

Announcing the
TWELFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of the
League of Evangelical Students

AT
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
(QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE)

February 18th Through 21st

Tentative Program

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH

- 7:00 P. M.—Registration of Delegates.
- 8:00 P. M.—Pre-Convention Prayer Meeting—REV. CALVIN K. CUMMINGS.
- 9:00 P. M.—*Opening Business Session.*

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19TH

- 9:00 A. M.—Devotional Message—SAMUEL FISK, M.A., John Brown University.
- 9:30 A. M.—Address of Welcome—DR. W. H. FRAZER, President, Queens-Chicora College.
- 10:00 A. M.—Address—DR. LEWIS S. CHAFER, President, Dallas Theological College.
- 10:45 A. M.—*Second Business Session.*
- 2:30 P. M.—Devotional Message—REV. EDGAR G. GAMMON, Charlotte.
- 3:00 P. M.—Address—CHAUNCEY D. EGGLESTON, LL.D., President, Hampden-Sydney College.

Third Business Session

- 8:00 P. M.—Address—WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, M.A., Th.D., D.D., Columbia Theological Seminary.

Fourth Business Session

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20TH

- 9:30 A. M.—Chapter Reports and Student Problems.
- 10:30 A. M.—Address—WILLIAM H. WRIGHTON, Ph.D., University of Georgia.
- Final Business Session*
- 2:30 P. M.—Devotional Message—DR. C. W. SOMMERVILLE, Queens-Chicora College.
- 3:00 P. M.—Missionary Message—REV. JAMES E. COUSAR, Missionary from Japan.
- 6:00 P. M.—Banquet—Toastmaster—MR. HARVEY MACARTHUR, President of the *League*.
Stunts—DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN.
Message—PROFESSOR R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.
- 8:00 P. M.—Address—J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Westminster Seminary.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21ST

- 3:00 P. M.—Address—DR. ROBERT C. MCQUILKIN, President, Columbia Bible College.
 - 8:00 P. M.—Address—REV. PROFESSOR R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D., Westminster Seminary.
-

Send all registrations, requests for lodging, and reservations for banquet to Miss Catherine Marshall, 404 East Boulevard, Charlotte, N. C., at least ten days before the Convention. Lodging will be supplied free. Price of banquet—fifty cents.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS
 REV. CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, *Editor*

Volume XII Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January, 1937

No. 1

EDITORIAL

CHRISTIAN LOVE

There is much talk today about love. The quintessence of the Christian religion, we are told, is "love thy neighbour." And by this is usually meant simply an earnest desire and effort to help those in need. On the surface this may sound very pious, for the true Christian does seek to help those in want. But when examined in the light of the true Christian love of the Old and New Testaments we see what a complete sham, what an utter farce this modern concept of love is. We see that the love of which the Modernist speaks is the precise opposite of Christian love. Far from being sweet and tender it is hatefully cruel toward men. It dishonors God, and despises truth.

The paramount need in the world and the Church is not less love but more love—more truly Christian love. What is Christian love and wherein does it differ from the current misrepresentation of it?

Christian love is love primarily toward God. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God" was Christ's summary of the first and great commandments. Christianity from beginning to end is theocentric. God has created us. God has preserved us. As Christians God has redeemed us. All we are and have is of God. Therefore we should love Him. O how the heart of the infinite God must ache as he hears men talking glibly about love, love, love and they never love Him. The early Christians coveted above all else the Lord their God. At all cost they "must obey God rather than men." This love toward God manifested itself in unswerving loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ and in righteous indignation when the honor and glory of their God was being trampled under foot. Because of their love for Him they could not but hate unbelief and sin which opposed Him.

True Christian love requires love for the truth. Paul, the great Apostle of the Christian Faith coveted and loved the truth. We see him in Athens among the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers who were given over to "the unknown god." When Paul saw error he opposed it and zealously upheld the truth. His epistles ring with a great love for and devotion to the truth. There are many today who contend—yes we believe as you do but we do not believe in contending as you do. We may concede for the sake of argument that they do believe as we do, although in many instances it is very apparent that they do not even believe as we do. But there is one thing that we cannot possibly concede; it is that these men love the truth. For if a Christian loves the truth he will stand for that truth and contend for that truth no matter what the consequence.

Christian love involves love for the souls of men. But for the Christian this means something vastly more than and radically different from that which is meant by the Modernist. The Christian learns from the Bible that men are lost, helpless sinners abiding under the just wrath of God. He knows that the greatest cry of the human heart is "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" For the Christian it is cruel mockery to ignore this fundamental and primary need of every human heart. Realizing man's greatest need and filled with a com-

passion for the souls of men the Christian tells of the Saviour. It was the thought of man's lost estate that moved the heart of our Lord with compassion as he beheld the multitude. He came "to seek and to save that which was lost." It was Paul's unquenchable desire that men be brought "out of darkness into His marvelous light" which impelled him to labor so assiduously. His epistles ring with a tremendous love for those whom he had begotten in Christ. The early Christians did not ignore the physical needs of men, nor should we. But to them there was a greater need and the ministration of that need was their primary task.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE"

Inscribed on the pediment of one of the beautiful colonial-styled edifices of a large non-Christian university in the South are the words of Jesus—"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is thereby declared to students that academic knowledge apart from Christ is truth and that in this truth there is liberation. This philosophy of truth is both uncritically assumed and dogmatically taught in the greater number of our colleges today. Nothing could be farther removed from the meaning Christ very plainly intended by His magnificent words. Indeed, our Lord meant precisely the opposite. In the words that are quoted Christ asserted most emphatically that the truth was not apart from Him but "in" Him and that in Him alone would there be freedom. This becomes evident when we examine the context from which these words are taken (John 8:31-36).

This widely quoted verse of Scripture was spoken by our Lord to "those Jews which *believed* on him." It was not spoken to or intended for those who did not believe on Him. It was necessary that they first believe on Christ as God and Saviour if they were to "know the truth." What is more, it was necessary that another very important condition be met before this promise of Christ could be appropriated. Jesus said "*If ye continue in my word . . . ye shall know the truth.*" Modern educators that do not believe in the Christ and abide in Christ have no claim on the promise of Christ. They cannot "know the truth." Christ said "I am *the* truth." Apart from Christ we cannot know God's revelation of the real essence of things—the character of God, the nature of man and the relation of the two in Christ. Apart from Christ there is no answer to the basic question of life—"What must I do to be saved?" Yes, and apart from the Christ we do not even know the most important facts about the phenomena of science—the fact that God has created them, sustains them, and has purposed to glorify Himself in them.

The freedom that Christ promises those who believe in Him and abide in Him is not merely liberation from ignorance and childhood concepts as is supposed. Christ promised far more than that. He promised freedom from bondage to sin. It is this freedom that our Lord is referring to in the words under consideration. Jesus declared to his hearers that "Whoso committeth sin is the servant to sin" (vs. 34). It was the slavery of sin from which He promised everlasting freedom. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." To paraphrase Christ's utterance in the negative we have, indeed, the opposite of that which was supposed: if ye believe not on me and abide not in me ye can not know the truth, ye can not be free.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVOLUTION

One of the most destructive enemies of Christianity during the past half century has been the theory of evolution. By evolution, of course, we do not mean mere development or progression but "continuous progressive change according to certain laws and by means of *resident forces*" (LeConte's definition). Much of current Modernism is but a reconstruction of Christianity along evolutionary lines. Christ and the Scriptures are made to fit into the evolutionary scheme. The salvation of man is from within man.

The theory of evolution is widely assumed and frequently affirmed to be an established fact. We would state most emphatically that evolution is not a fact. Whether it be evolution in the field of science or evolution in the realm of religion evolution is without foundation in fact. Evolution is a philosophy of life, an explanation of certain phenomena. It is at best only an hypothesis.

In the sphere of science Dr. Floyd E. Hamilton has written a very commendable book on *The Basis of Evolutionary Faith* in which he carefully examines the facts of science which are usually set forth as evidence for the evolutionary theory. It is a book which every Christian student should read. In each instance, the author, who himself was once an evolutionist, discovers that the facts of science do not support the theory of evolution. One of the strongest arguments for evolution, the similarities between various species, it is shown, does not prove a common ancestry. Rather, these similarities may better be accounted for on the basis of a common Creator.

When we examine evolution as applied in the realm of religion there are some very stubborn facts that make this theory untenable. There is the fact of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Evolution cannot account for this phenomenon in history. There are the manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments. They do not lend themselves at all to the evolutionary hypothesis. "The Short Bible" might fit the Wellhausen development hypothesis but it is not the Bible of the manuscripts. No, the facts do not support an evolutionary Christianity. The only kind of Christianity history knows anything of is a Christianity that is supernatural to the core. At the center of that supernatural Christianity is the supernatural figure of Jesus. This supernatural Christ of history will never fit into the evolutionary scheme.

TO ALL LEAGUE MEMBERS—AN OPEN LETTER

Dear Christian Friend:

There is in the fact of the ever-shifting and transient character of the *League's* constituency a constant danger. It is the danger that students affiliating with the *League* will not understand the great original purposes for which the *League* was founded and will thus diverge from these original purposes. At the present moment in the history of the *League* this danger exists in a very real way. Personal visits among Chapters and correspondence received from Chapters reveal that some of our constituency is in grave danger of falling into certain pitfalls. They are the ancient pitfalls of anti-intellectualism and inclusivism. The former of these is characterized by a neglect of a diligent study of the Word of God and by a taking of the *League's* meetings off the campus. The latter, inclusivism, is characterized by a shunting of those who have been

conspicuous for their defense of the Gospel in preference to those who compromise with the Gospel. In order that these pitfalls may be averted and the *League's* historic witness to the Gospel preserved, certain facts should be called to the students' attention.

First, the League of Evangelical Students is a testimony *of students*. It is an amazing thing that so many Christian students who go to college for the avowed purpose of acquiring knowledge can be perfectly content with a superficial dabbling in the Scriptures received from well meaning but untrained laymen. Let us not forget that we are students and Christian students. Let us dig deep into the Word of God and study the evidences for its truth. In the *League's* program of study, *Christian Truth Today*, there is a thorough presentation of the basic truths of Christianity by competent writers. Let us not spurn this splendid program of study as "too deep," but let us thank God for the opportunity to engage in a systematic study of the Word of God with the help of real students of His Word. May there be no substitute for each student faithfully studying the Scriptures for himself.

Second, the League of Evangelical Students is a testimony *for students*. To take the *League's* meetings off the campus in deference to "fisherman clubs" or in the interest of attracting a crowd is simply to miss the whole point of the *League's* testimony. There are many organizations and many Christians who can meet and are meeting the general needs of the communities for Christ. But what organizations and what Christians are endeavoring to reach students with the Gospel? If students in the *League* abandon the campus to unbelief then no one will reach our college students with the Gospel. The Lord give us all a fresh vision of a million students who will not be reached unless we reach them. May He enable us to raise our witness where it is needed most and where we are best qualified to labor.

