath dealt bountifully with thee. For thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the LORD in the land of the living" (Ps. 116:7-9).

—AL

LETTER

"Assurance of Justification"

Andy -

So you think that the child of God living in unrepentant sin need not repent or has no need to repent? So you don't think that GOD withholds the faith that gives assurance of Justification when the elect sinner refuses to repent? So you don't think that God uses that withholding to bring the elect sinner to repentance, so once again the elect sinner can experience God's love and favor? (Read about King David)

Of course repentance is God's work even as Faith is God's work. never did I say otherwise. Where did you get that from out of my three sentence E-mail. If you would quit writing page after page of rebuttal full of half truths and twisting of what was said in my first E-mail, you would have some credibility.

You know you have a whole world out there you could work on evangelizing so why are you so bent on destroying the PRC?

Put this letter in your next edition of "Reformed Pavilion" and be truthful in your response.

Sincerely,
John Mantel.

A hearty welcome back to our Protestant Reformed correspondent. Quite frankly, I was not sure that we would hear from Mr. Mantel after last week. It is a pleasant surprise, then, that he has written again—and so soon! And what is even better, our correspondent reappears on the scene with a thoroughly doctrinal letter. There are depths to discover and riches to mine in the topics that he raises: repentance, faith, and justification. And our correspondent evidently feels very strongly about his position, for he writes with some vinegar. But a little vinegar is a welcome relief from the hordes of bland, sleepy, nice men that plague the churches today. Would that the entire church world be as full of vim as our correspondent when it comes to the heart of

the gospel. So again, Mr. Mantel, a hearty welcome back to the pages of *Reformed Pavilion*.

Accusations and Answers

Doctrine is at the heart of our correspondent's letter. But our correspondent also makes accusations against the undersigned regarding matters that would undermine my credibility. Let us deal with our correspondent's accusations, then, in order that those accusations not interfere with our consideration of the doctrine.

First, our correspondent accuses the undersigned of "writing page after page of rebuttal full of half truths and twisting of what was said in my first E-mail." Our correspondent offers this example of my deceit: "Of course repentance is God's work even as Faith is God's work. never did I say otherwise. Where did you get that from out of my three sentence E-mail."

I think that our correspondent and I must be talking past each other. I do not remember any such exchange about whether repentance is God's work or man's work. I went back and re-read the correspondence from last week, but I still cannot find the example that our correspondent offers. I agree with our correspondent that "repentance is God's work even as Faith is God's work." My heartiest *amen* to our correspondent's confession! Did I somehow leave the impression that our correspondent was weak on this? Did I perhaps imply that our correspondent thinks that repentance is the work of man and not of God? If so, let me assure Mr. Mantel that we agree that repentance and faith are both God's work. I object to other points of our correspondent's theology but not to this point. In fact, I think Mr. Mantel is stating the doctrine more strongly than some in his denomination would be comfortable with: "repentance is God's work." Yes, indeed! God's work! And, therefore, repentance is not of man. Amen and amen!

As for our correspondent's accusation that the rest of my reply was "full of half truths and twisting of what was said," I simply do not agree with our correspondent. The undersigned

is certainly capable of twisting men's words, whether on purpose or by mistake. But I did not deal deceitfully with our correspondent. I believe that the reply published last week was fair, careful, accurate, and true. In fact, part of the reason that my reply went on for "page after page" was the care that was taken to understand our correspondent and to do justice to his concerns. Both in the writing of the reply by the undersigned and in the reading of it by our audience, *Reformed Pavilion* labored over Mr. Mantel's doctrine point by point. This is not deceit; this is fairness, respect, love for the neighbor, and love for the truth.

If our correspondent still believes that he was misrepresented, he is welcome to write again to instruct us—with evidence—where we dealt with him deceitfully.

Second, our correspondent accuses the undersigned of being "bent on destroying the PRC" and thus of neglecting the "whole world out there you could work on evangelizing."

