

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING  
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-JULY, 1931

Vol. 2

No. 3

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at  
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

## Christianity as a Power

“THE Kingdom of GOD is not in word but in power.” The statement just cited is from the pen of the apostle Paul (I Cor. 4:20). Paul draws a contrast between knowledge and power and reminded the Corinthians (and through them us) that for the establishing of Christianity in the world something more was needed than an addition to the world’s fund of knowledge, to wit—an addition to the world’s fund of power.

That Christianity adds to the world’s fund of power as well as to the world’s fund of knowledge finds its ultimate explanation in the person of CHRIST. If CHRIST were but a teacher and example, it would be proper to say that Christianity had come in word only; but inasmuch as He came primarily as a Saviour both from the guilt and the power of sin, it is absolutely necessary, in order to bring out anything like the whole truth, to say that it came also in power. Moreover here, as always, the earthly life of JESUS should be interpreted in the light of His resurrection and ascension. In JESUS CHRIST we have to do not merely with one who *was* but with one who lives today exerting a direct and moulding influence over the thoughts and lives of men similar to but vastly more extensive than He exerted in the days of His flesh. For only as we realize that CHRIST is today a living reality—who has lost none of His power with the lapse of the centuries—can we appreciate aright why the Scriptures speak of Christianity as the power of GOD unto salvation. In a word, Christianity is what it is because of what JESUS CHRIST himself is.

The consideration just alluded to is one of great practical importance. In fact our confidence not only that Christianity will never become extinct but that its truth and supremacy will yet be universally recognized, and our labor in the LORD not in vain, is closely bound up with our conviction that it does more than tell us what we should believe concerning GOD and what duty GOD requires of us. Our confidence as Christians is rooted in the fact that the religion we profess contains within itself a power, an energy, a dynamic that is destined to turn and overturn until “the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD and of His CHRIST.” Let us never forget, or allow others to forget, that Christianity makes available more than a knowledge of divine things plus the forgiveness of sins; it manifests a power through contact with which men are enabled to be and do

what otherwise would be impossible for them. Indeed, if we would direct attention to that which is most distinctive of Christianity—apart from the fact that it offers salvation from sin in and through the atoning death of its divine founder—we will do well to point to the great and abiding contribution it made to the world’s fund of power, to the fact that it brought into the complex of human history a new energy fully sufficient to meet the world’s needs and that will continue to meet the world’s needs until the end of time.

If Christianity, along with the assurance that there is forgiveness for past sins, merely substituted a correct for an incorrect conception of GOD and a perfect for an imperfect ideal of character and conduct, we would have no good reason to suppose that this better knowledge would ever get translated into character and conduct. The trouble with men generally is not so much their ignorance of what they ought to be and do as their failure to live up to the knowledge they possess. There is probably no man in whom practice does not lag behind knowledge. If men merely needed to know the truth in order to be led to put it into practice, the situation would be far different from what it actually is. But the facts being what they are, Christianity would never have been able to get any real footing in this world, nor would it be able to maintain the footing it now has, were it not for what we call its dynamic qualities. These dynamic qualities, as we have intimated, center in and radiate from the CHRIST who abides the same, yesterday, today and forever. The real CHRIST, in distinction from the

### IN THIS ISSUE:

The Montreat Assembly.....	4
J. Blair Morton	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	5
J. Gresham Machen	
The Philosophy of Paul's Calling.....	7
Stewart P. MacLennan	
Dr. Warfield's Great Books.....	10
Questions and Answers.....	11
Letters to the Editor.....	12
Current Views and Voices.....	15
Ministerial Changes.....	17
News of the Church.....	18

mythical CHRIST of Modernism, is infinitely more than a teacher and example. The very nerve of the Christian religion, that apart from which it could never have gotten itself established in the world, let alone have become a world-historical influence, lies in the fact that not only for a few brief years in the long ago but through all the changing centuries that have followed it has been able to direct men to that all-powerful CHRIST of whom we learn in the Gospels. Certainly this element of power was not over-looked by the early exponents of Christianity. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation," wrote Paul. "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," wrote John. "The multitude glorified God who had given such power unto men," wrote Matthew. "The kingdom of God comes with power," wrote Mark. "His word was with power," wrote Luke. "We made known unto you the power of our LORD JESUS CHRIST," wrote Peter. "He upholds all things by the word of His power," wrote the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Such citations could be multiplied. Individually and as a whole they witness to the fact that the object of our faith as Christians is the living CHRIST clothed with the power of God.

In stressing this dynamic element, we are stressing something distinctive of Christianity. There are really but two kinds of religion—Christianity and all other kinds. All religions except Christianity, into whatever varieties they may divide, assume that men must save themselves if they are to be saved at all; Christianity, into whatever varieties it may divide, assumes that if men are to be saved at all they must be saved by a power outside of themselves, that in the strict sense of the words there is no such thing as a commendable self-made man. Other religions may inculcate excellent moral and spiritual lessons, may afford much wise counsel and good advice, but they know of no dynamic, no source of energy, except that which inheres in man as man. But Christianity, though it surpasses all other religions in the matter of spiritual insight and good advice, yet finds its distinctive note in the fact that it proclaims a divine redemption in and through the work of another, and so does infinitely more than first instruct and then arouse into activity those powers

which inhere in man as man. What is frequently overlooked in this connection is that Christianity is unique in this respect. As a great theologian has put it: "There are fundamentally only two doctrines of salvation: that salvation is from God, and that salvation is from ourselves. The former is the doctrine of common Christianity; the latter is the doctrine of universal heathenism."

We may properly speak of Christianity as static in the sense that it has a definite content of its own, given it once and for all by CHRIST and His apostles; but we can speak of it as quiescent and inactive only by shutting our eyes to the plainest facts of history. As a matter of fact Christianity has shown itself to be a manifestation of power as well as an exhibition of truth. How can this be reasonably questioned in view of the marvelous energy with which it has wrought in the life of our western world? Consult the historians and they tell us that it was not from Greece or Rome that the regeneration of human life came forth but from the cradle of Bethlehem and the cross of Calvary; and that the superiority of our western civilization finds its explanation in the potencies that were wrapped up in the gospel of the risen CHRIST that the apostles proclaimed. We are aware that many speak today of the Christian church as moribund and of its faith as outgrown, as dying and decadent; but we are far from supposing that they speak from adequate knowledge. With them the wish is father to the thought. It is not that the facts warrant such a conclusion; it is merely that they would have it so. It is true that the fortunes of Christianity are not today at flood tide; but it is well to remember that there have been even darker periods in the history of Christianity than that which exists today. It is not much over two hundred years ago since Bishop Butler wrote in his famous book *The Analogy of Religion*: "It has come I know not how to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this was an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule as it were by

way of reprisal for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." Most of the so-called leading thinkers of that day thought that Christianity had exhausted its power, that it was a spent force, that its day was over. And yet it was but a short time after that when the great Wesleyan revival broke out and it was demonstrated afresh that the old Gospel was still a living and conquering power. It has ever been thus in the history of the Christian church. The darkness has ever preceded the dawn of a brighter and more glorious day. We may be sure that what has been true of the past will also be true of the future. And that because it is no mere human power but a divine power that energizes in Christianity. Ours is the gospel of the risen and exalted CHRIST, of the glorified Son of God. All power has been committed unto Him: His strength is therefore inexhaustible. Because He lives and is actively interested in the religion He founded, we may be sure that the gates of hell will not prevail against it, that, no matter what the opposition, it will go on conquering and to conquer. "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the LORD, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the LORD."

For the comfort and encouragement of those who share the viewpoint of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, it may not be out of place to point out that it is the Christianity of the New Testament, not that Christianity as it has been reconstructed by modern religious liberalism, that has exhibited these dynamic qualities. We may have no historical warrant for saying that liberal Christianity (so-called) lacks dynamic qualities; but we can say that, up-to-date at least, it has given no evidence of possessing dynamic qualities at all comparable to historic Christianity. The Christianity of the New Testament, however, taken at its face value—what is known as conservative Christianity—has shown abundant evidence of its power. No movement in history has been so influential. It has turned and over-turned, not only altering but ennobling the course of human history. It has yet many a battle to fight, but as it looks upon that boastful youth known as liberal Christianity, it may well address him in the words that the King of Israel

addressed to Benhadad: "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off."

## Doctrines as Related to Life

THE immediate occasion of this brief editorial is the recent merger of the Congregational and Christian churches on the basis of their common acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life—of which more may be learned in our news columns.

In our judgment this merger is based on a fundamental misapprehension of the place that doctrines occupy in the Christian religion. Unless we are greatly mistaken—in which case CHRIST and His apostles were mistaken—Christianity as a way of life is neither reasonable nor practicable except on the assumption of the truth of the doctrines of Christianity. Christianity is indeed a way of life; and yet the fact that one accepts Christianity as a way of life does not of itself indicate that he is a Christian. There is, in fact, no historical warrant for calling any one a Christian who does not worship CHRIST as GOD and who does not receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation from sin conceived as guilt and power and corruption, as was pointed out in some detail in our October (1930) issue. To suppose that the acceptance of Christianity as a way of life constitutes one a Christian harmonizes with the notion that men save themselves by following CHRIST's example. The distinctive thing about CHRIST in this connection, however, is not that He points out the way to salvation; He is the Way itself.

Our interest in Christian doctrines has a two-fold basis. In the first instance it rests on experience. As we interrogate our own souls we find that Christian experience, as we know it, is rooted in Christian doctrines. It was not until we believed in the reality of certain historic facts together with the explanation of those facts given in the Bible (i. e. certain doctrines) that we obtained a sense of sin forgiven, of divine sonship, of access to a living power by and through whom the power of sin in us was broken and we enabled to walk in newness of life, of a well-grounded hope of a blessed immortality—not to mention other marks of the

### WHY NOT EXTEND

the ministry of this paper by recommending it to your friends, or subscribing for them? The Editors are doing their utmost to give you a paper that will be second to none. Every subscription sent by our loyal friends counts mightily. We need your help to help the Church.

Christian life. If we read our souls aright, objective Christianity (i. e. the facts and doctrines of Christianity) is an indispensable antecedent to subjective Christianity (i. e. Christianity as it is lived and experienced by those like ourselves). To expect the Christian life to flourish apart from these facts and doctrines seems to us like expecting water to flow through pipes that have no connection with the central reservoir.

In the second instance, it rests on the knowledge that the founders of Christianity—CHRIST and His apostles—had this conception of the relation between doctrine and life. With them it was always first the doctrine and then the life. Recall the emphasis JESUS Himself threw on the Father's Word which had been given Him that He might give it to His followers. It was His desire that they might know the truth so that they might have eternal life and prayed that they might be sanctified by the truth, which truth He identified with God's Word. And then recall the conception of the relation between doctrines and life that dominates the epistles of PAUL. The Epistle to the Romans is in this respect typical of all his writings. First, there are eleven chapters of doctrinal exposition; then, there are five chapters that deal with Christianity as a way of life; but between these two sections there is what has been called his "tremendous therefore." "I beseech you *therefore*"—that is to say because of the great doctrines taught in the first eleven chapters of the epistle—live the life commended in the last five chapters. Only as we share PAUL's conception of the relation between doctrine and life can we appreciate the importance he attached to sound doctrine. He gloried in the fact that he was not as many who corrupted the Word of GOD, that word of divine grace which alone was able to build them up and give

them an inheritance among those who are truly sanctified. PAUL did not deem it sufficient that CHRIST was preached unless He was preached specifically as the crucified, i. e. unless the preaching of CHRIST was accompanied by sound teaching as to the significance of His death. "We may believe as we will; but it is very evident that the founders of Christianity earnestly believed, not that the so-called Word of God is the product of faith and its only use to witness to the faith that lies behind it and gives it birth, but that the veritable Word of God is the seed of faith, that faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God; or, in other words, that behind the Christian life stands the doctrine of CHRIST intelligently believed."

Our zeal for Christian doctrines is, therefore, not in the interest of a sterile intellectualism but in the interest of the Christian life itself. We are zealous for Christian doctrines because we desire, both for ourselves and others, a better exhibition of the life that is truly Christian. The doctrines of themselves are neither life nor a substitute for life. Who claims that they are? It does not follow, however, that they are not an essential condition of the life that is life indeed. Doctrines of themselves have no power to create life. Certainly not. The Holy Spirit alone has power to quicken dead souls into newness of life. It does not follow, however, that the Holy Spirit ordinarily exercises His life-giving power except in connection with the Word or that the Christian life may bud and blossom apart from Christian conceptions. In short, while Christianity is a life it is a life based on a message—a message that derives its content from CHRIST and His apostles—and only as that message is known and believed will the Christian life either exist or thrive.

The hope has been expressed that this merger marks the beginning of a new movement in church life. It is even prophesied that we will soon have a "United Church of Christ in America" based on the mere acceptance of Christianity as a way of life. We sincerely trust that such is not the case as it does not seem to us that confessionally speaking such a church could justify its right to be called a Christian Church in the New Testament meaning of the words.

# The Montreat Assembly

## A Condensed Sketch of Salient Actions

By The Rev. J. Blair Morton, D.D.

[We are glad to publish this interpretative description of the last Southern General Assembly by a distinguished Minister of that Church. A further account of its proceedings will be found in our news pages.]

**T**HIS Assembly was: packed with the keenest interest, chock full of hardest kind of work, filled with momentous actions, permeated with fervent Christianity. It was in session at Montreat, N. C. from May 28th to June 3rd, 1931. Becoming more and more enamoured with its Montreat property, which under the supervision of the Rev. R. C. Anderson, D.D., is offering from year to year greater and greater advantages along the lines of recreation and spiritual edification, the Assembly chose Montreat as its next place of meeting. Some think with a little longer courtship, that Montreat with its wonderful Assembly Inn and spacious Auditorium and other remarkable attractions, will become the permanent home of the Assembly.

**THE MODERATOR:** Hon. R. A. Dunn, LL.D., Ruling Elder of the First Church, Charlotte, N. C., was chosen from a field of six to be the Moderator. Scotch and Presbyterian to the core he handled the Assembly's business, in a remarkably canny way.

**AS A WHOLE:** It was surnamed "Layman's Assembly." It was characterized by "The Call for the Question." It was almost immortalized by, "I Call for Division." Its moments might easily be designated as tense, tenser, tensest. Determined by the point of view, its actions were termed sane or radical, and even Bolshevistic, but scarcely ever commonplace.

**TO PRESBYTERIES:** It sent down to the Presbyteries for consideration a plan for using more Ministers and supplying all Churches, after a Majority and a Minority report of an Ad Interim Committee, had been considered by a Special Committee. A Rotary Plan of Eldership, oiled by several options and smoothed by some qualifications was also sent down.

**JUDICIAL CASE:** The famous Arkansas-Smith appeal greatly disappointed the newspapers by failing to develop any fire-

works, it being remanded to the Synod of Arkansas for retrial on the technicality that the said Synod had used a Committee of trial rather than a Commission. Yet it kept a large Judicial Committee and Judicial Commission of the Assembly busy for a number of days and nights.