Third, the League of Evangelical Students historically stands for the utter exclusiveness of the Christian religion. It believes that Christianity and Modernism are "mutually exclusive." It can have no fellowship with any who do not profess the evangelical faith and stand firmly for that faith. It bids God's speed to all, no matter what their denominational affiliation may be, who stand for the exclusiveness of the Christian religion. It welcomes all such to its testimony. It has no sympathy for those who regard Christianity and Modernism as compatible religions. It is not at all in harmony with the League's traditional position to exclude in any way or manner those who in their respective denominations have stood valiantly for the Lord Jesus Christ. Nothing could be farther removed from the original purposes for which the *League* was founded than to welcome those who by their acts or by their silence have compromised on the Gospel. To include those who are engaged in compromise is to participate in that compromise.

Faithfully,

CALVIN K. CUMMINGS,

Field Secretary.



A REVOLUTIONARY DISCOVERY OR A GIGANTIC HOAX?*

ALLAN A. MACRAE, PH.D.

Gospel Light, by George M. Lamsa, B.A., "Ethnologist, Aramaic Language Expert," A. J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, 1936.

A New and Enlightening Translation of the Gospels according to the Eastern Version, translated from the Aramaic, "The language Jesus spoke," by George M. Lamsa, Author of *My Neighbor Jesus*, A. J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, 1933.

During the last few years newspaper headlines have frequently declared that remarkable discoveries regarding the original Gospels had been made—discoveries so remarkable, indeed, as to revolutionize our understanding of many Bible verses. Great publicity has been given to these claims. Newspapers in every part of the country have joined the chorus, while at least one national radio hook-up has declared on the basis of these assertions that our idea of the story of Jonah and of many of our Lord's miracles must now be completely altered. We are told that the gospels as we have them represent translations of a Greek version which is itself not the original but a very poor translation of an Aramaic original. After almost twenty centuries of their use, we have now the opportunity to learn their true meaning, since Mr. George M. Lamsa has at last appeared to give us the correct explanation, based on what he declares to be the original Aramaic version of the scriptures. This version he claims to be able to interpret correctly because of his knowledge of the language and customs of his Eastern home, which, he asserts, have scarcely changed since the days of Christ.

These are tremendous claims. They cannot be treated with indifference. If they are true, an advance in Christian knowledge is possible, greater than any since the Reformation. In this case it is our duty to forward them with all our strength. If they are not true, a gigantic hoax has been perpetuated upon the people of our land. In this case it is our duty to expose it mercilessly. When claims so stupendous as these are made and widely publicized, no middle ground is possible. It becomes our duty to examine them dispassionately, and to announce our decision firmly.

Mr. Lamsa's claims may be summarized in three heads: first, that our Gospels represent a very poor translation of an Aramaic original; second, that he has access to that original; third, that he is supremely qualified to interpret that original.

Since the first of these claims is dependent for its effect upon the second and third, and since the third is the one which has been most widely advertised, we shall examine them in reverse order. On what does Mr. Lamsa base his claim to be a supremely qualified interpreter? Certainly it is not on the basis of great scholarship or extended education that he considers himself entitled to be designated as "Ethnologist, Aramaic Language Expert." The only education he claims is that provided by undergraduate departments of a mission college in Persia and of an American theological seminary. He puts no higher degree than "B.A." after his name. His claim to be an expert is based entirely on his knowledge of the language and customs of his early environment.

* A book review reprinted through the courtesy of *The Presbyterian Guardian*.

DISTANCE FROM PALESTINE

This being the case, it is important to notice that the region from which Mr. Lamsa comes is over five hundred miles by air line from the nearest border of Palestine. A region of varied topography intervenes, with many racial types, a number of different languages, and all sorts of customs. The language and customs of Mr. Lamsa's people would throw little light on those of present-day Palestine. What right has he to assume that the two were identical in ancient times?

Indeed, such an assumption is quite contrary to fact. The language which Mr. Lamsa quotes in his books is the Syriac of Edessa in northern Syria. It was the most widely used literary dialect of ancient Aramaic. *But it was definitely not the dialect which Jesus spoke.* The Aramaic of Palestine can be studied as it occurs in the Jerusalem Targum (a translation of sections of the Old Testament into Aramaic by ancient Palestinian Jews), and in the Palestinian translation of the Gospels into Aramaic, of which parts have been preserved. The Western Aramaic dialect which these present—the language which was spoken by Jesus and His disciples—is quite different from the dialect of the Syrians of Edessa.

IS THE LANGUAGE UNCHANGED?

The assumption which Mr. Lamsa makes that the language of his people has not changed since the time of Christ is a large one. Two thousand years is a long time for a language to remain stationary. In no other case has a language remained unchanged for even a far smaller period. Among the many and varied dialects of Aramaic it is hardly to be expected that exactly at the time of Christ this one would have stopped the long development which it had already undergone and that it would have remained unaltered ever since. When we examine some of Mr. Lamsa's translations in the light of other portions of the Syriac Bible, we shall see how far indeed the language must have been changed. For it is easy to demonstrate that the ancient Syriac language, in which a capacious literature has been preserved, gives no warrant at all for most of the interpretations which he presents.

Before we examine some of Mr. Lamsa's actual translations, let us look briefly at his second claim, that he has before him the original Aramaic scripture, from which he alleges that the Greek gospels were translated. He makes no claim to have discovered a new manuscript. According to his definite statements, the version on which he bases his translation is the Syriac Peshitta, which he calls the Eastern Version. Now this version was translated from the Greek at the direction of Bishop Rabbula, bishop of Edessa in the early part of the fifth century. It is a well-known fact of history that this bishop ordered that the Peshitta should be used in all the churches. The so-called Old Syriac, which had been previously used but had become corrupted, was discarded. Within the last century certain manuscripts of this Old Syriac have been found. They differ in many places from the Peshitta, which Lamsa uses as his basis. Dr. F. C. Burkitt of Cambridge has demonstrated that the quotations from the scriptures found in Syriac writings before the fifth century are not from the Peshitta, but from the Old Syriac, while in Syriac writings subsequent to that time the Peshitta is regularly quoted. No one asserts that the Old Syriac gives us the original Gospels. The Peshitta cannot possibly do so, since it was unknown before the fifth century. Moreover, Mr. Lamsa's use of the Peshitta must have been con-

fined to one or two manuscripts, or, more likely, to printed copies. Had he made any extensive use of ancient manuscripts of the Peshitta, he would have noted the fact that almost all of them definitely state that Matthew composed his Gospel "in Hebrew in Palestine," Mark "in Latin at Rome," Luke "in Greek at Alexandria the Great," and John "in Greek at Ephesus." Such statements in the very manuscripts of the Peshitta decisively exclude any possibility of its claiming to be itself the original form of the Gospels.

UNWARRANTED INTERPRETATIONS

If space permitted it would be easy to show that the ancient Syriac language itself gives no warrant for most of Mr. Lamsa's interpretations. If they represent the modern dialect of his people, it must have changed tremendously since ancient times. One of his most widely publicized emendations is the case of Matt. 27:46: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Here Lamsa would substitute for the words "Why hast thou forsaken me?", the following: "for this I was kept." In *Gospel Light*, pp. 151-5, he gives his detailed argument for his rendering. Much of it consists of a consideration of the nature of God. It is unnecessary to enter this phase of the matter here, since the question before us is not, "What do we think the Bible ought to say?" but "What does it say?" We are interested in his linguistic arguments for his rendering. It can be safely asserted that they are not valid, as far as ancient Syriac is concerned. *Lmana* is never used to mean "for this." In the Peshitta it always means "for what?" or "why?" *Shbakthani* cannot mean "I was kept." It is not passive, but active. He endeavors to prove that the root *shbak* can mean *keep* by referring to I Kings 19:18, Romans 11:4, and Joshua 8:35. Actually the word does not occur at all in the Peshitta (Walton Polyglot Edition) of the first or last of these three passages, but only in the middle one. There it means to *leave*, and not to *keep*. It never occurs in the Peshitta in the sense of *keep*, but always of *leave*, *forsake*, *loosen*, *allow*, etc. "Why hast thou forsaken me?" is an accurate translation of the Syriac expression. Moreover these are exactly the words used in the Peshitta in Ps. 22:1, where the meaning of the Hebrew original from which the Syriac was translated is absolutely clear. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that in the parallel to this very passage, in Mark 15:34, the Peshitta gives unmistakable proof to anyone who can read Aramaic at all that it is a translation from the Greek and not the reverse (by giving the words twice, to represent the Aramaic words spoken and the Greek translation that follows).

DID CHRIST WALK ON THE WATER?

On pp. 338-340 of *Gospel Light* Mr. Lamsa asserts that the Aramaic preposition *al*, as used in John 6:19, Matt. 14:25, and Mark 6:48, though literally meaning *on*, is properly translated *by*. He quite overlooks the fact that even in his own translation of the Peshitta Matt. 14:24 says "the boat was many miles away from the land" and that when Peter tried similarly to walk "*al* the water" he sank (Matt. 14:28-31). Clearly here the interpretation which Lamsa would give is utterly impossible in view of the context. The same criticism obviously applies to his interpretation of "Jonah in the whale" (*Gospel Light*, pp. 90-91).

Similarly on pp. 316-319 he gives a long interpretation of the saying of Jesus in John 2:4, "mine hour is not yet come," which at first sight appears greatly

to simplify the entire matter. However, the fact that in vv. 9-10 the master of the feast calls the bridegroom and speaks to him in such a way as to show that he considers him responsible for the excellence of what has been served proves Lamsa's entire interpretation to be untenable. It is an application of a custom with which he is familiar to a situation that is entirely different and demonstrates the utter falsity of the oft-repeated references to "unchanged Eastern customs." A careful reading of the passage designated should convince any intelligent English reader that there is not the slightest reason to consider either that the customs of Mr. Lamsa's people are identical with those of this region two thousand years ago, or that the customs of that region have at any time had any close similarity to those of ancient Palestine.

IGNORANCE OF TRUE FACTS

Thus we see that the version which Lamsa translates is not the original of the Gospels at all, but a translation from the Greek, and that his claim to be qualified to interpret it is based on no solid evidence. His knowledge of the Syriac of the Peshitta is utterly untrustworthy. No one who had more than a very elementary knowledge of languages could possibly say, as he does on p. 385 of *Gospel Light*, "Hebrew was primarily derived from Aramaic. The two languages are so alike one can hardly make distinctions." One might fully as well say that Spanish and Italian are so alike one can hardly make distinctions!

In view of the results of our investigation of Lamsa's second and third claims, it is hardly necessary to examine the first. Even a glance at the evidences for and against the possibility that an Aramaic original underlies some parts of our Greek Gospels would require far more space than is at our disposal. Whatever the result of such a study might be, it would not alter the situation before us: no such original is available to the author of *Gospel Light*.

Aramaic has much to teach us that will be of value in the interpretation of the Bible. It needs to be studied scientifically, not in the slipshod and unscholarly fashion of Lamsa. When we observe what a stir his half-baked theories and extravagant assertions have made, we are bound to admit that Barnum's characterization of humanity was correct. A gigantic hoax has been perpetrated. It is to be feared that it will dispose people to be slow to accept the real contributions that scientific study of Aramaic has to make to the understanding of the Bible.

Gospel Light, like its predecessor, *The Four Gospels According to the Eastern Version*, is published in very attractive form. The A. J. Holman Co. has done a fine job of printing. One wishes the content were worthy of it.

"CHRISTIAN TRUTH TODAY"

VOL. I

A presentation and defense of historic redemptive
Christianity for young people.

