



- Jaar: 1918
- Plaats: Grand Rapids, Mich
- Uitgever: Eerdmans-Sevensma
- Bestand: [Download PDF](#) (6.14 MB)

Translated through Google Translate to get a general impression, not a precise understanding.

p. 46

... then they had to complete the typical element of Scripture to deny. Since Premillennialists actually to make an absolute distinction between the two parts of God's Revelation, it surprises us not that Saphir can no longer find himself in the ordinary names, Old Testament and New Testament,

and would prefer to speak as one of the one  
the book of the Kingdom, and of the other, as  
the book of the Church. \* (5) And if it is true, that it is  
Old Testament only relates to the Jews,  
then we can hardly scold them, those with  
Schleiermacher and his followers to it, as  
a Jewish book, all normative authority for the Church  
to deny Jesus Christ; and then we have to  
also New Testament chants as soon as possible  
in place of our Old Testament  
psalms. Why would we rather sing  
of the temporary peace and prosperity of Israel  
then from the eternal blessings of the Church of Jesus  
Christ? Why rejoice in the future  
earthly glory of God's old people, while  
yet our own glory is much greater and  
will be heavenly in nature?  
There is another point that requires our attention here,  
that is, Premillennialism with its absolute separation  
between Israel and the Church, progressive  
character of God's work of redemption and of being  
Revelation completely loses sight of. The fact that  
God the redemption of man in an organic way  
\* Saphir, The Divine Unity or Scripture, pp. 172-174.

p. 47  
brings about, naturally means that in that  
work progress is from a small insignificant beginning,  
through different stages of development,  
until the final completion. And we find the revelation  
of this progressive work in the Holy One,  
Scripture. We cannot go into details here  
demonstrate, however attractive the task may be;  
and therefore we only point out the fact that we are  
especially in the later prophets find indications  
of a further development in three directions. In  
the **first** place they point forward to a time,  
in which the particularism of the Old Testament  
will disappear in the universalism of a better  
day, if not only Israel, but also the nations of it  
world will share in the blessings of Abraham.  
In the **second** place we already notice it in them  
flash of the day in which religion no longer  
will be a matter of the nation as a whole, but rather  
of the single person; when the personal  
responsibility will come to the foreground  
steps, and the big question will no longer be that of  
a person's relationship to some special one

nation, but that of the personal relationship  
the soul to God. And finally they already contain  
clear indications that the religion gradually  
be stripped of his external ceremonial  
shapes and in his true spiritual character  
will come to light. Now we are turning from the  
Prophets to the New Testament, we see  
because these promises are fulfilled, that higher position  
p. 48

reached, and the Old Testament button unfolded  
to a delicious flower.

However, what is the position of the  
Premillennialism? If we then turn to  
the New Testament, we suddenly see ourselves  
placed for a completely new phenomenon, of which  
the prophets had no knowledge whatsoever,  
namely the Church of Jesus Christ. Even the old  
the federal people were in no way at her foundation  
prepared, and we cannot blame them  
to assume that they did not accept the Messiah, where  
He accomplished a work of which the prophets  
had not spoken, and undid what they as  
had designated the special task of the Messiah.

The Church is here for us as the embodiment  
of a thought that first emerged later.  
She is only one to the word of Guers  
kind of parenthesis (tusschenzin) - well a delicious one  
parenthesis-but only a parenthesis. \*

It does not represent a further development  
of the work of redemption, but a temporary deviation  
of the straight line, in which God his work  
position. Speaking in the language of motorists,  
we would say that God is in the present  
make a detour.

To the disbelief of the Jews, He thought it necessary  
to leave the smooth roads on which He rode in the old dispensation;  
now He does not follow without greatness  
difficulty the sinful and dusty ways of the  
p. 49

dispensation of the Spirit; and He will be the royal army  
not reach until finally the Millennium ushered in.

