

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

HEADQUARTERS

Wheaton, Illinois

OFFICERS

DAVID MELLEMA, *President*, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary

ROBERT K. RUDOLPH, *Vice-President*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
University of Pennsylvania

WILBURN S. McLAIN, *Secretary*, Siloam Springs, Arkansas
John Brown Schools

W. HARLEE BORDEAUX, *Treasurer*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Westminster Theological Seminary

JOHN H. DE GROOT, *Treasurer*, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary

ADVISORY BOARD

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D., Hama Divinity School

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Westminster Theological Seminary

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., Temple University

"By the word of truth, by the power of God."—2 Corinthians 6:7.

The League of Evangelical Students is a continent-wide organization of students, founded in 1925 by a student group. Its aim is to exalt our Lord Jesus Christ—by setting forth the gospel of His grace as presented in the inerrant Word of God, by promoting the intellectual defense of the evangelical faith, by proclaiming the joy of Christian living through the indwelling power of the Spirit, by presenting the claims of the gospel ministry at home and abroad. By these means it desires to present a well-rounded witness, spiritual and intellectual, to the truths of historic, evangelical Christianity. It is an organization of, and for, students. It is set for the proclamation and defense of the gospel.

A student group in any higher educational institution may become affiliated with the League. Its membership may range in size from three to the total number of students in the institution. The procedure is exceedingly simple, and is explained in the following extract from the Constitution:

"And student association, society, or club of any theological seminary, school for the training of Christian workers, college, or other institution of higher learning may apply for membership in the League upon the ratification and adoption of this constitution by a three-fourths vote of its members. Otherwise, a local chapter of the League may be formed, consisting of not less than three members, such a chapter to have the same standing—in proportion to the number of its members—as an entire student body or association that constitutes a branch of the League.

"Application for membership shall be sent to the Secretary or General Secretary of the League." (Article III, Sections 3 and 5.)

The Evangelical Student is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

Printed in the United States of America.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

VOL. IV

Wheaton, Illinois, January, 1930

No. 2

EDITORIAL

THE primacy of doctrine is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the League; it asserts that the beliefs of historic Christianity are basic, fundamental, if you please. It is true, though, that in liberal Christian circles there seems to be a reaction to the idea that beliefs grow out of Christian experience, rather than that doctrine, or belief, give rise to Christian experience.¹ The leaders of student religious life in this country are still dallying with the shibboleth, *Christianity is not a doctrine, but a life!* But "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Psalm 11:3.)

One student movement, older than the League, recently winnowed its condition of membership, the process yielding the formula that the organization was "a fellowship of students who desire to understand the Christian Faith and to live the Christian Life. This *desire* is the *only* condition of membership." We have italicized the words "desire" and "only". Perhaps an Agrippa could qualify for membership, with such terms! That concept of Christianity (both in its beginnings and in its history) must be woefully dwarfed, which allows such a group to be called a *fellowship*, in the Christian sense of the term. Such a shallow view of the gospel and similar views occasioned the formation of the League's testimony against the superficiality of certain quasi-Christian student associations.

It is revealing to notice certain objectionable statements in that portion of the constitution of this organization just mentioned, called the "Aim and Basis":

"We affirm our faith in God our Father, whose nature is creative love and power."

"God is *made known* to us in Jesus Christ, in whom we see the true expression of His being and the true nature of man."

"We seek the Kingdom of God, the re-creation of all mankind into one family, without distinction of race or nation, class or capacity."

We would not be unfair in our stricture of these statements, but it does seem as if a God whose only attributes were "creative love and power" would fail dismally to correspond to the God of the Old and New Testaments. Men need to know the justice, the righteousness, and the mercy of God, quite as much as His love and power, for only when His awful

¹*Beliefs That Matter*, William Adams Brown.

holiness and righteousness are fully appreciated can we know Him "Who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us" (Ephesians 2:4), and know the "exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe" (Ephesians 1:19).

The Schleiermacher-like notion of God displayed by that document is inadequate for the student who is hungering and thirsting for the living God.

That God is "made known" in Jesus Christ may not be objectionable at first sight, but saying that is far from saying that Jesus Christ is the "express image" of God's person.

As for the conception of the Kingdom of God, just quoted, we can say that St. Paul, by inspiration, spoke of the only brotherhood or kingdom which the New Testament, or the Old Testament for that matter, regards as spiritual, as heavenly—that organic relationship and society which is a fellowship of redeemed souls, or as the Apostle puts it, those "in Christ Jesus" are all one (that is positionally *in Christ*), and that "in Him" alone, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Galatians 4:28). How sublimely plain the language of the Book itself!

It is encouraging, however, to note in the document we are discussing such a purpose as this:

"Faced with the need and perplexity of the world, we desire to give ourselves to Christ and to follow Him wherever He may call us."

What a cry of mingled hope and gloom; what a challenging cry to us! What a need is that of the student world, the world of all lost mankind! And what a Saviour we have, One who can "save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Hebrews 7:25, *R. V.*)

In explanation of the discussions of the conference which adopted this "Aim and Basis" it is remarked, "Some of them wanted a more positive message in which reference was made to the Divinity of Christ and the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Others felt that the present Aim and Basis contained already too much of doctrinal affirmation and preferred the old statement as leaving a larger freedom." Eventually the feelings of both objecting groups were rejected, and the constitution just referred to was accepted. That there are students in such groups who recognize the necessity of credal affirmation is something for which to be thankful; but that they should consent with those who whittle away, and attenuate the heart message of the gospel is a thing to be regretted.

One editorial writer in commenting on this very document said that the realignment came because of the testing period and the strain which has come upon student societies such as the denominational societies, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., and the Student Volunteers. Praise God! the League reposes its safety in the keeping power, and the witness of the Spirit, trusting that the faith of its members will remain steady, and that, because their convictions and beliefs are "those things which cannot be shaken".

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

HORACE M. DU BOSE

ARCHAEOLOGY is a second revelation from God; another law as from Sinai; another sermon on the mount.

It chances that the lands which constitute the chief field of archaeological research and discovery, Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt, were also the chief center of Bible interest and activity. The ancient civilization of these lands left in their ruins vast remains of architecture, art, and literary records which have become a key to the secrets of their history, and have yielded amazing proofs of the historical and revelatory truth of the Holy Scriptures.

What geology is to the life history of the earth, archaeology has become to the world history written in the Bible. What the fossils in the earth series are to geology, the potsherds and artifacts of ancient civilizations are to archaeology and Bible science. A brief account of the basis and methods of archaeology will serve to bring the matter effectively before the mind.

The basis of Bible archaeology is simply this, that in the great lands of Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt, the architecture was anciently of such character as to preserve in its ruins all articles of clay, stone, bronze and other metals which were the materials used in the manufactures of ancient times. This, together with the enduring character of the ruins themselves, represents what we commonly think of as a prevision of providence.

In Babylon, the building materials, used alike in the construction of temples, palaces, zyggarats or towers, and the defense walls of cities, were of clay bricks, slightly burned or dried in the sun. These buildings generally were built upon great mounds of earth, so that their foundations should be above the Euphrates-Tigris overflow; while their walls were of immense thickness and great height, so as to shut out the torrid heat and produce convection throughout their chambers and halls. Thus again did providence favor in these thick walls the far-off possibilities of archaeology and Bible corroboration.

Into these palaces, temples and zyggarats, were gathered great stores of ancient art, alabaster figures of winged bulls and lions, bas reliefs, cuneiform tablets, monoliths and the richest types of pottery turned from ancient wheels. When the walls of these fell, as a result of war, earthquake or desuetude, they covered with immense heaps of ruins everything contained in palace and shrine; the torrential rains beat them into a cyst and left them as an impervious covering of the treasures below. The winds of after centuries piled the desert sands high upon them, so that they came to look like natural elevations, and were called by the natives *tells*, a word which in the Arabic tongue means a hill. It is into these *tells*, or hills, that the archaeologists have digged and brought to light the amazing hordes of antiquity which have made Assyriology one of the noblest and most enlightening of the sciences.

In Palestine, the more ancient cities were built of both stone and

sun-dried bricks, or of lime agglomerate. The foundations of both defense walls and of temples and dwellings were constructed of roughly-quarried stones, upon which were reared superstructural walls of mud or clay bricks. This combination has still more effectively contributed to the preservation of archaeological remains. The ancient foundations, which generally remain as when first built, serve as containers of pottery and artifacts, while the fallen upper walls make a complete and enduring envelope for the protection of all within.

In many cases, a series of civilizations have been found in these *tells*, built one upon the other, the superficial debris having been smoothed down and the stone foundations left unmolested with their priceless contents.

In ancient Egypt, early building was almost exclusively of stone, syenite, porphyry, limestone, and alabaster being plentifully at hand. From a most remote time it was the habit of the builders to write these walls over with curious inscriptions, known as hieroglyphics, which modern scholars, having mastered, have made to shed a most astonishing light on undeciphered pages of history.

The methods of archaeology have been as simple as the science of its basis. It is thus explained. The sites of these ancient cities have been uncovered, and through the testimony of their stones, their tablets, their pottery, and the incidentally impressed accidents of their history, the ages which they represent, and their contacts with the Bible and other records, are determined. We may now illustrate these methods in a brief study of some of the principal centers of archaeology which are also centers of interest in Bible history.

Let us begin with Jericho, the initial contact of archaeology with the national history of the Israelitish people. With the conquest of Jericho, Israel became a nation. Its record is an example of the absolute test which archaeology brings to the Bible.

In 1926, I had the privilege of studying in the ruins of Jericho, whose uncovered pottery, walls and artifacts, absolutely confirm the story of the conquest of Joshua. Even the statement made in the Bible that Joshua burned the city with fire, is testified to in the charred lime agglomerate, and the flame blackened stones of the uncovered foundations.

The foundation walls of Jericho were constructed of rudely carved limestones of irregular size and shape. The superstructural walls, both of the houses and of the defense barriers, were of mud bricks or of lime agglomerate. The frailty of these walls well can be imagined. A breath of miracle toppled them into confusion. From a survey of the ruins, the impression made upon my mind was that the walls had fallen inward, and that the agency of destruction was an earthquake, or other nature disturbance, rather than artificial force. The walls were probably oblique in form, as were those at Shechem. One who studies the site must conclude that the situation quite comports with the story of the city's destruction as told in the Book of Joshua.

The Bible statement is that, after the pillage of Jericho, Joshua pronounced a curse on the man who should attempt to rebuild it. But in the

first Book of Kings we are told that Hiel, a provincial governor, built his capital there. This has long been a butt for critical jest, it being assumed that this city was built upon the lines of the Jericho of Joshua. But Dr. Sellin, the excavator of Jericho, found that the walls of the capital of Hiel were well without those of the ancient city; and that especially the palace of Hiel was quite a way removed to the east of it. The foundations of the Jericho of the conquest had not been disturbed, and so remained for near three thousand years.

The story of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, we find testified to in the signs of a great geological convulsion which anciently took place at the southern end of the Dead Sea; as also in quantities of potsherds and artifacts which read back to a period nineteen hundred years before Christ, the exact age of Abraham, with whose history the story of Sodom's overthrow is inextricably connected.

In the numberless excavations and identifications which have been accomplished at Jerusalem, each one, as the discovery of the pool of Bethesda, the identification of the arch of the "Ecce Homo," Gordon's Calvary and the conduit of Hezekiah, important historical facts recited in both the Old and the New Testament have been made clear.

At the Hill of Samaria were uncovered the foundations of Ahab's ivory palace, as described in the Book of Kings. The identification is complete. The foundations of Omri's palace are equally in evidence.

In Egypt, the store cities of Raamses and Pithom, built by Hebrew slaves, were brought to light, the very bricks testifying to the truth of the Bible story of the labors of these slaves. Also, was exhumed the palace of Pharaoh, where Jeremiah was carried to be an unwilling sojourner. The pavement of this palace, as described by Jeremiah, has been laid bare, showing the very place where the prophet matched his tiles in judgment against his disobedient countryman.

Direct archaeological proofs of Scripture fact and history are numerous, and grow more numerous each year. In this line stand the black obelisk of Shalmaneser, which makes contact with Israelitish history in the reign of Jehu; the Moabite stone which corroborates that history in the reigns of Omri and Ahab; Sargon's half erased inscription, touching the fall of Samaria; the Siloam inscription, and the Tell-el-Amarna tablets.

But the noblest of these contacts is made at Shechem, whose ruins were partially uncovered in 1926. This uncovering bore testimony to the residence there of Abraham and Jacob, as told in Genesis. Indeed, the voices of the patriarchs are all but echoed by the stones of that ancient capital; nor does this fully identified site, with its ruins of the temple of El-berith, less confirm the story of Joshua's celebration of the conquest, as told in the book which bears his name. The footsteps of the conqueror are there. At Shechem, Jacob set up an altar; Joshua set up a stone to commemorate the reënactment of the Mosaic law of the wilderness. That these two mementoes of a divine antiquity were uncovered at Shechem is the belief of more than one archaeologist today. In my judgment it is not to be doubted.

THE REVIVAL OF EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY IN THE NETHERLANDS

WINFIELD BURGGRAAFF

THE history of Protestantism is a sad commentary on the natural inability of humankind to remain consistently upon high levels of moral and religious achievements. It is not difficult for a student of theology to show that one would rather expect the life in the Roman Catholic church to be subject to great slumps, due to the principles which Rome teaches, principles which, to some of us, must inevitably tend to keep people at low levels. But to think that Protestantism, purged of all those things which in the Medieval church did much hurt to the cause of Christ, —to think that Protestantism should at various times have "Ichabod" written all over it, is a thing one does not expect.