TEN CENTS PER COPY FOR STUDENTS
AND SUBSCRIBERS

Published by the League of Evangelical Students

SOME RECENT TRENDS IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT*

MARTIN C. LEHMAN, PH.D.

A general statement formulating some of the issues between what is known as theological "modernism" and "fundamentalism" is necessary in order to properly appreciate some trends becoming discernible in the present.

As expressed in the Westminster, Augusburg, Dortrecht and other historic confessions of faith some of the distinguishing features of "fundamentalism" are the following:

1. God is the completely sovereign creator, conservor, and ruler of the universe transcendent, immanent, and personal.
2. The Bible is an inerrant revelation of God's will for all mankind for all time.
3. Jesus is the personal revelation of God in the flesh; in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; the satisfier of divine justice in the demand of the death penalty for sin; the conqueror of death by miraculous resurrection; the ransom of souls from the penalty of eternal death for the guilt of sin; now personally reigning in heaven with God his Father.
4. The Holy Spirit is the third person of the divine, triune God-head and the personal representative of Christ on earth today.
5. Man is God's creature endowed with a soul for which he is a responsible, willing agent involved in the crisis of death or life in a world hereafter according to faith or disbelief and the deeds done in the body. Man is unable to save himself.
6. Sin is the willful transgression of God's law.

In contrast some of the distinctive features of modernism are the following:

1. The Bible is not inerrant and permanently authoritative but a collection of religious writings, disclosing progress of religious and ethical thought over a period of about ten centuries which needs to be subjected to criticism because of modern scientific theory, historical research and the social need for a new ethics.
2. God is a living principle at the heart of the universe before which human beings are infinitely precious. Such a God has initiated a vast growth-process called evolution the apex of which is human kind. This principle is considered personal by some, and impersonal by others.
3. Jesus is the best human embodiment of perfect life so far produced in the world and so is ethically the Son of God. A process of apotheosis has obscured his real self and robbed his personality of much of its human value for mankind as living example. He is the closest approach to God and interpretation of God's attitude toward mankind.
4. The Holy Spirit is the personal, posthumous, influence of Jesus in the world today.
5. Man is the apex of a process of evolution within nature as the result of an inherent principle of natural selection and so the nearest approach to God.
6. Sin is man's maladjustment to the evolutionary process in a cosmic and social world.

* Excerpt from an address delivered at the Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students in Chicago on February 22, 1936.

Many other possible distinctions with implications might be given but these will suffice to proceed.

The obvious divergence between the above statements of views will form the base for our critical examination of a perplexed world's reaction as many are militantly lined up in support of one or the other of these views and still more are unconcerned. I believe it is fair to say that the "modernist" views above expressed indicate two general tendencies which are not mutually exclusive. These tendencies and their implications have some significance as to the factors and conditions conducive to the historical development of "modernism."

These tendencies are the following:

- a. the humanizing of deity by subordinating deity to rational categories and abrogating all ideas of transcendence,
- b. the depersonalizing of deity.

From this observation let us pass on to a brief statement about the historical development of the present day "modernism."

In 1911 Professor Olin A. Curtis of Drew Theological Seminary made a survey of theological thought in the United States and summarized his findings in the following quotation from his report.

"In the theological situation I found in my study, a powerful movement which I was obliged to regard as a direct response to the failing sense of sin. To cover this entire movement, in its various phases, I called it *the modern mediating movement*. This name I deemed fair and fitting, inasmuch as, in the theology of the movement, the ostensible aim nearly always is to place a feasible bridge between Christianity and the modern mind, or, as one of the leaders in the movement said, 'to relieve the present strain on faith.' As to mediating books no one book has appeared in a class with Wm. Newton Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology* (1906). From this has come Wm. Adams Brown's *Christian Theology in Outline*. 'I look upon Ritschlianism as the creative center of the mediating movement.' With the publication in 1901 of Albrecht Ritschle's, *Unterricht in der Christlichen Religion* (Instruction in the Christian Religion) our alert preachers have easily come into actual contact with the master mind of the movement."

In tracing this movement to its possible sources Professor Curtis cites the publication in 1902 of a book entitled *What Is Christianity?* which was purported to be a series of lectures at the University of Berlin by Professor Harnack. This book is said to have had a very marked effect on theological thought in the U. S. A. and to have carried forward the theological trend expressed in a work by Professor Hermann of Marburg University published in 1886 entitled *Der Verker des Christen mit Gott*. (The Christian's Communion with God.)

This work was already at that time expressing advanced liberal theological thought in Germany. The English translation and American publication of Ritschle's and Harnack's books brought Hermann's work into tremendous vogue. An impartial reading of these works will readily show that their main objective is the bringing together of religious thought and new scientific theory apparently contradictory to religious faith. The technique resorted to in order to accomplish this is the depersonalizing and rationalizing of deity.

It may be possible to trace this trend to more remote sources in the theology and metaphysics of Schliermacher and the theological implications of the Kantian, "Ding an Sich." The point that is to be noted here however is that the American attempt to "relieve the strain on faith" in Clarke's and Brown's works had its source in German theological writing. In fact the similarities between German

and American theological thought when studied in chronological sequence, and developmental stages noted, give indications that the theological trend in America set off by the works of the above theologians was, "made in Germany." This trend is characterized by a tendency to regard deity in purely immanent and impersonal terms.

It will be interesting and necessary to note conditions existing in Germany simultaneously with the theological development noted above which have the potentiality to foster it. Among others the following may be noted. 1. A sense of economic and social security. 2. Scientific achievement and advanced scholarship. German Universities were drawing students from all nations. 3. A feeling of military superiority. 4. A sense of political solidarity and the possible dominance of German kultur.

Conditions in America at the time when Clarke and Brown's books appeared were also such as to foster a feeling of human sufficiency and may be characterized as follows: 1. A sense of unlimited resources, 2. A rapidly receding frontier, 3. Immense wealth, and 4. A vast educational system although a bit naive.

Comparison of conditions in both nations shows that the psychological, social and religious tendencies in both countries could easily be identical as springing from similar backgrounds. American mind-set was as favorable for the assimilation of a mediating theology as was German mind-set for its production. Very potent factors in both countries were economic, social, political and academic features of national life in each case. A feeling of self-sufficiency in both cases tended to depersonalize and minimize deity as a transcendent entity.

In bold contrast to the theology assuming an exclusive immanence for God note the following as an expression of a now very popular theological trend in Germany, on the continent, and with a beginning vogue in America. While not identical in all respects with a "fundamentalist" position it is far from "modernism" and the direction of its trend is in the direction of fundamentalism.

Brunner, *The Theology of Crisis*, p. 29 f. "A God who is identical with the depths of the world or the soul is not really God. He is neither the sovereign of the world or of man. He is too close to both of them to be really their Lord. Indeed he is merely another aspect, the hidden portion, as it were, of the world and of myself. Such a religion, in its final analysis, is nothing but ancient paganism, a deification of the world and self."

"Such a God is not really personal. What is not personal cannot be my superior but must be my inferior. For the personal is above the impersonal. A God whom I shall have to know through an interpretation of the world or of myself is less than I am because I give utterance to him who himself is dumb, as it were. He becomes a personality only through me."

"This religion of immanence is not really based on faith. Faith is an answer to a call, a response to a challenge. An immanent God however, neither calls or challenges me. He does not demand a decision. In fact a decision is not even possible. A religion of immanence excludes decision because the divine is supposed to be identical with the deepest self of man. Man is not asked to choose one or another alternative, for man is already in God and God in man."

"For this very reason man never becomes a real personality. For decision is the essence of personality. Only when man comes to a crisis and is compelled to choose between life and death does he become a personality. At the very moment when God challenges man to make his decision man is given personality. Apart from faith, which constitutes man's decision, personality is not to be found. Man becomes personal when his own will is broken into by the will of the Lord."

A natural question arises. Were there any changes in the secular life of Germany which preceded this sudden change in theological thought? It is sig-

nificant that the Barthian theology arose as a reaction against a theology of exclusive immanence when Germany was in the throes of military disaster bringing with it its inevitable political upheaval, social insecurity and economic desperation. The following may be given as characterizing the mind-set and emotional bias of German life in 1923-4 when Barth's *Romer Brief* made its wonderful appeal to a desperate German population. There was a defeated Germany. The economic status was completely insecure. Social life was disarranged. Anguish in the way of killed in nearly every home. There was a political transformation of Government system and a general feeling of insecurity and futility with the present order of things.

The completely immanentistic, impersonal, rationally subordinate deity of liberal religious thought in Germany broke down and was not satisfying for a people in crisis in all phases of their life. No theology which fails to take into account *all* phases of life, particularly the tragic phases, can endure for life individually and in groups is of all sorts and conditions. Germany had produced and America had assimilated a theology adapted to the needs of an economically, socially and politically confident people.

This tendency or desire for a theology with a more realistic estimate of life and its implications is beginning to assert itself in the English speaking world also.

A leading modernistic paper, *The Christian Century*, of Chicago, occasionally expresses a feeling of uncertainty as is to be noted from the following titles of articles and editorials: What's the matter with liberalism? Is liberalism bankrupt? After liberalism what? Can liberalism meet the modern challenge for a new social order?

Ministers of national and international prominence are beginning to sense a feeling of inadequacy with liberal theological thought on the part of the masses. Note the following quotation from a sermon by Dr. H. E. Fosdick preached in Riverside Church in November last. "Modernism is excessively preoccupied with intellectualism, dangerously sentimental, predominantly man-centered and has too commonly lost its ethical standing ground and its power of moral attack." Such expressions could be quoted from many other religious leaders.

Any impartial survey of indices of recent periodical literature, both religious and secular, will show that the anticipation of at least a renovation of the whole liberal position is a very evident characteristic. This is to be seen as springing from a sense of futility engendered by the realization that modernism has not inherent within it that which meets the normal religious aspirations of the human heart.

Further indications of this desire on the part of the masses for a more definitely personal and theistic expression of religious faith is to be seen in the type of radio service supported by popular subscription from most of our mid-western broadcasting stations. These are usually of a rather demonstrative but warmly appealing nature and above all definite in their theological commitments. These programs are increasingly popular among people who have become somewhat dissatisfied with the liberal theology they detect in their pulpits.

The same may be said for the tabernacle movement also spreading rapidly through the middle west. Statistics show that in nearly every city of over ten thousand inhabitants (and in many smaller towns) tabernacles have sprung up in the last ten years. Only slight acquaintance with the frequenters of these tabernacles discloses them to be malcontent, nominal members of liberal churches

who find religious satisfaction in tabernacle services where theological commitments are clear although the services rather demonstrative.

Another movement on a higher social level is also indicative of this same trend. The Buchman Movement, although professedly non-committal as to the formulated issues between modernism and fundamentalism, is nevertheless a catering to a more definitely personal and expressive form of religious life which is lacking in modernistic circles.

The recent phenomenal growth of the Nazarene Church is another indication of the same tendency. This church has grown into one of the numerically strongest denominations in the United States from very humble beginnings in the last thirty years. It supplies expression for religious feeling, worship and service of thousands leaving over liturgical and theologically non-committal churches.

These are ominous signs on the horizon that not all is well with modernism. It certainly lacks that which satisfied the human heart. The modernist has failed to realize that in supplying that which the human heart is designed to demand, in the way of genuine religious expression, he must recognize a "consumptive demand." This he has failed to do.