We see the Premillennialists refer back to  
the Judaic ideal. The prophets will be theirs  
fulfillment in a restored Kingdom of  
Israel and in a rebuilt temple with whole  
ceremonies service. The revelation of animal fulfillment  
wait for us in the future. It is true the Gentiles  
can also share in the future glory

of the Kingdom, but only if she  
Israel be incorporated. Is this not the error of  
Judaics from Paul days? And just like that old one  
false teachers, also do the Chiliasts, while they do  
Israel honor high, the Christ actually-clean  
perhaps unconsciously-dishonor. Gal. 5: 2 ff. (6) Not  
the world but Israel, is the ultimate goal of history  
of redemption; an earthly kingdom  
the inception of a spiritual people, it is wonderfully ideal!  
And this kingdom will not be established by  
moral agents, as e.g. the preaching of it  
Gospel, nor by such workings of the Holy  
Spirit in the hearts of men as we are  
to experience the present dispensation-those means  
are completely inadequate; but by great judgment  
at the end of the world, by an external  
supernatural power. \* The emphasis is shifted  
in the work of redemption from the first on the  
second coming of Jesus Christ; and the spiritual one  
p.50

(?) he work of the Savior in the dispensation of the  
Gospel is being reduced. Once again, the Chiliasm  
is blind to the progressive nature of the work  
of redemption and of corresponding thereto  
Revelation. It despairs the present  
world, and finds its only comfort in it  
view of the Millennium.

My **fourth** and final point of criticism is focused  
against the distinction, which the Premillennialists  
make between the Kingdom and the Church in the  
New Testament; and against the resulting  
denial of the present kingship of  
Christ. We are told that the Messiah, then  
He came, really had the plan, for his Kingdom  
to be founded, but was retained  
the unbelief of the Jews. It will still be erected,  
but not until the Christ returns. Insteed  
of the Kingdom, Christ has founded his Church,  
those in distinction from the Kingdom one  
spiritual organization. And He is not of this Church  
the King, but the divine Head. Possibly possible  
He also now be considered a King, but  
then only as a King without a Kingdom.  
Gray says: Christ considered his human  
nature, Christ the God-Mench, reigns on this  
moment nowhere. As God, He rules Himself  
about the universe, just as He always did  
has, since He created it; but as the resurrected

p. 51

and glorified man He is "seated on the right hand of God, further expecting, until his enemies are made into a foot bank feet. "(Heb 10: 12-13) In that day, however, when his enemies are made into his footstool, He will come again, and "the Lord will give him the throne of David his father. And He will pass over to be the house of Jacob's King forever. " (Luke 1: 32, 33). \*

But what teaches us about the New Testament these businesses? To clear education, that it gives us, is the Kingdom of God both present and future. It is nowadays as a spiritual reality, visible only before the eye of the born again, as an organic one planting, and as an all-pervading force, Matt. 6: 33; 13: 31-33; 16: 28; 24: 34; Luke 17: 20, 21; Joh. 3: 5; Rev. 1: 6. Until the time of John the Baptist was the subject of the prophecy; from his days on, however, it is it theme of Gospel preaching, Matt. 11: 11-13; Luke 16: 16.f And this Kingdom is, though not entirely, but still be identical to a certain extent with the Church. In the Church the Kingdom obtains a visible shape; the believers are at the same time members of one person and citizens of the other.

p. 52

Dr. Vos says: "The Church is a form that the Kingdom assuming as a result of the new stage, which is the Messiahship of Christ with his death and resurrection. As much as the expansiveness of the membership, Jesus teaches clear to us, the invisible Church and the Kingdom to identify. "\* That these two to a certain height are identical, we also see from it next: (1) In Matth. 16:18, 19 are the names "Church" and "Kingdom of God" apparently synonymous. The intimate connection, in which these verses come to each other standing, the image of a house that underlies both lies, and the fact that Peter was appointed to home carer in the Kingdom (so it is nowadays was in his time), ensuring it conclusion.f (2) At the convent in Jerusalem says James, the brother of the Lord: "Men brothers ! hear me! Simeon has told how God

first visited the Gentiles, to get from them one  
to accept people for his name; and with this  
agree with the words of the prophets  
It is written: After this I will return, and  
rebuild the tabernacle of David, which is decayed  
is, and rebuilt that which is broken,  
and I will rebuild it, that the  
peoples seek the Lord, and all  
p. 53