**OUTSTANDING ACTIONS:** It is impossible, at least for this writer, to place a finger on the most remarkable action of this Assembly. The smartest competition for said position lies between the report of the Standing Committee on Work, the Severing of Relations between this Assembly and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the Report of the Special Committee on Union.

If the Minority of the Assembly's ears had not been prepared by rumors of what was to come, rumors running as indistinct heralds all over the Southland before and up to the Montreat Meeting and pervading its atmosphere; what might have been the feelings of the unconsulted, as the Chairman of the said Standing Committee read his report on the Assembly's Work Committee, widely known as the Committee of Forty-Four, is almost beyond imagination. Even to the prepared the report came as a terrific shock and did not provide shock-absorbers. Whatever may be the result, and this article is no prophecy, the discontinuing of this Committee, which was years in coming to birth, and was still in its infancy compared with age of conflicting misunderstandings it was elected to iron out, was a radical and hasty action. The new Committee, or Committees, seemingly sprang ready-made from someone's head, or some group's head. It seems to be a group of Committees loosely hinged together with a Committee called the Committee on Stewardship and Finance. This Committee on Stewardship and Finance has eleven members, two from each of the four executive Committees and one from each of the

Promotional Committees of the Assembly. The members are elected for terms of three years, and the Committee dignified each year with a Chairman, in the person of the Retiring Moderator of the Assembly.

Following the discontinuance of the said Committee of Forty-Four there were crisp, clear recommendations, but just such recommendations as might have been used by the old Committee. The effect as a whole seems to leave the Assembly's Executive Committees in the position of more or less free-lances. The reason given for the change was failure on the part of the Committee of Forty-Four to do the impossible, the dissatisfaction on the part of the whole Church, and the falling off in contributions. But in the mind of some, at least, it seems that if the Executive Committees would not function efficiently enough to reduce their debts under the directions of that notably able committee of forty-four, rigidly organized, what assurance has the Church that a loosely organized Committee of Thirty-Five will do any better? Suffice it to say that a new piece of machinery, of short conception, has come to birth and been adopted by the Assembly. Upon this machinery depends, for the coming year at least, the hastening of the coming of the Kingdom of God in many parts of the world.

In regard to the second of the above items, eleven overtures, in precise and piercing language, asked to have the Southern Presbyterian Church relieved of the responsibility of being connected with the said Federal Council. Birth Control, yes, that was the cap which set off the bomb; but the bomb contained several kinds of T. N. T. How closely Birth Control was related to the said Council, and what was the Council's responsibility in the matter, seemed a question hard to answer. Able speakers said that the said Council was irresponsible in

the matter of this publication. Anyway and anyhow relations between the Southern Presbyterian Church and the said Council have been severed. But do not forget that the arduous task of renewing the said relations by the Assemblies of the past, were always near explosions. In the face of 175 to 79 votes against such relations, some prophesied that the severed relations in a year or two would be patched. However that may be, there was an audible sigh of relief, if not even applause, when the vote on this much and heatedly debated question was counted.

And lastly in regard to Union with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches: This pressing question has been to forefront for years. There have been Ad Interim Committees and Ad Interim Committees. There have been Overtures pro and con, but mostly con, to Assembly after Assembly. There has been proposed Organic Union with the United Presbyterian Church. Committees have met and endeavored in the best sense of the word to bring about Union, but without avail. There have been exchanges of Fraternal Delegates with them, but they decided on no union for a while at least.

It has been almost the same with the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, and their delegate told this Assembly that they loved us, but as to Union, not now, may be in the coming years. And with the U. S. A. Presbyterian Church, it has been the same story over a longer period, with a gradual forgetting of the past. With the above historical setting, the Ad Interim Committee of the last Assembly brought in an interesting but impractical report. There were ten overtures. Nine of the ten asked that negotiations in regard to Organic Union cease. One asked for a continuance. The Assembly placed the report and the overtures in the hands of a Special Committee, composed of one Minister and one Ruling Elder from each of the seventeen Synods. After hours of consideration, in the most Christian spirit, with many prayers, 26 out of 34 agreed to the Majority Report, which provided for the ending of negotiations for Organic Union, the appointing of an Ad Interim Committee to draft a complete and definite plan of Federal Union with all Presbyterian and Reformed bodies, either jointly with all, or with any that were willing. The Committee to place emphasis on the

historic interpretation of our faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of Mankind, rather than the mechanics of Church Government and operation; that in the meantime our Church concern itself mightily in prayerful, Christian stewardship of its possessions, time, talents and opportunities. In the opinion of your writer this was a polite way of stopping agitation of the Organic Union because the Assembly knew that it was impossible now. Insofar as the U. S. A. Church was concerned, both in Committee and on the floor of the Assembly, it was argued that that Church itself did not have Organic Union, that it existed under Administrative Union. So with the United Presbyterian Church not wanting us alone, and the Associate Reformed not wanting us with others, and the U. S. A. wanting us and everybody else, we compromised on the Majority Report, which was adopted 148 to 97.

Thus ended an interesting, strenuous, almost radical but at the same time a kindly Christian meeting of the Seventy-First Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

## Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

### VII. HOW PAUL RECEIVED THE GOSPEL

*"For I make known to you, brethren, the gospel that was preached by me, that it is not according to man. For no more did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but I received it through revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my manner of life formerly in Judaism, how that excessively I persecuted the Church of God and laid it waste and advanced in Judaism beyond many contemporaries in my race, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers. But when He who set me apart from my mother's womb and called me through His grace was pleased to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, nor did I*

*go up into Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia and again I returned into Damascus" (Gal. 1:11-17, in a literal translation).*

#### Paul and Paul's Gospel

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY we discussed the first verse of this passage in connection with what precedes. "You are turning away from the gospel," Paul says (if we may summarize and paraphrase his words), "to another teaching. That other teaching purports to be a gospel, but it is really only a perversion of the one true gospel. These Judaizers have laid violent hands on a gospel that belongs only to Christ. Even

we who preached that gospel to you have no right to do that, and even the angels in heaven may not do it. If anyone is doing it, let him be anathema! I said that when I was with you, and I am saying exactly the same thing now. Surely that does not look like the vacillation and inconsistency with which I have been charged; surely it does not look as though I were seeking to please men. Nay, if I were still pleasing men, I should be no true servant of Christ at all; for the gospel with which I have been entrusted by Christ conforms to no human norm, and a man who has been entrusted with such a gospel must put all thought of human favor aside."

In verse 12, Paul passes from the gospel itself to his own connection with the

gospel. "I make known to you, brethren, *the gospel* which was preached by me, that it is not according to man (verse 11); for no more did I receive it from man" (verse 12). The pronoun "I" in this last clause is emphatic; for if it were not emphatic, it would not be expressed separately in Greek at all, but would be regarded as expressed sufficiently by the ending of the verb form.

Emphasis is nearly always a matter of contrast, either expressed or implied. If I say, "I did not do it" (with the emphasis on the "I"), that implies that someone else did do it or may have done it. The contrast is here between *me* and someone else. If, on the other hand, I say, "I did not *do* it" (with the emphasis on the "do"), that implies that whereas I did not *do* it I may have *thought* it or *said* it. The contrast is here between *doing* and some other action of mine.

What, then, in our passage, is the contrast that is implied by the emphasis on the "I"? The commentators have held various views about this question. Does Paul mean: "I did not receive the gospel from men, though the Judaizers did so receive it;" or does he mean: "I did not receive it from men, though the ordinary Christian who is not an apostle does so receive it;" or does he mean: "I did not receive it from men any more than the original apostles did?" These various views—with the exception of the first—yield a good enough sense. But in point of fact we think that the emphasis on the "I" is to be explained in a very much simpler way. It is due, we think, to the simple contrast between the gospel that Paul preached and Paul himself in his connection with that gospel. "The gospel that I have preached," says Paul, "is not according to man; for, what is more, I, the preacher of that gospel, did not receive it from man. It might have been a divine gospel and yet have been handed over to me by a purely human agent. But as a matter of fact that was not the case. Not only was the gospel that I was to preach divine, but I received it in a divine manner—namely by direct revelation from Jesus Christ."

#### Revelation of Jesus Christ

Paul says that he received the gospel "by revelation of Jesus Christ." That

might mean one of two things. It might mean (1) that he received the gospel by having Jesus Christ revealed to him, or it might mean (2) that he received the gospel by having Jesus Christ reveal the gospel to him. In the former case, the Greek genitive case of the noun "Jesus Christ" (translated into English by the preposition "of") would be an "objective genitive;" "Jesus Christ" would be the *object* of the verb, "reveal," underlying the verbal noun "revelation." In the latter case, the genitive would be a "subjective genitive;" "Jesus Christ" would be the *subject* of the verb underlying the verbal noun.

Both usages are perfectly grammatical in English just as they are in Greek. When we speak of the revelation "of holy mysteries" to us by God in His Word, the preposition "of" indicates that the mysteries are the things that *are revealed*. That corresponds to the Greek objective genitive. But when we say of some piece of knowledge that we possess that it was no product of our own research but came to us by revelation "of God," the preposition "of" indicates that God was the One who *revealed* the thing to us. That corresponds to the Greek subjective genitive.

In our passage, it is perfectly clear from the context that the genitive "of Jesus Christ" is subjective genitive and not objective genitive. Paul means that he received the gospel by a revelation which Jesus Christ gave him, not that he received it by the fact that God revealed Jesus Christ to him. The objective genitive would, indeed, in itself yield a perfectly good sense; it is perfectly true that Paul received the gospel through the fact that God revealed Jesus Christ to him, and indeed he says practically that just below, in verse 16, when he says that God revealed His Son in him. But here the point plainly is concerned not with the content of the revelation but with the source of it. "I received the gospel," Paul says, "not from man, but from Jesus Christ." Plainly the same contrast between Jesus Christ and ordinary humanity is intended as that which appears in the first verse of the Epistle—"not through a man but through Jesus Christ." Light-foot admirably paraphrases as follows: "I received it not by *instruction* from man but by *revelation* from Christ."

#### Paul's Apostolic Independence

In this verse Paul is enunciating the thesis which he proceeds to prove in the first great division of the Epistle, running through to the end of the second chapter. His proof of the thesis may be divided into three parts. "In the first place," he says, "before my conversion I certainly did not receive my gospel from the original apostles, because I was then an active persecutor of the Church; and even after I was converted (suddenly and without human intermediation, by a sovereign act of God) I had in the early period no extensive contact with the apostles and so could not have become their disciple (Gal. 1:13-24). In the second place, when I did finally hold a conference with the pillars of the Jerusalem Church, they themselves recognized that the gospel had already been given to me by God and that they had nothing to add (Gal. 2:1-10). In the third place, so independent was I of the original apostles that on one occasion I could even withstand the chief of them to his face, though my objection was altogether to his practice and not at all to his gospel, which was the same gospel of divine grace as that which I myself preached" (Gal. 2:11-21).

"Ye have heard of my manner of life formerly in Judaism," says Paul, as he begins his defence of his apostolic independence, "how that excessively I persecuted the Church of God and laid it waste, and advanced in Judaism beyond many contemporaries in my race, being more exceedingly zealous (than those contemporaries were) for the traditions of my fathers."

#### The Church of God

It is interesting to observe that Paul here calls the whole body of the disciples "the Church of God." The Greek word *ecclesia*, which is translated "church" in our English Bible, is derived from the Greek word for "call" and the preposition *ek* which means "out." An *ecclesia*, therefore, is a company of those who are called out from their homes to a common meeting-place.

So the word designates, first of all, any ordinary assembly, or an assembly in civil or political life. It is used in this way, for example, in Acts 19:32, where, with reference to the mob in the theatre at

Ephesus, it is said that the "assembly" (*ecclesia*) was confused. So also in verse 39 of the same chapter the town clerk is represented as saying: "And if ye seek anything further, it will be attended to in the lawful assembly (*ecclesia*)." In both of these passages the word appears in its ordinary secular use.

But in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, which was the Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews in the first century and was also the Greek Bible of the New Testament writers, the word *ecclesia* is used to translate a Hebrew word that designates the solemn assembly of God's covenant people. This solemn, religious sense of the word was taken over by the writers of the New Testament books.

In the New Testament, at least three special uses of the word may be distinguished. The word designates (1) the little company of disciples meeting in an

individual house, as in I Cor. 16:19, where Paul speaks of Aquila and Priscilla and the "church" (*ecclesia*) which is in their house. It also designates (2) the whole company of Christians living in any city, as in I Cor. 1:2, where "the Church (*ecclesia*) of God which is at Corinth" includes, presumably, not only the "church" in Aquila and Priscilla's house but also other house-churches in Corinth. Finally, it designates (3) the whole body of Christians throughout the world, as in our passage.

We cannot say that this third usage came as any mere later development from the other two uses of the word. At any rate, it appears plainly in the apostolic age, in the universally accepted Epistles of Paul. With our passage is to be compared particularly I Cor. 15:9, where Paul says: "For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the

Church of God." In both places, Paul is speaking of his guilt as a persecutor, and in both places, as though to enhance his guilt, he calls the Church that he persecuted by its full title. What a terrible thing it was to lay violent hands upon a company of disciples which, though despised by the world, was in reality nothing less than "the Church of God!"

Certainly it required faith to designate those little groups of humble people, insignificant in numbers, insignificant in the judgment of men, by any such title as that. But Paul was right in so designating them. The future really belonged to those little groups. God does not judge as man judges; He does not look upon the outward appearance but upon the heart, and in His sight those humble little companies were His Church, forever under His care and keeping, not to be separated from Him by principalities or powers or things present or things to come.

# The Philosophy of Paul's Calling

Stewart P. MacLennan, D. D.

Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Hollywood, Calif.

An address delivered at the Second Commencement of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

WERE it mine to choose the model for the Ministers of Christ in all lands, and in all ages, I would unhesitatingly name the apostle Paul. By race, a Jew; by culture, a Greek; by citizenship, a Roman, and subsequently, by grace, a Christian, he combined in his personality elements which, by their completeness, made him preeminently the model for Ministers in all subsequent ages.

The philosophy of his calling is stated in his letter to the Romans:

"I am a debtor, both to the Greeks and the barbarians, the wise and the unwise, and so much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also; for I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation, to everyone that believeth; for therein is revealed God's righteousness, from faith unto faith; for the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven."

"I am a debtor!" The language is commercial, but not the obligation which it acknowledges. Paul was not, in any such way, indebted to the Gentiles; he had never bought anything in their market without

paying its price; no human being had any pecuniary claim on Paul.

Nor was he in debt in a non-commercial sense to any Gentile city of the world. From them he had received no favours. Rather he had laboured hard, encountered suffering and persecution in almost every city of the Greeks and barbarians where he labored, thereby placing them in debt to him.