Let me assure our correspondent that I am not bent on destroying the Protestant Reformed Churches (PRC). The PRC is already destroyed. The denomination has apostatized from the truth as it is in Jesus. The denomination is offended by the pure preaching of the gospel. The denomination has persecuted those who rebuked her for her errors, covetousness, and idolatry. Now the denomination officially proclaims that it is "not erroneous" to teach that good works are "by no means to be slighted" in assuring a man of his justification.¹ And thus the denomination is "easily known" as a "false church" (Belgic Confession 29).

If I am bent on anything, it is on calling God's people who are still mired in that false denomination to come out. According to the word of God, God's beloved people who are in Babylon are to "come out of her" (Rev. 18:4). But this call does not destroy the church. Rather, God uses this call to gather, defend, and preserve the true church by bringing his people out of the synagogue of Satan and unto himself.

¹ Synod 2024, Committee 3 advice, II.D.

And as for the false church, God has already destroyed her. She may always exist as an institution in the world, but she exists as a harlot, not as a bride (see Rev. 17:1–6). Or to use another figure, the leaders of the false church may always have that institution as their house, but their house is left unto them desolate (see Matt. 23:38).

With regard to evangelizing the whole world, that is part of the purpose of *Reformed Pavilion*. The magazine can go out online to places that we otherwise could never reach. Pardon what must look like boasting, but the magazine is read far and wide: in the last thirty days people from forty-one countries visited the magazine's website. (This is no boast in ourselves; we are such worms that I am ashamed even to have to write this.) Of course, this does not mean that we are large. It is probable that our readership only numbers in the hundreds, not even in the thousands. Nevertheless, we are very thankful for the little space that the Lord has granted us. And with the space that the Lord has given, what better topics could there be to set forth than the gospel and worship? Exposing the PRC's error regarding justification is not neglecting the evangelizing of the world but is practicing the evangelizing of the world.

Justification by Faith Alone

The heart of our correspondent's letter is not the above accusations. Rather, the heart of his letter is the doctrine of justification.

Our correspondent teaches his doctrine of justification by posing several questions. First question: "So you think that the child of God living in unrepentant sin need not repent or has no need to repent?" Because our correspondent is dealing with justification and the assurance of justification, as is evident from his following questions, my answer to his question is this: Correct; I believe that the child of God living in unrepentant sin has no need to repent *for his justification or for his assurance of his justification*.

If our correspondent were asking in general terms whether an impenitent sinner must repent, then I would answer yes! An impenitent

sinner must repent! The child of God may not live impenitently in sin. One who lives impenitently in sin reveals by his impenitence that he is not a child of God. One who lives impenitently in sin must be excommunicated from the church. The sinner may not be impenitent! The sinner must repent! So preached our Lord: "Repent ye" (Mark 1:15).

Or if our correspondent were asking whether a justified sinner will inevitably repent, then I would answer yes! A justified sinner will certainly repent. The faith by which a child of God is justified is not a vain faith but is a faith that worketh by love. The faith by which a child of God is justified "excites man to the practice of those works which God has commanded in His Word" (Belgic Confession 24). A justified sinner will not remain an impenitent sinner, for it is impossible that this holy faith can be unfruitful in man!

But because our correspondent is asking about what is necessary for justification (or the assurance of justification), my answer is no! An impenitent sinner need not repent *for his justification or for the assurance of his justification*.

There is one thing, and one thing only, that a sinner needs for his justification: Jesus Christ. There is one thing, and one thing only, that a sinner needs for the assurance of his justification: Jesus Christ. After all, how is the child of God right with God? Not by anything that the child of God does. Not by his loving God; not by his loving the neighbor; not by his repenting of his sin. If the child of God needed any of these things to be right with God, he would never be right with God! Even his best works are polluted with sin. Even his most sincere repentance lacks the zeal that it should have.