Translate

Tu

|       |         |         |                 |  |  |         |       |         |           |
|-------|---------|---------|-----------------|--|--|---------|-------|---------|-----------|
| Dutch | English | Spanish | Detect language |  |  | English | Dutch | Spanish | Translate |
|-------|---------|---------|-----------------|--|--|---------|-------|---------|-----------|

de Heidenen, over welke mijn naam aangeroepen is, spreekt de Heere, die dit alles doet." Hand. 15: 13-17. In deze toespraak is "de tabernakel van David" blijkbaar een beeld van de theocratie. Naar L de beschouwing van Jakobus is dus het inzamelen van de Heidenen de oprichting van het Koninkrijk. En als Blackstone en Haldeman het voorstellen, als zeide Jakobus, dat God zich eerst een volk wil vergaderen uit de Heidenen, en dan—daarna—het Koninkrijk oprichten, maken zij zich schuldig aan Schriftverdraaien.\* (3) De naam, "Koninkrijk der hemelen", wordt blijkbaar op de Kerk toegepast in sommige van de gelijkenissen van het Koninkrijk, Matth. 13. Zelfs Premillennialisten erkennen dat. f Waarom zichzelf niet gelijk gebleven? En indien het Koninkrijk een thans bestaande werkelijkheid is, en wat de onderdanen aangaat één is met de Kerk, dan volgt daaruit, dat Christus ook nu werkelijk Koning is; niet een Koning in ballingschap op den hemelschen troon, zooals Haldeman het wil—een zeer vreemde gedachte • voorwaar!—maar een Koning, die zelfs nu het koninklijk bewind voert; en dan is Hij bijgevolg ook de Koning zijner Kerk. Hij zelf verklaart uitdrukkelijk, als Hij voor Pilatus staat, dat Hij een Koning is, schoon niet in nationalen zin des woords, Joh. 18:33-38. Op de vraag van den stadhouder: "Zijt \* Blackstone, Jesus is Coming, p. 173; Haldeman, The Coming of Christ, p. 215. t Blackstone, Jesus is Coming, pp. 153 ff.; Haldeman, The Coming of Christ, pp. 33 ff.; Scofield Bible

x the Gentiles, about which my name was called, says the Lord, who does all this. "Acts 15: 13-17. In this speech is "the tabernacle of David" apparently an image of the theocracy." To L James's view is therefore to collect of the Gentiles the establishment of the Kingdom. And if Blackstone and Haldeman propose it, if said James, that God first wants to gather a people from the Gentiles, and then-after-the Kingdom they are guilty of Turning scripture. \* (3) The name, "Kingdom of heavens ", is apparently applied to the Church in some of the similarities of the Kingdom, Matth. 13. Even Premillennialists recognize that. f Why did not they stay the same? And if the Kingdom is a present one reality, and as far as nationals are concerned one is with the Church, then it follows that Christ even now really is King; not a King in exile on the heavenly throne, as Haldeman wants it-a very strange thought • verily! -but a King, who even now the royal govern; and then He is consequently also the King of his Church. He himself explicitly declares, when He stands before Pilate, that He is a King is, not clean in the national sense of the word, Joh. 18: 33-38. To the question of the Stadholder: "Be \* Blackstone, Jesus is Coming, p. 173; Haldeman, The Coming of Christ, p. 215. t Blackstone, Jesus is Coming, pp. 153 ff.; Haldeman, The Coming of Christ, pp. 33 ff.; Scofield Bible