Nor is this disgrace confined to only one branch of Protestantism, as some would think. It is quite natural for the Calvinist, for instance, to think that his fundamental principles of the Sovereignty of God and the free Grace of God, are so full of vitality that they will keep Calvinism blooming, even though he rather expects that Lutheranism with its less theocentric point of departure will, for just that reason, be subject to all the ups and downs of the sinful human nature. But history has shown that both for Lutheranism and for Calvinism it is not sufficient to have a *correct* theology, but we must have a *living* theology. The winter frost which swept over Calvinistic and Lutheran Protestantism during the latter half of the seventeenth century and the following century, was not due to an incorrect theology, but to the theologians. They succumbed to the methods and the objects of the schools of that time, they became scholastics, and that is not the same as being theologians, students of the Word of God, which Word, according to its own statement of itself, is living and active. The high level of the century or so immediately following the outbursting of the Reformation, was attained and maintained because of the vitality and the glory of the re-discovered doctrine of justification by faith, as a gift of God's grace. And this level was abdicated when the glory of this new truth had become common, and when the living Word of God was changed to a compendium of proof-texts to prove or disprove what the church fathers had said.

All this is true of Protestantism in general, and thus also of the Netherlands, which country is the object of our discussion just now. The Synod of Dort in the years 1618-19 was undoubtedly a high point in the theological life of Calvinism. Representatives from all countries, there formulated the famous five points against the Arminians. It was one of those moments in the life of the church when some truth of Scripture seems to burst out of the limits of the printed word into the consciousness of the church of God. It is the birth of dogma.

The enthusiasm which filled all of the Netherlands, especially the Calvinists, at this decision of Dort, carried the church life on its waves for well-nigh half a century. But then the great danger of orthodoxy asserted

itself, and turned the tide. Orthodox Christianity, because it adheres to a revelation, must adhere to words and letters. The homo-ousia and the homoi-ousia of the Council of Nicea were not mere shibboleths, as the unbelievers thought, and as liberal theologians still think. The words were necessary to get at the truth of the revelation. Creeds have always formed a very important part of the life of orthodox Christianity. But—and here you have the unfortunate human element again—with the impoverishing of spiritual life, the creeds are looked upon as the heart of Christianity, and, instead of using them as the containers, as the expressions of the truths of revelation, they are looked upon as revelation itself. It is this deadening process that brought on the winter period in the religious life of the Netherlands. It was here that orthodoxy cut its own throat. Its ideas about creeds were suicidal. So scholasticism entered, and rationalism came and conquered the entire field at last.

The study of the revival of evangelical theology in the Netherlands shows quite clearly that there are two revivals, even though the first was more a revival of evangelical preaching, and the second a revival of evangelical theology. The first was a secession movement; the second was a reforming movement. The first said: the established church in Netherlands is Satanic, and not a true church,—therefore we will walk out; the second said: we will reform the church, go back to its old standards, which have been neglected, and organize a new Synod to take place of the hierarchy which has been placed upon us by the king. We shall look at both of these movements.

II.

In enumerating the causes for the first revival, we mention the following:

1. There is the sad situation in the established church of the Netherlands, with its rationalism, and the accompanying tolerance. They did not like the narrowness of the fathers at Dort, and thus proceeded to eliminate anything that might suggest fidelity to creeds. As true rationalists they still believed in God, virtue and immortality, and they were not sloth in extolling their own human greatness. Godliness was despised; and whenever a minister ventured to call the attention of his fellow-Christians to the terrible condition of religious life, he was immediately squelched, and shunned as a contagious disease.

2. A second cause must be seen in the small group of devoted Christians all through the land. These were not learned folk, nor great in the things of the world. They lived in the atmosphere of Dort, and of the old theologians whose works they read and studied together. There was some unhealthy, sickly pietism among them, but for all that, they preserved the seed of the true faith during those years when the intellectual world knew nothing of it. Some one has expressed it in this figure: "These people took the plant of the Gospel, and carried it into their cellars to preserve it during the long cold winter of rationalism, only to bring it out again when it should please God to permeate the clammy atmosphere of the Netherlands with the sunshine of His grace." And this they verily

did. When at last the first signs of the revival came, and the good news was brought in from other lands, it was in the hearts of these pious people that it found a welcome reception.

3. The third cause is the Reveil, or revival in Switzerland. One cannot understand the revival of evangelical thought and life in the Netherlands without knowing about this Swiss revival. It is a strange but fascinating story. Geneva, that citadel of Calvinism, that center of religious tolerance during the wild days of persecution,—Geneva had also come under the blighting influences of rationalism. In the church where Calvin had preached, and other faithful witnesses to the truth of the gospel had proclaimed the truth, there was now to be heard nothing but the vain babbling of unbelieving ministers who aspired most of all to keep peace among their people, and to let sleeping dogs lie.

But in every nation, God has those who fear him. There were a few Moravians in Geneva who still clung to the gospel. Then a merchant from England, a Calvinistic Methodist by the name of Wilcox, came to Geneva, and soon had a small group of friends, some of whom were students, gathering at his home for their prayer and discussion meetings. He was preparing to leave Geneva when a Scotsman by the name of Haldane, arrived in the city. He had worked hard during the revival in Scotland, and began to attempt great things for God in Geneva. The same type of prayer and discussion meetings were held. Some of the theological students attended, much to the disgust of the ministers of Geneva, who in 1817 demanded the signatures of these students to a document in which they promised not to attend these meetings. Some of them refused to sign, and this was the first step in a movement to separate from the Church of Geneva. Cesar Malan was a member of this group, especially after he had been put out of the Established church, since he had dared to preach the doctrines of sin and grace. This revival in Geneva did not gain any permanence, largely because it was pietistic, and as such did not want any confessions or creeds, and also in part because it was Haldane who had placed his mark upon them, and Haldane was a Congregationalist.

But that does not mean that it bore no fruit. Several people from Netherlands visited Geneva and so came into contact with the revival there. Besides, French pastors visited Holland and preached the re-discovered Gospel. And they came just at a time when Holland had been rudely awakened out of its religious stupor by a brochure written by a minister from The Hague, calling the attention of the people to the dearth of real religious life. And it was just at this time that Da Costa, a converted Jew, sent his cannon-ball through the land, when he wrote his brochure about his objections to the spirit of the age. Small groups of Christians were formed everywhere. Many of the learned men of the land, poets and statesmen, formed the nucleus of these meetings. And so the new life began to pulsate. Those who know Dutch history will recognize such names as Bilderdyk, Da Costa, Capadose, and Groen van Prinsterer, all poets and statesmen, who sounded their voices against the religious coldness of the land. There was one of these groups in Leiden, attended by

some of the theological students, and it was these students who later on were to become the leaders in the secession movement, and leaders in the first revival in Netherlands in the nineteenth century.

These three causes are the chief ones. Some go on to mention one or two more, but these will suffice for our purpose.

But what was the occasion for the secession? It was the conversion of a minister, Henry De Cock. He had finished his theological training at the University of Groningen, knowing as little of the truth of historic Christianity as other students did. The doctrines of sin and grace were totally unknown; the canons of Dort he had never read; the theological works published in the hey-day of evangelicalism, he knew only by name, while he scarcely knew of such a thing as Calvin's Institutes. He assumed his work in the town of Ulrum, in the northern part of Netherlands, and preached as all others preached,—love and tolerance. He was startled, therefore, when one of his catechumens, an aged man named Klaas Pieters Kuipenga, once made this statement: "If I should have to contribute as much as one sigh to my salvation, I should be eternally lost." How strange this sounded to De Cock, but a little thinking and much study, brought the thing to his mind, and he remembered that as a lad he had heard something of it from a catechism teacher. He dugged about in the evangelical theology of the former century, secured a copy of Calvin's Institutes, and now his eyes were opened to the truth of the Gospel. No small wonder, then, that his parishioners began to notice a different note in his preaching, and that they and hundreds of other simple believing folk for miles around crowded to the church at Ulrum to hear again the everlasting Gospel. Wherever he went to preach tremendous crowds waited to listen. Windows were taken out of the churches so that the crowds outside could listen; services were held in the cemeteries adjoining the church; ladders were placed near the windows at other times, so as to afford the anxious listener a view of the messenger of the Cross.

Although received with much enthusiasm by the believing people, the ministers in the neighborhood resented his popularity, and some of them questioned the Christianity of De Cock. One minister visited Ulrum one day to see whether this man De Cock, whom he had once known as a man of sound mind, had actually placed himself at the head of a group of farmers who did not know as much about religion as their cattle did. De Cock preached on the text: "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world". The inquisitive minister wrote later about this service: "I returned home unsatisfied, and in my reflections about what I had heard, I imagined I was back in the age of Augustine, in the days of Maurits and Oldenbarneveldt, yes, in the much-known days of the Synod of Dort." Two centuries and more since, this evangel of forgiveness had been openly and enthusiastically preached.

Under the ordinary church polity of the Reformed churches, it is doubtful whether the preaching of De Cock would have caused such a stir. But the polity of the church in the Netherlands was not then Reformed. King William III, while in England, had become enamored of

the Anglican church, and upon his return to Holland, violating a fundamental constitutional point which assured the church its right to rule in all spiritual matters, he organized a Synodical Commission, meeting at The Hague, a commission consisting of a few ministers and still fewer elders, and to them he gave all authority over every matter within the church, with the special injunction that they should preserve peace at any price. This Bureaucracy henceforth ruled. Among other things which they foisted upon the churches, was a collection of hymns, some of which were not Christian. Congregations were commanded to use this hymnal. So that when De Cock preached, and through his preaching disturbed the peace of the church, and at last also refused to use the hymnal, the ire of the Commission at The Hague was aroused, and what followed for the next decade or so, is one of the most terrible pages in the wonderful history of the little country hid behind the dikes. The secessionists were persecuted, hounded about, fined, imprisoned, boycotted in their business, all the while instead of securing government protection, suffering from governmental violence. A forgotten article in Napoleon's Penal Code, stating that no meeting of more than nineteen persons might be held, was resurrected and applied. It is a strange thing to what extent liberalism has gone to take from others just that which it claims for itself, namely, tolerance.

I will not burden you with a review of all the suffering and hardships endured by these secessionists. Not only in Ulrum but also in other parts of the country where such men as Scholte, Brummelkamp, Van Velzen and others preached the full gospel, and made objections to the un-Reformed Bureaucracy at The Hague, there persecutions followed. But the movement spread. Light was at last breaking through the black night of rationalism. Reformed Holland was awakening. Even in Parliament, friends were found who dared to accuse the government of unfair dealings with the Secessionists. At last the government recognized the rights of these groups to form churches of their own, and finally the excitement died down, and the Christian Reformed Church of the Netherlands started its separate existence. This new group was not intellectually inclined. Although they immediately organized a theological seminary for the education of their ministers, still they made no contribution to the science of theology. They were content to stay by what had been written and taught. This is due partly, perhaps mostly, to the fact that all of their strength was needed those first decades to deal with the manifold problems and difficulties involved in this new church life.

To those of you who are not aware of the history which lies behind the founding of the institution which is acting as host of this conference, it might be interesting to learn that one of the five ministers who were leaders in this secession movement, was a certain Albert Christian Van Raalte, who felt himself called by God to lead a body of emigrants to this country where they might worship the Lord according to His own revealed will. It is to Western Michigan that they came, and the names of Holland, Zeeland, Overysel and others which you will find in this vicinity betray the land and communities from which the early settlers came. Hope Col-

lege and the Western Theological Seminary are products of Van Raalte's far-sightedness and organizing genius. They are the schools which, as he himself said when pleading before an Eastern synod for funds, would be the anchor of Hope for his people in the west.

III.

I must go on to outline for you the second revival in the Netherlands, to show you at last how these two streams flowed together into one, a mighty stream which today exerts so much influence upon the life of Holland.

I have said that the background for the first revival must be found in the winter deadness of rationalism. Not an aggressive rationalism, but a dead and unproductive rationalism. Twelve o'clock and all's well, was the only shout ever heard, even though enemies were crowding about. On the other hand, the second awakening must be seen against a rationalism which was wide awake, a modernism which asserted itself. So that while the first awakening affected only the immediate religious life of the people, the second awakening affected the educational life and the political life of the Netherlands as well.

The various phases of the unbelief of the day can be seen in the various schools of the time. We shall enumerate them briefly:

1. The spiritual father of the Groningen school was Professor Van Heusde, of Utrecht, who said that philosophy must find its beginning in man, and must have as its purpose the educating of man for his true end. It was a humanistic Christianity that he preached. It found great response in the University of Groningen, and formed a school there. They called themselves the Evangelicals, because, as they themselves said, they drew their teachings from the New Testament rather than from the entire Bible. They despised doctrine, and shouted: Not doctrine, but the living Lord! They were unitarian in their theology, semi-pelagian in their conception of sin, somewhat Arian in their Christology. The idea of salvation scarcely entered their minds, since education had taken the place of regeneration. And judgment would never come, because, as they taught, all things are ultimately to be restored again. This Groningen school had quite a following, especially in the northern section of Holland. But it was not scientific enough to hold its own, and has lost most of its power. While in Netherlands in 1927 a professor in theology, appointed and supported by these Evangelicals, gave his inaugural. It was as if Hofstede De Groot, the first great leader of the school, was speaking again. But the address aroused very little comment, which fact is proof enough that the movement is practically dead,—especially when it happens in a country like Holland, where polemics in theological matters are to the Hollanders what the well-known Shorter Catechism and porridge are to the Scotsmen.