It is noteworthy that modern science is not now hostile to a definite and personal theism. The recent findings of Compton in sub-atomic physics further confirm Planck's theory of indeterminism. Jeans and Eddington in England follow the same vein. "The reality of the objective world must be forever unknown to science as such," Eddington. Watsonian Behavioristic psychology is rapidly losing its erstwhile prestige and hormic teleological interpretations of psychic phenomena are acquiring vogue. A purely mechanistic determinism as an explanation of ultimate reality is not in line with the most modern science.

While science is not even now a definite ally of personal theism it is less hostile than previously and its most recent findings leave room for the supernatural and many of its implications in creation, revelation and salvation. It is now possible to be scientific and religiously thoroughly theistic at the same time.

It is a frequently made indictment of fundamentalism, or the form of Christianity accepted largely a generation ago, that it has failed to give an effectual witness against evident evils in our modern social, political and economic life. A fair statement of this viewpoint is to be had from the following quotation from *The Christian Century* of September 26, 1934, p. 1204 ff.

"Limiting itself to the inner life, it (Christianity) made an easy adjustment to the secular order; it fitted itself neatly into the whole system of nationalism, imperialism and capitalism. Protestantism became a sort of private chaplain to the state, blessing its wars, its tariffs, its profit motive, its class privileges, its brutal discriminations, its 'economic man,' and the inordinate wealth gathered in the hands of a small minority."

"Why has Christianity allowed our unchristian social system to go unchallenged? The answer is plain. It was because the Christian community was preoccupied with the ideology of the inner life. It sought to regenerate the souls of men by direct action, while all the time the total secular environment in which these same men and women lived, and to which their real inner life was a living response, was left unmodified and unchallenged by the Christian gospel."

In the light of this indictment must the fundamentalist group confess that its theological tenets in the past account for impotence in witness against and lack of effort for the eradication of certain evil features in our past and present world set up? Is modernism responsible for fresh Christian ethics which would eliminate war, unfair accumulation of wealth, race prejudice and an

acquisitive social order? If so is it true that fundamentalism's preoccupation with the "ideology of the inner life" is responsible for such impotence?

It is not true that liberal theology is first to be non-resistant or pacifist. The church of the first two centuries of the Christian era required a soldier to resign when converted. There are denominations (Mennonites) which have held for non-resistance for four hundred years before our present modern theological trend began and these have held rigidly for a conservative theological position from the beginning. Mennonites and other communions carried on communities to exemplify a more equitable distribution of wealth in this country as early as the seventeenth century. Modern liberalism cannot lay claim to the production of a fresh ethic. What is claimed along this line was begun by churches who were preoccupied with the "ideology of the inner life."

Modernism has been alert to point out to orthodox communions and individuals that lack within them of a witness of the gospel against such great sins as war and special privilege of any kind. Orthodoxy should thank liberalism for this and with contrition for the past rededicate itself with fresh courage to live the whole of the Gospel of Christ in a world now so sorely perplexed and in many ways increasingly susceptible to the message of Jesus.

To liberalism orthodox Christianity must however also say two things in addition to admitting the charge of weak witness against great national sins. Our weak witness is not due to wrong doctrinal belief or "preoccupation" with ideology of the inner life, because it is only the Christian possessor of that inner life who can witness for that abundant life which repudiates and sacrifices to the uttermost to stop great national and social wrongs like, war, capitalism, special privileges and imperialism. Liberalism's indictment of the ethics of orthodoxy here justly goes deeper than Dr. Morrison intended, for a lack of clear witness against great wrongs must mean a lack of experience of sufficient of the abundant life of Christ inwardly to fructify into courageous sacrificial witness against great group sins.

Finally and by way of summary we want to say a God who is only immanent is not a God because he is only part of that life in which man himself lives. Liberalism cannot survive so long as no supernatural, transcendent God is its center. Such a God must incarnate and reveal himself to the world and be immanent through the presence and operation of his Spirit in the world today.

Humanity will be satisfied with nothing less. As ministers we must live this fact in our lives and preach it and all its logical and theological implications from our pulpits to be true to our commission as servants of Christ.



THE WORSHIP OF JESUS

WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, M.A., TH.D., D.D.

The advent of Jesus Christ was heralded by the adoration of the angels, Luke 11:14, Hebrews 1:6. Imitating the heavenly hosts wise men fell down and worshiped the babe Jesus, Matthew 11:11.

For over nineteen hundred years now this chorus of praise to our Lord Jesus has swelled from an ever increasing host of redeemed. Through the centuries the Church of Jesus Christ has been marching up the heights of God with a prayer in her heart to the Lord Jesus for His grace and on her lips a song of praise to His ever-victorious name. On earth her members taste the stream of His love; more deep they drink above. Here they lisp His glory, there they bless His hand that guided and His heart that planned, for "the Lamb is all the glory of Emmanuel's land." There are contingents in this mighty chorus from every nation and kindred and tribe. They use every type of instrument, and bear many denominational crests; but they vie one with another in the fulsomeness of their praise to their Lord, the One altogether lovely, the Chiefest among ten thousand.

Unroll the pages of history and through every corridor of time you will see that endless procession, its file leaders one by one stepping from time into eternity, but its ranks growing as others take up the refrain:

"Crown Him with many crowns,
The Lamb upon His throne;
Hark how the heav'nly anthem drowns
All music but its own!
Awake my soul and sing
Of Him who died for thee,
And hail Him as thy matchless King
Thro' all eternity."

They are marching onward toward that great moment in God's plan when every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, Phil. 11:11.

Thus far on its way that part of the City of God which has been manifest on earth has been surrounded by the city of the world. While wise men came from afar with gifts of gold, Herod came with a sword to take the young child's life. A generation later the rulers of this world crucified the Lord of glory, I Cor. 11:8. The world has frequently turned a cold heart and a deaf ear to the carols of our King. That was and is to be expected. One matter, however, calls for comment. Ever and anon the influence of unbelief creeps into the host of those who have enrolled under the banner of the Christ striking a discordant note, seeking to hush the anthems ascending to our Lord. The extent of such efforts in the past centuries has not been large, nor has the number of those carried away with these apostasies been great. But since this rasping discord has been introduced into the worship of American Christianity by the celebrated New York Modernist it may be in order to sketch the history of those who have held that there was peril in worshipping Jesus.

(a) *The Psilanthropists.* The ancient church declared that Christ was eternal God who became complete man, and was the proper object of Divine

worship, *latreia*. The occasional individuals or groups who denied that Jesus was worthy of worship were dubbed by the accurate Greeks 'psilanthropists.' This term means 'mere man.' Stripped of all camouflage this view is that Jesus is only a human being, only a temporal person. The Divine power, spirit or influence may have indwelt His human personality in a special measure; but He is ultimately just a man and, therefore, is not properly an object for Divine worship. Dr. B. J. Kidd¹ of Oxford lists Cerinthus, Carpocrates the Gnostic, some of the Ebionites, the two Theodoti and Paul of Samosata as the psilanthropists of the ante-Nicæan Church. Paul held civil as well as ecclesiastical office under Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. He had a great retinue, a throne and tribunal for himself with applause when he preached by professional *claqueurs*. "He put down the psalms to our Lord and on Easter Day had a trained choir of ladies to sing psalms in honour of himself." Finally, a synod at Antioch exposed his sophisms and excommunicated Paul.

(b) *The Non-Adorantes*. The skepticism of the scholastic modernists and the Renaissance issued in the Socinian theology of the sixteenth century. Socinianism asserts that Christ is a teacher rather than a Saviour and that the Bible contains the Word of God rather than is the Word of God. Human reason is the ultimate guide. Many of the Polish Unitarians denied that Christ was worthy of worship and earned for themselves the title *non-adorantes*. However, the numerous examples of prayer and worship offered to Jesus in the Bible and the high respect in which the good book was still held proved too strong for the *non-adorantes*. Ultimately, even the Socinians agreed that "we ought at all times to adore Christ and may in our necessities address our prayer to Him as often as we please; and there are many reasons to induce us to do this freely" . . . Indeed, "God requires from us divine worship to Him (Christ)."

(c) American Unitarianism, however, seems to have run an opposite course in this particular from that of its elder sister Socinian Unitarianism. William Ellery Channing writes that "wonder, reverence, and love" are due to Jesus.² Whittier, the poet of early Unitarianism, sings, thus, of Christ.

"Thro' Him the first fond prayers are said
Our lips of childhood frame,
The last low whispers of our dead
Are burdened with His name."

But Emerson condemned Christianity for dwelling "with noxious exaggeration about the person of Jesus"; and Parker added to make Christ God or a Son of God is heathenish.³ Under such bludgeonings the Unitarian praise to our Saviour was stilled.

(d) *German 'Liberalism.'* "Liberalism" has cut itself loose from the orthodox doctrine of Christ. Writing in the early years of this century Professor Friedrich Loofs declared that there was not a single learned Protestant theologian who thought that the orthodox Christology did sufficient justice to the truly human life of Jesus. Dr. Warfield's comment on this alarming statement is: "Revolt from the doctrine of the Two Natures means, therefore, nothing more or less than the explanation of Christ in terms of mere humanity. When

¹ *A History of the Church to A. D. 461.*

² Hurlbut, *Sunday Half Hours with Great Preachers*, p. 383.

³ Parker, *The Transient and Permanent in Christianity*.

we are told by Loofs that the whole of learned Germany has rejected the doctrine of the Two Natures, that is equivalent accordingly, to being told that the whole of learned Germany has rejected the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, and construes Him to its thought as a purely human being." For a while the traditional worship continued to be given Jesus. But ere long these scholars were reproached with idolatry and contemptuously described "Jesusites"—worshippers of the man Jesus. Men like Wilhelm von Schnehen and Arthur Drews declared that this idolatrous adoration of Jesus, interpreted as a mere man, was the greatest obstacle to pure religion in the world. Small wonder, then, that a neopaganism has captured a section of Germany and that the aged Professor of Missions in Berlin, Dr. J. Richter, is lamenting that today for the first time in history nations are seeing Jesus, considering His offers and then consciously rejecting Him. The German government has issued a calendar for 1936⁴ which avoids all reference to Easter or Christmas. The twenty-fifth of December is referred to as Baldur's Light-Birth; Good Friday as a memorial to 4,500 Saxons slain by Charlemagne; Easter as the Feast of Ostara or Sunrise; and Ascension day as "Thor's return for his hammer" . . . War-machines in honor of Thor and the rolling of great hoops in honor of Wodan replaces the Christian holy days.

(e) There are not lacking indications that British "liberalism" is moving in the same direction. Representative writers⁵ of this school regularly present Jesus as a man, a human, temporal ego through whom the Father does something specific or unique. They use substantive or ontological terms to describe the Saviour on His human sides and then think that they are preserving the Athanasian faith when they use adjectival, functional, or predicational words to express the Divine activity in Him. Dr. Walter Lowrie has properly protested this error of treating divinity (i. e. God) as an attribute or predicate of humanity.⁶ Start with Christ as a human personality and no matter what acts God did in or through the life of this man he is man still, and questionings as to the propriety of worshipping him will arise. Our Anglican writer allows an occasional prayer to the ascended Christ, but declares that "Jesuolatry" is not normal to Evangelical Christianity. Other writers are even more caustic of that for which this epithet was coined. We join issue with our British cousins on their own term. Jesus, Jehovah is salvation, is the name given our Lord by the angel to indicate that He would fully meet the expectations of that name, that He would do what only Jehovah does, Ps. 130:8, save His Israel from their sins, Matthew 1:21.⁷ From the days of the Seventh Ecumenical Council *latreia* has properly been reserved for the worship of the Divine nature. With the church of the Ages we offer *latreia* to our Lord Jesus Christ for we hold that in His Person He is true and eternal God, who for us men and for our salvation took human nature. On the other hand "liberalism" withholds Divine worship from our Lord and is satisfied to offer Him such occasional form of prayer or reverence as 'Catholic practice' bestows upon the Virgin.