Dutch English Spanish Detect language

English Dutch Spanish Translate

gij de Koning der Joden?" geeft Hij ten antwoord: "Mijn Koninkrijk is niet van deze wereld." Blijkens het verband houdt dit antwoord in: (1) dat zijn Koninkrijk niet van aardchen maar van hemelschen oorsprong is; (2) dat het niet door de gewone middelen van uitwendig geweld zal worden gevestigd; (3) dat het geen nationaal karakter draagt en derhalve geen inbreuk maakt op de regeering der Romeinen. Na dus een mogelijke misvatting van zijn aanspraak op het koningschap te hebben voorkomen, zegt de Heiland uitdrukkelijk, dat Hij een Koning is, ja dat Hij geboren was, om Koning te zijn. Maar Hij voegt er zeer voorzichtig aan toe, dat Hij niet gekomen was, om zijn Koninkrijk met geweld van wapenen te vestigen, doch om de menschen aan zich te onderwerpen door der waarheid getuigenis te geven. En zijn gebied is niet beperkt tot de Joden, maar strekt zich uit over allen, die uit de waarheid zijn. Met het oog op deze uitdrukkelijke verklaring van den Heiland schijnt het wel onmogelijk, om staande te houden, dat Christus thans geen Koning is, of hoogstens een Koning zonder rijk; en dat Hij niet is de Koning zijner Kerk.\* Bovendien verklaart Paulus betreffende Christus in I Cor. 15: 25: "Want Hij moet als Koning heerschen, totdat Hij al de vijanden onder zijne voeten zal gelegd hebben." De Premillennialisten laten dit slaan op de regeering van Christus als Koning ge-

thou the King of the Jews? "he answers: "My Kingdom is not of this world." It appears the link implies this answer: (1) to be that Kingdom not from earth but from heaven origin; (2) that it is not by the ordinary means of external violence will be established; (3) that it does not carry any national character and therefore does not infringe the Government of the Romans. So after a possible misconception of it have prevented his claim to the monarchy, the Savior expressly says that He is one King is, yes that He was born, to be King. But He very carefully adds that He had not come, for his Kingdom by force to establish arms, but to the people to submit through the truthful testimony to give. And his area is not limited to the Jews, but it extends to all who are of the truth to be. In view of this express statement of the Savior seems impossible to maintain that Christ is not now King is, or at most a King without a kingdom; and that He not is the King of his Church. \* Moreover, Paul declares concerning Christ in I Cor. 15: 25: "For He must rule as King, until He put all the enemies under his feet will have laid. "The Premillennialists leave this the government of Christ as King

\* See the comments of Godet, Zahn and Van Andel (and W. Blackstone was also cited above)

skipping down to the end of his appendices for his mention of Van Andel:

(7) It may be useful to point here at the position of Rev. J. Van Andel, a man who is as general known, had Chiliastic tendencies, and which nevertheless Writer in high esteem was in Gereformeerde [Reformed] circles, both in the Netherlands and in our own country. His predilection for Chiasm clearly appears to be Sacred History, p. 488. But we must not think that he would also endorse such Chiliastic strangeness, like that Israel and the Church of the Lords of the New Testament not together formed the one people of God; that it Kingdom and the Church are absolutely distinct; and that Christ is not the great King of his Church. Just it contrary! Thus we read in his, Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 220: "They are not a tree (the believers of the New Testament) planted next to Israel's tree, but in these branches included, they are the continuation of the tribe, connected to the root, fed by the spirit of life from the tree, and sharing in the tree given to the tree blessing. "See also, Paul's Gospel, p.

He explicitly teaches that the Kingdom of God is a present reality is in the hearts of believers. Listen to what he says on p. 90, 91 of his, Jesus' doctrine: "Asked being of the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God come, he says, that it does not come with outward appearance, actually, under observation, Luke 17: 20, that is, through sensual signs, which were observed with the eyes of the flesh become, it does not announce its arrival. Honor one it knows it is in our midst, as an unseen force, carried by persons whose appearance does not betray them, and seated wherever, on the basis of personal reconciliation the divine government has been restored Before all He directs, by spiritual means only, with rejection of oak-flesh stimulus, his dominion in the secret of the heart; only later he gives his rich the appropriate figure of the empire, which it in its full glory appear before all eyes. To have that we should thus take the realm as a spiritual one power, yet we must not think that it is without intervention of human means, or that it would all take shape before his revelation in glory to miss. On the contrary, his appearance presupposes labor his servants, the preaching of the word, the service of the sacraments, the presence of churches, all of them things that belong to the visible. " Read on, what he says concerning the testimony of Jesus before Pilate: "Jesus recognizes that He is one Kingdom has, and servants who are in his service. But with recoil on the question whether he is the King of the Jews, He says that his kingdom is not of this world, that Pilate was not allowed to think, that are accused pregnant went from the plan, to the Emperor as a Jew to let the king proclaim. His Kingdom is in this world, but it is not of this world, neither now nor later on. " Gospel of John, p.361. [see [John 18:36](#) ]