2. About 1850 there arose in the Netherlands what is constantly referred to as Modernism. Its purpose was the same as that of Modernism today, namely, to find peace between the truths of the Scripture and the world of thought round about us. The father of this movement was Professor Scholten at Leiden, first a dogmatician, and later on an exegete

in the New Testament. He started out with a belief in a personal God, the metaphysical sonship of Christ, his sinlessness, resurrection and ascension; and also in the genuineness of most of the New Testament. But he came under the influence of German philosophy, and before he was aware of what he was doing, he was identifying monism with Calvinism, substituting one thing for another, until at last it was a pure monism, evolutionistic, with the idea of determinism taking the place of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. At last he recognized himself that there was a deep chasm between the ideas of Scripture and his own ideas.

Two other men are usually mentioned in this modernistic movement, namely, Kuennen, who became an advocate for the idea of evolution as applied to the Old Testament, saying that the Jewish religion can be explained very well without any supernatural factors at all; and next to him there was Opzoomer, an empiricist, who had no place in his thought for the miracle. And after them there came a preacher from Amsterdam, a certain Hoekstra, who added an ethical tint to the teachings of modernism. In short, this movement was a denial of the supernatural in religion, and as such, it was diametrically opposed to Christianity.

3. We may mention as a third background the apologetic school at Utrecht, who, while they are substantially orthodox, did not have that positive spirit which the orthodox thought ought to show in such a critical time. They were irenic, and had the spirit of peace at any price. And there was also the ethical school of Chantapie De La Saussaye.

The immediate causes for this second revival are undoubtedly the Synodical Commission at the Hague, which, supported by a law in 1853, gave liberty to the ministers at their ordination to sign their adherence to the confessions of the church *insofar* as they agreed with the Scriptures, instead of *because* they agreed with the Scriptures. This gave to any minister the right to preach what he pleased without any danger of being put out of the ministry, or even called to task for his preaching, since the principle of peace was still to be enforced. In 1856 a law was passed barring all religion from the public schools, thus secularizing primary education. In 1876 the chairs of theology at the various universities were changed to chairs in the history and philosophy of religion.

These conditions were bound to bring about unpleasanties. For instance, if a person was received as member in full communion of a church of which an unbeliever was pastor, such a reception depended not upon a confession of faith at all. If such a person went to another church, of which an evangelical was minister, with the consistory likewise evangelicals, this consistory was *forced* by the Synodical Commission to receive this member, even though further questioning proved that he believed none of the specifically Christian truths. This could not last forever. Objection was made. Consistories refused to subject themselves to this unconstitutional and un-Reformed Synodical Commission.

Two ministers, Dr. vander Bergh and Rev. Ploos van Amstel, wrote missives to the government complaining of the situation. In many places in the country other ministers felt likewise. But the center of interest

and of the conflict soon turned up in Amsterdam, and there it centered about a young minister by the name of Abraham Kuyper. Dr. Kuyper had been a student of the Modernists at Leiden, but had never found peace for his head or heart in the systems taught there. He himself tells of three experiences which were used by God to bring him to the light of the gospel. The first was a very evident work of God who, after Kuyper had searched all the libraries in Europe for the writings of A Lasco, in order that he might enter an essay contest on A Lasco's doctrine of the church, suddenly had the entire set placed before him in the library of a minister. How wonderful this seemed to him. Never before had he dreamed of this God and his wonderful work. But now, how could he account for this apparent miracle in any other way? And then, beside this, to find in A Lasco's teaching about the church just what he had never found in the church life in Leiden, filled him with great joy. It did not bring about his conversion, but it did bring about a change. The second experience followed the reading of Miss Yonge's novel, *The Heir of Redcliffe*. The part of the story that affected him tells of a certain young man whose ideas about himself were very great, especially as regards his moral character, in comparison with a friend, named Guy. But one day a friend broke down his conceit bit by bit, showed him his own moral failure, until at last tears of repentance burst forth from his eyes. Kuyper writes: "O, it was as if in the broken Phillip, my own heart was broken, as if every word of self-accusation which he spoke cut me through the soul as a judgment upon my own striving and character." The story goes on. The friend Guy is dying, and as the clergyman comes and is ready to administer the sacrament to the dying one, Phillip is asked to partake with them. He refuses. He is not worthy, he says. But someone whispers to him: A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise. This was as balsam that soothed his pained heart, and he goes in, kneels by the bed of the dying, and takes the sacrament. At the funeral the clergyman read the ritual, and the novelist says that Guy "has been rendered a home by those words of the Motherchurch—the mother who had guided each of his steps in his orphaned life." This aroused Dr. Kuyper as from a trance. A mother-church! Such a church he had never known, and the longing for such a church, a real spiritual mother became the constant thirst of his life. He became homesick for such a church. And the third experience came when he was minister in his first charge, a small village church. He preached as all liberals did, and the average person was satisfied. But there were malcontents, he was told. People who did not agree with the minister; some of them did not even come to church. It was one of these malcontents, a certain Pietje Baldus, who dared to point out to the young and brilliant doctor that salvation through the blood of Christ was the one thing needed. He admired her daring, got angry at her stubbornness, marveled at her life and world view, which was the first that had ever as much as partly satisfied him. He began to study the older evangelical theologians. He learned what he had never heard before, namely, the historic Christian faith. The miracle is performed,

Kuyper sees the light, and with one all-embracing movement he casts himself, giant intellect and all, thoroughly bound and captive, before the cross of the newly-found Christ. From that time on his preaching is different. He accepts a call to Utrecht; two years later to Amsterdam, and it is there that he girds himself for the battle.

Through the great poet Da Costa and the statesman Groen Van Prinsterer, Kuyper is genetically related to the awakening in Geneva. These men, while they sympathized with the men and the work of the secession movement of 1834, were not ready to leave the established church. And although constantly pointing out its mistakes, and preaching against the errors in it, they died in communion with that Established church. Kuyper did not want to secede, either. But with a great daring he began his battle against the Synodical Committee; against the liberal preachers in Amsterdam, against the liberals in politics; and against all liberalism in the field of education. As a reaction against the rationalism and liberalism in the universities, he led a movement which organized the Free University and based it upon the confessions of the Reformed Church, became its first rector, and one of the three men who formed the first faculties. He worked as a member of Parliament to secure franchise for all the people, a feat which later on resulted in the organization of an evangelical political party, the anti-revolutionary party. And so all the way through he battled his way. He feared neither friend nor foe. What he was convinced of as being truth, he fought for, and slashed his way through every opposition.

The biography of Kuyper is at the same time a history of this second revival. He was put out of the Established church along with other ministers and elders. They organized into a body again, and refused to be called a *new* church. They were, they said, the real Reformed Church of the Netherlands, going back to the standpoint of Dort. This group later on united with the Christian Reformed church of the secession of 1834, and are known today as The Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, a live church with its members occupying leading positions in the field of politics, education, and business. In Holland, more than anywhere else, one has opportunity to see a real demonstration of the life and world view of the Reformed faith put into practice.

IV.

I trust you will not think it presumption to have started with this task of portraying to you the revival of evangelical theology in the Netherlands, covering about one century. There is much more that could be said, many things which if you could read them, would read like a novel. And that is commendation enough. But I judge that the purpose of this review is not merely for the sake of the review, but for what we can learn from this bit of history in view of things which are going on today in our own nation. It is not the mark of a fanatic to see everything in relation to the present conflict here in America. It is plain, common sense. A ninety-year old parishioner of mine, who is a personal link between me and the secession movement of 1834, who came to this country in order to evade

the persecutions of Holland, and who now and then in a reminiscent half-hour tells me of those terrible days,—this old saint, shaking hands not long ago with a young theological student said with all her heart: “Student, welcome in the strife!” And when I shout out to you gentlemen this same cry: Welcome to the battle, it is not merely a war-cry of mine, but a shout that comes to you across one century of revival, from those brave men and women who, before the second half of the nineteenth century had dawned, were paying with money and life’s blessings the price, not of safety and peace, but the price of truth!

If what I have called to your mind has in any way been of inspiration to you, I shall be happy. But I wish also to be of some service in helping you understand some things which it will be good to know in this time of warfare.

1. To begin with, may I remind you that in the beginnings of these revival movements, it was the pious, unlearned saint who was used by God. In Geneva the Moravians, and two men from the British Isles, one a merchant. In Ulrum, a simple man, who with his conviction of the new life as a gift of God’s free grace, touched the heart of De Cock. In Beesd, this simple woman, Pietje Baldus, who dared to preach the Gospel to a brilliant theological doctor. It was with these simple folk, foolish in the eyes of the world, yet learned in the wisdom of God, that God had been pleased to deposit the faith once delivered to the saints. Will you remember that? I admit the inspiration of having great scientists tell us of their faith in the Word of God,—but I do not expect to hear much of that. The worldly wise finds the Cross an offense and a stumbling block. When you find yourself fighting against the terrific onslaught of doubt; when you need to be refreshed again by some water from the well at Bethlehem, beside the gate, chances are that you will not find any Croix de Guerre men, or Distinguished Service Cross men to drive their way through the camp of the enemy, to get your heart’s desire. If you have an old woman, or a man, who know not much of this world’s wisdom, but who have been schooled in the school of Christ, learn of them. Stay close to the common folks, the believing folk, the folk in whose heart the love of Christ has been shed abroad. And I venture to say that the present conflict, when at last it shall result in new life on the part of the evangelical faith, will not be won by the intellectual giants, although I confess our need of them,—but it will be won by the thousands of lesser folk, who when the sound of the trumpet is heard, will be willing to sacrifice all for their faith in the Saviour.

2. Have you noticed perhaps, that in these periods of awakening in Holland, there was immediately a return to the writings and the doctrinal standards of the previous centuries? That is, the spirit of conservatism seemed to prevail. This is not the place to go into a long and extended discussion as to the relative merits of the conservatist and the progressive. I merely say that the question is not; are you a conservative or a progressive, but rather: what are you conserving, or toward what are you progressing? There is a conservatism which is sin, since it insists upon hold-

ing on to things which should be let go. Sin is very conservative, and so is the sinner. On the other hand, is it good to be a progressive when progress seems to be made only toward things which are bad? Lots of speed, but no place in particular to go? We shall simply have to have the courage to say that we are conservatives in the matter of the faith of the Christian church. That faith rests upon revelation of God. And isn't that a good thing to conserve? Can you exchange that for anything of equal value? A minister once told us in a seminary conference that Hodge's theology was a good example of what not to read. He did not oppose Hodge, but that type of work was the particular point of his remark. He himself had a weakness for sociology; others have a weakness for psychology or philosophy, while theology, that queen of the sciences, is steadily and readily neglected. Whatever your hopes may be for yourselves as leaders in the church of Christ, you ought to know as much as possible of the things which great men have written in those periods of the church when faith was blooming, and the Christian life much alive. In this, as in other things, we stand on the shoulders of the generations who have gone on before. And it is a part of folly not to recognize this.

3. You will have noticed too, perhaps, that there was on the part of these people in these awakening movements of which I have spoken, a very critical attitude, and I commend that attitude to you. The spirit of liberalism has always been that of tolerance, an approving of practically everything except the evangelical faith. The Bible Christian, in order not to be fooled by this very polite way of doing, needs constantly to be on guard in all his reading and listening. When reading the works of liberals, do not take anything for granted. It simply isn't safe. We must learn to think clearly, to divide the word of truth rightly. And we must be fearless when it comes to the point where error needs to be exposed. I am not now pleading for more than a Christian intolerance of everything that needs to be done away with. I am not asking you to be intolerant of your Christian brethren, as if anyone of us comprehended all of the truth all by ourselves. Nor do I ask you to separate yourselves from Christian brethren the moment they have said something with which you do not agree. We must guard ourselves here. What I am asking for, is clear-cut thinking, and clear-cut issues. And when the issues have been cut clear, and seen clear, then there is but one road for action. And we expect you to take that road.

4. The second revival movement was more thorough than the first because it spread itself over all of life. It is a well-known saying of Dr. Kuyper: "There is not one sphere of our life about which Christ does not say: 'That's Mine!'" One does not need to go here into a series of arguments for the doctrine of the Sovereignty of God, a doctrine very real and dear to us who are Calvinists. All one needs to admit here is the Kingship of Christ; and who of His followers will dare to deny that truth? King not merely in name, but in reality! He ought to sway the sceptre over all of the world, and over all of life. Or is it mere sentiment when you sing:

“Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Doth its successive journeys run”?

Is it not Dr. Zwemer who shouted out to us at one of our student Conferences: “Jesus must be Lord of all, or not at all!” That means ALL of our life, to begin with; and it means all of the life of every other human, too. This means that we shall have to be ready to gird ourselves for the battle in other fields outside of the specific church life. With godlessness tearing its way into our public school system, can you think that we must always sit by just watching that tragedy play itself out? Does it not seem that the time will come when something will need to be done to keep this country from becoming pagan through its public schools? With socialism, and communism and anarchy working their way into our government and politics, can you think that this can go on forever? Must not the time come, sooner or later, that Christians shall have to assert themselves collectively in order that our political life may not be completely lost to the kingship of Christ?

So we might go on. You may be sure that settling the liberal-evangelical controversy in some of our churches, will not be the whole business that awaits you. That will be the beginning, but not the end. And my purpose in bringing the history of these two revivals of evangelical life in Holland to your attention, was that we might see how God has worked in other countries. And, remembering that while He is not bound to any one method, history does teach that God does repeat his method of working in various lands, we could even now be preparing ourselves for the conflict which has already begun, but which is still in its first stages.