Therefore, it was not on the ground of anything obtained from the Gentiles that Paul acknowledged himself to be their debtor. But he was a debtor in another sense. He had been made the depository of a trust. Being approved of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, he was under sacred obligation to carry out the trust according to its terms.

In Paul three civilizations met: the Hebrew, the Roman and the Christian. Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee. But it was not Paul the Pharisee that said, "I am a debtor." The Pharisee had no sense of obligation to the world. The world in its need, its sin and its bondage had no claim on him which he would admit.

Neither was it Paul the Roman that said, "I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians." Rome had no sense of owing anything to the world. She had built her roads to its rim, but over them she sent no Ministers to bless or to give, but oppressors to get and to hold. Rome was busy collecting her debt from the world, not paying a debt to the world.

It was Paul the Pharisee, who on a Roman road, met the risen Lord. And there a new civilization entered his heart and changed him from a persecutor to a preacher of glad tidings. Instead of going out to make men prisoners, he turned about and traveled to the ends of the earth in his day, to give men the word of freedom. He set his face toward Spain, where upon great Gibraltar the ancients had written the words "Ne plus ultra," (nothing beyond). He went preaching a pardon for all men, sealed and ratified by the blood of Christ, through the acceptance of which all men might be free.

Paul was distinctly and divinely commissioned by Christ to be the apostle to the Gentiles; yet he was a specific instance of a generic principle, and that principle holds

for every Minister of Jesus Christ today. The knowledge of the truth, the experience of forgiven sin, involves obligation and makes one the depository of a sacred trust which must be discharged in the same way as the apostle proposed to discharge his.

This, then, is the important question: "How did Paul propose to discharge his debt?"

### I. THE DEBT OF THE GOSPEL IS FIRST TO BE DISCHARGED BY PREACHING.

"I am ready to preach."

In the philosophy of Paul's calling, preaching holds the first place. To the Corinthians he said: "For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed."

Preaching is the greatest calling on earth; nothing in the Church will ever take its place. It has had a glorious past and it will have a yet more glorious future.

Organizers, administrators and directors of religious education are important, and may be necessary in the church, but God has not ordained to save the world by them. Without real preachers there is little to organize, nothing to administer, and religious education may become a handicap if not a serious menace or malady.

Name the great, growing, powerful and spiritual churches of the land, and you will find that they were brought into being by preaching. The history of the past nineteen centuries of Christianity confirms the truth of Paul's great declaration that it hath pleased God to save the world by preaching.

The pulpit in some quarters is being replaced by the altar. Bruce Barton gives us his picture of the future church:

"On Sunday the pastor conducts three short services in the morning, beginning at six o'clock and three in the late afternoon and evening. One may go at any time, and having bowed his head and knelt and listened to the organ and the prayers, may pass out into the sunshine and rejoice in the day. On rare occasions, such as Christmas and Easter, he preaches and his sermons are masterpieces. The church is a community church, non-denominational, and one in which doctrine is never mentioned."

A keen critic of Barton's book and church says:

"The aesthetic in worship can easily be perverted into an anaesthetic for the conscience. Absorption in worship may become, and in countless instances has become, an escape from facing the ethical consequences of faith."

No! Music, and hymn singing will not save the world. The most beautiful and worshipful service possible will not save, but it hath pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe.

Paul went to Rome not to establish an

altar, to institute a ritual, or to develop the worship life of the congregation at Rome. He was a real preacher with a message from God. Hence he was not going to conduct a round table of Academics, Peripatetics, Stoics and Epicureans. He did not conceive his ministry and mission, as do some modern Ministers and missionaries, to be the holding of a seminar of 57 varieties to "discover" the best message to preach. Paul was going to Rome with the "only message." He was going to erect a pulpit, preach the Gospel, and declare the whole counsel of God.

Many in the Church seem to think that the world can be saved by scholarship and education. Praise God for the reverent, devout and conservative scholarship of the Church, to them our debt is great. But scholarship has its limitations. "The world by wisdom knew not God." The truth pertaining to the salvation of mankind was not discovered by thinkers and philosophers. The Gospel that is the power of God unto salvation is a revelation. Concerning the Gospel which he preached, Paul declares that it is not after men, "for neither did I receive it from man; nor was I taught it, but it came to me through the revelation of Jesus Christ."

What Rome needed was a herald of the Gospel; one called of God, commissioned by Jesus Christ, and authenticated by the Holy Spirit. What Rome needed and what the world needs today is preachers.

Architecture likewise cannot save the world. Gothic architecture is beautiful and inspiring, and has its place, but architecture will not save the Church. There is a striking illustration of the passing power of architecture to be found in the little town of Famagusta on the Isle of Cyprus. There stand two beautiful Gothic churches with magnificent stained glass windows. One is today used by the Standard Oil Company as a storehouse for oil tins; and the other is a Mohammedan mosque.

When a Minister ceases to preach the gospel, a great darkness falls upon the world. The need of the Church in this hour is for preachers; preachers with a message; preachers who know God; preachers who consider the Gospel a trust and who will discharge that trust upon the principle of pleasing God, not man. No man can be a preacher in the real sense of the word, who does not please God first, and proclaim the message which God has given him. Preaching, I say again, is the great business in all the world and nothing will ever take its place, for "By the foolishness of preaching" God has ordained to save them that believe.

### II. WITH PAUL PREACHING WAS A PASSION.

In this same letter to the Romans, he says, "I caught myself wishing, praying, that I were accursed from Christ for my kinsmen according to the flesh."

What a phrase! "I caught myself wishing . . ." I discovered my ruling passion—the soul breaking into the processes of the mind. In the soul of the preacher a fire was kindled. A fire kindled by being with Christ. He was filled with Christ, eaten up of Christ, burning with Christ. Hence, when Paul preached he offered up himself, spirit, soul and body.

He was no drawing-room preacher. There was nothing tame or flat in his preaching. When he preached there always followed conviction and commotion.

The finest tribute ever paid him was the accusation brought against him and Silas by the citizens of Thessalonica, who said:

"These men who turned the world upside down have come hither also."

When Paul preached there was either a riot, a revolution or a revival.

What about modern preaching? It is generally as harmless as a crock of gelatine or a pail of skim milk. The trouble with much modern preaching is that there is a lack of passion, lack of yearning for the souls of men. Instead of catching ourselves wishing and praying for the souls of men, we often catch ourselves, in the most sacred and holy services, longing for the flesh pots of Egypt, turning our thoughts to the secular world.

The only thing that will drive professionalism out of the pulpit, place the Minister where he belongs, and bring the Church back to its place of power in the world, is for the preacher to get a new vision of Jesus Christ, to come into fellowship with Him and His suffering.

"I beseech you in Christ's stead," said Paul. There is the secret! "I preach," he might have said, "Yet not I, but Christ preacheth in me." That is perfectly true of the apostle. It was Christ first, midst and last. Christ flowed through his veins to such an extent that he could say: "To me to live is Christ."

When Christ lives in us, self-consciousness goes; self-importance disappears. What do we care what men say? We are thinking not of how we look or if we are preaching acceptably. These things do not matter.

Yes, with Paul preaching was a passion and it must be a passion with us, if we are going to persuade men.

My young friends, do not enter the ministry and take a pulpit if there is anything else you can possibly do; unless you feel within you the voice crying, "Woe! Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." The old world needs the Gospel as it has never needed it, and the only Gospel that will save is the old Gospel. It must be preached as Paul preached it, out of living, vital experience of the living God and the living Christ. Only a living soul with the living experience of the living Christ can preach a living Gospel to souls dead in trespasses and sins. A man half-dead cannot do it; a man with

an unclean heart cannot do it; a man with any misgivings as to the truth of his message cannot do it; a man who believes his doubts and doubts his faith cannot do it; a man of compromise and worldly spirit cannot do it.

The first commencement sermon ever delivered to prospective preachers was that spoken by Christ to His disciples and recorded for us in the fifth chapter of Matthew. In that message Jesus Christ puts all of the emphasis upon what a man is, upon being, not having; not upon any of his possessions but upon the man himself. "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God"—they shall be certain of God.

Probably part of the arrogance of modern science finds its explanation in the fact that people lack a convicting knowledge of certain great, primary facts. Is it not a fact that if the Church were as conscious of its great primary facts, namely:—God, the power of the Cross, as are the scientific schools of theirs, the Church also could abandon its attitude of defence and apology and move forward with a commanding carriage of assurance and self-respect? The reason why the scientist and pseudo-scientist are consulted today by a religious-hungry world, is because they have come to believe that they have found something of which they are certain.

A kind and able critic of the modern Minister says: "Character is supreme for the preacher. The difference in preachers in the pulpit is not in eloquence, rhetoric, ideas or training, but in the men." Therefore, young men, guard the heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life. See that your soul is growing daily in a living experience with the living Christ.

A theological seminary is not a spiritual retreat. It is an educational institution and as such must deal with technical matters. But if the seminary does not furnish that which will nourish the soul and build up the lives and spiritual experience of the men under its care, it will send men out into the ministry, impoverished, without a message, flat failures.

When will the Church of Jesus Christ learn that music will not save; financial campaigns will not save, seminars and conferences will not save; Gothic architecture will not save; a beautiful, worshipful service will not save! The only thing that will bring men out of darkness into light, from sin unto salvation, is the preaching of the Cross and the living Christ, by a living soul, aflame with a passion for Christ and men. Congregations of the land are coming to know this. What they need, and what they must have is men who know God; who know His Word; whose lives are living mirrors of the Book.

One most important thing remains to be said. Paul proposed to discharge this debt

by preaching a gospel that revealed God's righteousness.

### III. THE PREACHING THAT REVEALS GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.

There is a preaching of the Cross that modifies the Gospel, inflates the ego of man and makes the Cross of none-effect. Men imagine that religion must be kept abreast of the times. Hence, the shears of human expediency get busy cutting down the message of the Cross, diluting the Gospel Paul preached. And instead of being good news to men in need, the proclamation becomes good advice, and a helping hand to unfortunate people.

Sin is no longer guilt, it is but misfortune. What the average man wants, and what the devil wants, is a preaching of smooth words, homilies on duty, love, home, mother and heaven. What God wants and what man needs, is the preaching of a Gospel which reveals the holiness of God, discloses the fact that sin is guilt, and that it is a disease which leads to loneliness, death, and the darkness of eternal hell.

The Gospel that is the power of God unto salvation reveals God's holiness at the Cross of Calvary. The wrath of God, is not a popular topic. It appears seldom in modern-day preaching, yet Paul places it first in his Gospel. "For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all unrighteousness."

This is the first note from the Gospel trumpet. The salvation that Paul preached was a salvation from the wrath of God. And when we reach the heart of his Gospel, the Cross of Christ, we find that the first and deepest note struck is the holiness of God. "To declare at this time His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

A sad and tragic defect in the religion of our time and generation is ignorance of God. It has been said that we have almost "lost the sense of God's glorious, austere, holiness, and have so abused the idea of love that we have behaved as if God were indifferent to moral distinctions."

If we preach the Gospel which Paul preached, we preach the Cross revealing the holiness of God; God's righteousness. The Cross was the place where God put on display the holiness of His character, and where the blackness of sin was disclosed.

It is a glorious truth to believe and preach, that Christ loved us and gave Himself for us. Let us never forget however, that first of all, Christ died for God. Let us remember that the first and most important fact at the Cross of Calvary, in God's sight, is not that the sinner should be justified, but that God, in justifying him, might Himself be just.

If Paul's Gospel were preached faithfully today it would bring conviction of sin, because in preaching the Cross and the holi-

ness of God as manifest at that Cross, men would see the depths of his heart, for in the light of that Cross, sin is revealed in its true character. There is an old hymn which expresses the truth for us:—

"There is a fountain filled with blood,  
Drawn from Immanuel's veins.  
And sinners plunged beneath that flood,  
Lose all their guilty stains."

Many there are who do not like the figure which runs through that verse. Scores find in these words an offence. The Cross when it is preached, in the language of Scripture, has not ceased from being an "offence."

Conviction of sin has passed in most of our churches because we fail to preach a Gospel that reveals the Cross in the true light of God's holy character.

Hear the words of Jesus Christ as He emerges from the awful darkness that had hung for three hours, like a terrible pall, over the Cross of Calvary. "My God! My God! Why didst thou forsake me?" These are the words that reveal that Jesus Christ tasted death for every man. "The logical, irresistible, irrevocable issue of sin is to be God-forsaken. Sin in its genesis was rebellion against God; sin in its harvest is to be God-abandoned."

Yes, the final issue of sin is to be God-forsaken. He who knew no sin was made to be sin for us, and on the Cross of Calvary, once and for all He descended to the deepest depths, with my sin upon Him. He passed into awful darkness, and into depths not reached by physical death. Many have been crucified and many have lain down their lives in sacrifice for others; but the real sacrifice of the Son of God lay in the separation of His soul from God His Father. And in that moment of separation was gathered up all the depths and heinousness, guilt and uncleanness of sin, through all the ages past, present and future.

"Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God Almighty!" God's righteousness is declared when the lightning of His wrath strikes His own, beloved Son, the one in Whom He was well pleased. There is peace by the blood of that Cross, with a pardon to the whole world, to be proclaimed wherever man is found. And that is the Gospel that Paul preached.

The old Gospel is still the power of God unto salvation. There is power, wonder working power, in the blood of the Lamb.

The preacher who has no other evangel than a pale-livered emasculated Socinian humanism should step aside.

Go forth, young men, with the Gospel of the grace of God. Speed on, messengers of the Cross. You who have been in this seminary have come into possession of the knowledge of the Cross. You have a debt to discharge by the glorious work of preaching, preaching with a passion, persuading men to believe; and may the spirit of God that empowered Paul empower you.

# Dr. Warfield's Great Books

THE SELECTED WRITINGS OF BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE WARFIELD. Oxford University Press, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York.

WE owe the more scholarly of our readers an apology for not having sooner directed their attention to the fact that an Editorial Committee through the Oxford University Press is making available the more important of the late Dr. Warfield's contributions to theological thought. Five volumes have already appeared with five more to follow. It is safe to say that as a whole they will constitute the most valuable addition to the field of theological literature that has appeared in recent years or that is likely to appear for many years to come.

Three of the five volumes that have appeared—*Revelation and Inspiration* (\$3.00), *Biblical Doctrines* (\$4.00), *Christology and Criticism* (\$3.00)—were published previous to the launching of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The fourth and fifth volumes, however—*Studies in Tertullian and Augustine* (\$3.00) and *Calvin and Calvinism* (\$3.00) have appeared but recently. Other volumes are now in press and it is expected that the series as a whole will be completed in the near future. It may be added that the volumes are published individually and so may be bought separately.

The volume entitled *Revelation and Inspiration* contains the main articles that Dr. Warfield wrote in exposition and defense of the inspiration of the Bible. In a day when it is widely alleged that no real scholar can believe in the plenary inspiration (and so infallibility) of the Bible this volume deserves a wide reading and honest consideration. For here is a Biblical scholar who had few equals, the breadth and accuracy of whose scholarship was everywhere recognized, to whom the Bible was indeed the Word of God and as such wholly trustworthy in all its representations. It will be generally admitted, we believe, that this volume contains the most learned as well as the ablest up-to-date defense of the full trustworthiness of the Bible in existence. "Were this book widely read," says the *Sunday School Times*, "it would serve as a decisive check upon the many vagaries of 'inspiration' with which the believer is now confronted."