But Jesus Christ is perfectly righteous! Christ has fully covered every sin of his people by his blood—substitutionary atonement. And Christ has perfectly obeyed the law in his people's place—substitutionary obedience. God counts Christ's perfect righteousness as our perfect righteousness. And God counts Christ's righteousness as ours without any regard whatsoever to any of our works, whether good or bad. We are justified with

an alien righteousness, an external righteousness, another's righteousness—the righteousness of Jesus Christ alone.

Therefore, for justification it does not matter whether you sin or do not sin. For justification it does not matter whether you obey or do not obey. For justification it does not matter whether you love God or do not love God. For justification it does not matter whether you love the neighbor or do not love the neighbor. For justification it does not matter whether you repent or do not repent. This must be driven home to us because our natural inclination is that for justification it *does matter* whether we repent, obey, and love. But the truth is that for justification it *does not matter* whether you repent, obey, or love.

Rather, for justification it matters whether Christ sins or does not sin. And Christ did not sin! For justification it matters whether Christ obeyed or did not obey. And Christ obeyed! For justification it matters whether Christ loved God or did not love God. And Christ loved God! For justification it matters whether Christ loved the neighbor or not. And Christ loved the neighbor! For justification it matters whether Christ hated sin or not. And Christ hated sin! The righteousness of the child of God is entirely and exclusively and only the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ. For justification what matters is not what you have done but only what Christ has done. So says our Lord's apostle: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested... even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 3:21–22).

Just as there is only one thing that the sinner needs for his justification—Jesus Christ—so there is one means only by which the sinner receives Jesus Christ—faith. A sinner is justified by faith alone. A sinner's assurance of his righteousness in Christ is faith alone. And faith excludes all and every work. Even though faith always produces the fruit of good works, including repentance, faith excludes all those fruits from its view. Faith looks to Christ alone without any regard for faith's works. This is the doctrine of justification by faith alone. And this was the doctrine of Christ's apostle: "Therefore we

conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3:28).

The fruit of justification by faith alone is that a man will repent and do every good work. The *inevitable* fruit of justification by faith alone is that a man will repent and do every good work. This is why the Lord and his apostles so often called for repentance and faith in the same breath. "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark 1:15). But there is a world of difference between faith and repentance. Repentance is work; repentance is fruit. Faith is not work; faith is the opposite of work; faith is the refusal to work unto righteousness; faith views Jesus Christ's work alone.

Repentance will be the sure and inevitable *fruit of justification*. But repentance has no place whatsoever *for justification*. Therefore, our correspondent's question and my answer:

Q: So you think that the child of God living in unrepentant sin need not repent or has no need to repent?

A: Correct; I believe that the child of God living in unrepentant sin has no need to repent *for his justification* or *for his assurance of his justification*. The child of God living impenitently in sin needs Jesus Christ alone for his justification. And the child of God has assurance of his justification by faith alone. The *result* of his justification by faith alone will surely and inevitably be that the child of God is no longer impenitent but that he repents and does every other good work.

So say the confessions.

Moreover, though we do good works, we do not found our salvation upon them; for we can do no work but what is polluted by our flesh, and also punishable; and although we could perform such works, still the remembrance of one sin is sufficient to make God reject them. Thus, then, we would always be in doubt, tossed to and fro without any certainty, and our poor consciences continually vexed, if they relied not on the merits of the suffering and death of our Savior. (Belgic Confession 24)

Our correspondent's next questions reveal what place our correspondent gives repentance in a man's justification. "So you don't think that GOD withholds the faith that gives assurance of Justification when the elect sinner refuses to repent? So you don't think that God uses that withholding to bring the elect sinner to repentance, so once again the elect sinner can experience God's love and favor? (Read about King David)."