Whether you are planning to enter the ministry, or whether you attend this conference as a Christian student planning to take up some other work, it is to battle that you are called to gird yourselves. And it is not presumption that causes one who is still enrolled in an university to be saying these things to you, but it is an earnest conviction of the realness of the struggle. It is because of this, that I pray that all of us may be faithful in the place where God is pleased to put us, so that we may be ready in the day of His power.

We shall build on, we shall build on,
On through the cynic's scorning,
On through the coward's warning,
On through the darkest morning,
We shall build on:

City of saints and sages,
High on the Rock of ages.
Laugh while the tempest rages,
We shall build on.

Christ, though my hands be bleeding,
Fierce though my flesh be bleeding,
Still let me see Thee leading,
Let me build on.

'Til through death's cruel dealing,
Brain racked and reason reeling,
I hear love's trumpet pealing,
And I pass on.

—G. A. Studdert-Kennedy.

COMPARING THE INCOMPARABLE

OSWALD T. ALLIS

A DECADE or so ago an English scholar, Dr. Oesterley, made the prediction that "the study of comparative religion must in the future become one of the greatest dangers of the Christian religion or else its handmaiden."¹ It was hardly necessary at the time, to make this statement in the form of a prediction. For already the important bearing of the comparative method upon the study of religion and especially of Christianity was quite obvious. The article "Christianity" in the 11th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has a section dealing with "Christianity in the Modern World" which contains the following striking statements, which, it should be noted, have been allowed to remain unchanged in the recently published 14th edition:

"The Bible is studied [i.e. according to the 'modern' viewpoint] like other works, its origins discovered and its place in comparative religion assigned. It does not appear as altogether unique, but it is put among the other sacred books. For the great religions of the world show similar cycles of development, similar appropriations of prevalent science and philosophy, similar conservative insistence upon ancient truth, and similar claims to an exclusive authority."

This it will be observed amounts to a denial of the distinctiveness of the Biblical religion. It is *similar* to the other religions. But let us read a little further. This conception of religion, we are told, involves "an attitude of mind toward the supernatural." The view that the two are distinct and the supernatural could "descend upon the natural and be imparted to it," by which is clearly meant the recognition of miracle, prophecy, incarnation, regeneration, is rejected; and we are told that "In science the process has been reversed; nature ascends, so to speak, into the region of the supernatural and subdues it to itself; the marvelous or miraculous is brought under the domain of natural law, the canons of physics extend over metaphysics, and religion takes its place as one element in the natural relationship of man to his environment."² Such, according to an authoritative article in the latest edition of a great encyclopaedia, was the situation of Christianity in the modern world twenty years ago, and it is averred that it holds equally true today. For those who heartily accept this modern viewpoint, Christianity thus becomes, you will observe, simply one of many expressions of a single element in the natural relationship of man to his environment—namely religion. And how small a figure man cuts in this world of nature by which he is surrounded is indicated by the statement by the same writer that the world "is no longer merely the scene for the drama of the soul and God, nor is man independent of it. . . . Man's place is not even central, as he appears a temporary inhabitant of a minor planet in one of the lesser stellar systems."

¹*The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*, p. 276.

²Vol. 5, p. 636.

Is it any wonder that this writer should tell us that "the new world-view threatens the foundations of the ecclesiastical edifice," especially since he declares that "this revolution in the world-view is no longer the possession of philosophers and scholars, but the multitude accepts it in part."

This is a startling statement and every thinking person must recognize more or less clearly that the application of this so-called "scientific" method to religion and to Christianity, or the attempt of science to ascend into the region of the supernatural and subdue it, has effected and is effecting a transformation in Christian thinking which can be likened only to the Copernican revolution in the sphere of astronomy. In fact, according to the writer of the article on "Fundamentalism and Modernism" in the same encyclopaedia, here lies the very heart of the controversy between these two contending groups in the Christian Church today. For, he tells us, "common to all the Fundamentalist groups was [you note that the past tense is used as if the controversy were now ended] first the acceptance of a view of the supernatural which insists that God manifests His presence in nature and history through exceptional and extraordinary activities, transcending the laws of nature; and, secondly, the determination to use this conception of religion as a test to limit the freedom of teaching hitherto enjoyed by the ministers of the denomination." In other words it is the resistance of Christian people to this attempt of science to ascend into the region of the supernatural and subdue it which is largely responsible for the rise of Fundamentalism!

But how has this momentous revolution been effected? That it has been effected, is the belief of many men today and, what is most significant, of many leaders in the Christian Church. How has it been, how is it being effected? In a word, it is effected by *accepting the theory* that there is in Christianity nothing which makes it essentially different from the ethnic religions and that there is nothing in religion in general which is essentially different from the natural phenomena with which science is constantly dealing. This is the theory. But along with the theory and absolutely essential for its success goes, and must go, the *adoption of the practice* of refusing to recognize or at least to accept at its face value anything which cannot be fitted into this naturalistic scheme.

It is in the practical application of this naturalistic principle that the comparative method attains prominence. The word "compare" may be defined as meaning "to examine (two or more persons or things) with reference to points of likeness or unlikeness." So understood and applied it is a very helpful method and has produced valuable results. But we need to remember that the very idea of comparison implies that the things *compared* are to some extent at least *on a par* the one with the other. For if you seek to compare the higher category with the lower, you run the risk of either totally misconceiving the higher or failing to recognize that which is most truly characteristic of it. Try, if you will, to compare mind with matter, man with a potato. The best in man eludes comparison; he is incommensurate. And if you make the potato the standard of comparison, you will be in danger of ignoring or denying what is most char-

acteristic of man. In comparison the emphasis is likely to be placed on resemblances and not on differences.

Thus, the religion of Israel in the time of the Patriarchs may be compared with the ethnic faiths of antiquity; and the faith of Abraham stands out in the records of that early period like a rare flower in a garden of weeds. In the New Testament also that faith is highly praised. Yet a recent writer tells us that there is "only a small portion of the Pentateuchal tradition that can be used as a source for the Hebrew nomadic period. This is supplemented by comparative philology, comparative sociology, and comparative religion, the presumption being that ideas and institutions which later Israel had in common with the other Semites existed already in the nomadic period."³ You notice the emphasis on the word "comparative"! Now what is the result of the application of this method, the comparison of Israel with the other Semites? In a word, it is this, that the God of Israel in the days of the patriarchs was quite comparable with Chemosh, the abomination of the Moabites. "Except that he was more powerful he did not differ essentially from Chemosh of Moab,"⁴ says a well-known higher critic in speaking of the Yahweh of Moses' day.

But let us consider a little further the application of this principle. The Bible narrates many marvelous things or miracles. How are these miracles brought under the domain of natural law? The answer is simple. It is done by calling attention first and in general to the fact that all primitive and ancient peoples believed in wonders; and then by denying in particular that in the history of Israel anything unexplainable by natural law took place. This denial is stated in many different forms. It is denied that the narrative is reliable; it is declared to be late or composite or self-contradictory, or to represent an unintelligent, unscientific view of what actually occurred.

We may turn, by way of illustration, to the narrative of the Crossing of the Red Sea—a wonder upon which Israel often looked back with gratitude to God for His wondrous deliverance. The narrative tells us that "Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided." It tells us further that "the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." This is a clear and self-consistent statement. It tells briefly what took place, and how it took place. But it does not suit the critics. They divide the narrative into two or three accounts. One of these accounts simply tells us that "the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night and made the sea dry land." This is regarded as describing a simple, natural phenomenon; shallow waters were driven back by the wind and the reference to God can be regarded as simply a recognition of what is often

³*A New Standard Bible Dictionary*, edited by Jacobus, Nourse and Zenos, p. 399b. This article which discusses the "social development" of Israel illustrates very clearly the application of the comparative method to the literature of the Old Testament.

⁴*Religion of Israel*, by Henry Preserved Smith, p. 61.

called the hand of Providence, a singularly opportune natural phenomenon being attributed by a religious, or superstitious or at least "unscientific" writer to divine intervention. When this statement is taken out of the narrative, what remains is a declaration that "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea . . . and the waters were divided;" and it is further stated that the Israelites went into the "midst" of the waters and the waters were a "wall" unto them on either side. It reads as if Moses like an ancient Merlin stretched out his rod; and instantly the waters were cleft as with a knife and stood on either side like walls of glass between which the Israelites passed in safety. This grotesque miracle, made grotesque by critical manipulation of the sources, is rejected as late and legendary, and the other account, the naturalistic one, is accepted as substantially true to fact. That is, it is accepted by those who are ready to find any truth at all in the story.

Another example of the application of this method is the story of Jonah and the whale, or rather "great fish." For centuries it has been cited as a Bible wonder. Our Lord expressly refers to it: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." How is that explained? Quite simply! Jonah never was in the belly of the whale. The statement that he was is an interpolation due perhaps to a misunderstanding of his prayer. That Jonah ever went to Nineveh is far from certain. The story of Jonah is "an imaginary work with a moral lesson" designed to rebuke the Jews of a later age for their narrow provincialism and lack of foreign missionary zeal!⁵ And so highly is the Book of Jonah prized by the advocates of the "modern" view as a missionary tract that we are tempted to forget that the real Jonah and the real whale and the real visit to Nineveh have all been quietly disposed of!

Let us turn to the subject of *prophecy*. There is a strong tendency today to make the teachings of the eighth and seventh century prophets the distinctive feature in the religion of Israel. Everything else can be discarded. The teaching of the prophets is unique. A recent writer who accepts the conclusions of the critics as to the late date and unreliability of the Pentateuch comforts those who are troubled by the destructive conclusions of criticism by saying, "the permanent and unique value of the Bible is now seen to depend, not on any miracle attending its composition, nor on any form of inspiration confined to Biblical writers, but simply on the unique phenomenon of Hebrew prophecy and its culmination in the life and teaching of Jesus. So long as men recognize the distinctive character of Hebrew prophecy or so long as they respond to the influence of Jesus, the volume which contains the history of His people and their preparation for His coming, together with the memories, impressions and reflections of His first disciples, must retain in their hearts and thoughts a place no other book can claim or fill."⁶

But, you will say, is not prophecy distinctly supernatural? And if

⁵Art. "Jonah" in *New Standard Bible Dictionary*, p. 477b.

⁶Art. "Bible," *Encycl. Brit.*, 14th ed., p. 501.

it is unique, does not the religion of Israel stand apart from all other religions? Let us consider the question. It is a familiar canon of criticism, well stated by Davidson, that "The prophet is always a man of his own time, and it is always to the people of his own time that he speaks, not to a generation long after, nor to us. And the things of which he speaks will always be things of importance to the people of his own day, whether they be things belonging to their internal life and conduct, or things affecting their external fortunes as a people among other peoples."

But, we may ask, what is it in prophecy which reveals most clearly the supernatural? Is it not the disclosure of things which only God can know, things hidden in the lap of the future? "Behold, the former things are come to pass and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them." So the Lord describes His divine prerogative to make known what only He can know. But, to return to Davidson's dictum, not merely is the prophet restricted to his immediate audience, but he can make known to the people only things of importance to them. Do you notice how this tends to restrict the scope of prophecy? What is the future which is of immediate concern to most of us? Is it not the near future? When Isaiah told Hezekiah that his sons or descendants should be carried away to Babylon, Hezekiah apparently saw a gleam of comfort in the remoteness of this tragedy: "Good is the word of the Lord. . . . For there shall be peace and truth in my days." It is the future which concerns us directly and personally that is of immediate concern, of vital importance, to most of us. You notice, then, how the application of this dictum of criticism tends to restrict the scope of prophecy. Applied to Isaiah it has torn the book into a hundred fragments and scattered them over five centuries of time, from the days of Hezekiah to the time of the Maccabees.

The extreme to which this view can be carried is well illustrated by the treatment of the Immanuel prophecy (Isaiah VII) by a German scholar, Professor Duhm of Basel. He denies that the child there described is to be born of a virgin; he sees in the passage no Messianic promise. Some mother of some child to be born about a year hence (or there may be many) will cry "Immanuel," in gratitude that God has saved His people from Rezin and Pekah; and *that* is the "sign" given by the prophet to Ahaz. But Duhm is not content thus to empty the prophecy of its miraculous and Messianic content; he goes still further. He cites the words of another German scholar who declares that it is "idiotic" to ask any one to believe a statement on the ground that what is said today will ten months hence prove to be correct; and then he gently rebukes this scholar for objecting to such a sign as "idiotic," declaring that such absurdities are often found in the Old Testament; and he cites the "sign" given to Moses: "When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain," a sign that was a wonderful challenge to Moses' faith in God and love of Israel. This also he considers "idiotic." Think of it! A German scholar whose commentary on Isaiah

¹Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 118b.

is described in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as representing a few years ago "the high water mark of criticism" calls it "idiotic" to think that Isaiah gave Ahaz a "sign" which would not be fulfilled for nearly a year, and therefore called for the exercise of faith and patience. He calls it a prophecy *post festum*, a prophecy of the morning after. It is to such meagre limits that prophecy, this unique element in Israel's religion, can shrink when a thoroughgoing attempt is made to apply to it the "modern" method, to bring it under the domain of natural law.