The volume entitled, *Biblical Doctrines*, contains the major articles Dr. Warfield wrote in the field of Biblical doctrines. His discussion of these doctrines is based on a first hand exegesis of the scriptures (in which field he was such a master) and includes such doctrines as the Trinity, the Person of Christ, Faith, Predestination, Renewal, Jesus' Mission according to His own

Testimony, the New Testament Terminology of Love, Redemption, etc. While it does not cover anything like the whole range of Biblical doctrines, it does deal with many of those most vital to present day discussion.

The volume entitled, *Christology and Criticism*, deals with the Person and Work of Christ in relation to modern critical discussion. These articles are historico-critical in nature and are unsurpassed in this respect. It includes the articles on Jesus Christ, Christless Christianity, The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ, The Two Natures and Recent Christological Speculation, The Twentieth-Century Christ. This volume has great apologetic value and shows as perhaps no other existing volume that faith in the supernatural Christ of the New Testament and in His death as an expiatory sacrifice for sin is strengthened rather than diminished by a thorough-going knowledge of modern critical discussion.

The volume entitled, *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine*, has large historical as well as theological value, dealing as it does with the beginnings of the Church Doctrine of the Trinity and the Pelagian Controversy. It deals for the most part with Augustine. Especially noteworthy is the article dealing with Augustine's Doctrine of Knowledge and Authority.

The volume entitled, *Calvin and Calvinism*, includes one article on Calvinism as a historical movement, one article on "John Calvin: the Man and his Work," and four articles on specific doctrines of Calvin, viz., his Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, his Doctrine of God, his Doctrine of the Trinity, and his Doctrine of Creation. For Dr. Warfield Calvinism was just Christianity in its pure form so that in his judgment Calvinism does not differ from other manifestations of Christianity in kind but only in degree, as a good specimen of a thing differs from a poor specimen of a thing.

It is impossible in a notice like this to illustrate the extraordinary erudition, depth of insight, keenness of discrimination, breadth of outlook, comprehensiveness of survey, power and vigor of thought, that characterize these volumes. They must be read to be appreciated. While they contain much that every intelligent reader will appreciate, they also contain quite a little that is so technical that only the scholar will be able to derive much profit from it. None the less every Minister that makes any pretense to scholarship ought to acquaint himself with these volumes; and as many others as are interested in really scholarly expositions and defenses of the Christian faith.

The author of these volumes, it may be added, possessed in a high degree the qualifications of a great Christian theologian. In

him a deeply Christian heart—the primary qualification of a Christian theologian—was combined with a mind of rare power, extraordinary learning, and a remarkable facility for accurate and concise expression. Ceaselessly industrious it is small wonder that at the time of his death he was everywhere recognized as the leading Calvinistic theologian in the English speaking world, so that he shared with Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck of Holland the honor of being one of the three leading Calvinistic theologians of the last generation.

It is important to note, if we would properly appreciate his significance as a theologian, his conception of the task and method of theology as a science. Many of the ablest of those classed as theologians today are not really theologians at all. They define theology not as the science of God (its only proper meaning) but as the science of religion and so make religious phenomena in general the object of their study. Yet only as we make God Himself the object of our study are we entitled to the honorable name of theologian for only as we do this can we vindicate for theology an object of study peculiarly its own, and so an independent place in the circle of science. As a theologian Dr. Warfield did not exhaust his energies, as do so many theologians (so-called) in the study of the history of religion or the psychology or the philosophy of religion—though he by no means neglected these things. His chief center of interest was the knowledge of God himself and his central aim to first reflect in his own consciousness and then to cast into systematic form the whole of that knowledge of God that is available. His method of procedure was, of course, determined by his view of the sources from which our knowledge of God is derived. This means that his method was determined by his conception of the Scriptures. Dr. Warfield was by way of eminence a Biblical theologian. For him the declarations of Scripture were authoritative revelations of God which needed only to be understood to become trustworthy items in our knowledge of God. It was this that gave the content to his theology. It was this also, we may add, that accounts for that note of positiveness, that air of finality that characterized his expressions of his theological conclusions—so irritating to so many moderns. It was because he went where the Bible went, but no further, that he was so sure of his position. For him the declarations of the Scriptures were dictates of the Holy Spirit, not debatable propositions.

Dr. Warfield was not intimidated by that bugaboo that frightens so many present-day Christians, "the modern mind." He was not constantly trying to "mediate" between the

Christianity of the New Testament and that abstraction, to adapt the gospel to this or that local and temporary manifestation of belief (or unbelief); but rather to set forth the pure, positive truth as it lay in the Scriptures and as it has been assimilated by his own strong and devout mind and heart. Believing that Christianity had a definite content of its own, given it once and for all by Christ and His apostles, resting firmly on its own basis and buttressed by its own independent evidence, he was not constantly scanning the latest theological article to see whether he was still warranted in holding his beliefs (somewhat as many scan the stock reports to see whether they should still keep their stocks or bonds). Dr. Warfield not only knew *what* he believed but *why* he believed. Knowing Christianity to be the wisdom of God, he knew that it would never be brought to naught by the wisdom of men. Few knew as well as he what men had said and were saying against Christianity but he knew also the number and nature of its credentials. Hence in an age in which Christianity was everywhere spoken against, both as a system of thought and as a way of

life, he was able to stay his soul so firmly and unwaveringly on the gospel of the grace of God.

These volumes are significant not only because of the contribution they make to Biblical and theological knowledge but because of the evidence they offer that the most thorough-going critical scholarship is consistent not only with belief in the Bible as God's infallible Word but with an unwavering trust in Jesus Christ as that one in whom we can safely ground our confidence—both for this life and the life to come. Volumes like these give intellectual respectability to evangelical Christianity. In their presence the claim of the Modernists that there are no scholars among the "fundamentalists" is seen to be hollow, even ridiculous. They have our hearty approval. It is perhaps expecting too much to expect that our superficial age will give them the consideration they merit. Be this as it may, we believe it would be difficult, if not impossible to select a shelf of modern religious and theological books whose combined worth would equal these volumes by Dr. Warfield.

S. G. C.

## Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

### Was Christ a Radical?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In view of the fact that Christ was a radical, why have so many of His followers become intensely conservative? Is not the conservative Christian today still a radical in the sense of having a revolutionizing message?*

Sincerely yours

C.K.C.

IT seems to us that the question whether Christ was a "radical" is largely a matter of definition. He was not a "radical" in the sense that His teachings were altogether new. He came not to destroy but to fulfill. He was a radical in the original meaning of the word, viz., one who went to the root of matters, who dealt with causes rather than effects, and who proclaimed a message the application of which would involve a thorough-going transformation of human life in all its aspects. Moreover while Christ may not have been a "radical" as over against the teachings of the Old Testament. He was a "radical" as over against practically all His contemporaries, including Jews as well as Gentiles. That His immediate followers were regarded as radicals is indicated by Acts 17:6 in the charge of the Thessalonians: "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." If it be true, as doubt-

less it is, that many of Christ's followers have been too conservative, the reason for this is not that they have held too tenaciously to the fact that Christianity has a definite content of its own, given it once for all by Christ, that abides the same through every change of chance and time, but rather that they have not given proper recognition to the fact that Christianity is a redeeming activity of God that is available for turning and over-turning until all human life is transformed.

The conservative Christian, we believe, not only has a revolutionary message but the most revolutionary of messages. Possibly there have been periods when society was to such a degree Christianized that the revolutionary character of the Christian message did not appear so evident. At any rate the present-day apostasy from Christianity and the return to pagan conceptions and ideals is serving to make clear how revolutionary the Christian message really is. We believe a revival of Apostolic Christianity to be the need of the hour. It would perhaps be more correct to call the advocates of such a revival the "radicals" rather than the "conservatives" of today. Be this as it may, the message of the so-called conservative Christian will continue to be a revolutionary message until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ.

### "Descended into Hell"

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Would you kindly answer the question—What does it mean in the Apostles' Creed when it says "He descended into hell?" Did not Christ commend His spirit unto God from the Cross?*

J. H.

THERE is a wide diversity of opinion as to what is meant when in repeating the Apostles' Creed we say, "He descended into Hell"—such a diversity of opinion that many hold that the phrase is so ambiguous that it would be well to omit it altogether. Those who take this position never fail to point out that this article was lacking in the earliest editions of the Apostles' Creed, that it was in fact one of the last to be incorporated in that ancient confession.

It is not difficult, however, to say what this phrase means according to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. That is made clear by the answer given to question 50 of the Larger Catechism. There we read: "Christ's humiliation after his death, consisted in His being buried, and continuing in the state of the dead and under the power of death till the third day, which hath otherwise been expressed in these words, *He descended into hell.*" In harmony with this we always find the following explanation attached to the phrase in the official publications of the Church: "i. e. Continued in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day."

The phrase has a different meaning as used by Lutherans. While the Reformed theologians looked upon the descent into hell as part of Christ's humiliation, the Lutheran theologians looked upon it as the first stage in His exaltation—a view that found expression in the Formula of Concord. As understood in official publications of the Lutheran Church the descent into hell means that Christ between His resurrection and His appearance to His disciples went into hell and conquered the devil and thus consummated His victory over Satan and the powers of darkness.

According to Roman Catholics the place to which Christ descended was not the abode of the lost but the place in which dwelt the souls of believers who had died before the advent of the Redeemer, the object of His descent being to deliver the pious dead from the intermediate state in which they were living (the *Limbus Patrum*) and to take them to heaven.

Many, especially in recent times, have held that the phrase means that Christ descended into the realm of the dead to preach the Gospel to those who had died without salvation. According to this interpretation it refers in the first instance to a ministry of grace on the part of Christ to those who died previous to His advent. Those who put this interpretation on the phrase usually so

extend it as to mean that even now the ministry of grace is not confined to the present life. Such a view is, of course, out of harmony with the teaching of the Church universal, since according to the faith of the whole Church, Romanist, Lutheran and Reformed, the offer of salvation through the gospel is confined to the present life.

Some have held that the phrase means that Christ suffered in hell the penalties of the lost. Probably that is what our questioner has in mind when he asks, "Did not Christ commend His spirit unto God from the Cross?" Such an opinion seems to be plainly unscriptural inasmuch as the words "It is finished" (John 19:30) make plain that the sufferings of Christ ceased the moment He expired on the Cross.

We have not indicated all the meanings

that have been ascribed to this phrase, but we have mentioned a sufficient number to make clear that it does not have a definite, well-defined meaning. It is a phrase into which men seem to pour whatever meaning suits their convenience when dealing with the realm of the dead and Christ's relation thereto. More particularly it seems to be men's views as to what is known as the "Intermediate State" that determines the meaning they put into this article of the Apostles' Creed. It may be added that while the original meaning of the phrase is a matter of dispute, there seems to be a general agreement that it was not the same as any of the views expressed above. But whatever its original meaning there is no doubt as to the sense in which it is employed in our Presbyterian standards.

You are to be congratulated and encouraged for your fearless efforts in defending and preserving "The faith once delivered." Undoubtedly many more would be taking the middle of the road were it not for the information supplied by your paper. Enclosed is my check as payment for the renewal of my subscription. It is my most earnest petition that it be the Lord's will that you continue in this fine work, and that CHRISTIANITY TODAY shall have a far wider circulation. Permit me to assure you that I am in most hearty accord with CHRISTIANITY TODAY and Westminster Seminary.

Sincerely,  
ALBERT STANFIELD.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am pleased to enclose my check to renew my subscription for CHRISTIANITY TODAY, which I have learned to love for the virile and militant character of its utterances on the vital subjects that are dividing our beloved church.

I am convinced that there never was a time when a paper such as yours was so sorely needed as to-day. I am sure that the bulk of our people in the Presbyterian Church still believe the old true and tried doctrines but the danger is that they are not awake to the importance of contending for them.

I believe that the trouble with our General Assemblies is that we send too many "yes" men as commissioners. They are believers themselves but seem to be easily hypnotized by the men in charge of the church's machinery into voting for any measure that may be advocated by that group regardless of what it may involve. They come home and speak with glowing enthusiasm of the harmony and fellowship, &c, &c., forgetting that there is something better than peace and harmony and that these are only too often attained at the sacrifice of vital doctrine.

I am convinced that the "harmony" program is stressed by the liberal element in our church for the very purpose of disarming any opposition there may be to their plans for delivering the church over to modernism. We are told by returning commissioners that there is nothing wrong with the church and that everything is serene and lovely. Well, if I had a cancer of the stomach, I should not say there was nothing wrong with me. And I should rather have cancer of the stomach than to be afflicted with the deadly thing known as modernism that is eating at the vitals of our church.

May the Lord bless you and give you more and more power to fight the thing that the devil is using to destroy the church that we love.

Yours very sincerely,

CHAS. C. BOGGS.

Denver, Colorado.

## Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editors. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked to kindly sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I would renew my subscription to your most valuable paper,—not to say interesting.

You are not only calling for intellectual honesty, for The Standards,—therefore for the Scriptures, from these in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. but your strong clear-cut articles are most timely for us in the Southern Church; there is a growing laxity in the reception of Ministers, in the examination of candidates for licensure and in the examination Licentiatees for ordination, in these things that the "modernists" working to undermine. The vast majority of our Ministers are sound, but they need to be aroused to the fact of their growing carelessness. I seriously and and hopefully trust that CHRISTIANITY TODAY will circulate more and more throughout the Southern Church, for the sake of sound doctrine, and, the welfare of the Presbyterian Church.

(REV.) HERVEY McDOWELL.  
Versailles, Kentucky.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: We have just received and read aloud your diagnosis of the recent General Assembly. And we feel that we must express our appreciation of it, and satisfaction with it. It is consummate from start to finish. To find a person these days, who is not misled by the smoke screens thrown up by smooth speakers, who are trying to divert their listeners from their real issue of destroying standards and institutions for which our fathers bled and died, is a real

tonic and you have no idea how it exhilarated us mentally and spiritually.

And while showing up the true inwardness of their designs and how they used people who should have known better; but who either lacked spiritual insight or intestinal stamina, you were so fair and kindly with all.

You do not know what it meant to people who have loved the dear old Presbyterian Church will all their hearts and souls to find there are still men who have the courage to go against the tide and defend the old standards to the last ditch.

This number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is priceless and makes us so glad we sent you a contribution a few weeks ago to enable you to send it to several people who would not otherwise have it.

We do wish it would be possible to send this article in leaflet form perhaps to the ministers in small charges who do not realize what is being stealthily and unfairly managed. We wish every minister could be made to read it to his congregation.

Forgive this long letter but we—my sister and I—could not refrain from letting you know what your article meant to us.