In these questions our correspondent teaches the doctrine of justification by repentance. Consider the scenario that our correspondent presents. In this scenario we have an elect child of God, but he is presently living impenitently. In this scenario God withholds the assurance of justification from the impenitent sinner. Now, in this scenario how does our correspondent propose that the sinner may again obtain the assurance of his justification? Is it by Christ's atonement for the elect sinner? No, Christ makes no appearance in this scenario. Is it by faith alone? No, and, in fact, it is not by faith at all, for God is busy withholding "the faith that gives assurance of Justification." Then how does our correspondent propose that the sinner obtain the assurance of his justification? This way: by repenting! God brings "the elect sinner to repentance, so once again the elect sinner can experience God's love and favor."

Our correspondent teaches the doctrine of justification by repentance. And the doctrine of justification by repentance is the arch-enemy of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. For our correspondent's benefit, I am aware that he teaches that repentance is the gift of God. But his correct teaching on the source of repentance does not rescue his false teaching on the means of justification. The difference between us is not whether repentance is a gift of God or not. Rather, the difference between us is whether justification is by faith alone or whether justification is by anything at all other than faith, including repentance. One of these is the gospel of heaven: "We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law" (Gal. 2:16). The other of these is the lie from hell: "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ

is dead in vain" (v. 21). The difference between these doctrines is life and death.

What about an impenitent sinner then? An impenitent sinner's impenitence is deadly serious. The impenitent sinner highly offends God, incurs a deadly guilt, grieves the Holy Spirit, interrupts the exercise of faith, very grievously wounds his conscience, and sometimes loses the sense of God's favor for a time (Canons 5.5). But though a sinner's impenitence brings him all manner of grief and chastisement from the hand of his God, it is not the sinner's penitence that restores him to the blessing of forgiveness and favor. Rather, the sinner is restored through faith alone. For God only gives the assurance of justification through Christ alone, who is known and received and embraced by faith alone.

Therefore we justly say with Paul, that we are justified by faith alone, or by faith without works. However, to speak more clearly, we do not mean that faith itself justifies us, for it is only an instrument with which we embrace Christ our righteousness. But Jesus Christ, imputing to us all His merits and so many holy works which He has done for us and in our stead, is our righteousness. And faith is an instrument that keeps us in communion with Him in all His benefits, which, when become ours, are more than sufficient to acquit us of our sins. (Belgic Confession 22)

Therefore, when the confessions speak of "returning into the right way of serious repentance" (Canons 5.5), the confessions are not proposing repentance as another means of justification with faith. Rather, the confessions are speaking in terms of the first and inevitable fruit that true faith produces: repentance. The justified sinner is a penitent sinner exactly because he is justified by faith alone and not by his works.

And what about David then? David was righteous before God by faith, not by works. This was David's own confession: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.

Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile... he that trusteth in the LORD, mercy shall compass him about” (Ps. 32:1–2, 10). And this is the Reformed interpretation of David’s confession.

We believe that our salvation consists in the remission of our sins for Jesus Christ’s sake, and that therein our righteousness before God is implied; as David and Paul teach us, declaring this to be the happiness of man, that God imputes righteousness to him without works. (Belgic Confession 23)

Conclusion

Our correspondent writes with vim, vigor, zeal, and vinegar. Good for him. But, heartbreakingly, our correspondent writes without knowledge of the gospel. My heart’s desire and prayer to God for the members of the Protestant Reformed Churches is that they might be saved. For I bear some of them record that they have a zeal of God but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of

God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth (see Rom. 10:1–4).

Protestant Reformed people are ignorant of God’s righteousness in Christ received by faith alone because the Protestant Reformed denomination is a false church. The gospel that comes from her pulpits is another gospel. The Christ that is proclaimed there is another Jesus. Whatever juggling act the ministers and elders think that they are successfully performing with justification and repentance, the sheep are getting the message loud and clear that a man must work before he can be assured of his justification. And when the true gospel of justification by faith alone in Christ alone without works comes along, the members of the Protestant Reformed Churches are offended by it and pour their vinegar on it.