Some of you may have heard of the "Amos Society" with its headquarters in New York. It is described as "a Monotheistic World League," whose aim is "the renaissance of the religion of the prophets." Its secretary is Dr. Charles P. Fagnani, formerly professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. It is informing to learn Dr. Fagnani's idea of what this movement stands for. He has told us in an article appearing a few years ago in *The American Hebrew* that "There is one and only one religion that is different from all the others, and that one is to be seen in the teaching of the great prophets of Israel." This religion stresses "the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the establishment on earth of the 'Kingdom of God' or the organization of the real democracy, which involves world-wide co-öperation for the common good." You note that the "Kingdom of God" is declared to be the "real democracy." Religion is reduced very nearly if not quite to philanthropy. And most significant of all Dr. Fagnani congratulates the Jews that for nearly two thousand years and even in the face of persecution, they have refused to accept Jesus as their Divine Messiah and he urges them to claim Joshua, *ben Joseph*, that is, Jesus the *son* of Joseph as the greatest of their prophets. Thus the religion of the prophets is reduced to an ethical monotheism which is watered down to little more than humanitarianism; and Jesus becomes at best only the greatest of teachers.⁸

But let us turn from studying the effect of the modern viewpoint upon the Bible to consider its effect upon the propagation of Christianity. You are all interested in missions. Tomorrow you are to have a symposium on Foreign Missions. If it be true that Christianity is only one of many religions, all of which are designed to express man's "natural relationship to his environment," the great appeal of the heathen world for Christian Missions has lost its urgency. It is no longer a question of carrying the gospel to those who are in darkness and death. It is at most a case of carrying more light to those who already have some. Let me quote the words of one who attaches high importance to the comparative method. In a thoroughgoing attempt to "revalue" Scripture according to this method Dr. Eakin comes at length to the Koran. Notice what he says:

"If the situation were such that we could think of the Koran and the Jewish-Christian Bible as in a race for world supremacy it would seem that the former must find itself handicapped by the narrowness of its range—its lack of variety in style, literary forms, fields of interest, and

⁸*The Evangelical Student* (October, 1929), p. 15.

⁹*Revaluing Scripture*, p. 206.

methods of treatment. But of course the actual situation is different from that. The Old and New Testaments are the Bible of Christians and the Koran is the Bible of Mohammedans, and it seems probable that Christian missionaries, as well as Mohammedan apologists, will have to be content to leave it so. The utter unprofitableness of centering missionary effort on a contest of Bibles—or rather of bibliolatrics—has been sufficiently demonstrated.”⁹

In other words, the Christian missionary who goes with the Bible in his hands to the lands which are under the sway of the False Prophet is engaging in an unprofitable contest of bibliolatrics! Is it any wonder that missions are valued by many today chiefly for their educational and cultural achievements?

“But why this abandonment of Christian missions as the Christian Church has hitherto understood it? Let us hear Dr. Eakin a little further:

“Christians naturally cannot concede the claim that Mohammed is God’s greatest and final Prophet and Apostle—the one to whom beyond all others humanity must look for its leadership. For better or for worse he was a warrior prophet, and it seems to us that a vindictive spirit speaks unmistakably through his words. We prefer to take our stand with Jesus, who refused to take up the sword and prayed for forgiveness for his enemies. Here is the crux of the comparison.”

The crux of the comparison! What is it? That Jesus is the Divine Messiah, the Only-Begotten Son of God, the alone Saviour of mankind, while Mohammed is proved by his life and words to have been a man, a sinful man, not a saviour of others, but himself in need of salvation? Is this the crux of the comparison? Not at all! Mohammed was a warrior and showed a vindictive spirit; Jesus was peaceable and forgiving! I would not minimize this difference. But is that all the difference between Jesus and Mohammed? How the transcendent claims of the Saviour disappear. They are brushed aside as though they had never been advanced by prophet and apostle, by pastor and evangelist, by cross and creed.

When we consider the disastrous conclusions which result from the application of the “modern” method to the study of the Scriptures, the situation for the Bible-loving Christian is distressing in the extreme. It seems as if nothing can stand the test of the critical crucible. Miracles, prophecy, the uniqueness of the religion of Israel, the Deity of Christ—no fact, no doctrine, seems to be able to maintain itself in the face of its irresistible assault. It seems as if faith having yielded up position after position, long held and thought impregnable, must finally capitulate. The situation seems truly desperate. Yet there is one thing that the despondent Christian should always remember. It is this: the conclusions of the “modernist” critic, these terrible inescapable *conclusions*, were contained already in his *premises*. As Dr. James Orr pointed out years ago, and he is only one of many who have done so, “to a large and influential school of critical inquirers—those, moreover, who have had most to do with the shaping of the current critical theories—this question of a supernatural

⁹*The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 12.

origin for the religion of Israel is already foreclosed; is ruled out at the start as *a priori* inadmissible."¹⁰ Or in the language of the author whom we have already quoted it is assumed that nature can subdue the region of the supernatural, that the canons of physics extend over metaphysics; and all the contents of the Bible is tested, and accepted or rejected in accordance with the foregone conclusions of the advocates of the "modern" view. Prophecy is reduced within the possibilities of human foresight, miracles become natural phenomena misunderstood or elaborated by the wonder-loving fancy of generations of story tellers. Israel becomes a nation among the nations and it is her genius for religion and not God's special dealings with her which makes her history remarkable. All this lies in the premise of the critic. It is only for him to elaborate his theory and apply it in detail. It is the decision of the scholars that the religion of Israel must be *like* that of other nations. They have spoken; let it be so. It is their judgment that the domain of the natural must be extended over the supernatural; who shall gainsay them?

I hope you will not misunderstand me. I am not an enemy of science. I have no quarrel with the comparative method. By all means let us use it and apply it wherever we can. It is a great method, it has accomplished great things, and may accomplish still greater things in days to come. But let me give you two words of counsel.

In the first place, remember that this much lauded "modern" method is not very modern after all. It is an *old* method; and history, both sacred and profane, gives us many instances both of the use and the abuse of it. Benhadad was dabbling with this method when he accepted the advice of his sage counsellors and in trying conclusions with Ahab a second time, chose the plain as his battle ground because, arguing from analogy, he thought the God of Israel was a local deity like other gods—a god of the hills, who would be helpless on the plain. And the Lord gave sinful Ahab a glorious victory that day over Benhadad that men might know that He was the Lord not of the hills alone but of the valleys also. Sennacherib was a great exponent of this view of comparative religions. He taunted Hezekiah with his invincible might. "Who are there among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?" You notice the force of the argument. Sennacherib was speaking like a higher critic of today. But what was the verdict? "And it came to pass that night that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred and fourscore and five thousand and when they arose early in the morning behold they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed." There was a flaw in his argument, a grievous flaw; and it proved his undoing.

But not merely is it important to remember that the comparative method is not a new one, not a weapon first forged by the great thinkers of our day. It is equally important if you would use it aright that you go to the great masters of this method and study their use of it. Elijah made singularly effective use of it at Carmel as the people who were halt-

ing between two opinions could not but recognize. And I know of no greater authority to whom I can send you than Isaiah the prophet. If you would see the difference between the comparative method as applied by the skeptic and that same method as applied by the believer, I counsel you to turn to Isaiah's unsurpassed descriptions of the utter folly of heathen idolatry and the incomparable greatness of the God of Israel. Turn to Isaiah's description of the idol-maker in his forty-fourth chapter, where he pictures the folly of the man who burns part of a tree in the fire because he is cold; "and of the residue thereof he maketh a god even his graven image. He falleth down unto it and worshippeth it. . . . And none calleth to mind neither is their knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh and eaten it; and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?" Or turn to that wonderful description in the forty-sixth chapter: "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols were upon the beasts and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy laden; they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Who are Bel and Nebo? Two of the great gods of the ancient world, gods of mighty Babylon. Why are their idols loaded on the backs of beasts? Because they have legs, but walk not. Where are they going? Into captivity, into endless oblivion with the nation they were impotent to save. And the voice continues: "Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb: and even to your old age, I am he; and even to hoar hair will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry and will deliver you." What a contrast! The impotence of the idols, the might of Israel's God. "To whom," it is the voice of God that speaks, "To whom will ye liken me and make me equal and compare me, that we may be like?" That was the challenge of Israel's God to the great gods of antiquity. Did they take up the challenge? No, they have gone down to oblivion; and who is there to mourn their passing?

Study Isaiah, study Jeremiah in their conflict with the heathenism of their day. Study the New Testament and the history of the Early Church; and observe how in the face of bitter persecution the Christians insisted upon the utter difference between Christianity and the syncretistic faiths of Greece and Rome; and refused to allow the Lord Jesus to be given an honorable place in Caesar's pantheon. Then turn to the great missionaries of the Cross, to Carey, Moffat, Judson, Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, Paton, and many another who has come to grips with heathenism and idolatry, and ask them whether Isaiah was wrong, whether his application of the comparative method must be revised. I need not speak for them. You know their answer.

No, my friends, be not dismayed. Be not afraid of the armies of unbelief, even though they come under the banner of Science and Modern Thought. The old challenge of the Almighty, uttered as I like to think

in reply to Sennacherib's blasphemy and the blasphemy of every enemy of God, is still unanswered and it is as unanswerable as ever: "To whom will ye liken me and make me equal and compare me, that we may be like?" True science and archaeology and history echo the words of Moses, who gave the answer, the true answer, centuries before Isaiah wrote: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun who rideth upon the heavens for thy help, and in his excellency on the skies." Three millenniums support this verdict. There is none like unto our God. It is as true today as it ever was. And it is for us who believe this, to go forth under His banner, the blood stained banner of the Cross, to declare boldly to the doubters and scoffers of our day that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, none other name, than the name of Christ Jesus our Lord; and that He is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God through Him.

THE MEANING OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST

E. H. BANCROFT

TEXT: 1 Peter 2:24-25—"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

The subject seems most vital and important because it is the meaning of the death of Christ which gives to it its value. There is no value in the merely historical fact that Christ died nor in a faith in such a fact. It is the meaning that is to be attached to Christ's death which differentiates it from the death of all other men and gives to it unique valuation. There is no saving efficacy in merely believing that Jesus died, no more than in believing that George Washington or Abraham Lincoln died. Jesus was an historical character. His death is a matter of historical record, therefore all people of intelligence who are informed believe it. It is the significance with which the Scriptures invest Christ's death that gives saving efficacy and value to the fact and to the faith in the fact. We have in this passage just quoted the description of the death of Christ by an eyewitness. For the Apostle Peter was in the midst of that rabble throng gazing upon the scene which was being enacted upon dark Golgotha. It is also the description of the death of Christ by an eyewitness who saw it through his tears. You will remember that Peter had just denied his Lord thrice, and with oaths and curses; that Jesus had looked upon him, and that Peter had gone out and wept bitterly. Doubtless those tears were still within his heart, and it may be in his eyes and upon his cheeks, as he looked upon his suffering Lord. And after all, we can only truly grasp the significance of the cross as we see it through the tears of true penitence, especially in its application to ourselves.

Then, too, it is the description of the death of Christ by an eyewitness who saw it through his tears, who was fully inspired of God to describe it. For some of us still believe that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." All Scripture is *theopneustic*, that is, God-breathed. The message of the Scriptures was produced by the action of the Spirit of God upon the minds of the human writers, just as human speech is produced by the action of the breath upon the vocal chords. Hence we have the presentation of Christ's death upon which we can place our faith and build our hope for time and eternity.

In this inspired description we have set forth:

I. The nature of the death of Christ. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree". Literally, "Who our sins himself bear up in His body unto the tree".

In this succinct statement we have the refutation of almost every false theory of the atonement. This passage teaches that the death of Jesus Christ was vicarious and substitutionary. It was vicarious, that is, on the behalf of others, and therefore not by reason of human necessity or compulsion. It was voluntary. We sometimes attribute the death of

Christ to the Jews and sometimes to the Roman soldiers, but in the final analysis Jesus Christ died under the contract of His own will. Paul, referring to His death, says of Him, "Who loved me and gave Himself for me." And Jesus declared, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." This harmonizes with another statement of the Apostle Paul, who, in speaking of Christ's humiliation, said, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be seized upon to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

With almost His last words, Jesus said to the Father, "Into thy hands I commend (*dismiss*, or *discharge*) my spirit". It is a military term which he here uses and it is thought that this in connection with the blackened heavens, the rending rocks, and quaking earth, caused the centurion to acknowledge the Deity of Christ, exclaiming, "Truly this was the Son of God."

The death of Christ was vicarious in that it was effectually sacrificial on behalf of the world's sin. John the Baptist seeing Jesus, cried, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The sin of the world is that guilt which attaches itself to the world or human race through the sin of Adam. Adam, during the period of his probation and temptation, acted not only as an individual man, but as the race man. He was the federal and biological head of the human race and therefore his action was racial as well as individual. The Apostle Paul declares that we all sinned in Adam. We acted in him and through him; thus we sinned in his sin and fell in his fall and became guilty with his guilt. But while this is true no member of the human race is lost because of the guilt of Adam's sin, for that guilt was completely and perfectly removed by the death of Christ, as the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Therefore every member of the human race is born under the protecting shadow of the cross. As the guilt of Adam's sin is reckoned to Adam's posterity without their personal ratification or repudiation, so are his posterity made sharers of the merit of Christ's obedient action in redemption with reference to the guilt of Adam's sin regardless of their personal approval or appropriation. Hence the only guilt which attaches itself to that irresponsible part of humanity which includes infancy, imbecility, and idiocy is the guilt of the Adamic sin for which Christ has atoned. All therefore who pass out of life in this irresponsible state of mind, never having had the capacity of a rational choice are

"Safe in the arms of Jesus,
Safe on His gentle breast;
There by His love o'ershaded,
Sweetly their souls do rest."