Yours in His service,

H. J. THOMAS.

Pasadena, Calif.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Having been fortunate enough to receive a copy of the first issue of your splendid paper, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, I immediately subscribed and have found each issue to contain much fine material.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I very heartily endorse the bold stand your paper takes for "Fundamentalism" against so-called "Modernism." I also endorse the stand your contributors take on "Birth control."

There is only one thing we would disagree on very materially, I think, that is the doctrine of "Predestination." You hold to the old form of "Predestination" as taught in the "Westminster Confession." I am a Cumberland Presbyterian, and you know the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church rejected the "Westminster Confession" as teaching "fatalism" because of the doctrine of "Predestination" as taught in the "Westminster Confession." We believe that any one is "elected" when "regenerated," and that their destiny is fixed at "regeneration," and not before.

I am not raising this question to argue over, but simply to show how close we are together. I am with you when it comes to standing for the truths of the Bible, however we may differ in our interpretation of the Bible on this one point.

But go on in your fight for the Fundamentals of the Bible against so-called "Modernism." I join hands with you in your fight for the Bible. I trust your school there at Philadelphia will prepare many a young man for the ministry who will be true to the truths of the Bible.

Fraternally yours,  
(Rev.) J. P. MACDONALD.

Elmwood, Tenn.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: As I send this dollar for renewal, I want to express my appreciation of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

It is a model. You are making it so good it would be hard to make it any better.

What a satisfaction it is to have such a real Presbyterian journal. Those who love the Bible and the truth must be helped and edified by every reading of it.

With personal regards,  
(Rev.) HERMAN A. GOFF.

Hamilton, Ill.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am enclosing check for my subscription for CHRISTIANITY TODAY for the next twelve months. I could not do without this splendid paper of what Christianity is—or should be today, as it was yesterday and will be forever.

The article on the General Assembly signed by initials was the finest vivisection of an Assembly that I have ever read. Whoever wrote it deserves great praise for his discriminating judgment and fine literary as well as Christian spirit.

More power to you, my dear Craig, and may your subscription grow by leaps and

bounds. I believe that we are at the turn of the tide and I believe you have had much to do with it.

(Rev.) WM. CARTER.

Throop Ave. Presbyterian Church,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Do I want to continue my subscription to your out-spoken, soul-cheering paper? Most assuredly! I await its coming every month and read its every word with great pleasure. I was disappointed in the action of the General Assembly re Federal Council. I had hoped we would have washed our hands of the whole concern as the Southern Assembly has done. Dr. Ross Stevenson said it needed to be taken to the woodshed, but I would have sent it to the boneyard instead. Success to you and to your laudable effort to maintain inviolate the "faith of our fathers."

Your sincerely,  
(Rev.) WM. McNALLY.

Philadelphia, Pa.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have only recently come to know of your paper and am a subscriber and a delighted reader of each issue. Your editorials are always helpful and inspiring. The one in the last issue, "Christianity and the Miraculous" was illuminating, especially to a layman like myself. Such teaching methods as you use are greatly needed, but seldom to be had by us and I trust that it will be continued. My interest was at first captured by your distinction between the "supernatural" and the "miraculous."

And now for a little crack at the editor:

In my early Christian experience I was led to appreciate the *exact* words of the Scriptures, by Dwight L. Moody, especially, and so, I did not fail to notice in your editorial on p. 2 half-way down column 2 that you had misquoted Luke 15:10 or 15:7. It is a common error even by otherwise well versed ministers. The phrase "in the presence of" means more to me than "among;" for it means none other than that the "joy" has come to my blessed Lord, Himself; and the context verifies that interpretation.

You see how closely folks are reading your paper. We will continue to do so with profit, I am sure.

H. A. BALDWIN.

Evanston, Ill.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed please find check for \$1.10, being renewal of my subscription; adding 10 cents to make it expire in July instead of June.

This is a great paper and I enjoy its rich contents as you "earnestly contend for the

faith once for all delivered to the saints." May the "good hand of our God" be upon you.

Yours in Him,  
(Rev.) W. I. CARROLL.

First Presbyterian Church,  
Marshall, Texas.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I take great pleasure in sending my renewal subscription to the fine paper you are publishing. I am sure it will continue to be a source of strength and good cheer to that large group of Christians who hold with full assurance to the faith "once for all delivered." May the Lord bless you greatly in the scholarly and fearless work you are doing for his cause in the publication of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

WARREN F. GOFF.

Cambria, Wisconsin.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: It seems to me that a full definition of Evangelical ought not to leave out Evangelism as a part of it, that spirit which flamed in the hearts of Christians of the early church, impelling each one to ask his neighbor "knowest thou the Lord" and which, within the first hundred years, carried the glad tidings to the ends of the earth. This spirit is sorely lacking today, for too many of us leave the invitation to be given by the Minister alone and the contacts we make in life with our fellowmen are not used for the salvation of souls, for the extension of the Master's Kingdom.

SAMUEL B. WOODS.

Charlottesville, Va.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed please find a one-dollar bill with which to renew my subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

I think it is one of the finest papers relative to the Christian work that I have ever been privileged to read.

May the blessings of God rest upon you and your good work.

Respectfully,  
MARY KREIDER.

Strasburg, Pa.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am renewing my subscription largely because of the general news of the church, which I do not have in any paper of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

I am devoted to the conservative theology and always will be, but I am not interested in some of the fine distinctions which your editors make so much of.

Sincerely,  
C. H. MAURY, JR.

Houston, Texas.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I certainly enjoy your splendid paper. May God bless you in the firm stand you are taking on the fundamentals of our glorious gospel in face of so much heresy prevalent in our church. I have been an elder in the Presbyterian Church for 62 years and cannot understand how anyone can claim to be a Minister of the Gospel and at the same time doubt its essential truths.

S. D. COCHRAN.

Dinuba, Calif.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed is my subscription for renewal of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It is good but wish it had more to say about our Lord's near return—the most tremendously important truth for the present times.

Sincerely in Christ,

(REV.) H. A. IRONSIDE.

Moody Memorial Church,  
Chicago, Ill.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have read the paper for a year, and cannot recall a single position taken or statement made in regard to the "Faith once delivered" with which I am not in accord. You are altogether right in "Earnestly contending for the faith," and, none too pronounced. Why have men who have vowed before God and men to stand by the Confession holding the doctrines embedded in the Scriptures not the honor and honesty enough to demit the Presbyterian pulpit and go where they belong?

Looks as if the "apostate" times in the church indicate a nearing of the latter days. But God knows His own, and will bring things out to the weal of those who are His. You have laid down the exact standard of truth; keep on along that line, and God will see you through!

Yours fraternally,

REV. A. C. V. SKINNER.

San Diego, Calif.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed find \$1.00 in check, for one year's subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

I like the tone of your magazine. Its articles and messages are always in the major keys.

I hope it may be possible, soon, to publish the great works of Dr. R. D. Wilson in your paper. Would this be out of question?

May God richly bless your efforts in Christian fellowship, I am

(REV.) GEO. E. MURAN.

Detroit, Mich.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I enclose herewith check for renewal of subscription.

As a pastor of 3 country churches in Bethel Presbytery (U. S.) I have derived great profit personally, and much help in preaching and pastoral work from your publication during the past year.

May God graciously bless you all and increase the service you are rendering!

Sincerely,

(REV.) W. G. SOMERVILLE.

Guthrieville, S. C.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed, I hand you one dollar; a year's subscription for CHRISTIANITY TODAY, beginning August 1st, 1931.

As I read from it to my husband, who is blind, my faith is stimulated, as it echoes: "In the Cross of Christ,"—it "glories, towering over the wreck of time" . . . (these times) "All the light of sacred story, gathers round" . . . its words "sublime."

Sincerely yours,

(MRS.) LIZZIE A. SHANNON.

Watsonstown, Pa.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed find my dollar for renewal of your fine paper. It is what we have needed for a long time, for no other church paper gives us the inside facts of our Who's Who in the conducting of the affairs of the Presbyterian Church, so many of them Modernists but parading as champions of the cross of Christ. The Lord bless you.

Truly yours,

(REV.) W. A. GEORGE.

Windsor, N. Y.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I enjoy every number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It's the best paper that comes to me. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

(REV.) S. M. ERICKSON.

Takamatsu, Japan.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I enjoy your paper. I am a "U.P." Success to your efforts and to the "movement" to maintain orthodoxy.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. WILSON.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Your message is wonderful, heart refreshing and soul uplifting, just what we need in our time, where real interpretation has become precious and spiritual poverty beggars description.

R. KLAUDT.

Manitowac, Wis.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Permit me in renewing my subscription to CHRISTIANITY TODAY to express my deep appreciation of the stand you are taking and the influence you are exerting in the cause of truth. Now when the wave of "Christless Christianity" is dwindling, and the surge of faith grows stronger your valuable paper does much to hasten the flow.

Most Sincerely Yours,

W. C. MERCER.

Toronto, Canada.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have read every issue of your paper with special interest and hearty approval.

The masterly exposition of Galatians by Dr. Machen which he so modestly entitles "Notes on Biblical Exposition," in itself places the paper in the front rank of scholarly Christian publications, and proves him to be on a par with Calvin in exegetical acumen.

That you draw the fire and stir the ire of the enemy now and then is proof that your telling thrusts are penetrating "under the fifth rib." "Only be thou strong and very courageous" then thou shalt have good success."

Sincerely yours,

T. S. ARMENTROUT.

Wilmington, Del.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am sending check to cover renewal of my subscription to your excellent paper.

Your position has my heartiest sympathy and respect. Only a militant orthodoxy can hope to survive the present subtle attack upon historic Christianity.

My prayer is that your service may do much to restore to its rightful honor the Reformed truth—which is merely Christianity at its best.

Sincerely,

REV. L. VERDUIN.

Christian Reformed Church,  
Corsica, S. D.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Please find inclosed one dollar with which to renew my subscription to your excellent paper. I appreciate very much the work you are doing.

These are perilous days. We need just such scholarly testimony as you are giving to the Scriptures.

Very truly yours,

JAY C. HANNA.

Glendale, Calif.

# Current Views and Voices

## God's Foolish Ones

Editorial in "The Presbyterian of the South"

**G**OD'S foolish ones are sometimes found among the leaders of the Churches. This is illustrated in what took place in St. Louis a short time ago, according to an account given by the *St. Louis Star*. A debate was held in that city between a Roman Catholic layman, a Jewish Rabbi, a preacher of the Southern Methodist Church, representing Protestantism, and Clarence Darrow, well known all over the country as the opponent of religion and the defender of law violators.

It is hard to see what good could come of such a meeting. It gave Darrow the opportunity of getting his agnostic views and his denial of religion before a great concourse of people, many of whom would never have heard him otherwise. It gave him the opportunity of getting his views broadcast over the land in the newspapers, and having them read by multitudes, who would never have the opportunity of hearing him speak.

The newspapers naturally give much more prominence to what such a man says than they do to what an orthodox Christian minister says. Darrow is classed among the unusual, while the preacher belongs to the commonplace set that everybody knows about.

What good could be expected to come out of such a debate, so far as the Christian Church, or the cause of Christ is concerned, it is hard to see. To invite or take part in such a debate is very much like what would happen, if a devoted son of a true, pure and high toned mother should invite an unprincipled blackguard to enter a debate with him as to his mother's character. Whatever might be said would not change the sons' opinion of his mother, nor would anything that he might say have any influence upon the man, who had determined to defame her character. But among those who heard the debate, there would in all probability be some who would be more or less influenced by the false charges made against a woman whom they had always known to be true and above suspicion. And those who were not so influenced would have no higher opinion of her than they had before.

How any true son of the Church of God can stand by and see his great and glorious mother dragged down into the filth and mire of such thoughts and language as those used by such a defamer of the Church, and all that it stands for, it is hard to understand.

The religion of God should be proclaimed in its purity and truth, and when this is done, there need be no fear of the gain-sayers and defamers.

## When We Must Economize

Editorial in "Grace and Truth"

**W**HEN we must economize, where do we start? The answer to this question is a good test of our love for our Lord. If our first step in the hour of financial stringency is to discontinue our offerings to our Lord's work, can we truly say that He has the pre-eminence in our lives? Does such a step not betray that our love for Him has waxed cold? Does it not show that we are depending upon ourselves for the supply of our needs rather than trusting His gracious providence?

The spirit of the Macedonian believers was in striking contrast to this. Of them the apostle Paul testifies that "in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their *deep poverty* abounded unto the riches of their liberality" (II Cor. 8:2). Such a spirit shows that souls are responding in a scriptural manner to the testings which God permits. But any other spirit shows that our souls are missing the blessing which God designs for us in adversity.

Our gifts should be an expression of the worship of our hearts. It is poor economy through reducing our gifts to try to make up for shortage of funds caused by expenditures for luxuries. Such a policy indicates that we are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. God's Word teaches giving proportionate to our means, and when our income is reduced it may be His pleasure for us to reduce our offerings; but most certainly He would have us start with other things first, and it may even be that in the face of reduced income He would have us *increase* our giving.

## University Christianity

From the "Christian Fundamentalist"

**T**HE greatest exponent of Christianity since the Lord Jesus Christ died, rose from the dead, and ascended to Heaven, was born and brought up in a university centre. He was of "blue blood," highly connected, cultured to an exceptional degree, and probably a man of wealth and large influence before his conversion. To this man, Paul (Saul) of Tarsus, was revealed the Gospel of Jesus Christ as to no other man in the history of Christianity. From that day to this there has been a certain "apostolic succession" in what may be called university Christians. Straight down through the Christian era there have been innumerable instances of university-trained men who were not only Christians, but on fire for the Lord and His Gospel—flaming epistles of

Christ, to whom the evangelization of the world owes much.

It is important to remember this today, when we are hearing so much about university atheism. There can be no denying the charge that atheism is a fact, a terrible reality, in university life today as in the outside world. But perhaps some of the student atheists have not realized that Christianity of the most pronounced and pragmatic sort is also a fact in university life today. And it may be said truthfully that Christianity is a much greater fact than atheism, for the positive is always greater than the negative, truth always greater than the lie. Atheism rests on foundations of falsehood; its dogmatic creed is that God is a liar, for "he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar." And any structure that is built upon a lie is doomed to failure, while "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever."

Meantime the public ought to know, and to thank God, that as fine Christian work and faithful testimony to the truth as can be found anywhere in the world today is going on in our great universities, in the Dominion, in Britain, and in the United States.

One of the most inspiring bits of Christian literature that one can find anywhere is the Review of the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union, the association of Christian students at Cambridge University. Its members are no nonentities, nor are they timorous disciples of the Lord. In the President's Report this winter occurs the statement: "Let us pray that His work may go forward far more mightily next term. . . . Let us pray for the Sunday evening services and for personal talks that many more may come to a knowledge of the Saviour, and also for the Bible readings that again, as during this term, they may be times when we are all built up in Him. 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name give glory.'"

The Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions is a larger organization of the Christian Unions of more than a score of universities in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland.