Here are some cut and paste of image screenshots, they could be run through an OCR to generate text. Henry Zwaanstra, "Louis Berkhof," in David F. Wells, ed., Reformed Theology in America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), p. 159-161.

[https://books.google.com/books?id=S\\_ja7y27VYsC&pg=PA170&dq=Henry+Zwaanstra,+%E2%80%9CLouis+Berkhof,%E2%80%9D+in+David+F.+Wells,+ed.,+Reformed+Theology+in+America&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewj2dS63qTeAhVF5awKHdWiDXcQ6AEIPDAE#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=S_ja7y27VYsC&pg=PA170&dq=Henry+Zwaanstra,+%E2%80%9CLouis+Berkhof,%E2%80%9D+in+David+F.+Wells,+ed.,+Reformed+Theology+in+America&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewj2dS63qTeAhVF5awKHdWiDXcQ6AEIPDAE#v=onepage&q&f=false)



In the midst of the international turmoil and upheavals occasioned by the First World War, Henry Bultema, pastor of the First Christian Reformed Church in Muskegon, Michigan, published *Maranatha*.<sup>19</sup> The central thesis of Bultema's book was that the unfulfilled prophecies in the Bible should be interpreted literally just like those that have already been fulfilled. Bultema also attempted to defend chiliastic and premillennial views. *Maranatha* provoked an immediate response in the Christian Reformed Church. Berkhof was asked to speak on the subject. He did so in English. At the request of friends and because of the urgency of the matter, Berkhof had his address published in edited and expanded form in Dutch.<sup>20</sup> In April 1918 *Premillennialisme: Zijn Schriftuurlijke Basis en Enkele van Zijn Practische Gevolgtrekkingen* (Premillennialism: Its Scriptural Basis and Some of Its Practical Consequences) appeared. Berkhof cordially and judiciously refrained from mentioning Bultema in the text. In the notes Bultema and *Maranatha* appear along with other American premillennialists and their works.

After expressing great respect for the premillennialists' unconditional acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God and for the warmth of their devotion to Scripture, a striking contrast to the "icebergs of higher

criticism," Berkhof proceeded to elaborate four objections to their views. Berkhof's first and most fundamental objection was to the premillennialists' mistaken insistence on a strictly literal interpretation of the prophetic writings. According to Berkhof the historic Christian church in its exegesis of prophecy self-consciously accepted and applied a different hermeneutical principle from that of the premillennialists. Those holding premillennial views did not deal adequately with the progressive and historical character of God's revelation. Berkhof insisted that the historical form in which a prophecy was given belonged to the essence of the prophecy and that it was proper to make a distinction between a literal historical explanation of a prophecy and its fulfillment. Berkhof also criticized the premillennialists for not interpreting Scripture according to the analogy of Scripture. In this respect they were following a practice wholly in agreement with modern, liberal exegetes. Berkhof further stated that Revelation 20:4-6 should also be interpreted according to the analogy of the New Testament. The Dutch theologians Kuyper, Bavinck, Greydanus, and Hoekstra so interpreted the text, as did Warfield, Vos, Milligan, and Eckman. And finally Berkhof asserted that by insisting on a literal fulfillment of prophecy the premillennialists got involved in all kinds of contradictions and bound God in fulfilling prophecies to conditions and situations that existed when the predictions were first given.<sup>21</sup>

Berkhof's second objection to premillennialism focused on the thousand-year kingdom of Christ and the doctrine of the second resurrection. After a rather extensive treatment of the texts appealed to in support of the doctrines, Berkhof concluded that the scriptural basis for both was very weak.<sup>22</sup>