(f) American Modernism. In the notorious sermon *The Peril of Worshipping Jesus* American Modernism has given its aid and comfort to those who reject the historic Christian worship of Jesus. This sermon is more than

⁴ *Christianity To-day*.

⁵ Bouquet, A. C., (Cambridge), *Jesus—A New Outline and Estimate*. Baillie, John (Edinburgh), *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christinity*.

⁶ Lowrie, *Our Concern with the Theology of Crisis*, pp. 140, 144.

⁷ Cf. Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, p. 154.

a warning against the danger that there is in worshipping Jesus without doing what he says. The preacher rejects the historic Christian doctrines of the Trinity and the Two Natures of Christ upon which this worship is predicated.⁸ In the two prayers published in the pamphlet with the sermon the minister avoided praying either to Jesus or in His name.⁹

Some years earlier, Professor Fagnani, another Union (N. Y.) professor asserted that "Jesus did not proclaim Himself God, He did not claim worship" and that the Pauline and the historic Christian worship of Him as the Saviour God was a perversion of the religion of Jesus. A third professor in the same institution in a 1935 volume writes, "Nor does Saint Paul ever pray to Jesus."¹⁰ Since some twenty-five of Paul's prayers to Jesus are recorded, this conspicuous inaccuracy has all the marks of wishful thinking.

Among Southern parallels Dr. Fagnani's words closely agree with the teachings of Dr. Thomas Cooper, a protege of Thomas Jefferson, who served as President of the College of South Carolina from 1819 to 1834. A current Southern educator in a volume on the new science and the old religion says:

"There are few more tragic conditions of religious thinking than the inability of the populace to worship God. To comprehend a power such as modern science discovers is impossible to anyone and to apprehend Him impossible to the masses. Their ability to worship is satisfied with the more easily conceivable; some with ancestors; some with a Mohammed or Confucius or Buddha; some with a Virgin Mary; some with a Jesus . . . Great men can be understood only by their equals. Anthromorphic (*sic*) idolotry (*sic*) remains the only possible form of religion for the masses."

And, of course, *the Peril of Worshipping Jesus* has been echoed from the 'liberal' pulpits of the South.

However, the most recent echo that the writer has seen in print comes from another section of America. Writing in the *Christian Century*, December 11, 1935, a former Methodist missionary says that he does not want to Christianize the world, since "the teachings of Jesus are more like teachings of Buddha than they are like the doctrines of 'Christianity' " and since "Christianity is the name of the religion which rejects the principles of Jesus, but worships his name."

When one turns from these occasional and disparate groups to that continuing stream of piety which is historically designated Christianity he finds that "nothing has been more characteristic of Christians from the beginning than that they have been 'worshippers of Christ' ".¹¹ "Christianity is pre-eminently the worship of Christ." He is worshipped as God, hymned, prayed to, invoked.

⁸ *The Hope of the World*, p. 104.

The contrast between the modernist and the conservative practice with reference to the worship of Christ was brought home to the writer during February, 1936. On successive Sabbaths the following programs of worship were heard: Dr. H. E. Fosdick speaking over a Federal Council of Churches national hook-up; Dr. J. Sprole Lyons, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Atlanta, over WSB and Dr. Charles A. Logan, Presbyterian missionary to Japan, also over WSB. The first named offered no prayer either to Jesus or in his name. The Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church read a Gospel lesson and addressed to the same One about whom he had been reading, namely, the Lord Jesus Christ, the long prayer. The missionary followed his address by a prayer directed in the most intimate and personal way to the Lord Jesus. Professor Andrew W. Blackwood of Princeton has the following comment on the services of the first type mentioned in the *Union Seminary Review*, July 1934: "In the five o'clock services broadcast under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America—thus financed partly by Presbyterian (that is, Presbyterian USA) money—one almost never hears an evangelistic note or anything else that is distinctively Christian. Any one who questions the statement should read the volume of radio sermons recently published by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick under the title, "The Hope of the World." This volume contains his sermon on "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus" . . . One turns away in sadness of heart, exclaiming, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him." "

9

¹⁰ Curry, B., *Speaking of Religion*, p. 70.

¹¹ Warfield, *Christology and Criticism*, p. 372.

"The central idea of the primitive Christian religion is the redemption accomplished through Jesus' death and resurrection; and for its adherents Christ is not merely the preacher and example of the new piety, but likewise and predominantly the object of religious worship."¹² Dr. A. C. McGiffert says, "Equally significant is the evidence that he (Christ) was an object of worship from the beginning."¹³ Indeed the evidence is so great that this distinguished American "liberal" has built upon it his novel thesis that Jesus was the God of the early Christians to the exclusion of the Father. With his customary balance, Shedd writes: "If regard be had to the emotional utterances and invocations of the first generations of Christians, there is full as much evidence for the deity of the Son as of the Father. The religious feeling in all its varieties terminated full as much upon the second Person of the trinity, as upon the first, in that early period that was nearest to the living presence and teachings of its Founder."¹⁴

While Peter, Acts 10:25, and an angel, Rev. 22:8, 9, refused worship offered to them "we find that the Lord Jesus never refused lowly homage, which implies that adoration was fittingly paid to Him."¹⁵ The Evangelists, following their sources were worshippers of Jesus. The whole tone of the Acts and Epistles shows that after His ascension Christ was the object of a worship and an adoration that was indistinguishable from that paid to God.¹⁶ In Acts 4:24 the voice is lifted to God, the Creator, while in 1:24 and 7:59, 60 the heavenly Christ is appealed to "as at once the searcher of hearts, the forgiver of sins, and the receiver of the spirits of the saints." This shows that "to the infant community the ascended Jesus was their God—(not, of course, to the exclusion of the Father),—whom they addressed in prayer and from whom they sought in prayer the activities which specifically belong to God."¹⁷

I. *Individual Christians Worship Jesus.*

In examining the Christian worship of Jesus, with special reference to that recorded in the New Testament, one notices first the individuals who worship Jesus. Many prophets and righteous men desired to see the Son of man in the days of His flesh and saw Him not; many of the wise and prudent who saw Him knew Him not. But ever and anon the Father has opened the councils of His peace and revealed unto needy souls the glory of the Redeemer and these have come unto Him with prayer and supplication and have departed graced with His boons.

The Gospel records are rich in these examples of individuals who worshipped Jesus. At His cradle the wise men worshipped, and Herod at least recognized that this was the proper attitude, Matt. 2:8, 11. The leper worshipped Jesus that he might be cleansed, Matt. 8:2; the man born blind in gratitude for receiving his sight, John 9:38; the Syro-phoenician woman for her daughter, Matt. 15:25; the Gadarene demoniac that he might be healed, Mk. 5:6; the disciples after the stilling of the tempest, Matt. 14:33; James and John and their mother for a place in the Kingdom, Matt. 20:20. After the resur-

¹² Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte*, 1930, p. 23.

¹³ McGiffert, *The God of the Early Christians*, p. 54.

¹⁴ Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine*, I:263.

¹⁵ Marshall, J. T., *Adoration in ERE*.

¹⁶ Edwards, D. Miall, *Adoration in ISBE*.

¹⁷ Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, p. 209.

rection the two Marys, Matt. 28:17 worshipped Him. As He blessed them He was parted from them and ascended to heaven while they worshipped Him, Luke 24:51-52. It may not be amiss to point out that in these instances each of the three Gospels, of which the original ending is preserved, reaches its culmination in the worship of Jesus.

Likewise Jairus prayed to Jesus for his daughter, Matt. 9:18; Bartimaeus for his sight, Mark 10:47; a nobleman for his Son, John 4:27; a centurion for his servant, Matt. 8:5f. Stephen prayed to Jesus both for his persecutors and for the salvation of his own soul, Acts 7:59, 60. The father of the demoniac came kneeling to Jesus for his child, Matt. 17:14; Mary fell at His feet for Lazarus her deceased brother, John 11:32; Peter overcome with a sense of his own sinfulness knelt to Him, Luke 5:8; and John fell at His feet as one dead, Rev. 1:17.

Paul began his Christian life with a prayer to the Lord Jesus, "What shall I do, Lord?", Acts 22:10; and repeatedly besought Him for guidance, Acts 22:17-21, I Thess. 3:11. Thrice he prayed to the Lord for the removal of his thorn in the flesh, II Cor. 12:8. The New Testament writers lift the loftiest doxologies to Christ, Rom. 9:5; II Tim. 4:18; II Peter 3:18; Rev. 1:6; Rom. 16:27; Heb. 13:21. Or, as Dr. Hugh T. Kerr has appropriately expressed it, "whenever the majesty and mystery of Christ Jesus is the theme, the language frequently passes into a prayer of adoration."¹⁸ Polycarp, probably the last of those who had known the Apostles, closed his martyr prayer with a Trinitarian doxology, "I glorify thee through the eternal and heavenly highpriest Jesus Christ, thy beloved child, through whom to thee with him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now and forever, Amen."

Referring to several of the New Testament examples Johannes Weiss says that there can be no doubt that they "prayed in the strict sense of the word to Christ, not only in loyal adoration, but also in the form of petition" and that these examples show that "such prayers were certainly made infinitely more often."¹⁹ In confirmation of this judgment one may read the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles written in the second and third centuries. In the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Acts of John, the Acts of Thomas "Christ appears quite frankly and naively as God and prayers are freely offered to Him."²⁰ For example Thecla prays, "My God, thou Son of the Most High, who art in heaven, grant her according to her wish, that her daughter Falconella may live forever." John prays, "I beseech thee, Jesus, help such a great multitude to come to thee, thou Master of the universe" and "Glory be to thee, my Jesus, the only God of truth." Thomas says: "I give thanks to thee, Lord Jesus, that thou hast revealed thy truth in these men. For thou alone art the God of truth and not another." And Peter prays, "Thou most good and alone holy, in thy name have I spoken, for thou didst appear unto us, O God Jesus Christ."

II. *Christians as a Class Worship Jesus*

The worship of Jesus was not only a matter of individual appeal to Him. Christians as a class, group, community or body constantly and regularly worshipped Him. Paul directed First Corinthians to the Church at Corinth and then expanded the address to take in all Christians. In doing so his verbiage

¹⁸ *A God Centered Faith*, p. 113.

¹⁹ *Christus: Die Anfänge des Dogmas* (1909), pp. 24-25.

