

could perform this in one operation. Better yet, cross out the two words "clean heart" and insert "good testimony" (1 Peter 2:12).

Item 4: Specification D: Here it is charged that, "Faith is represented as a bridge; this is ~~partly~~ partly true and partly false...." See Page 20, par. 3, line 8(sic.).

Opinion. As I note page 20, par. 3, I see that ~~the~~ ^{the book} calls Christ the "bridge" and faith "the cable which links us with Him." Thus even the statement of the charge is not able to sustain the scrutiny of perfection ~~for it charged that~~ ^{for it charged that} faith was called a "bride," when in actuality faith was called "a cable."

Now the question is, Can Christ be pictured as a bridge between God and man? and can faith be compared to a "cable" which attaches us to Christ? Without belaboring the point, I think that both are acceptable for illustrative purposes. Christ does in His atonement "bridge" the chasm by paying the penalty for our sins. Faith can be likened to a cable in the respect that it fastens us to the merits of Christ's finished work. If these were used as sermon illustrations, which is a comparable case to that at hand, I judge that it would be unfair for a parishoner to attack the preacher at the end of the sermon for using them.

Item 4: Specification E: "A teaching of free will,"(sic) is charged in ~~instances of the charge~~ ^{four places}. The charge lists Chap. IX of the Confession. This is the chapter, "Of Free Will."

Opinion: Page 4, par. 1, line 12--I see nothing objectionable here. The paragraph cites Joshua 14:15 wherein Joshua asked Israel to "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." Surely Joshua was not out of order in asking for ^{such} a choice. The Bible everywhere asks man to choose, even the invitation to believe in Christ is an invitation to make a choice. The affirmation of human free agency is not a denial of the bondage of the will of fallen man.

Page 7, par. 2 (under the poem it is the first paragraph), line 3.-- I find nothing here objectionable. If such things are objected to, there will be no more testimonies orally given in our churches. Someone at the first line will jump up with an accusation.

Page 8, par. 2, line 1.-- "I have made"--If this objection is allowed to stand it could be said that Paul erred in 1 Thess. 2:13-14 because he said, "Ye received...Ye became followers..." instead of saying, "God caused you to receive...God made you followers...." The ~~assertion~~ ^{assertion} of ~~the~~ free agency, i.e., apparent freedom of volitional choice, is (1) a characteristic of all tongues of all ages; (2) was used by Paul; (3) and it cannot be equated with a denial of the bondage of the will of fallen man. *Calvinism affirms free agency while denying free will to fallen man; Hyper-Calvinism denies both. This particular charge is Hyper-Calvinistic.*

Page 9, par. 2, lines 2 and 6.-- I find no objection in these lines. Again, such over-theological scrutiny must logically find fault with Paul's words in Acts 16:31, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." It could be said, "No man can of himself believe, etc."

I am of the opinion here that all four specifications of error must be dismissed. The approach of analyzing each sentence in a search for an all-comprehensive systematic theology quite misses the purpose of the book.

Item 4: Specification F: (Nay, rather "G"--The statement of charges made the error of omitting the letter "F." Such scrutiny the statement of charges cannot itself ~~stand~~ withstand, and I think this to be here significant). Specification G (sic): Here it is charged that the doctrine of Christ is confused with the doctrine of Faith and the doctrine of Salvation.