The teaching of the old theologians that there are infants in hell not a span long is absolutely unwarranted, having no foundation in the Scriptures nor in the character of God. David said, at the death of his own infant child, which was born of an adulterous relationship, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

The death of Jesus Christ is potentially and provisionally sacrificial on behalf of the world's sins. In this sense, He tasted death for every man, and "gave Himself a ransom for all," and is the Saviour of all men. While, however, He is a sacrifice for all, He is not a substitute for all. For if, in His death, Christ was a substitute for every member of the human race, then every member of the human race would be saved, regardless of their faith or unfaith. In past military service, whenever a drafted man provided a substitute for himself, he was exempt from all future military obligation to his country. If Christ's death, therefore, was substitutionary for all men, then they would be exempt from all penal obligation to the law and justice of God, but this is not the case. Christ's death is *sufficient*, in its sacrificial and atoning merit, for all, but it is *efficient* only for those who believe. This is the truth of John 3:16, "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." This is illustrated in the Old Testament offerings. When a sinning Israelite brought a lamb or a bullock for sacrifice he was required to lay his hand upon its head and confess his sins, thus identifying himself with the sacrifice and typically changing places with it; the guilt of the man being typically placed upon the sacrifice and the innocence of the lamb typically placed to the credit of the offerer. That which was typically true of the sinner then in relation to the sacrifice is actually true of the sinner now in relation to Christ. Says the Apostle Paul, "He (Christ) who knew no sin, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." As the sinning Israelite laid his hand of identification upon the sacrificial victim, so the believing sinner lays his hand of faith upon Christ the Lamb of Calvary, thus appropriating the sacrifice that He made and Him who made it. His death therefore is substitutionary on behalf of the believer only. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." Thus Christ's death is seen to be sacrificial on behalf of the world's sin and sins and substitutionary on behalf of the believer. This harmonizes with the teachings of Jesus himself, who said, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

II. The second aspect of Christ's death included in this inspired description is the purpose of it. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness"!

The purpose of Christ's death for sin was to accomplish our death to sin and our text teaches that this was accomplished. Christ's death is looked upon by some as a mere fire escape by which they avoid the doom of the damned and enjoy the blessings of the blessed. It is true that the

cross saves from the lowest hell to the highest heaven, from the deepest misery to the greatest joy. But this is a sordid and false conception of the purpose of Christ's death. It is said of Him in the Scriptures, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." It was in expression of His infinite hatred of sin and His infinite love of righteousness, that He died to save the objects of His love from that condition that was loathsome and abhorrent, to that condition in which His soul delights—that "we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness".

Every believer is looked upon as having been judicially and representatively put to death in Christ's death and as having been raised again in Christ's resurrection.

The believer is united to Christ in a two-fold union, that of life and death. He is united to the Christ of the Cross in a death union through his old nature. He is united to the Christ of the glory in a life union through His new nature. Our responsibility is to reckon or to account this to be true. Says the Apostle Paul, "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is the work of the Holy Spirit then, to make our reckoning real, to make real in us that which is real for us in Jesus Christ. "The law of the spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death." He does this not by the eradication of the old nature, as some would have us believe, but as Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas would say, "By counteraction." The superior law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which is none other than the Holy Spirit, operating in the sphere known as "in Christ Jesus," overcoming the inferior and lower law of "sin and death," thus freeing me from its power.

This is illustrated by the law of gravitation which draws everything earthward and downward through the force of specific gravity, being overcome by the law of physical force in a man's hand and arm, and thus objects which otherwise would gravitate downward, may rise, according to the will of the individual. So we by the Holy Spirit's power, instead of gravitating downward in selfishness, sordidness, and sin, may rise to the plane of obedience and fellowship with God.

III. The third aspect of Christ's death which the inspired Apostle describes for us is its necessity. "Ye were as sheep going astray".

This is doubtless an inspired paraphrase of the passage in Isaiah, which says, "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned everyone to his own way". Ye were going astray, not incidentally or accidentally, occasionally nor semi-occasionally, but continuously, unceasingly, premeditatedly, wilfully, knowingly, and therefore irretrievably and irrevocably lost, as far as we ourselves were concerned, for a lost sheep never finds itself, never returns of its own accord. It was this lost strayed condition of humanity that made necessary the death of Christ. This was the magnet that drew the Son of God from the skies. He could not be satisfied with the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, with all the adoration and admiration of all the unfallen hosts of

heaven, angels and archangels, cherubim and seraphim, while man remained estranged and lost from God.

IV. The last aspect of the death of Christ dealt with in this description is its result. "But now are returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls".

The emphatic word here is "returned". It is a passive not an active verb. It denotes being acted upon rather than acting. It is an effect due to a cause. The cause was "who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree"; the effect is "But are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

"None of the ransomed ever knew,
How deep were the waters crossed,
N'or how dark was the night that the Lord passed through
E'er He found the sheep that was lost."

It was at the awful cost of the Cross that this sublime effect was produced. No one will ever be able to fathom the depth of the suffering, shame, and sorrow of Christ's atoning death.

You have doubtless heard the story of the old Scotch shepherd who came into his hut one stormy night when his collie dog was lying with her puppies before the fire and said, "Collie, there are three sheep out in the storm upon the mountains. Go find them." She arose, looked tenderly at her puppies, longingly at the fire, pleadingly up into the face of the shepherd, then out into the dark and night of the storm she sallied forth. After a time she brought back one of the sheep and while the shepherd cared for it she lay down again with her puppies before the fire. The shepherd came in and said, "Collie, there are two sheep out in the mountains. Go find them." Again she looked up into the face of the shepherd, down at her puppies, into the bright glow of the fire, and then out into the storm she went. After a longer period she brought back the second sheep. The shepherd cared for this one as he had the other and returning into the hut said, "Collie, there is one more sheep out on the mountain. Go find it." This time she raised herself wearily, looked despairingly into the fire and at her puppies, pathetically up into the face of the shepherd and out into the dark of the night she went. She was gone a still longer time on this occasion but finally returned with the sheep in a weakened and bedraggled condition. It took the shepherd a much longer time to nurse this one back to some degree of vital life and when he returned he found the collie stretched on the floor beside her puppies, dead. The sheep were returned, but it cost the life of the collie dog.

But you say, "Will he compare my Lord to a dog?" Listen to me, as I tell you this stern truth, that for your redemption and mine, Jesus Christ went down below the level of the brute. Hear Christ speaking in prophecy, "The reproaches of them that reproach thee have fallen upon me. I am a worm and no man, a reproach and despised of the people." Who can fathom the depth of the shame seen in this passage, "He who knew no sin was made sin for us." This was the cup from which He

shrank in dark Gethsemane, praying, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me". It was the identification with human sin which caused Him the loss of the presence of God, in His human consciousness, and made Him cry out in the experience of it, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

Paul sums up this depth of shame by saying, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree". This was the cause that produced the glorious effect of our return unto the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. This is provisionally and potentially true of all who have sinned. It becomes actually and experimentally true of those who trust the Saviour.

MISSIONARY SYMPOSIUM:

Why I Became A Missionary

H. V. S. PEEKE*

I BECAME a Christian at sixteen. Fortunately my conception of the Christian life was that I, with body and soul, belonged to my faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ,—literally belonged.

I never had questioned that the church needed pastors and teachers. There should never be lack of these; so my study for the ministry was as natural a step as becoming a Christian.

During my college course I began to hear about foreign missions; the outpost work of the church. If the outpost work was really the work of the church, surely there must never be lack of outpost workers, that is, missionaries. Hence I could not settle in a parish at home until I knew the church did not want and need me at the outposts.

I had an ambition to go to Korea, but my own church had no work there and I did not feel free to go to Korea till my own church had passed me up from its own fields.

The result has been forty-two years of connection with mission work in Japan.

My ideal has always been that of a well-curb missionary, rather than the pulpit missionary, the office missionary, the social worker, or the missionary statesman. I have done various kinds of work, but my value as a missionary has been to the extent that I have been able to carry with me the well-curb missionary ideal, as set forth by Jesus at Jacob's well in Samaria.

My one regret today is that I am not to return to Japan next April and work till I am seventy. Should I be able to do so, more than ever before would I stress the idea of constant personal witnessing.

I believe there is a loud Macedonian call today. It is a call for men and women who will go to foreign fields, gain a competent knowledge of the native language, and then, day in and day out, witness to the redeeming love of Jesus and the joy of a new birth through a power outside ourselves—that is, the Holy Spirit of God.

A native church with marked abilities and great obligations has sprung up in many lands and we thank God for it; but the Spirit-filled household of a foreign missionary has a vision, a power and a field all its own, and will have for many, many years to come.

The mission field as a place for teachers, social-workers, and special workers of various kinds does not exist for me. The only mission field I fervently believe in, is the one in which a friendly, redeemed man, is witnessing of his great blessings to the still unblessed.

*Dr. Peeke was unable to give his message at the Conference; it was read by the General Secretary. The Chairman of the Symposium, Dr. Pieters, prefaced the reading of Dr. Peeke's message with these significant remarks, whose touching meaning gave added lustre on the already radiant life of this servant of God: "This message (referring to that of Dr. Peeke) comes to us from the very brink of the grave, or rather, from the very entrance to heaven. He has, as it were, his hand on the latch of the pearly gate. He will not be with us many weeks; he is dying of cancer. He said to me several days ago, 'I am eager to go.'"

WHY I BECAME A MISSIONARY

ALBERTUS PIETERS

IT is frequently said, both in print and from the platforms of missionary conventions, that while the volunteers of a generation ago went out to save souls from eternal perdition, those of today have given up that idea as untenable, and go out for other reasons.

The first part of the statement is true. I was one of them, and, not to deny or minimize other motives, one great motive of my missionary consecration was certainly the hope that I might be an instrument in the hand of God to save souls. The second part of the statement is also true—of some missionaries, not of all or of most of those who go out in these days. The great missionary of the eighth century, Willebrod, said somewhat cynically of certain of his associates, that they were led to be missionaries by “timor Christi et amor peregrinationis,” and this is true of some modern missionaries, but the great majority of them go out with the same faith and hope as those of forty and fifty years ago. Those who have not this faith usually do not stay very long. They cumber the ground for a time, and then go back to a better country, having no root in themselves, so far as any adequate missionary motive is concerned.

When it is said that the old missionary motive is no longer valid, I enter an earnest protest. I had good reasons for thinking that all men are lost in sin, and after an experience of more than thirty years abroad, I see no reason to think anything else. I learned this important truth from two sources, from my Bible and from my own heart. In my Bible I found such words as these: “The fire that is not quenched,” “The outer darkness,” “The worm that dieth not,” “Weeping and gnashing of teeth,” “The lake that burneth with fire and brimstone,” “Their torment goeth up for ever and ever.” To be sure, I was not so unintelligent as to forget that these are figures of speech. I had no thought of material fire, of literal worms, and so forth; but, on the other hand, neither was I so superficial and stupid as to think that our blessed Lord would use such tremendous symbols without an equally tremendous reality behind them. If the future state of the unsaved could be pictured in human language only by the use of such terms, then it was clear that a very dark and terrible tragedy was impending for every one who died in his sins.

This was further clear to me from many other texts. When I heard from the lips of the Lord Jesus the parables of the lost coin, the lost sheep, and the lost boy, I heard the thrice repeated “Lost! Lost! Lost!” ring out like a knell. When the gospel of John, in chapter 3:16, told me that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that every one who believed on Him should not perish but have everlasting life, I had logic enough in my composition to see that if the emergency was such as to justify sending His only Son, the danger of perishing was very real and very great.

Now, forsooth, distinguished and honored leaders tell us that this old motive is no longer valid! It seems that by some intellectual hocus-pocus

they have gotten the idea that we can have sunshine without shadow, that we can have healing without disease, that we can have a great Saviour and a great salvation without anything much to be saved from! I knew better forty years ago, and I know better now.

The second place where I learned that men were lost was in my own heart. The Lord never saved me from the gutter, the gambling den, or the brothel. I stand at this moment within a few hundred yards of the two houses in which I passed my boyhood and youth. There are many of the older people in this town who knew me when I was a boy, for I was from childhood much in the public eye, being the minister's son! If they are called upon, they can testify of my manner of life, in which, like St. Paul, I "profited in our religion above many mine equals in age" and "lived in all the righteousness of the law, blameless." "But what things were gain to me, those I count but loss," for if the mercy of God had not intervened, this very fact of a blameless youth would have been to the eternal ruin of my soul. Mercifully, it was not so. I learned to turn the mirror of the word of God inwards, and found that I was as much a sinner as any other man; indeed, when it came to the "thoughts and intents of the heart," I was literally the worst man I knew, for I knew my thoughts and not those of others; and of these thoughts and passions, the less said the better. I read the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, and found therein my own spiritual biography, as well as Paul's.

So I took refuge at the foot of the cross, and was accepted of God in Christ Jesus my Lord. I often hear the expression: "He has accepted Christ," and I do not say that this manner of describing conversion is wrong, but, for my own part, I prefer to turn it around, and say that God accepted me, in Christ. It is with me as the hymn has it:

"I sought the Lord, and afterwards I knew
He moved my soul to seek Him, seeking me.
It was not I that found, O Saviour true.
Nay, *I was found of Thee.*"

Believing thus, of myself, that I was a lost sinner, redeemed by Christ, I could not very well think of any other person in the whole wide world as needing no salvation, or as being saved in any other way. So it was most natural, logical, and reasonable that I should wish to go and tell them how to be saved. I never have quite understood how others, who believe the same things, and can go, are content not to go.