“My people,” says your God, “come out of her, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues” (see Rev. 18:4). And let those who have been delivered from bondage by the grace of God rejoice! For “being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1).

—AL



Article LXV. The New King and His Kingdom (continued)

With regard to the intertrinitarian relation of the Father and the Son we reached the following conclusions. In the first place, that the Father from eternity to eternity generates the Son, thus giving to the Son to have life in Himself; and that the Son is by this eternal, uninterrupted act generated by the Father. In the second place, we found that by this act of eternal generation the Father objectifies Himself perfectly in the Son, so that the Son is the perfect likeness, the personal impress of the Father. In the third place, we found that the Son in perfect love turns Himself toward the Father, is “with” the Father, has the constant tendency of His being directed towards the Father. And lastly, we expressed ourselves thus, that within the Holy Trinity the Father is God revealing, the Son is God revealed, the Father knows Himself thru the Son, the Son knows the Father thru Himself.

We remarked, however, that this bond of knowledge and love between the Father and the Son can be understood only if we take into consideration the intertrinitarian place of the Holy Spirit. It is this subject we must discuss now.

Surely, not one of the easiest subjects to elucidate. It is, on the contrary, extremely difficult to form any conception whatever of the place of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Trinity. Of His relation to the Father and the Son it is difficult to speak. If the Trinity is a mystery, an inscrutable mystery; if we must, while speaking about this holy mystery, never forget that we cannot comprehend God; we feel this especially when we approach the subject of the Holy Spirit of God. It is comparatively easy to speak about the Father; it is still more easy to

say something about the Son; but it is as if human thought ceases to flow and human language can make but futile attempts to give adequate expression, when we begin to meditate and try to speak about the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son.

Thus we find it in the congregation. In general, there is but little knowledge of God the Holy Spirit. Not as if there were no experimental knowledge of Him. Surely, there is. Even though in this respect there is no reason to boast; even though many, were they honest, would probably have to confess: “we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit” Acts 19:2; the fact remains that the children of God naturally have experienced the operation of the Spirit in their hearts. He it was that regenerated them and incorporated them into the Body of Christ. He it was that, under the influence of the Word, called them in to conscious faith and hope and love. He it is that makes them daily partakers of Christ Jesus, makes them eat and drink Him, thru whom they are in Christ and He in them. He it is that sanctifies them, perfects them, makes them rejoice in the inheritance prepared for the saints. Surely, they know Him in this light. They know His work in their hearts. They have experienced Him as the Comforter. But when it comes to describe His work, or when it comes to make evident what is really the relation of this Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, when it comes to explain the person and work of that Spirit to our understanding, it seems that all human wisdom fails. Of God the Father and our creation we can speak. Of God the Son and our redemption especially we never grow weary of

speaking. But of God the Holy Spirit we have but little to say.

Neither is it only in the congregation that you meet this phenomenon. Our standards reveal the same fact. If you peruse the Heidelberg Catechism, you will find that there is but one question and answer devoted to the discussion of the Holy Spirit. True, the heading: “Of God the Holy Spirit” covers more than one chapter in the Heidelberg. But the fact remains, that really only one small Lord’s Day speaks of the Holy Spirit as such. The other questions and answers that follow speak not of the Holy Spirit proper, but of the church in which He dwells, and the gifts of grace He bestows on the people of God. All that we read about the Holy Spirit as person is contained in the twentieth Lord’s Day: “What dost thou believe concerning the Holy Ghost? First, that he is the 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.” Even the last part of this answer, as you will notice, does no more speak of the Holy Spirit proper, but of His relation to me as a member of the body of Christ. The same fact holds for the Confession of Faith. If you will compare, you will find that the chapter on the Holy Ghost is one of the smallest in the confession. All it says is: “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.” Truly, this article of our confession is most beautifully and carefully formulated. It emphasizes all there is to be emphasized. It speaks of the true and eternal Godhead of the Spirit. It speaks of the fact that He is a Person as well as the Father and the Son. It emphasizes that He is not begotten, thus distinguishing Him from the Son, but that He proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

But characteristic is the brevity of the article nevertheless. And, finally, you will meet with the same phenomenon in books and treatises that speak of the Holy Trinity. Much has been written on God the Son. Comparatively little you will find on God the Holy Spirit.