²⁰ McGiffert, *The God of the Early Christians*, p. 59f.

is "With all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours." Thus for Paul "those who invoke the Lord Jesus Christ" are Christians; and Christians are those who invoke the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul regularly opens his epistles with a prayer for "grace and peace" "from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ" for those to whom he is writing. This means, as Weiss puts it, that "what is looked for from God can also be granted by the Lord. This inclusion of God and Christ in a single view which corresponds precisely with their co-enthronement is characteristic of the piety of primitive Christianity."²¹ Similarly Paul closes eight of his epistles with a prayer to the Lord Jesus for grace to his Church, another with a prayer to Christ for peace and love, and still another to our Lord for His presence. In the epistles to the Thessalonians there are three additional prayers to Christ for blessings for these Christians, I Thess. 3:11-13; II Thess. 2:16-17, 3:16. In I John 5:14ff prayer to Christ is spoken of as if it were a regular Christian practice.

In the Book of Acts the Lord is asked to decide who should fill the place of Judas and be numbered with the apostles. The Lord Jesus is regarded as the author of Pentecost and all the spiritual power of the primitive movement. The spokesmen of the primitive community direct men to call upon His name for salvation, and for healing, Acts 2:4. The faith of the earliest disciples is seen in the fact that they preserved the several books of the New Testament in which so many individuals are represented as worshipping Jesus. The Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Revelation are not only indicative of the attitude of the authors of these several books, but as well of the community from which these authors come, and which preserved these testimonies for future ages. The Book of Revelation is primarily a picture of the worship of the Church above. But the earthly Church which treasured this vision of the Lord Jesus adored in heaven ever strove for closer likeness to her heavenly prototype. The New Testament is in a true sense primitive Christianity's "song of praise to the Jesus Christ" a song that "all the sacred writers with a like enthusiasm sing."²² An interesting confirmation of this characteristic occurs in one of the earliest references to our religion in secular history, the letter of Pliny to Trajan. The Roman governor declares that Christians meet weekly to sing a hymn antiphonally to Christ as to God (*carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*). When Christianity came forth conquering and to conquer, when she trod the field of history in the glowing bloom of her ardent youth, she did so praying to the Lord Jesus for grace and peace and hymning His praise in her victory songs.

Through the ages the Christian Church has marched in the power that has answered her prayers to and adoration of Christ. The Martyrdom of Polycarp states that Christians were accustomed to pray to Christ. Justin Martyr says that "we adore and worship Him (the Father) and with Him the Son who came from Him and taught us these things."²³ There is a hymn to Christ in Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus*, 3:12; while Eusebius quotes a third century writer thus "And how many psalms and hymns, written by the faithful brethren from the beginning, celebrate Christ, the Word of God, speaking of him as Divine."²⁴

²¹ Weiss, *ibid*.

²² Guiton, W. H., *Le Nouveau Testament et La Critique*.

²³ *Apology* I.6.

²⁴ *Church History*, V. 28:5.

Basil the Great argues at length that Christ is not only celebrated in the doxology as the one through whom the Father is glorified, but also receives glory with the Father, that the persons of the Trinity are coordinate, not subordinate, and connumerated not subnumerated.²⁵ The Nicene²⁶ Creed teaches that the

²⁶ Holy Ghost "with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified."

Ambrose is remembered as the father of Western hymnody. This bishop prevented an Empress from securing one of the Milanese churches for Arian worship by keeping his congregation in the basilica occupied singing psalms and hymns to Christ. Ambrose's best hymn begins:

Veni, Redemptor gentium,
Ostende partum Virginis,
Miretur omne saeculum:
Talis partus decet Deum.

Whether or not the *Te Deum* was composed by Ambrose on the baptism of Augustine it is representative "of the old Catholic church poetry; and will be prayed and sung with devotion in all parts of Christendom to the end of time."²⁷ Henry Voes and John Esch, the first martyrs of the Dutch Reformation, died with this hymn on their lips. The *Te Deum*, as its ancient companions the *Gloria Patri* and the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the more recent long meter doxology, shows that the Church of the Ages praises Christ equally with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Francis of Assissi is easily the most lovable figure of the middle ages and his *Canticle to the Sun* its noblest poem.

"All creatures of our God and King
Lift up your voice and with us sing
Alleluia, Alleluia!
Thou burning sun with golden beam,
Thou silver moon with silver gleam,

* * * * *

And all ye men of tender heart
Forgiving others, take your part,
O sing ye, Alleluia.
Praise, praise the Father, praise the Son
And praise the Spirit, Three in One."

(To Be Continued in April Issue)



THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST CONFRONTING A RECALCITRANT WORLD

HENRY SCHULTZE, TH.D.

PART II*

2. Alongside of the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God, the world cherishes the vain ideal of the universal brotherhood of man. Certainly, if God be the father of all men, all men must be brothers. In Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethic it is put suavely as follows, "From his doctrine of the divine fatherhood, Jesus leads to infer the doctrine of human brotherhood." Such a statement deserves but slight attention, since its basic assumption finds no support in the gospel. Jesus never taught the general fatherhood of God and could therefore not have urged on that basis the universal brotherhood of man.

There is, however, a second argument that seems to many to be irresistible. To mention it is apparently sufficient to settle the matter. And that is the persistent demand of Christ that men must love their neighbors regardless of who they may be. This argument seems further sustained by the fact that Jesus commands men to pray for, to bless, to help, to forgive, etc. their fellowmen. Even the golden rule is cited as a precept implying that all men are brothers. And it does seem to be a great ideal. It seems so broadminded and broadhearted. We have grown exceedingly fond of that adjective broad. If anything is broad it must be good. We don't like to draw sharp lines of demarcation. It doesn't seem Christian to classify men as sheep and goats. It seems more charitable to make sheep out of them all.

But when Jesus instructs his disciple to love all men he is very far from urging that they all be regarded as brothers with whom brotherly fellowship should be exercised. In fact, he says no more than that they should be godlike in their reaction to men. They must by their reaction to men promote spiritual values in themselves, in the objects of their love, or in both. That is quite a different thing than being brotherly. Indeed, God assumes that attitude toward men and it cannot be possibly stated that he therefore belongs to an alleged brotherhood of men.

The prescriptions to love, pray, bless and forgive your fellowmen are but an analysis of the statement that men must first seek the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness. And in order to do that we are invited in the New Testament once and again "to come out from among them and be ye separate."

The golden rule can lend the universal brotherhood theorists no support. It is a rule that is practicable only within the Christian brotherhood. This rule has often been presented as being ridiculous by demonstrating how it may work among the ungodly. A man who desires to be treated with strong drink would be required on the basis of this rule to dispense liquor to others freely. This rule may be paraphrased as follows, "I must seek to promote the Kingdom of Heaven in others, for that is what I wish others to promote in me." It is a rule specifically meant for those who have been enlightened so that they are able to make proper evaluations.

It is not difficult to find in the Gospel of Christ abundant reason to believe that mankind is not one but two.

* For Part I see the previous issue of *The Evangelical Student*.

In the very section in which Jesus instructs his disciples to love, pray, bless, and forgive men, he makes a careful distinction between the **brothers and others**. "And if ye salute your brethren what do ye more than others"? The distinction here clearly stated is unjustifiable, if the idea of the universal brotherhood of men be tenable. Again, when a man persistently refuses to repent of his sin, the Christ definitely instructs that the brotherly relationship with him be broken and that the fellowship be no longer maintained. Then, too, when the relatives of Jesus appeared to see him and he was informed about the presence of his brothers, sisters and mother, he insisted that only those who do the will of the father in heaven can lay any claim to such family relationship to him. The doing of God's will and the not-doing of God's will indicate two distinct types of people. Finally, Christ prays very definitely for a distinct group and not for the world. He has divided the world into two groups. There is no universal brotherhood there.

Paul also speaks of brothers or brethren and recognizes them as distinct from the world and united in Christ. They constitute one body. And they are urged to come out from among the others, and "be ye separate."

There is only one place in all the New Testament where the word "brotherhood" occurs (I Peter 2:17), and there it is sharply distinguished from all men. "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King."

I need to go no further to show that Jesus and his followers knew of a brotherhood all right, but it was not the brotherhood of all men. There is a sharp line dividing men from men. This good news is not agreeable or pleasurable to the goats. But it is good nevertheless because God so ordered it and because it promotes the Kingdom.

3. The leadership of Jesus is the third position that contrasts with that of Christ's Gospel. It is a beautiful idea and has an element of truth in it. We must think as he thought, and live as he lived. The great value of Jesus is to show us the way to a more abundant life. And the world builds an apparently strong case for that position.

Peter (I Peter 2:21) urges his readers who are in fiery trial to suffer as it becometh Christians, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving an example that ye should follow his steps. Now it is always precarious to generalize a scriptural statement. The point is simply this that Peter is urging men to suffer acceptably to God as Jesus did. But the point must not be further pressed, as if that is the sum total of the significance of the suffering of Jesus. Peter seems to have anticipated such an interpretation and adds significantly that Jesus did no sin and that He himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree. It is not fair to call Peter to the witness-stand to testify to the exemplary aspect of Christ's suffering and then to demand him to keep silent before he has finished his story.

Paul also appeals to the example of Jesus, notably in the Kenosis passage where he urges the Philippians to let this mind be in you which is also in Christ Jesus. But here too the exhortation must not be pressed beyond the lesson that the brethren must be self-effacing in their mutual relationships even as Jesus was self-effacing. The specific example of self-effacement which Paul adduces is simply impossible for man. No one save Jesus was ever in the form of God and made himself of no reputation.

Christ repeatedly suggests that men must do as he does. "Follow me" is a familiar injunction. But the real significance of Jesus is hid back of such a declaration when one fails to recognize the authoritative note in it. Jesus de-

mands decision. One can't walk away from him without making it. When Jesus came to his people he presented himself in such a way that men cried out "My Lord and My God," or "Away with Him, Crucify Him." And if such positive reactions are not registered today it is because he is not presented as he presented himself. He declares that we must believe in him or eternal damnation is our lot. The value of Jesus as an example lies in the fact that he is the Son of God who lived a life of perfect obedience to God's will. The will of God controlled him, and so must it control man. This comes from Christ with an inescapable compulsion. He is leader not by virtue of his excellent teaching nor by virtue of his incomparable life, but by virtue of the divine authority which is his. There is a demand that requires submission, subjugation, and enslavement. This occasions recalcitrancy.

4. The fourth point over against which the world stands recalcitrant is that which is diametrically opposed to its conception of salvation by character. It is said that the Sermon on the Mount is but a road map unto salvation and that the sum total of all these precepts in the sermon can be summarized in the word "Love." "You yourself must build the ladder by which you rise from this lowly earth to the vaulted skies." You yourself are "the captain of your soul."

The recalcitrant world adds that Jesus not only teaches us how we are to save ourselves, but he even goes through the process of salvation himself by losing himself in service. The cross is at best an example of how to live, or to die if need be.

The position is exceedingly complimentary to man. But the Gospel of Christ is not complimentary. It tells us quite plainly that salvation by character development is ridiculous. Man is a desperately vile sinner. He is both incapable and unwilling to do anything to secure salvation. In fact there is no picture of man more humiliating than the gospel picture. It is utterly disheartening. It teaches the futility of man trying to save himself. It informs us that salvation is God's work. If it is to be done at all he must do it.