So they sent me out as a missionary to Japan. Ignorant and inexperienced I certainly was. To be sure, I was at that time already a married man, an ordained minister of the gospel, a Bachelor of Arts, and a graduate in theology, but for all that I was an inexperienced and ignorant boy of twenty-two. What I did not know of the world and its ways, or of the language, politics, religions, customs, ideas, virtues and vices of the Japanese, would have filled a big book—no, a library of big books.

Yet I was, in a sense, very well qualified to go; for there were two things I knew, that the Bible was the word of God, and that Jesus Christ

was my Saviour; and these two things were so immensely more important than all the things I did not know, that mathematics has not yet invented an adequate method of computing the difference. I would say to all students, with all earnestness: "If you have not both of these things, for God's sake stay out of the mission field." To these two convictions I have clung, through thick and thin, for more than forty years, and they have made a missionary of me. So I continued in the missionary work until six years ago, when an imperative providential call, over which I had no control, compelled me to lay it down.

Well, what came of it? Was it worth while?

In one way of looking at it, nothing much came of it. I was no Paul, I assure you. The walls of the Jericho of Japanese paganism did not fall because I walked around them and sounded my little trumpet. There were no mass movements among those who heard me; neither did the hosts of Japanese Buddhism and Shintoism tremble because I was in the field. I am sometimes very jealous of the Apostle Paul. He resided three years in Ephesus, and when he left, the whole city was in a riot, because the trade in silver images of Artemis had fallen off. I was fourteen years in Nagasaki, five years in Kumamoto, eight years in Oita, and two years in Fukuoka: and in all of these cities there were workmen enough of the craft of Demetrius, but I have never heard that any one of them ever had an hour's anxiety on my account! So, in one way, I did not amount to much. I am truly less than the least of all saints, and the least of the apostles, that am not worthy to be called an apostle.

Yet, through the grace that was given unto me, some things did happen. I will mention three or four of them. South of Kagoshima is a lonely island called Kikai Mura, where, until a few years ago it was as if Christ had not yet been born, for the people had never heard of Him. One man wrote to me, and I led a minister to go and preach to those people. Not long ago I received a letter from a colleague in Japan, telling me that last year 26 persons were baptized there, and this year 31. Also that they have a Sunday School with 110 pupils, practically all the children in the village. At last Christ has come to Kikai Mura. I did not do it all, or very much of it, but without me it did not come to pass.

There was a Russian Jew, more than thirty years ago, in Nagasaki, who sought some one to explain the gospel. I did it, and he became a new man in Christ. Being a new man, he thought he ought to have a new name, and was baptized at his own request: "Alexander Albertus Pieters." He became a Presbyterian missionary in Korea, and has for many years done a blessed and fruitful work.

There was a young telegraph operator in Kagoshima, who used to come and spend his evening with us, and we spoke to him of the Saviour. Recently he has begun to publish a series of commentaries on the New Testament, being now one of the most successful and scholarly ministers in Japan. His commentary is practically certain to be the chief Bible study help of the ordinary minister in that country for the next generation. When the first volume was published, he sent me a copy, with

the words: "To whom should I send the first copy of my commentary but to you?"

In our school at Nagasaki, thirty years ago, there was a bright and studious young man, who became a Christian. Recently the Japanese government appropriated three hundred thousand dollars to establish an institute for the rehabilitation of men who had been maimed or injured in railway accidents; and placed this man at the head of it, because his work along that line had made him the only possible choice. His name is Masudomi, and when he visited Hope College some years ago, he said he had come to see his grandmother, because Hope is my Alma Mater.

Through the work of these men, even though I have but few sons in Christ, I have many spiritual grandchildren. Though I be not an apostle to others, yet doubtless I am to these.

Mark Twain, in a terrible passage in his autobiography, speaks of human life as a failure, and I know just where he got the idea; for the adversary sometimes tries to discourage me in the same way. He will say: "Pieters, your life is drawing to a close, and what has it amounted to? You have achieved nothing. You are a mistake and a failure and a foolishness"; but at such times I think of Kikai Mura, and Alexander Albertus Pieters, of Hidaka Zenichi and his commentary, of Masudomi Masasuke, and the hundreds who through them are learning the way of life, and I reply boldly: "All that is true of me, outside of Christ, but thank God, I have been *in Christ* for upwards of forty years, and in Him I am no failure, but a glorious success; for through me He has put in motion spiritual forces that will go on and on, so long as the world shall last; forces that will save souls from death and cause many to shine as the stars for ever and ever."

THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

GLEANINGS FROM OTHER ADDRESSES

Devotionals

BISHOP DU BOSE in the opening devotional address of the Conference, read a few verses from the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers, by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds."

It was rather fitting that the Bishop chose to devote this opening Convention address to a subject dealing with the beginnings of things, treating them from the book of beginnings, Genesis.

He began, "There is no theology without God, there is no Christianity without Christ."

The Bible was made for man to understand and use. He cannot understand it if he does not use it, and he cannot use it if he does not understand it.

There are two attitudes which we must always sustain to the written Word of God.

First, Demand for a word of integrity, or inerrancy, and of self-consistency.

I maintain that men always have a right to demand that this Word be an unerring testimony.

Second, Reverent acceptance and loyal obedience.

There are, however, three classes of problems which have confronted the Bible student, especially during the past one hundred years.

(1) Science, (2) History, (3) Absolute faith.

Every statement of fact has, or will be verified by science before the task of human research is ended.

In dealing with the problem of Mosaic authorship of the book of Genesis, particularly the creation account, the Bishop said: "Moses was either the most astute geologist, or else an inspired writer. I believe he was both!"

The Bishop then discussed various critical matters, such as the creation of woman from man, the flood, and the Galilean miracles.

The devotional of the Friday evening meeting was by Dr. Winfield Burggraaff. With characteristic earnestness, he pointed out the attitude of the Apostle Paul and of believers to the wisdom of the world, and enjoined his hearers to seek the wisdom that was spiritual.

Dr. Hospers, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in Western Theological Seminary, gave the next devotional. He spoke on the forty-first chapter of Isaiah, pointing out the portions of exquisite poetic merit. He prefaced his discussion by saying, "This chapter involves something for which this League stands, faith in the inspiration of the entire Scriptures, including the Old Testament, and such fundamentally as the traditional doctrine of inspiration maintains it."

The exposition was so well-handled that it impelled one to follow the advice of the Professor, and to read the chapter discussed.

The last devotional address of the Conference was given by the Rev. Jack Mitchell, of the Open Bible Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan. He appealed to the delegates directly, imploring them to devote themselves to the work of the gospel, taking heed to the "one thing needful". His message was centered about the Scriptures dealing with the person of Christ. The message was fervent and warm with a love for the Lord Jesus.

Missionary Symposium

The general theme of the Missionary meeting was, Why I Became a Missionary. The reasons of two missionaries for their acceptance of the call to missionary service, are given in full on preceding pages. We cite here just the sketchings or outlines of those vital portions of the addresses given by the other speakers in the Symposium.

Mrs. Theodore Zwemer, India Mission.

Speaking of her call, Mrs. Zwemer told of her interest in missions while in college. "I came to feel that India was my country. There was no real reason why I should not go, so I decided that if Christ wanted me to go I would go."

"Upon my return, people asked why I should go on with my work after my husband's death. There were three reasons. First, Why, I felt no reason for coming home. Second, The human friendships of the missionary family. Third, God was as near there, as here."

Mrs. Zwemer closed with this challenge from India: "They need the saving power of Christ in their lives, in their homes, in society."

Mrs. H. V. S. Peeke, Japan Mission.

Mrs. Peeke was a Methodist missionary in China before she became Mrs. Peeke. She chose to become a missionary by herself, before she met Dr. Peeke.

In a remarkable, pictorially-told message, Mrs. Peeke described her life, prior to that as a missionary. She told of her youth in a Methodist minister's home, her joining the church, after a probation of six months, and her teaching a Sunday School class. She thought that she was a Christian. A lady handed her a book by Frances Ridley Havergal; she discovered that she was not a Christian, that she was following the forms of religion. So convicted of sin was she that she sought her Saviour.

Her resistance to a call for a missionary, which came while she was in college, her struggle the night of the call, and her final triumph, by completely yielding to the Lord, were the next steps in her call.

Finally, the speaker said, she found her place as one of the first lady missionaries sent out by her church.

Dr. H. Moerdyk, Arabian Mission.

"I felt that because Jesus Christ loved me and died on the cross for me, I was indebted to Him." With these opening words, Dr. Moerdyk

rapidly sketched his life as a medical student in the University of Michigan. When he was facing the issue of service as a foreign missionary, his final answer to the question was this: "I became a missionary because I could not prove to God that I shouldn't be a missionary. The best thing I could do was to offer my services as a medical missionary."

For five and a half years the Doctor has labored in Arabia. One of the important factors in his locating there was the influence of Dr. Harrison. Dr. Moerdyk referred to the incidents in his missionary life, when physical dangers were great. "In my five and one-half years' work, one thing looms up. When I was alone in the station when the Moslems sent an individual to preach against me . . . all seemed to be against me . . . When I was there with my back to the wall I said, 'Why did I become a missionary?' I felt when I was alone I knew I wasn't fighting alone. Jesus Christ was fighting with me."

Miss Nellie Zwemer, Amoy Mission, China.

The Chairman of the meeting, Dr. Pieters, in presenting Miss Zwemer remarked: "On August 11th, 1891, there cut loose from San Francisco the Pacific Mail S. S. 'City of Peking', and on board were four missionaries, the greatest company up to that time sent out by our church—Miss Elizabeth Cappon, my wife, myself, and Miss Nellie Zwemer."

Miss Zwemer's message was winsome and winning. With joy she told of her work in China. "Paul said that the love of Christ constrained him to be reconciled to God and no other motive is strong enough to make us soul winners. The reason why I wanted to become a missionary was because my mother was very strict about obedience. When I realized God's command was to go to all the world and preach the gospel I hoped that I could be sent. We were always told that missionary work was not a sacrifice or a duty, but a great privilege."

"I feel that all of us have just this one short life; we ought, therefore, to spend that life where our Master needs us most. I am very glad to speak of the needs of China, to this company who are preparing for Christian service or training others for this service."

"Statistics cannot tell you of the heathen without a hope and without God. A missionary wrote: 'To live in a heathen town is a revealing thing and ought to fill our heart with compassion.' Another missionary wrote: 'My greatest grief is that I grieve so little.'"

"The Amoy mission has been working in China since 1842. There are a little more than 3,000 church members there, in a population of 3,000,000 souls—a proportion of 1/1000."

"It is a wonderful privilege that God deigns to use us to free those captives and to win them for His Kingdom. . . . Throughout China more than four-fifths of the land is open to us. The vast majority want us. We are needed there, and oh, the need is so great! We don't, in China, have to find many points of contact. I always introduce Christianity the first contact."

"I wouldn't change my work for any king or queen or any other

work. My only regret is to have spent thirty-eight years in this work, I can not spend thirty-eight years more."

One of the significant things pointed out by Dr. Pieters was that two hundred years of service in the foreign field was represented by the messages given by missionaries that day, all of whom were of the Reformed Church in America.

THE CONFERENCE ITSELF

We have endeavored to present in this Convention number a complete record of the Fifth Annual Conference. The leading articles of this issue are by the main speakers of the Convention, arranged in the order given on the program. Each article is given from the author's own manuscript and copy of the address. Two missionary articles are included because they are representative of the five addresses of the Symposium. Excerpts are given from devotional addresses, as well as from missionary addresses.

Thirty-seven registered delegates attended the Convention, which met as the guests of Western Theological Seminary (Reformed Church in America), Holland, Michigan. Ten institutions were represented, all of them having Chapters or Branches of the League.

With the hospitable Seminary men and friends caring for the physical needs of the delegates and speakers, and the Hope College friends caring for the physical requirements of the Convention, by permitting it to use the commodious Y. M. C. A. room, what more could be desired? Much of the credit for the success of the Conference is due Mr. Nicholas Gosselink, and those committees from the Seminary working with him.

The Conference sessions opened Friday afternoon, November 22nd. The Devotional was given by Bishop Du Bose, after which Dr. J. E. Kuizenga gave the official welcome of the hosts to the Convention. As President of Western Theological Seminary he greeted the delegates, first, because they "were in the home of your own true spiritual relatives." Second, "Because of what you are going to be, and what we are going to be. The League is coming more and more to deal with progressive theology." Third, "Because we agree on the essentials, but agree to differ on other matters."

The First Reformed Church welcomed the Convention for the Friday evening meeting. Dr. Burggraaff spoke in the devotional period, after which Dr. Du Bose gave the main address, "Archaeology and the Bible." The effectiveness of the message was attested by the marked interest shown by the audience, in its eagerness to know more of the work conducted by Bishop Du Bose. The Conference was greatly helped by his coming.

Preliminary business was discussed at the close of the evening meeting.

Saturday morning the delegates met for a time of prayer, prior to the morning session, which was for the transaction of business, entirely. It was a delight to have the guidance of such men as Professor Woolley, the former General Secretary of the League, Dr. Allis, Dr. Burggraaff, Dr. Bouma (representing the Advisory Board), the Rev. John L. Schaver, and Dr. Pieters.

The afternoon session, Saturday, was opened by the devotional address by Professor Hospers. This was followed by the address by Dr. Burggraaff, "The Rebirth of Evangelical Theology in the Netherlands." It is impossible to describe the deep and lasting effect which this discussion made upon the hearers. The longing and hope sprang up in more than one heart, that God would, by His Spirit, visit our student life, yea our whole national life, with the same manifestations of grace, so freely given in recent years, to Holland.