Thirdly, Berkhof objected to the premillennialists' absolute separation of Israel and the church. The separation resulted in a denial of the spiritual unity between them. Berkhof argued that this separation and denial destroyed the unity of God's revelation, conflicted with the organic nature of his redemptive work, negated the salvation of humanity in Jesus Christ, and robbed the church of Christ of the blessings of the covenant.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, Berkhof objected to the premillennialists' customary use of the distinction between the Kingdom and the church in the New Testament. Again they separated the two so that Christ's present kingship was denied. Quoting Vos, Berkhof argued that the church is a form that the Kingdom takes after Christ's death and resurrection. He concluded by saying that the Kingdom is a present reality, its subjects are united with Christ in the church, and Christ is now really king.<sup>24</sup>

The synod agreed with Berkhof. Bultema and *Maranatha* were tested strictly by the standards of Reformed confessional orthodoxy and found wanting for separating Israel and the church, and the church and the

LOUIS BERKHOF

161

Kingdom, thus denying the spiritual unity between Israel and the church and the present kingship of Christ. Bultema was later deposed. He and his followers formed the Berean Church.<sup>25</sup>

The end notes were not included within this Google Books excerpt.

Here is a 2009 paper by Geoffrey Randall Kirkland on Berkhof;

<http://vassaloftheking.com/home/180007755/180007755/Images/Paper%20-%20Berkhof%20-%20Theologian%20and%20Theology%20by%20Geoffrey%20Kirkland.pdf>

It cites Zwaanstra and another source on the topic (p. 20) was Berkhof's *Second Coming*, p. 93.

"In view of all this it is a conundrum to me how they who belong to the Church, for whom the promises given to Israel do NOT at all apply, can derive special comfort from the fact that Jesus at his return will establish a temporal Jewish kingdom on earth; how they can find it a specially consoling thought that Jesus, who after his resurrection was already endowed as Mediator with an endless life and as such could not remain in this sinful world, but had to ascend to heaven, will after his return again dwell on earth for a thousand years in a world in which sin and death still hold sway; and how they can find it a cause for special rejoicing that Christ will again have to descend from his heavenly throne for a prolonged stay on earth, which is still under the curse of sin and death and still a scene of wickedness and lawlessness, of sickness and sorrows; and that with him his saints will also for a thousand years have to exchange their heavenly bliss and glory for an environment that is not at all suited to their glorified conditions. In the light of all these considerations it becomes very difficult to explain the supposedly unique comfort of the dispensationalists." From the next sentence; "Berkhof says that 'the New Testament never says anything about the restoration to that ancient covenant people.'"

But to really see what Berkhof said on Premillennialism, go to his Systematic Theology section about it.

[https://archive.org/stream/SystematicTheology/93884037-Louis-Berkhof--Systematic-Theology\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/SystematicTheology/93884037-Louis-Berkhof--Systematic-Theology_djvu.txt)

I. Millennial Views

There are some who connect with the advent of Christ the idea of a millennium, either immediately before or immediately following the second coming. While this idea is not an integral part of Reformed theology, it nevertheless deserves consideration here, since it has become rather popular in many circles. Reformed theology cannot afford to ignore the wide-spread millenarian views of the present day, but should define its position with respect to these. Some of those who expect a millennium in the future hold that the ...

Searching for the word 'spiritualize' there gives an example of what Berkhof meant; "This national idea [of Israel] is naturally very prominent in the Old Testament, but the striking thing is that it did not disappear when the nation of Israel had served its purpose. It was **spiritualized** and thus carried over into the New Testament, so that the New Testament people of God are also represented as a nation, Matt. 21:43; Rom. 9:25.26," etc. So in this example the Church does inherit from Israel certain shared characteristics.

This example probably doesn't answer the question of what does the CRC mean when it spiritualizes the promises made to Israel, but in general it is clear the promises are fulfilled through the Church. Another biographer said of him, "Berkhof believed from Vos that the church is the form the Kingdom took ..." (Thomas, Geoff -Banner of Truth [Article](#), March 28, 2008).