This organization is sound, true, deeply spiritual, seeking to bring students to the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Saviour, Lord, and God. It recognizes the prevalence and poison of atheism, but is neither dismayed nor discouraged by this, for it realizes that it has in its hands a weapon that has never been defeated and never will be: "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." Mr. F. Noel Palmer, General Secretary of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada, has well said: "The prevailing notion that a man cannot accept the Bible

today without becoming intellectually dishonest, is false and monstrous. . . . The Bible has nothing to fear from facts, always wins in the open, and is still the least understood and yet the simplest and profoundest Book, in a class by itself." And again: "Christ still forgives sins and baptizes with the Holy Spirit and power. This is our witness."

In the United States the League of Evangelical Students was organized in 1925, and is doing a vital work in the colleges, universities, and theological seminaries of the nation. "Its aim is to exalt our Lord Jesus Christ—by setting forth the Gospel of His grace as presented in the inerrant Word of God, by promoting the intellectual defense of the evangelical faith, by proclaiming the joy of Christian living through the indwelling power of the Spirit, by presenting the claims of the Gospel ministry at home and abroad."

While such student organizations as these are at work, atheism in the universities will find itself opposed by insuperable odds. For it is a conflict between the powers of darkness and the Lord Jesus Christ, and in that conflict only One can win.

### Should the Church Interfere In Business and Politics?

Editorial in "Christian Standard"

CHRISTIANITY is nothing if not practical.

That the teaching of Jesus Christ has a vital bearing upon ethics must be manifest to any careful student. Jesus Himself underscored the practical import of His doctrine when in the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount He so cogently presented the alternative of the house built upon the rock and the house built upon the sand. Religion it is; but, more than is the case with any other religion, Christianity revolutionizes daily living—is intended to do so.

There is no better evidence of this fact than the history and present status of those civilizations that have been to any extent affected by Christianity. Despite all the warfare of Christian sects, and despite all the interference of human hierarchies and philosophies, the Christian doctrine has contrived to effect ethical progress through the nineteen centuries so that we can point out what Christianity has done for the moral uplift of humanity.

So much impressed are some with this fact that they are inclined to think of the whole Christian program as an ethical program only. They think of Jesus as but a social reformer. What He seeks chiefly is to change social conditions. At least, we have reached the point, they say, at which the important expression of Christianity is the activity of the church in social reforms. Consequently, they want to use the church

assemblies principally for declarations and agitations upon unemployment, prohibition, old-age pensions and various methods for prevention of war.

Now, it is manifest to any careful student of Jesus that He quite definitely turned away from that pathway. No man ever walked the earth who had a better opportunity to seize leadership for social reform by the political method than had Jesus. He had a nation zealous for leadership along that line, and, for a time, a people convinced that He was the Messiah to fill that place. Not only did He refuse the kingdoms of the world at the hand of Satan; He sacrificed His popularity by refusing to allow zealous followers to make Him king, and He went to a cross rather than yield to that concept.

His apostles, particularly Paul, steered the young church away from that same channel. It was not fear, but wisdom, that made the church avoid a direct or a political attack upon the curse of human slavery. The church had a far more effective and powerful weapon.

And yet the church does go into business and into politics. It should do so. In the very nature of the case it must do so. If Jesus teaches the righteousness and unrighteousness of certain practices, the church is bound somewhere and somehow to express itself.

What, after all, is the church? It is not a building. It is not an organization. It is men and women. If they are in the church at all they are in it when they act as clerks or housewives or shopmen or managers or salesmen or lawmakers or statesmen as much as when they sit together in an assembly at one place. A dispersed church is as truly the body of Christ as the church assembled about the table of the Lord. If that be true, the church is always in business and always in government. Nothing can prevent its taking its part in such practical affairs. And if these members of the body act every day in harmony with the principles and spirit of Jesus Christ, the church is bound to interfere in these practical matters even to a revolutionary degree.

What, then, is the distinction? Why do we protest against attempts to involve the church in politics and in social reform? Only this: The thing against which we protest is the effort to involve the whole church as an organized unit, a political entity so to speak, in human philosophies or schemes of reform. That the church should be opposed to war, and its ministers and members should exercise their wisdom and use their opportunities to speak and vote as their best judgment directs against war, is one thing. But that well-meaning leaders should manipulate assemblies and utilize ecclesiasticisms as political units, and claim to commit the church to particular schemes for fighting war, is quite another thing. Such groups cannot speak for the entire church. They become divided and embarrassed over issues other

than their chief concern. And they tend to be thus led away from that evangelistic work they should make their prime objective. Above all else, such political use of church bodies tends all too rapidly to entrenchment of hierarchies and the consequent obscuration of that simple and inclusive fellowship which is the true church of Christ.

It is the business of the church in its assemblies to develop the spirit of Christianity. It is the business of the church in its individual members to express that spirit in practical reform, whether as they work as individual citizens or as they assemble in groups of citizens.

No one has a right to involve the church as a whole in particular schemes of economic, social or political reform.

### Regulars Not Guerillas

Editorial in "The Watchman Examiner"

THE church—meaning the local company of believers associated for work and worship—unquestionably derives no little part of its vitality and power from the close and persistent fellowship of those who make up its membership. It is a sad thing to see a church hampered in its influence and restricted in its efforts by the open desertion or the indifferent attitude of those pledged to support it. Apart from its members it can do nothing.

But the thought may be turned about without entirely losing its truth. That one can be a Christian wholly without reference to a church is beyond question. But how much of a Christian is one likely to be who deliberately forsakes and deserts the church? How deep will the tides of his own spiritual life be likely to run? How strenuous or protracted his efforts for the advancement of the kingdom?

The answers to questions like these need not be hypothetical. There is sufficient data furnished by observation and experience. The people who are bringing things to pass for the glory of God are almost without exception the people who are affiliated with the churches and faithful in the fulfillment of their obligations as church members. They are like the men of Israel who came down to Hebron to make David king over all the tribes, they can "keep rank." The battle of the Lord is being fought by regulars, not guerillas.

The man who cannot find a place and a chance to do his best work inside the church is not likely to find either by going outside it. The average man needs the stimulus, the incitement, the encouragement of the elbow touch with his fellows, the sense of comradeship with others in a great cause, the steady discipline of ordered and orderly service. The man who throws all this away, and breaks ranks to go where and do what he will, amounts to little or nothing in the work of the Lord.

## Ministerial Changes

### Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

#### Calls

Peter De Ruiter, to Nottingham, Pa.;  
John Rotschafer, Sibley, Ia. to Holland, Ia.

#### Calls Accepted

Carl B. Bare, South Congregational Church, Concord, N. H. to Rye, N. Y.;  
J. W. Boyer, Ph.D., First Church, Vincennes, to Warren Ave. Church, Saginaw, Mich.;  
James E. Congdon, Jr., D.D., First Church, El Paso, Tex. to Northminster Church, Evanston, Ill.;  
W. R. Craig, Latrobe, Pa. to Gaston Church, Philadelphia, Pa.;  
J. M. L. Eckard, Barton, Md. to Pleasant Plains, N. Y.;  
Charles F. Geiger, Raymond, S. D. to Houston and Rushford, Minn.;  
John Hammond, D.D., Lime Springs, Ia. to Delta, Pa.;  
E. Arfon Jones, Peniel Memorial Church, Granville, N. Y. to Welsh Church, Los Angeles, Cal.;  
Floyd E. Kline, University, Bloomington, Ind. to Plymouth, Ind.;  
E. F. McGaughey, East Side Church, Wichita Falls, Tex. to Westminster Church, Houston, Tex.;  
Frank P. Miller, D.D., Mason City, Ill. as stated supply Kirkwood, Ill.;  
Harris Pillsbury, Bible Dept. Westminster College, Utah and Third Church, Salt Lake City, Utah, to Chico, Cal.;  
William H. Ryall to Lemington Ave. Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.;  
Percy L. Smith, Bethany Church, Rockford, Ill. to Madison, S. D.;  
William T. Thayer, Dexter, N. Y. to King Ferry, N. Y.

#### Changed Addresses

A. J. Huddock, Orangeburg, N. Y.;  
Andrew M. Lowry, Napoleon, O.;  
Bruce H. McDonald, 817 St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.

#### Ordinations

Chas. F. Ball, Bethany Church, Phila., June 25;  
William Crudden Evans, Faith Church, Baltimore, Md., June 12;  
Carl W. Fleth, Petersburg Church, Scranton, Pa., June 19;  
Martin D. Hardin, Jr., Cayuga, N. Y. Presbytery;  
Adam Hunter, Athboy, S. D., May 14.

#### Installations

B. Forest Bend, Stated supply Mendon, N. Y., June 15;  
Stanley V. Bergen, McCausland Avenue Church, St. Louis, Mo.;  
Norman D. Braby, Lapeer, Mich., Jan. 14;  
Adolph F. Broman, Rhawnhurst, Phila., Pa., May 29;  
Earl L. Douglass, Summit Church, Germantown, Phila., Pa., June 9;  
Francis M. Dowlin, E. Whiteland Church, Frazer, Pa.;  
Robert Findlay, North Church, Rochester, N. Y., Sept.;  
Ward F. Folsom, Calvary Church, Tacoma, Wash.;  
Howard L. Frame, Grace Church, Horsham, Pa., June 2;  
James E. Jackson, Barnesboro, Pa., June 23;  
J. A. Long, Newton, Pa., May 22;  
Gordon W. Mattice, Westminster Church, Rochester, N. Y., September;

George C. Noetling, Mt. Morris, N. Y., August 12;  
Arthur W. Ratz, D.D., First Church, Fargo, N. D., Jan. 7;  
Edwin J. Reinke, West Grove, Pa.;  
J. O. Homer Rinker, Wissinoming, Phila., Pa., May 22;  
Robert H. Rolofson, First Church, Ash-tabula, O., May 21;  
Philip M. Smith, Martinsburg, Pa., June 30;  
Petrolia, Pa. July 2;  
Andrew S. Taylor, Cranberry Lake and Wanakena, N. Y.;  
Frank M. Weston, as executive secretary and treasurer Rochester, N. Y. Presbytery, June 15;  
Henry L. Woll, Great Valley, Pa., May 19.

#### Resignations

F. G. Belner, D.D., First Church, Clarksburg, W. Va., July 1;  
Campbell Coyle, D.D., Boulder, Colo. to take effect Oct. 1;  
William A. Hallock, Grace Church, Rochester, N. Y., July 1;  
Lloyd D. Homer, Bakerstown, Pa.;  
E. P. Leick, Carrollton, Ill.;  
R. J. Shields, Charleroi, Pa.;  
Herbert Ure, Athens, Pa.;  
M. F. Usner, Aberdeen, Idaho;  
J. Carlton Wetterhahn, Westminster Church, Colorado Springs, Colo.

#### Deaths

Stanton A. Parker, Brigham City, Utah, May 26;  
Michael W. Payuk, Chester, Pa., May 24.

### Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

#### Call

W. P. Chalmers to Chattahoochee and Smyrna, Fla.

#### Calls Accepted

D. R. Bitzer, as assistant pastor First Church, Charleston, W. Va.;  
W. E. Davis, D.D., Evergreen Church, Memphis, Tenn. to Princeton, W. Va.;  
R. H. Long, D.D. to Greenwood, S. C.;  
C. R. McCubbins, as evangelist McDowell County, N. C.

#### Changed Address

S. M. Glasgow, D.D., 138 E. 45th St., Savannah, Ga.

#### Ordination

F. B. Appleby, Florence, Ala.

#### Installations

W. B. Hood, Sylacanga, Ala.;  
J. D. McPhail, Henry Memorial Church, Dublin, Ga.

#### Death

J. F. Jacobs, Clinton, S. C.

### Presbyterian Church in Canada

#### Calls

D. Parry Jones, Wales, to Knox Church, Selkirk, Man.;  
R. B. Ledingham, Harriston, Ont. to Weston, Ont.;  
John D. MacKenzie, Fairmount-Taylor Church, Montreal, Que. to Avonmore, Ont.;  
Henry R. Pickup, Toronto, Ont. to Renfrew, Ont.;  
Thomas A. Rodger, Belfast, P.E.I. to Knox Church, Calgary, Alta.;  
E. Pugh Thomas, D.D., Buffalo, N. Y. to Ancaster and Alberton, Ont.

#### Calls Accepted

William Allan, Peterborough, Ont. to Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.;  
Alexander McLean, Lambeth, Ont. to Knox Church, Embro, Ont.;  
W. A. MacWilliams, Burgoyne and Dunblane (Bruce Presbytery);  
P. Thornton Meek, Long Branch, Ont. to Uxbridge and Quaker Hill, Ont.;  
James D. Smart, Ph.D., University College, Ont. to Ailsa Craig, Ont.;  
F. W. Tingley, Glace Bay, N. S. to St. Stephen, N. B.;  
G. C. Webster, London, Ont. to Zion Church, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

#### Inductions

J. Fisher Anderson, Brampton, Ont., June;  
Robert W. Ellis, Burk's Falls, Ont., June 1;  
Ephraim J. Kerr, Watford, Brooke and Napier, Ont. June 18;  
W. H. McCracken, Knox Church, Walkerton, Ont., June 2;  
Robert C. McDermid, St. Paul's, Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont., May 28;  
Frederick R. Meredith, Aymer, Que., June 25;  
John V. Mills, Wiarton, Ont., June 12;  
George H. Nicol, St. Andrew's Church, Southampton, Ont., June 16;  
John Logan Venita, St. Giles Church, Ottawa, Ont., June 17.

### Reformed Church in the U. S.

#### Inductions

M. J. Eckert, Trinity Church, Fairfield, O., June;  
M. J. Flenner, Heidelberg Church, Dayton, O., June.

### Reformed Church in America

#### Calls

H. Belkman, Grand Haven, Mich. to Hope Church, Los Angeles, Cal.;  
J. R. Euwema, Alton, Ia. to Lynden, Wash.

#### Calls Accepted

Fred Bronkema, Prattsville, N. Y. as stated supply South Gilboa, N. Y.;  
Richard A. Jager, to Hull, Ia.;  
LeRoy Nattress, Chicago, Ill. to Saratoga Church, Schuylerville, N. Y.;  
Victor William Simons, Gardner, N. Y. to Glen Rock, N. J.

#### Installations

H. John Aberson, Fairview, S. D.;  
J. Stanley Addis, Oyster Bay Church, Brookville, N. Y., June 30;  
Chester Calvert Chilton, Hurley and N. Marbletown, N. Y., June 19;  
John Moedt, Racine, Wis., June 17.

#### Resignation

Alexander Wouters, Kew Gardens, N. Y., June 29, to become effective September 7.

### Christian Reformed Church

#### Calls

E. J. Krohne, Hudsonville, Mich. to Randolph, Wis. (declines);  
S. Struyk, Willard, O. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.