As a means of diversion, the Banquet in the Third Reformed Church parlors gave the delegates a period of respite. The jovial mood and spirit of Dr. Kuizenga gave the fifty odd guests much enjoyment. As Toastmaster, President Kuizenga called for impromptus from Professor Woolley, the Rev. Mr. Martin and Professor Welmers.

The Rev. Mr. Jack Mitchell was the devotional speaker at the Saturday evening session. He spoke directly to the students, beseeching them to be completely devoted to the work of the gospel ministry. With detailed analysis, Dr. Oswald T. Allis presented his address, "Comparing the Incomparable". By a searching condemnation of the absurdities of the comparative method, wrongly applied, Professor Allis was able to show that our faith in the Old Testament narrative and record need not be shaken.

Late Saturday evening, and far into the night; almost to the stroke of twelve, the Convention delegates labored to finish the remaining order of business. The careful and painstaking work of the various Committees; and the equally thorough work of Dr. Pieters, Dr. Allis, Professor Woolley, and others brought one of the most epochal discussions of League business to a close. The gains and results of these sessions are noted in subsequent sections of this article.

The Holland churches invited the delegates to worship on the Lord's Day—indeed one friend managed to attend three churches, so bountiful were the Thanksgiving services!

Time for prayer, all too short a time indeed, preceded the Missionary Symposium, when five returned missionaries spoke. What they gave as reasons for serving on foreign fields can be seen in preceding articles. The five missionaries whose messages were heard are: Mrs. Theodore Zwemer, Mrs. H. V. S. Peeke, Dr. H. Moerdyk, Miss Nellie Zwemer, Dr. H. V. S. Peeke, and Dr. Albertus Pieters. This was the first meeting of its kind ever fostered by the League, and it was, so to speak, a sealing of the action taken by the Conference the night before, when it went on record as favoring foreign missions in a definite manner.

As if in confirmation of things fundamental, the organ recital following the Symposium included several groups of numbers with religious themes. In the setting of the worshipful Hope Memorial Chapel, the Bach numbers were truly appreciated, as was also the rendering of Luther's "A Mighty Fortress". The Convention was grateful for the privilege of hearing Professor Curtis Snow; and it also acknowledged its debt to those

who made it possible to have musical selections in all of the Conference meetings.

The last Conference gathering was merged with Sunday evening worship of the Third Reformed Church of Holland.

Professor Bancroft was the preacher of the evening, speaking on "The Meaning of the Death of Christ". In a message replete with scripture, he spoke of the eternal significance of the sacrificial work of the Saviour. It was a fitting close to the Convention of the organization whose very purpose is charged through and through with fidelity to the truth of the supremacy of the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in the lives of believers.

The retiring President of the League, Mr. William T. Blackstone, introduced the incoming officers who were present, each one saying a word concerning the League work. President-elect Mellema remarked, "We have precedent, but we have new plans to follow; because of that, it was not easy to take the reins of government, so to speak. To the delegates let me say a final word. There were not large numbers, but as we go forward this year we are to go to accomplish something. We have made a step in advance. It is necessary to go back to our Chapters and Branches and promote the interests of the League."

Each of the officers who spoke voiced similar expressions regarding the importance of the League's witness.

Then came the closing remarks of Mr. Blackstone, the reading of the resolutions, the benediction by Dr. Pieters, and the Fifth Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students was past.

THE CONFERENCE BUSINESS

In an effort to show precisely what ground has been covered, what territory remains to be reached, we are presenting a very full account of the activities of the League as seen in the Annual Reports, and in the business of the League in session.

The following Chapters and Branches were represented at the Convention:

John Brown College, Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
 Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
 Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
 Cleveland Bible Institute, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas.
 Marion College, Marion, Indiana.
 Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.
 Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan.
 Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Retiring Treasurer Mr. John De Groot presented the following Annual Report:

*Financial Report, 1928-1929**Receipts—*

Cash balance transferred by C. Long (1928 Treasurer)	\$1,049.20	
Donations and Sustaining Membership.....	3,029.79	
Dues	271.00	
EVANGELICAL STUDENT	57.21	
Balance of Northern Baptist Conference Fund....	18.01	
	<hr/>	
Total Receipts	\$4,425.21	\$4,425.21

Disbursements—

General Expense	\$ 340.91	
Office Supplies	52.99	
Calvin Campaign Expenses.....	14.84	
Salaries	2,200.00	
Conference Expenses (Chicago).....	51.51	
EVANGELICAL STUDENT	826.75	
Publicity and Propaganda.....	160.28	
	<hr/>	
Total Disbursements	\$3,647.28	3,647.28

Balance on hand November 22, 1929.....\$ 777.93

Since that report, however, there have been numerous expenditures (including the outstanding bills), which will reduce the balance on hand far below the sum mentioned above. In spite of this, we are grateful to the Lord for His providential care; truly, He has provided, and for this we praise Him!

The General Secretary reported the following schools having active groups:

- Austin Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas.
- University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- John E. Brown College, Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
- Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.
- University of California (Berkeley), Berkeley, California.
- Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- *Central College, Pella, Iowa.
- Cleveland Bible Institute, Cleveland, Ohio.
- *Columbia Bible College, Columbia, South Carolina.
- *Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas.
- **Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Virginia.
- *Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
- Marion College, Marion, Indiana.
- Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois.
- Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio.

- Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.
 *Oberlin University, Oberlin, Ohio.
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 *Philadelphia General Hospital (Nurses' Home), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 **Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.
 *Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 *State College (of New York), Albany, New York.
 **Union College, Schenectady, New York.
 Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan.
 *Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

*Indicates groups admitted to the League at the last Conference.

**Signifies that the school marked did not render Annual Report.

Thirty schools are thus included in our membership; a gain of *eight* over last year, or *thirty-three per cent*. And this in the face of two successive changes in the office of General Secretary! The total number of undergraduate members in the League is over *one thousand*; this includes all members in the Chapters and Branches just listed. The exact number of members, from Annual Reports, shows a total of 958.

At the business meetings, already mentioned, there were two major proposals submitted. Both of these were carefully discussed, before passing. Other matters of routine business were quickly taken care of, in order that these important subjects might be handled adequately.

Note has already been made of the help given the Conference by visiting friends. Especially on such matters as the creation of a Board of Trustees were these men able to give sound advice. During the discussion of this problem various opinions were given on the work and character of the League. The Rev. Schaver said, "The outstanding weakness of the League is the lack of a practical program." Dr. Bouma, of the Advisory Board, reminded the delegates of the "seriousness of our task; we need this movement, and need it sorely. I am tremendously impressed, however, by the ineffectiveness of our body."

From such open and free discussion, not only on the part of the non-voting delegates, but also from the official delegates, the question of reorganizing the League's executive and administrative machinery was presented. The amendment proposed by the Western Theological Seminary Branch was the center of discussion. That a change in the mode of organization was imperative was conceded by all of the delegates; the precise form of the constitutional amendment was the point of disagreement. Rather than make hasty decisions, the Convention took up in detail every angle and phase of the matter, with the result that with the aid of extra business sessions, the whole proposal, modified and adjusted to all

of the wishes of the League Conference, was presented and passed, late Saturday evening.

The new amendment calls for a legally incorporated Board of Trustees of fifteen members, members of the first board to be chosen by the Advisory Board and the Executive Committee, in joint session. The duties of this Board shall be to guide and advise the League in matters of finance, and general welfare. Details of the amendment will be sent to all concerned with the change; we cannot enumerate them here. This much can be stated: the objections to the present working of the League will be largely overruled when the present amendment is effective. That will not take place until certain requirements have been met satisfactorily. We trust that God will grant wisdom as those in authority perfect plans for the establishment of the new Board.

The second important gain of the Convention was the decision to encourage the work of Foreign Missions, especially by welcoming into the League fellowship all groups who seek definitely evangelical alignment. This step will involve a great deal of work and planning, but the result will be well worth the effort. The wording of the League's motion is: "Motion was made that it be a fixed policy of the League that we have a missionary department." The General Secretary will take definite steps towards realizing this act of the Conference. Already several earnest friends of the League have offered their help in forming such a program for Missions.

Attention is called to the new officers of the League. Their names, and those of the members of the continuing Advisory Board will be found on the inside front cover of this number of the EVANGELICAL STUDENT.

NEWS AND NOTES

The General Secretary hopes that, the Lord willing, he can visit each of the groups of the League. A short trip is being planned for the early part of January, which will enable him to visit schools in Ohio, Indiana, and neighboring states.

Some of the Chapters have sent in notes, which give cause for joy and thanksgiving. The Lord's name be praised! He has promised to watch over His Word to perform it!

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY)

"We are holding meetings regularly with an average attendance of about a dozen. At present we are having a study of the booklet by James H. McConkey, entitled *The Three-Fold Secret of the Holy Spirit*. We find this an excellent discussion of the subject."

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

"We lost several of our regular fellows last year, and so far this year haven't succeeded in building up the attendance as much as we hope to. We are continuing to have our weekly meetings for study and praise. I was fortunate in obtaining a large dormitory room this year so that we have plenty of room for expansion. We have no regular officers or any-

thing like that, and we try to get each fellow to take part at every meeting.

"Recently we received an invitation . . . to take charge of the C. E. some Sunday night. Am hoping half a dozen of us can get out there . . . and give our testimonials for the Lord."

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Our activities as planned for 1929-30 are:

1. Prayer meetings, Fridays, 1 p. m.
2. Five meetings with special speakers advertised in the University; in two meetings of which other Chapters may participate.*
3. Five hours of Bible Study the first term (this is not a Seminary, you know).

One of our members is editor-in-chief of one of our student magazines and is introducing Machen to some thousands of students thereby. . . . Individually we are reading (in turn)

Leaven of the Sadducees—Gordon

Origin of Paul's Religion—Machen

Luke the Historian—A. T. Robertson".

PHILADELPHIA GENERAL HOSPITAL (NURSES' HOME)

"Our little group meets on Tuesday evenings for prayer and Bible Study and already the Lord is working wonderfully. It is our aim and purpose to speak a word of witness and testimony to at least one girl here each day and God has wondrously blessed. Also as a result another Bible class for new Christians is meeting each week under very capable leadership. Then, too, some have become interested in the Student Volunteer Movement and are praying for a revival in that body. And so I could go on to relate the faithfulness of God. We shall be praying for the Convention and shall eagerly await news of it."

The General Secretary of the League is hoping to be present at the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship Retreat in Toronto, during the holidays. We are happy to mention the work of our brethren across the border, in Canada. A few excerpts from their news bulletin will give an idea of the blessing which attends their testimony.

One school reports "signs of true revival of evangelistic fervour amongst ourselves, with at least one definite conversion already." The bulletin contains this bit of news: "Let us pray for continued blessing on Dr. Guinness as he leaves us very soon for Australia to undertake similar work there (D. V.). Let us pray, too, for Mr. Kenneth Hooker, a graduate of Cambridge, and past President of the Christian Union in that University, who will arrive in Canada early in December (D. V.) and remain with us as organizing Secretary of the Fellowship; that he may have the guidance and rich blessing of God."

*We are rejoiced to note that the Pennsylvania Chapter concluded a most successful Regional Conference, Friday, December 13th. Unofficial reports give information of fifty delegates from all of the Philadelphia groups and visitors from Temple University, Beaver College for Women, and Jefferson Medical School.

The addresses were by the Rev. Mr. Charles Woodbridge, speaking on "Objectivism versus Subjectivism"; and Dr. H. S. Laird on "The Duty of Intolerance."

WHO ARE THE WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE?

BISHOP HORACE M. DU BOSE is of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. His best-known work as a scholar is his investigation in the field of archaeology. Dr. Du Bose, in addition to his work as an editor for various church publications and book series, has written such books as, *Consciousness of Jesus*, *History of Methodism*, and *Planting of the Cross*.

DR. WINFIELD BURGGRAAFF is not new to the League. He is the pastor of the First Reformed Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Besides his work as one of the editors of the *Leader*, Reformed Church paper, he is an author whose volume, *The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America* has caused such favorable comment among reviewers of conservative religious periodicals.

DR. OSWALD T. ALLIS, Professor of Old Testament History and Exegesis in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, is a former contributor to this magazine. His chief work is that of an editor and author. As the recent editor of the *Princeton Theological Review*, his work for conservative theology is noteworthy. But Professor Allis is also the author of a number of brochures and treatises dealing with critical problems of the Old Testament.

PROFESSOR E. H. BANCROFT is the Head of the Department of Systematic Theology in the Practical Bible Training School, Binghamton, New York. As a Bible teacher, Professor Bancroft is well known, but also as the author of *Christian Theology Systematic and Biblical*. This volume is used in many leading seminaries in this country.

DR. ALBERTUS PIETERS is Professor of Bible and Missions in Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan. Forty years as a missionary in Japan, a co-worker of Dr. Peeke, have served to give Professor Pieters rich experience. He is the author of *The Facts and Mysteries of the Christian Faith*.

DR. H. V. S. PEEKE, returned missionary of the Reformed Church in America, was one of the pioneer Student Volunteers. He has a wide acquaintance with the missionary problems of the field which he served, Japan. Dr. Peeke is not able to return to his work, and consequently is residing in this country, near his Alma Mater, Hope College.

Your attention is invited to the financial needs of the League of Evangelical Students. The work receives support only from the offerings and gifts of Christian friends. The cost of this magazine last year, for instance, was FIFTEEN times the amount of receipts sent in for subscriptions. If you are led to contribute, kindly mail your remittance to **W. Harlee Bordeaux, Treasurer, Wheaton, Illinois.**