However, when we turn to the cross to which our attention has been directed, we find that it had no direct effect upon man of any great saving value. Men passed by and mocked, maltreated him and said "He's a righteous man." Indeed the cross of Christ was vain if it must be measured by its immediate effects upon men. The effect of the cross ascended heavenward first of all. God was affected by it. His justice received full satisfaction. And He came back with the blessings of salvation as a free gift to man. In short, salvation is God-planned, God-wrought, God-given, and God-applied. Even the part that man plays in this drama of salvation in his appropriation of the blessings and in his journeying on the high way of sanctification is effectively taken from by the Pauline addition, that it is "God that works within you both the willing and the doing."

That is the Gospel of Christ. It is good news, but the world remains recalcitrant before it, because God's ways are not man's ways, and because God's way of salvation for man is not man's way for himself.

WHAT FACTORS LIE BACK OF THIS RECALCITRANCY?

1. There is first of all the intellectual factor. It is a persistent desire on the part of men to harmonize, to seek agreement between what is taught in the Bible and what is taught elsewhere, what is found in the Gospel of Christ and in the minds of men. And such harmonization has always been made at the expense of the former. There are some modernists, or near-modernists, who are beginning

to realize that this tendency has robbed the church of its power. The authors of the Church against World realize that the Church has been impotent because it hasn't had the courage to be itself. It has always catered to the dominant power. If the dominate civilization be capitalistic, the church becomes capitalistic. If it be red, the church turns red. If it be militaristic, the church served at the altar of Mars. If the dove of peace hover over the land, the Church is pacifistic. It doesn't lead, but is led. It hasn't leavened but has been leavened. The Church to itself must be true or it is nothing.

Fosdick has made a similar observation in his critique of modernism. He said in his *Beyond Modernism* somewhat as follows; When long ago new music came, the church far from clinging to the old sackbuts and psalteries, welcomed Beethoven, Bach and others. When the new art came, the Church welcomed Raphael and Michelangelo to the enrichment of its faith. When the new architecture came, far from clinging to its forms of building, it greeted the Gothic with its expanded spaces and aspiring altitudes. And so when the new science came, it took that too. And he might have added, however, painful it may have been, it adjusted itself to that also and lost itself in so doing.

This tendency on the part of men to seek mental adjustments is quite natural to man. Men have been doing it throughout the ages. Philo was a master at it. He made Moses agree perfectly with Plato. But he saved Plato at the expense of Moses. Baur forced the New Testament to agree with his Hegelian reconstruction of the early Christian era. But he lost the Gospel in so doing. The Gospel of Jesus boldly declares to the world: "Take me as I am, or loose me." The recalcitrant world refuses to take it: It means the inevitable surrender of some of its most cherished ideals.

2. A second cause for the recalcitrant reaction may be called psychological in character. The Gospel is good news, but not always pleasant and welcome news. It is hard, rigid and inflexible. It comes to man and tells him that he is not good. And if it be asked in what respects he is not good, the answer comes back that he is good in no respect whatever. He has been thinking erroneously. For the thoughts and imaginations of a man's heart are evil altogether. Consequently he has not been speaking rightly. The mouth of every one is an open sepulchre. And he has not been doing rightly, for he is evil in all his ways.

It is readily understood (is it not?) that psychologically such an approach to man fills him with resentment. In a world where man is the one from, through, and unto whom all things are, it is difficult to tolerate any such devaluation. It seems impossible for a man who has been striving to go forward and upward to swing into reverse. It seems a nullification of all that he has been and has stood for. And yet, however difficult it may seem, the Gospel comes with an authoritative demand to make tremendous adjustments of thought and life. To acknowledge a comparative small mistake is painful enough. But to acknowledge that one is altogether wrong is a much more serious matter. It is easier to adjust the Gospel to our way of living and thinking. So men stand recalcitrant before the gospel of Christ and declare, "You can't mean that, you must mean this."

3. The third factor back of this recalcitrancy is spiritual in character. This is fundamental. It is sin. There is a peculiar perversity about man that resents any authoritative statement from God. It is a tragic thing that brought tears to eyes of Jesus as he sat upon the brow of a hill overlooking Jerusalem. The anguish of his soul was expressed with a "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often wouldn't I have gathered thee together like as a hen gathereth her chick under

her wings but ye would not." The Jews in the Old Testament maltreated and stoned the prophets that came to them with good tidings from God; they would have none of it.

In the fourth Gospel it is succinctly put. "And this is the condemnation that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Paul, that man of rich spiritual experience, realized fully that there was such sinful reaction in his own life. "But sin," says he, "taking occasion by the commandment wrought in me all manner of concupiscence—when the commandment came sin revived." In other words, when God says yes, the sinful hearts replies NO. This is at the bottom of whatever bit of recalcitrancy one may find in the man confronted by the Gospel of Christ.

A SPIRITUAL AWAKENING IN A SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM H. WRIGHTON, PH.D.

Last winter, while attending a Bible conference at Columbia Bible College, I felt led to ask the students present to pray that there might be a band of Christian students raised up in the University of Georgia, as my helpers in the joyous task of soul winning.

We suggested that there was need of a "Georgia Seven" as, years ago, there was a "Cambridge Seven." Even as we prayed that early morning we believed our prayers were heard in heaven.

Soon after the college year started in September the Lord literally answered my request by giving me seven earnest Christians to meet in my classroom every Monday morning for a period of Bible study, heart-searching, and intercession for those we were seeking to win to Christ.

One of the most spiritual members of the group was made executive secretary, and beyond that there was no attempt to create an organization. The members became affiliated with the League of Evangelical Students.

God has graciously used this praying band to reach unsaved students, and even faculty members. Now to our prayers we are having to add our praise for the signs of His blessing upon our testimony.

At one of our meetings we all prayed that God would send His servant Mr. J. Edwin Orr to visit us, and on the following Saturday he came and spoke to a meeting of about twenty students. The Lord was with His servant, and there were evident signs of this in the way the Christians were convicted of sin, and led by the Spirit into confession, and prayer for cleansing and revival.

The blessing of this service was followed with an overwhelming sense of the Lord's presence in the regular meeting of the group on the following Monday. The tides of power were flowing in, and all came under the conviction of the Holy Spirit. One new student present called on Christ for salvation. Others searched their hearts to see what it was that was holding back the blessing God was waiting to bestow. One called "Take away our sins, Lord, take away our sins." There were confessions of unbelief, prayerlessness, lovelessness, failure, hypocrisy, and other sins. And with it all there was a melting sense of grace and forgiveness.

We do not know how it will come, but we believe we are on the verge of a mighty spiritual awakening in this university, and we give thanks to God for answering our prayers and sending Mr. Orr to us at the very time we needed his message.

THE SOURCE OF SALVATION—A DEVOTIONAL MEDITATION

JOHN MURRAY, M.A., TH.M.

“Knowing brethren, beloved of God, your election.” (I Thess. 1:4)

Salvation is of the Lord. The fact of salvation flows from the purpose of salvation. What God accomplishes in fact He has eternally ordained to accomplish. The whole body of the saved who will at the last day be presented faultless before the presence of the Father will be co-extensive with the body of those, who, according to the eternal purpose, were elected to that end. All in whom salvation is realised are in the last analysis saved because God chose them in Christ unto salvation.

No man knows the whole company of the elect. Only God has knowledge comprehensive enough to know them that are His. His knowing of them as His does not begin with the actual accomplishment of salvation. He knows them as His from eternal ages. His knowledge of them as such is not consequent upon His foresight of their penitence, faith and perseverance. Rather is it the case that His knowledge of them as penitent and believing is consequent upon His knowledge of them as elect. They are elected not because of faith, nor because of foresight of faith, but they are elect unto faith, repentance, and perseverance unto the end. Peter says, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, . . . unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (I Peter 1:2). Paul says, “He chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him, in love having predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto Himself” (Eph. 1:4, 5).

There is, it is true, no temporal sequence in the divine thought. He knows the end from the beginning. Accessions are not constantly being made to the divine knowledge. Such a thought would be inconsistent with His omniscience and the perfection of His knowledge. But though there is no temporal sequence in the divine thought, we must believe that there is a logical order. In the order of causation, though not in the order of time, election is prior to the purpose to give to the elect that repentance and faith and new obedience which realise the end of electing grace. The order of divine thought, then, is from the fountain which is electing love, to the stream which is faith, repentance, love, and new obedience. The divine thought, therefore, one might say works downstream; it proceeds from the root to the fruit.

Though no man knows who the whole body of the elect are, and though no man can know who of unbelievers are elect of God and who are not, yet man can come to know elect persons. Paul affirms that he knows these Thessalonian believers are elect of God. How did he attain to that knowledge?

The answer is that it is just in the reverse order of what we have found to be in a very transcendent and inimitable sense the order of the divine thought.

God's thought in this matter proceeds downstream, human thought works upstream. Divine thought, not in the sequences of time but in that of supratemporal causation, proceeds from the root to the fruits, human thought proceeds from the fruits to the root. In God the order is from election to the fruits in faith and love, in man it is from the fruits of faith and love to election. Human thought proceeds from the stream to the fountain.

Paul was not given an immediate perception or revelation to the effect that these Thessalonians were elect. His knowledge of their election was mediated by his perception of certain fruits, fruits which never proceed from any other root than that of divine election. His knowledge was an inference based upon certain evidence. That evidence consisted in the manifestations of grace that appeared in the Thessalonian Church—the work of faith, the labour of love, and patience of hope in the Lord Jesus Christ. The gospel came not unto them in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance. These manifestations of grace were connected, Paul knew, with an eternal purpose of God. By an unbreakable chain the divine calling realised in time is joined to the two poles of eternal election and eternal glory. "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be confirmed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified" (Romans 8:29, 30).

Just as it is with our knowledge of others as elect, so it must be with knowledge of ourselves as such. The knowledge of ourselves as elect of God must be mediated through the fruits of grace manifested in our hearts and lives. Endless confusion and perplexity arise from our failure to appreciate this truth. Immediate knowledge belongs to God, and for us to aim at it is to arrogate to ourselves divine prerogatives. Our thought and knowledge must work upstream. We can never as unbelievers know our election of God. God does not reveal to an unbeliever that he or she is elect. It cannot be required, therefore, of an unbeliever as an article to be accepted and acted upon that he or she is elect. What is revealed to the unbeliever and the demand that is made upon his faith is the gospel in all its fulness and freeness. The knowledge of our own individual election does not constitute any part of the warrant of faith. It is not as persons antecedently aware of our election by God that we repent and believe the gospel, but as sinners destitute of grace and subject to the wrath and curse of God even as others. The warrant we have for believing in Jesus' name is the invitation, demand, promise and sufficiency of the gospel freely proffered to us. When by the grace of God the gospel is accepted and the obedience of faith is rendered to the call, then we may become assured of our election. We may know it as an inference from the manifestations of grace and the indwelling of the Spirit in our hearts.

When by the grace of God we follow the faith of divine revelation to us and adopt the divinely ordained order of knowledge for us, then we shall come to the conviction and appropriation of the amazing truth, that out of the boundless depths of unspeakable goodness and love before the foundations of the world were laid, God chose us in Christ unto salvation. What otherwise is a perplexing enigma becomes to us a disclosure of amazing love. "I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee." And we shall be constrained to exclaim, "Of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

CURRENT EVANGELICAL BOOKS—REVIEWED**THE PROGRESS OF WORLD-WIDE MISSIONS**

Rev. Robert H. Glover, M.D., F.R.G.S. Doubleday, Doran & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1928. \$2.50.