#### Changed Address

H. J. DeVries, 1945 S. Euclid Ave., Ontario, Cal.

# News of the Church

## The Southern General Assembly

THE seventy-first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. was convened at Montreat, N. C., in the "Anderson Auditorium" on the morning of May 28. The Moderator of the preceding Assembly, the Rev. T. W. Currie, D.D., preached the opening sermon. He took as his theme "Repentance," preaching from Matthew 3:2: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Following this, the Assembly solemnly partook of the Lord's Supper.

In the afternoon, the Assembly elected its new Moderator. The following were nominated: The Rev. John S. Foster, D.D., of Winston-Salem, N. C.; Ruling Elder R. A. Dunn, of Charlotte, N. C.; The Rev. Wm. Crowe, D.D., of St. Louis; The Rev. J. L. Mauze, D.D., of Kansas City; The Rev. B. F. Wilson, of Harrisburg, Va., The Rev. D. W. Richardson, of Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va.

The first ballot resulted as follows: Mr. Dunn, 108; Dr. Crowe, 65; Dr. Mauze, 54; Dr. Richardson, 22; Dr. Wilson, 18; Dr. Foster, 16. Total, 283. Necessary to choice 142. There was no election, and the name of Dr. Foster as having received the lowest number of votes was dropped.

The second ballot resulted as follows: Mr. Dunn, 140; Dr. Crowe, 66; Dr. Mauze, 51; Dr. Richardson, 20; Dr. Wilson, 8. Total 285. Necessary to choice, 143. Again there was no election.

The third ballot resulted as follows: Mr. Dunn, 161; Dr. Crowe, 69; Dr. Mauze, 40; Dr. Richardson, 13. Total, 283. Necessary to choice, 142.

Ruling Elder R. A. Dunn was declared elected and was escorted to the chair by Dr. C. M. Richards. Mr. Dunn said he accepted the office not as a personal tribute but as a tribute to the ruling elders.

Mr. Dunn is an elder in the First Church of Charlotte, N. C. He is President of the Trustees of the General Assembly, and the Presbyterian Foundation. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of Davidson College and Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.

On Friday morning, May 29, the Moderator announced chairmen of Standing Committees as follows:

Bills and Overtures: T. W. Currie.  
 Judicial Business: William Crowe.  
 Assembly's Work: J. L. Mauze.  
 Foreign Relations: C. M. Richards.  
 Foreign Missions: A. S. Johnson.  
 Home Missions: B. F. Wilson.  
 Christian Education and Ministerial Relief: W. D. Richardson.  
 Religious Education: John M. Wells.  
 Stewardship: J. J. Murray.

Men's Work: Charles G. Rose.  
 Nominations: Thomas M. Glasgow.  
 Synodical Records: W. A. Alexander.  
 Woman's Work: J. H. Henderlite.  
 Theological Seminaries: E. R. Leyburn.  
 Training School for Lay Workers: F. C. Symonds.  
 Mountain Retreat Association: F. C. Groover.  
 Bible Cause: E. A. Dillard.  
 Historical Foundation: W. C. Alexander.  
 Finance, Budget and Rules: Judge W. C. Wells.  
 Devotional Exercises: W. H. Johnson.  
 Leave of Absence: B. F. Yandel.  
 Thanks: J. A. McLean.

On motion of Dr. J. M. Wells, all overtures on union with other Presbyterian Churches and the report of the Ad Interim Committee on Union were referred to a special committee of one Minister and one ruling elder from each Synod.

The names of the members from the various Synods who were selected to act on this committee were announced as follows:

Rev. C. M. Richards, chairman.  
 Alabama, Rev. C. M. Boyd, H. H. Booth.  
 Appalachia, Rev. James L. Fowle, S. B. Campbell.  
 Arkansas, Rev. C. W. Anderson, Judge T. J. Moore.  
 Florida, Rev. E. W. Way, J. G. Anderson, Jr.  
 Georgia, Rev. Harold Shields, D. N. Harvey.  
 Kentucky, Rev. Edgar C. Lucas, Hugh B. Fleece.  
 Louisiana, Rev. A. C. Ingram, John Glassell.  
 Mississippi, Rev. J. C. Crane, Major W. C. Wells.  
 Missouri, Rev. Wm. Crowe, Floyd F. Gauldin.  
 North Carolina, Rev. C. M. Richards, W. E. Price.  
 Oklahoma, Rev. J. W. Moseley, Jr., Judge Robert Crockett.  
 Snedecor Memorial, Rev. M. U. Williams, L. T. Taylor.  
 South Carolina, Rev. G. G. Mayes, F. H. McMaster.  
 Tennessee, Rev. J. F. Ligon, R. B. Clinton.  
 Texas, Rev. W. A. McLeod, J. M. Gordon.  
 Virginia, Rev. J. J. Murray, Dr. A. L. Tynes.  
 West Virginia, Rev. J. Blair Morton, Dr. John Thames.

The Judicial Committee reported that the complaint of the Rev. J. E. McJunkin, et al., against the Synod of Arkansas, in the case of the Rev. Hay Watson Smith, D.D., accused of heresy, be found in order and entertained by the Assembly.

The Commission to try the complaint was appointed by the Moderator as follows:

Calvin Wells, Rev. J. M. McChesney, E. J. McMillan, Rev. E. F. Montgomery, Rev. E. R. Leyburn, B. M. Heatt, W. C. McLeod, Rev. J. L. Mauze, C. G. Rose, Rev. A. S. Johnson, Rev. J. S. Foster, T. G. Matheson, Rev. W. C. Alexander, Rev. W. A. Alexander, Rev. W. A. McLeod, Rev. R. L. Kinnaird, J. H. Hassinger, J. G. Anderson, Jr., D. G. Wise, John Stites, Rev. F. C. Symonds, A. F. Davidson, Dr. R. L. Carr, E. A. Dillard, Rev. C. C. Anderson, W. E. Price, Rev. C. M. Richards, convener.

On Monday, June 1, the Assembly received the report of the standing committee on Bills and Overtures recommending that an overture regarding rotary eldership be sent to the Presbyteries for their vote. If a majority of the Presbyteries concur, the overture will become a part of the law of the Church. It was later adopted and is as follows:

"That the Assembly, in accordance with the provisions made therefor in the Book of Church Order, paragraph 160, hereby approves of, recommends to the Presbyteries, and submits to the Presbyteries for their advice and consent, the following amendment to the Book of Church Order, paragraph 149, viz., that there be added the following sub-paragraph to said paragraph 149: If any particular church, by a majority vote, at a congregational meeting, shall prefer to elect Ruling Elders and Deacons for a limited term in the exercise of their functions, this may be done; provided that the time of such active exercise be not less than three years, and that the session and the board of Deacons be made to consist of three classes, one of which classes shall be elected each year; and provided further that the Ruling Elders and Deacons, once ordained, shall not be divested of their office when they are not re-elected for active service, and if re-elected shall not be re-ordained; and provided further that a congregation voting to make such terms of office limited may also determine for how long a period of time, if any, such retired officers shall be ineligible for re-election. Elders thus retired shall be entitled to represent their church in the higher courts of the Church when appointed by the session or by the Presbytery."

The Assembly refused to adopt an overture asking it to declare against military training in schools owned and controlled by the church, and requesting such schools to plan for the elimination of military courses. By a vote of 147 to 89 the overture was defeated, and by a vote of 136 to 83 the Assembly adopted the following substitute:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church hereby adopts the following: (1) We do not believe the church-owned or controlled school should make compulsory military training a part of its curriculum. (2) We request Synods and Presbyteries owning and controlling schools now having military training or plan for the making of such compulsory military training optional as soon as possible."

On Monday, June 1, the matter of the relationship of the church to the "Federal Council" was debated. The standing committee on Foreign Relations sent two reports, that of the majority, and a minority report. The former recommended continuance in the Council. The latter recommended severance of relations. Among those upholding the Council in the debate were, The Rev. J. E. Cook, Dr. George Summey, and Dr. J. J. Murray. Among those opposing the Council were the Revs. J. S. Sleeper, E. A. Dillard, J. C. Johnson, A. S. Johnson, H. B. Deady, F. B. Yandell and Ruling Elder T. M. Glasgow. At 5:20 in the afternoon the vote was taken, and the majority report was defeated by 175 to 79 votes. The minority report was then adopted and the Southern Church was out of the Council.

On Tuesday the most important business was the consideration of the recommendation of the standing committee on Assembly's work. This committee made a startling recommendation, namely, the abolition of the "Committee of 44," sometimes called the "Assembly's Work Committee." This committee was set up in 1927 to supervise the work of the agencies of the church, and to secure increased efficiency. In the view of the standing committee this body had not justified its existence. After hot debate, the recommendation was adopted by a vote of 144 to 92.

In place of the Work Committee, the Assembly decreed "That the four Executive Committees, being invested with full authority and responsibility for the conduct of the work entrusted to them severally, be held accountable for the same to the Assembly alone; and that the membership of these Committees be: Foreign Missions twelve, Home Missions nine, and seven each for Christian Education and Ministerial Relief, and Religious Education. The members of the Executive Committees shall be elected by the Assembly on nomination by their respective Standing Committees to serve for three years and divided into three classes ending 1932, 1933, 1934."

The Judicial Commission appointed to try the complaint against the Synod of Arkansas, reported as follows, which report became the judgment of the Assembly:

The commission appointed by the Assembly to try the complaint of Rev. J. R. McJunkin and others against the Synod of Arkansas has held two meetings. The first

was for the purpose of organization. Nineteen members were present. Rev. John S. Foster was elected chairman, and Rev. F. C. Symonds, clerk.

At the second meeting of the commission its twenty-seven members were present. It was led in prayer by the chairman.

The chairman then charged the commission, and the records of the case, as agreed upon by the Complainants, the Respondent and the Court, were read.

The Commission first heard Rev. J. E. McJunkin in behalf of the Complainants. It next heard Rev. Marion A. Boggs, the Respondent on behalf of the Synod of Arkansas.

The members of the Commission were then given an opportunity to state their opinions.

The Commission by unanimous vote sustained the complaint and rendered the following judgment: That this cause be remanded to the Synod of Arkansas for a new hearing in accordance with paragraph 288, Book of Church Order.

The minutes were read and approved and the commission adjourned with prayer by Rev. A. S. Johnson.

John S. Foster, Chairman, F. C. Symonds, clerk.

Dr. C. M. Richards, chairman of the Special Committee on Union with other bodies, presented the report of the Special Committee on Union. He said there was a majority report and also a minority report. He presented the majority report which is as follows:

*Majority Report of the Special Committee on Union.*

Your committee believes that after the continuous and unsuccessful efforts for many years of the best and most consecrated minds of our Church to agree, either among themselves, or with representatives of other Presbyterian and Reformed bodies upon a satisfactory plan, or basis, for organic union with any of such Presbyterian or Reformed bodies, the continuance of negotiations to that end would be detrimental to the peace, unity, and usefulness of our Church.

We therefore recommend:

First: That negotiations and conferences looking to organic union cease.

Second: That the Ad Interim Committee be continued with direction to draft, either jointly with all, or any other Presbyterian or Reformed bodies, or alone, a definite, complete and detailed plan for a Federal union of our Church with any or all Presbyterian or Reformed bodies and present the same to the next General Assembly for its consideration.

Third: The committee, in its delibera-

tions, place emphasis upon the historic interpretations of our faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind, rather than the mechanics of church government and operation; that in the meantime our Church concern itself mightily in the prayerful, Christian stewardship of its possessions, time, talents, and opportunities.

Fourth: That this action be the answer of the Assembly to all overtures before this Assembly touching the matter of negotiations for union with other Churches.

C. M. Richards, Chairman.

Rev. C. M. Boyd, Rev. C. W. Anderson, Rev. E. W. Way, Rev. Harold Shields, Rev. A. C. Ingram, Rev. J. C. Crane, Rev. Wm. Crowe, Rev. C. M. Richards, Rev. M. U. Williams, Rev. J. F. Ligon, Rev. J. Blair Morton, H. H. Booth, S. B. Campbell, Judge T. J. Moore, J. G. Anderson, Jr., D. N. Harvey, Hugh B. Fleece, John Glassell, Major W. C. Wells, W. E. Price, Judge Robert Crockett, L. T. Taylor, F. N. McMaster, R. B. Clinton, Dr. A. L. Tynes, Dr. James Thames.

Dr. J. L. Fowle presented the minority report which is as follows:

*Minority Report of Special Committee on Union.*

Your Committee recommends that the Assembly distinctly announce to the Church at large that it is not now committing itself in any sense to organic union, but that it is unwilling to close the door to further discussion of the important question of union, and to this end continues the Ad Interim Committee appointed by the Assembly of 1930, to continue conferences with the representatives of the Churches holding the Presbyterian and Reformed system, with the view of placing before the Assembly of 1932 any information this Ad Interim Committee may secure and a statement of any plans that may be evolved concerning union with such churches; and that the Joint Committee be asked, as it has itself recommended, that a time and place be designated where a sufficient period may be given to a matter so important and needing such careful, prayerful, and deliberate consideration.

James L. Fowle, J. M. Gordon, Floyd F. Gauldin, Edgar C. Lucas, G. G. Mayes, J. J. Murray, W. A. McLeod, J. W. Moseley, Jr.

Some one asked for a definition of the "Federal" as used in the majority report, which authorized a committee to work out a plan of "Federal Union."

Dr. Richards requested Ruling Elder Calvin W. Wells to answer.

Judge Wells said a Federal union is one in which the complete autonomy of the bodies uniting is maintained, with certain powers delegated to the Federal body. Federal union, he said, is opposed to organic union.

In the strenuous debate which followed, the majority report (against organic union) was upheld by Dr. J. S. Foster, Dr. C. M. Richards, Dr. J. M. Wells and Dr. Wm. Crowe. Those arguing in favor of continuing negotiations were the Rev. J. E. Travis, Dr. T. W. Currie and Dr. J. J. Murray. After the vote had been taken it was found that the majority report had been substituted for the minority report by 133 votes to 105. Dr. T. W. Currie then moved to lay the majority report on the table. The motion was lost. The majority report was then adopted by a vote of 148 to 97. Thus the Southern Church said "No" to organic union but left the door open for a Federal union.

On Wednesday, June 2, the Assembly refused to accede to the recommendation of the special committee on the Country Church Department that the department be discontinued. It was also voted that Dr. Henry W. McLaughlin be re-elected as secretary of that work for three years.

A great deal of discussion centered about the perennial problem of vacancy and supply. It was finally resolved to send down to the Presbyteries for "study, suggested amendment and approval" a plan worked out by a special committee. This plan is based upon the erection of a Synodical Committee on Nomination and Supply. The committee is to nominate Ministers to vacant charges and recommend the changes to the Presbyteries involved. There is, however, to be no coercion.

The Assembly was dissolved on Wednesday afternoon, and another General Assembly ordered to meet in Montreat on May 26, 1932.

### Congregational-"Christian" Merger Accomplished

FORMAL action which merged two major church bodies, the Congregationalists and the "Christian Church," with a combined membership of more than 1,000,000, was taken at a joint convention held in Seattle, Wash., late in June, when a new constitution providing for the union was approved at separate assemblies.