Naturally, there is a reason for this. A reason, moreover, that is not difficult to discover. With God the Father we are accustomed to connect especially the work of creation. With God the Son we come into contact with the work of redemption immediately. Both of these, creation and redemption, offer us something tangible, something we can visualize, something we can lay our hands on. But the work of the Holy Spirit eludes our vision. We cannot draw pictures of it. We cannot concretely call it before our imagination. It is always more or less mystical. And if it is difficult already to give ourselves account of the work of the Holy Spirit, how much more difficult will it naturally be to speak about His Person! In regard to God the Father and God the Son, we have names that call to our mind analogies from the world of man. These very names express something of the relation of each to the other. But the name Holy Spirit expresses at best that He is not begotten but “spirited,” breathed, that He proceeds. And lastly, even Scripture is undoubtedly far more clear in revealing to us the relation between the Father and the Son than that of the Holy Spirit to both.

And yet, we realize that it is necessary to make use of all the light Scripture gives to elucidate the relation of the Third Person to the Father and the Son. Unless we have somewhat satisfied ourselves about this relation our minds can find no rest. This is true in the first place with regard to the Trinity itself. Spontaneously our minds postulate a Third Person next to the First and the Second. It may be bold to express ourselves in regard to the possibility of Divine Existence, but we feel that God could not be two persons. The divine life is not complete, does not rest in itself, has not come to the unity of Divine Love, as long as we have not found the Third Person of the Holy Family. All sorts of questions

arise that leave our thinking no rest. Why, if God generates the Son, does not that Son become Father in turn and generate another Son? Why are there not an endless number of Sons in the Godhead? Or why does not the Father generate more sons? How, if the Son by an act of eternal generation proceeds from the Father, is eternally begotten of Him, is the relation established between the Two? How is it possible that this Son with the constant tendency of divine love turns His face to the Father? Our minds do find no rest until they have found the Triune God. But the same is true with regard to the works of God outside of Himself. What relation is there between God and creation? How does the tie of the covenant work between God and the Church? And, therefore, our minds will not cease to struggle, until we have obtained satisfaction in regard to this Third Person of the Holy Trinity.

Variouly this relation has been expressed by the great men of God's church, whose minds thirsted after the knowledge of the living God. St. Augustine, who so deeply experienced that our hearts and minds find no rest until they have found rest in God, expressed this relation by calling the Holy Spirit Love. The three Persons of the Trinity respectively he designated as "amans," "amatus" and "amor," the Loving One, the Beloved, and Love. Indeed, very ingeniously conceived, very beautifully expressed. But the question remains: Does in this case the Spirit proceed only from the Father? If so, how is

it the perfect tie of unity? And, besides, is not love rather an attribute of God's being and not a personal attribute? Another very common representation, originated in scholasticism, is that the Son is begotten of the Father's intellect. Hence, He is called the Word, Wisdom. And the Holy Spirit proceeds from His will, and is, therefore, love, the bond of unity in the Holy Godhead. But also here we object: intellect and will are not peculiarly personal attributes, but belong to God's very Nature. And therefore, even thus the characteristic relation of the Holy Spirit is not expressed.

In general, and also in our Confession of Faith, the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son is expressed by saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Two elements, clearly expressed, there are in this description must be considered.

In the first place, that the Holy Spirit proceeds, is not begotten. This distinguishes Him from God the Son.

But this is not sufficient.

To understand the characteristic significance of the Holy Spirit it must be emphasized, that He proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Only when this is evident do we rest satisfied that the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity are One indeed!

—Holland, Mich.