No more thrilling tale can be told today than that of the conquests of the Cross. How the gospel of the Crucified Christ has been carried to all parts of the globe is a subject of unending interest. For 1900 years the Church of Christ has been engaged in the task of world-wide evangelization. At times the light of missionary zeal has almost been extinguished, but at other times it has blazed forth in power enough to stir the heart of the most apathetic Christian.

It is safe to say that no one who is interested at all in the salvation of the lost can read Dr. Glover's book and not respond in some way to its interest and its thrill. Here is a volume by one who saw service on the mission field in China for eighteen years and who is generally acknowledged today as a leader in missionary statesmanship.

Dr. Glover covers the whole history of missions in 370 pages. He confines himself, therefore, to the most important features and figures of the Christian missionary movement. At the same time, however, his work is not a dry compilation of historical data but a vivid recording of the hopes and disappointments, the joys and sorrows, the victories and defeats, and the courage and perseverance of great men and women of God. One who reads this book cannot help but feel that in the final analysis there is no greater cause in which to enlist, no more glorious banner under which to serve, than that of the gospel of Christ.

Intimate touches in the lives of great heroes of the faith are given by the author. Surely, "there were giants in the earth in those days." After apostolic times and the greatest missionary of all, St. Paul, came early European missionaries, Ulfilas among the Goths, Martin in France, Patrick in Ireland, Columba in Scotland, and the courageous Boniface in Germany. In the middle ages Raymond Lull stands out for his work among the followers of Mohammed.

The Reformation was a time when "new and better foundations were laid for greater work which was to follow" mainly because "there was an insistent call for a return to the teachings of the Bible" (p. 69). The 17th and 18th centuries, on the other hand, were a time when the earliest missionary societies were begun. In this time lived the remarkable Danish missionary, Schwartz, who labored with such telling effect for 48 years in India.

The roll call of modern missionaries includes the names of William Carey, Brainerd, Judson, Morrison, Hudson Taylor, Robert Moffat, Livingstone, and Mackay of Uganda. Interesting anecdotes are given about these and others which make them live over again in the pages of the book. Every Christian student should have this book not only for the information it provides but because of the stimulus it gives to consecrated living.

CARY N. WEISIGER, 3RD, A.B.

A SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D. Philadelphia, Harper and Brothers.

1929. 255 pp.

In short compass we can do little more than recommend this book by one of the finest Old Testament scholars this country has ever known. It was written for popular use and yet it presents the fruits of Dr. Wilson's thorough scholarship and its facts and arguments will stand the severest attack of our modernist colleges or seminaries. Dr. Wilson aims to present verifiable facts and to guide his research by the laws of evidence as if he were pleading his case before a jury. We shall merely outline his defense.

The Old Testament, considering especially the Pentateuch, is allowed first to speak for itself. It says what Christ and Christians always did say: Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Dr. Wilson shows it bears the *prima facie* marks of genuineness—its names, places, and dates have not been disproved, but rather corroborated.

The text is first investigated. Do we have what the authors wrote? Dr. Wilson shows from old manuscripts and early translations that our text has been substantially the same since 300 B. C., the Pentateuch since 400 B. C. A powerful argument is then advanced from the spelling of the names of forty kings now known by archeologists showing that the authors' very letters have been preserved practically unchanged through centuries—a phenomenon without parallel in literature. The grammar and vocabulary of the Old Testament also are not against it. Five grammatical constructions and hundreds of words are considered. Alleged Aramaisms are shown to be no proof of lateness nor are rare words nor other peculiarities of diction. But Dr. Wilson does not merely give his opinion on these points. Evidence and parallels from other ancient documents support his statements. In the historical field too, modern archeology is shown to support the general chronology, city names, and specific historical data of the Old Testament. Very little of this latter material can be presented in so short a book, but the general outline of Old Testament history is wonderfully corroborated.

Such is part of the evidence for the revelation of the God of Israel. It includes the personal testimony of an orthodox scholar who was master of over fifty languages and dialects, who met the critical attack at every point, and contended triumphantly for the Christian faith. His life stands as a monumental example of Christian scholarship. Would that a number of young Christians of ability would be led to follow in his footsteps and devote their lives with similar patience and zeal to this vital field of Old Testament study and defense.

REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS, B.S.



NEWS OF THE LEAGUE

NUMBER OF NEW CHAPTERS NOW TOTALS SEVEN. Since the recent News Bulletin of the League was circulated two new Chapters have applied for membership in the League, bringing the total to seven. The latest additions are Columbia University and Iowa State College. Bucknell University, University of Texas, Memphis State Teachers College, Hibbing Junior College, and Oshkosh State Teachers College are among the other recent additions to the League's membership. Other groups are in process of formation.

LEAGUE'S PROGRAM OF STUDY "CHRISTIAN TRUTH TODAY" PROVING MOST BENEFICIAL. There is probably nothing that the League has done in recent years that has strengthened the League's testimony more than the publication of a program of systematic Bible study for college students. It is believed that the League is really accomplishing something substantial when students gather around a definite program of study. Students are using this program of study with encouraging results. It is hoped that more Chapters will adopt this program of study as a basis for their meetings.

FIELD SECRETARY TOURS COLLEGES OF THE NEW ENGLAND STATES. During the month of October the Field Secretary of the League visited twenty-nine colleges and universities in the New England States and spoke to twelve public gatherings in the interests of the League. The territory as a whole was not as fertile for the League as the regions farther South. However, some strong Christian students were found in numerous institutions. Most of these students stand alone for the Gospel. Let us pray that God may keep them faithful in their testimony and raise up those who with them will raise a united testimony to the Word of God.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES HELD IN EAST AND SOUTHWEST. Two Regional Conferences have been sponsored already during this academic year. There was one held in Philadelphia for the Middle Atlantic region November 20-21. Despite the fact that the Presbyterian Student Pastor at the University of Pennsylvania maneuvered to prevent the Eastern Regional Conference of the League from being held at the "Penn C. A." building, a most successful conference was held at the Second Church of the Covenanters. The Regional Conference for the Southwestern region was held at Dallas Seminary, Dallas, Texas. A splendid group of speakers were scheduled to speak at this conference.

CHAPTERS REPORT ENCOURAGING GROWTH. From many parts of the country come reports of growth. Wilson College, Beaver College, and Wheaton College report the largest increases. Wilson reports an average attendance of about fifty, and Beaver about twenty-two (as over against about three of last year). Wheaton now has a membership of over one hundred and fifty.

THE FIRST CAMPUS LEAGUE PUBLICATIONS. The Albany College Chapter (Oregon) of the League publishes a regular Bulletin for circulation among the students on the local campus. The name of the publication is *The Campus Witness*. The Bulletin gives evangelical messages and announces the League's activities to the campus. A good idea for other Chapters. The League Chapter at Eastern Nazarene College now publishes a splendid monthly called *Crusader*. The *Crusader* brings edifying messages to the students and news of League activities.

ON TO CHARLOTTE!

Announcing the
TWELFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of the
League of Evangelical Students

AT
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
(QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE)

February 18th Through 21st

Tentative Program

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH

- 7:00 P. M.—Registration of Delegates.
8:00 P. M.—Pre-Convention Prayer Meeting—REV. CALVIN K. CUMMINGS.
9:00 P. M.—*Opening Business Session.*

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19TH

- 9:00 A. M.—Devotional Message—SAMUEL FISK, M.A., John Brown University.
9:30 A. M.—Address of Welcome—DR. W. H. FRAZER, President, Queens-Chicora College.
10:00 A. M.—Address—DR. LEWIS S. CHAFER, President, Dallas Theological College.
10:45 A. M.—*Second Business Session.*
2:30 P. M.—Devotional Message—REV. EDGAR G. GAMMON, Charlotte.
3:00 P. M.—Address—CHAUNCEY D. EGGLESTON, LL.D., President, Hampden-Sydney College.

Third Business Session

- 8:00 P. M.—Address—WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, M.A., Th.D., D.D., Columbia Theological Seminary.

Fourth Business Session

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20TH

- 9:30 A. M.—Chapter Reports and Student Problems.
10:30 A. M.—Address—WILLIAM H. WRIGHTON, Ph.D., University of Georgia.
Final Business Session

- 2:30 P. M.—Devotional Message—DR. C. W. SOMMERVILLE, Queens-Chicora College.

- 3:00 P. M.—Missionary Message—REV. JAMES E. COUSAR, Missionary from Japan.

- 6:00 P. M.—Banquet—Toastmaster—MR. HARVEY MACARTHUR, President of the *League.*

Stunts—DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

Message—PROFESSOR R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.

- 8:00 P. M.—Address—J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Westminster Seminary.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21ST

- 3:00 P. M.—Address—DR. ROBERT C. McQUILKIN, President, Columbia Bible College.

- 8:00 P. M.—Address—REV. PROFESSOR R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D., Westminster Seminary.

Send all registrations, requests for lodging, and reservations for banquet to Miss Catherine Marshall, 404 East Boulevard, Charlotte, N. C., at least ten days before the Convention. Lodging will be supplied free. Price of banquet—fifty cents.

CHAPTER DIRECTORY of the LEAGUE of EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

- ALBANY COLLEGE,
Albany, Oregon.
- ALLEGHENY COLLEGE,
Meadville, Pennsylvania.
- ASHLAND COLLEGE,
Ashland, Ohio.
- BEAVER COLLEGE,
Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.
- BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Bloomfield, New Jersey.
- UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,
Vancouver, British Columbia.
- JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
- BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY,
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.
- CALVIN COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE,
Columbia, South Carolina.
- COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, New York.
- CONVERSE COLLEGE,
Spartansburg, South Carolina.
- CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
Newark, Delaware.
- EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMI-
NARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE,
Wollaston, Massachusetts.
- EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
Dallas, Texas.
- GENEVA COLLEGE,
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
Athens, Georgia.
- GORDON COLLEGE OF THEOLOGY AND
MISSIONS,
Boston, Massachusetts.
- HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE,
Hampden-Sydney, Virginia.
- HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HASTINGS COLLEGE,
Hastings, Nebraska.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
Haverford, Pennsylvania.
- HIBBING JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Hibbing, Minnesota.
- IOWA STATE COLLEGE,
Ames, Iowa.
- JOHNS HOPKINS TRAINING SCHOOL,
Baltimore, Maryland.
- KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Pittsburg, Kansas.
- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,
Easton, Pennsylvania.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Kentucky.
- MEMPHIS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Memphis, Tennessee.
- MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE,
East Lansing, Michigan.
- UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Illinois.
- NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTE,
New York, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebraska.
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Oklahoma.
- UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- OBERLIN COLLEGE,
Oberlin, Ohio.
- OSHKOSH STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Oshkosh, Wisconsin.
- PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
AND SCIENCE,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, New Jersey.
- PUGET SOUND COLLEGE,
Tacoma, Washington.
- QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE,
Charlotte, North Carolina.
- REFORMED EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- SHIPPENSBURG STATE TEACHERS
COLLEGE,
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.
- SIoux FALLS COLLEGE,
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, Texas.
- UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, Tennessee.
- VASSAR COLLEGE,
Poughkeepsie, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Washington.
- WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Holland, Michigan.
- WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- WHEATON COLLEGE,
Wheaton, Illinois.
- WILSON COLLEGE,
Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.
- WOOSTER COLLEGE,
Wooster, Ohio.