The majority of the Christian churches are located in the States of the Mississippi Valley and the Southeast.

The churches affected total 6,670, with a communicant membership of 1,050,000.

The foreign missions of the two groups already have been merged under the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," the agency of the former Congregational Church. The missions are in sixteen foreign countries, where 850 American missionaries and more than 6,000 nationals are employed.

Those who led the negotiations for the union expressed themselves as believing that it was the beginning of a new era among the churches, and will be followed by other mer-

gers. They hoped other denominations will join with them to form a group large enough to warrant the adoption of the name, "The United Church of Christ in America."

The Rev. Dr. Carl H. Patton, of the First Congregational Church, Los Angeles, was elected moderator of the National Congregational Council and thereby became co-moderator of the newly formed body.

An announcement said the union would consider current world problems from a religious standpoint and afford churchmen "opportunity for free discussion of religious problems without fear of being unorthodox."

The principles of the Church as set forth in the preamble to its constitution as adopted are:

"We hold sacred the freedom of the individual soul and the right of private judgment. We stand for the autonomy of the local church and its independence of ecclesiastical control. We cherish the fellowship of churches, united in district, State and national bodies, for counsel and cooperation. Affirming these convictions, we hold to the unity of the Church of Christ and will unite with all its branches in fellowship and hearty cooperation, and we earnestly seek that the prayer of Our Lord for the unity of His followers may be speedily answered.

"We find in the Bible the supreme rule of faith and life, but recognize wide room for differences in interpretation. We therefore base our union upon the acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life and not upon uniformity of theological opinion or any uniform practice of ordinances."

The constitution specifies that the new General Council shall have two Moderators, one from the Congregational group and one from the Christian group, until 1935, after which there shall be only one Moderator. There shall also be assistant Moderators. The council shall have a secretary, an assistant secretary and departmental secretaries. Bureaus of evangelism, of ministerial supply, of stewardship and of Christian unity, and two permanent commissions on social relationships and good citizenship, and on international and interracial relations are to be established.

At the closing session, held on July 3, a number of resolutions proposed by smaller groups into which the main body had divided for purposes of discussion were adopted. One such resolution, however, protesting "the present high tariff" and advocating a "freer exchange of commodities" in order that "brotherly relations" and "equality of opportunity" might be promoted between the peoples of the world, was tabled as "vague and indefinite" in phraseology.

The accepted resolutions included approval of the following "planks":

Voluntary parenthood through birth control.

Abolition of compulsory military training in Congregational and tax-supported colleges

and of all military training in high schools.

Entrance of the United States into the League of Nations and a special session of the Senate for the ratification of the protocols for membership in the World Court.

Naturalization of aliens who are conscientious objectors against war.

Eight-hour day and a five-day week for workers.

Preservation of the rights of free speech by the pulpit, the press and labor.

Maintenance and enforcement of the present prohibition laws.

Recognition of the Soviet Government.

### General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada met on the evening of Wednesday, June 3rd, in Knox Church, Toronto. The moderator of the Fifty-sixth Assembly, the Rev. Frank Baird, D.D., preached a masterful and inspiring sermon from the text "The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee" (I Kings 21:3). Following the constitution of the Assembly with prayer, Dr. Baird gave an account of his tireless labors during the year, and then called upon the Assembly to elect its moderator.

The nominations were three in number. In a stirring speech Rev. S. Farley, Regina, nominated Rev. Walter G. Brown of Saskatoon. This was seconded by Rev. Dr. Johnston of Ottawa. Dr. Banks Nelson was then nominated by Rev. T. D. McCullough of Kincardine, seconded by Rev. Norman D. Kennedy, New Glasgow, N. S., and followed by the nomination of Rev. Dr. Roderick G. MacBeth of Vancouver, B. C., by Rev. N. A. MacEachern, Winnipeg. Before a seconder could rise to his feet Dr. MacBeth rose and withdrew. Dr. Nelson in a brief speech also withdrew and after a verbal tilt with his nominator was allowed to do so. There were no further nominations and the Assembly then acclaimed Rev. Walter G. Brown as Moderator, who was robed and brought to the Chair by his sponsors. Mr. Brown briefly thanked the Assembly for the confidence reposed in him and added—"I trust that we, as an Assembly, shall have our hearts and minds guided by God's spirit in dealing with the problems before us—that, arising out of our action and decision, our work may redound to the greater glory of God in Canada and beyond the seas."

In electing Mr. Brown as Moderator, the Canadian Assembly honored one of its home missionaries. The new Moderator came from a farming community near Huntingdon, Quebec. His early training was at Huntingdon Academy. This was followed by a course at McGill from which he graduated in 1899 as Master of Arts and holding first

class honors in Philosophy. Pursuing his studies in theology he received his training for the ministry in the Presbyterian College, Montreal, graduating in 1902 with the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

On graduation in the spring of 1902, refusing calls to some of the leading pulpits in the Dominion, Mr. Brown went as a missionary to the lumbermen in the Nipissing, Muskoka, and Parry Sound district where he served for two summers as a student. In this capacity he tramped from fifteen to twenty miles a day, preaching in the camps at night. In the spring of 1903 when the lumber camps closed he asked to be sent to one of the toughest mining camps in British Columbia. His wish was granted and he labored for four years in the Slocan district.

Then came another period of study. Leaving for Scotland in 1907, he studied in Glasgow, taking a post-graduate course. On his return to Canada he again undertook frontier work, and in March, 1908, he was called to Red Deer, Alberta. From this centre he has served the Church in the West for eighteen years. For a number of years he was Convener of the Home Mission Committee of the Presbytery of Red Deer, and in this office he was instrumental in laying the foundation of most of the Presbyterian congregations in Alberta. From the time of his appointment as Convener the Church flourished and increased by leaps and bounds. The Presbytery of Castor was opened up and organized as the result of his energetic Conventership. It has been said, "He has given his whole soul to the West."

In the dark and difficult days prior to Union, when crisis faced the Church, Mr. Brown, fired with the need of the peculiar genius of Presbyterianism in the growing cities and newly settled places of the West, launched forth in defence of the faith of his fathers. During the controversy he travelled from coast to coast addressing meeting after meeting, not sparing himself. In the campaign he was a consistent fighter and even as early as the Assembly of 1910 in Halifax sounded a warning note. In this cause also he prepared numerous pamphlets and articles on Church Union. As he gave his whole soul to the work of building up the Church in Alberta so he gave himself to protecting and continuing the Church in her time of greatest peril. When Union had left the Presbyterian Church with only ten churches and fifteen preaching places in Alberta it was "Brown of Red Deer" who increased them by 600 per cent.

In July, 1925, he was called to lead a minority group in Saskatoon, now known as St. Andrew's, and of which he is still Minister. Since then, for the last six years, he has been Convener of Home Missions for the Synod of Saskatchewan, superintending its rapid growth of rebuilding and devoting himself with great energy to restoring the breaches in the walls of the Church in that

Province. Also during this period he organized the work of the Church at The Pas, Manitoba, laying the foundations for extension into the far North.

Among the matters dealt with at the Thursday sederunt was a report from the Board of Knox College, Toronto, as follows:

"An investigation undertaken as a result of a complaint made by a number of the students in theology disclosed a grave condition in the college which seriously affects its life, influence and usefulness, and which calls for further investigation and action. Your board, being without authority to deal adequately with this situation, would earnestly urge your venerable body to appoint a Commission to investigate and bring to an issue a situation which, in the opinion of the board, is intolerable."

The foregoing report was signed by Dr. J. T. Fotheringham, Chairman, and W. C. Thomson, Secretary of the board.

The delegate of the Church of Scotland, the Rev. J. R. Forgan, M.A., said in bringing greetings, "Nowhere am I happier to represent the great united Church of Scotland than in this virile daughter Church in Canada."

Thursday evening, was given over to the discussion of Home Missions. Addresses were delivered by the Rev. E. A. Wright, of the Peace River district, and the Rev. W. M. MacKay, Superintendent of Missions for Northern Ontario and Eastern Manitoba. Mr. MacKay drew a graphic picture of the advance of the Presbyterian Church in this mission district since the disruption of 1925, in the Presbyteries of Algoma, Sudbury, North Bay and Superior. "Then," said he, "12 preaching points, 1,993 members and \$313,000 worth of Church property. Now—65 preaching points, 7,192 members and \$789,000 worth of Church property. In other words, an increase within the narrow boundaries of those six years totalling 37 Ministers, 53 preaching points, 5,196 members and \$476,000 worth of Church property—and all within those Presbyteries."

On Friday, in the matter of the two Presbyterian colleges, at Montreal and Toronto, a motion by Rev. Dr. Banks Nelson came before the Assembly "that a committee be appointed to deal with the affairs of both institutions, and submit its findings to the Assembly." In the opinion of Dr. Banks Nelson, this method, in the past, had been found to be more effective and expeditious than having the problems come directly before the Assembly.

The motion was vigorously opposed by Rev. Dr. Duncan of Stratford and Rev. W. H. Leatham, D.D., Ottawa, the latter expressing the opinion that "it looks as if an attempt was being made to sidetrack some features in the college affairs which properly should come directly before the Assembly;" and, in Dr. Duncan's view, it was considered advisable to have those affairs subjected to the direct thought of the Assembly, in view

of the fact that there were now but two colleges to be dealt with, rather than a dozen as in past years. Dr. Banks Nelson energetically repudiated any suggestion of "ulterior motives" behind his motion. It was finally decided that the report of the Presbyterian College at Montreal and that of Knox College should come before the Assembly.

John Wilson made the report of the Presbyterian Record Committee. Here again distinctly divergent opinions were expressed by various commissioners, extending all the way from criticism to eulogy. In the absence of the editor, however, it was felt unwise, if not unfair, to arrive at conclusions.

In Dr. D. T. L. McKerroll's report of the Pension Board it was pointed out that there are now 487 beneficiaries of the pension fund. "Notwithstanding all the difficulties which, naturally, had to be met with," declares the report, "since division in 1925, we are able to note that the amount of money received as our share from the old endowment, and the only amount we had to start with in this fund, totalled \$463,642, and from this year's financial statement we are glad to note that the total assets of the fund as at Jan. 31, 1931, were \$639,299. But, notwithstanding this, we are only able to pay Ministers who have paid the full rates and given 40 years of service \$500 a year, and widows \$300, full rate, \$250 optional rate." The following recommendation in the report was concurred in by the Assembly: "Your board recommends that all those who were placed on the fund since 1925, owing to the condition of the fund through the liberality of the Church, be paid a maximum annuity of \$600, or relative portion thereof, and this to be retroactive from the time of their coming on to the fund."

Rev. Dr. George Duncan, member of the Pension Board, moved the reception and adoption of the report.

Among other features of the sederunt was an inspiring appeal by James Rodgers (Montreal) with reference to budget requirements in the coming year. Reference also was made to "the generosity of the veteran Rev. Dr. Ephraim Scott" in asking that his annuity be discontinued. At his request it had been applied to the credit of a special fund "to be used for the relief of sick and infirm Ministers." The amount was some \$2,500 to date. The Board of Pensions report further notes that "during the past year cheques have been received to the amount of \$10,000 from a generous friend of the fund."

On Friday evening, which was Foreign Mission night, three speakers were heard.

"India is a land of mystery and darkness; a land of pathos and poignancy; a land with a hoary past, a vital and tremendous present, and a future all unknown. Do you speak of retrenchment here at home? All I can say to this Assembly is that if you give up the work, we shall still go on," said Dr.

Thomas Draper of the Jobat Central India Mission.

Said Arthur Hawtin (Jhansi, U. P. India), of the Gwallior Mission: "I think the great need in India is not 'home rule' but rather Divine rule; not so much a change of Government as a change of heart. Until India is Christianized, that vast country would not be safe for self-government."

And this, from Allan Reoch of Manchuria: "Outer Mongolia has been made 'red' by Bolshevism—let us make Inner Mongolia 'red' with the blood of Him of Nazareth."

At the Saturday sederunt the question of the Board of Administration being given "power of control over expenditures" was the subject of considerable discussion. On the one hand there were commissioners who believed in that "control" as "both necessary and desirable in these times;" while the other view looked upon the suggestion as a "usurpation of and infringement upon the rights of this General Assembly." The contentious motion was finally carried by a standing vote of the Assembly, and reads as follows: "That, if, in the opinion of the Board of Administration or its executive, the amounts received from time to time by the Treasurer for what is known as the budget, together with moneys which the board or its executive think may be received during the remainder of the then current year, will not be sufficient to warrant the various boards or committees to expend even the amounts allocated to them by the Assembly, the Board of Administration or its executive is hereby authorized to make known to the various boards or committees interested their intention so to do, to make such changes in such proposed expenditures as it may seem advisable or necessary, in order that so far as possible any danger of a further and additional deficit be removed; and, should any such change in such proposed expenditure be made, that the Treasurer be notified accordingly."

In the course of his statistical report, Rev. J. W. MacNamara, Clerk of the Assembly, gave various significant facts and figures detailing the present position of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The amount raised last year for missionary and benevolent purposes apart from the Budget and the Women's Missionary Society, totalled \$195,619—which sum is greater than the total cumulative deficit of the Church since 1925. Last year 20 Presbyterian Ministers died, and since 1925 the Church has lost 86 Ministers. The membership of the Church as at Dec. 31, 1930, is 180,680, with 702 Ministers. During the year 6,989 were received into the membership of the Church upon profession of faith. The aggregate amount raised by congregations for stipend during 1930 was \$1,301,698, representing an increase of \$8,718 over the previous year. The amount raised "for all purposes" in the past twelve months totals \$4,284,336.

Rev. Dr. A. S. Grant of the Mission Committee indicated the work that is being done, pointed out that the Home Missions had been living within the restricted allotments, but that the Foreign Missions had not. "We would have to ask the Assembly," he said, "to assume the responsibility for recalling our missionaries. It seems to me, however, that this is not the time to attempt to raise that deficit. I think it is the time to carry it." It was Dr. Grant's opinion that other available trust funds should be drawn upon to keep home and foreign missions as active as ever "rather than to cut the life germ out of our work."

Temperatures rose to the high point on Monday as the winds of controversy, alike with respect to the so-called "intolerable situation" at Knox College, and the suggested amalgamation of both "Knox College, Toronto, and the Presbyterian Theological College at Montreal" assumed occasionally storm velocity in a heated debate.

The Report of the Board of Administration of Knox College was read to the Assembly by the Rev. William Barclay of Hamilton, in the enforced absence of Chairman General J. T. Fotheringham, who is ill. The various sections of the report were speedily dealt with, with the exception of the concluding paragraphs, in which reference was made to "a grave condition in the college, which seriously affects its life, influence and usefulness," and urging the Assembly "to appoint a Commission to investigate and bring to an issue a situation which, in the opinion of the board, is intolerable."

Following an extended discussion which was participated in by commissioners from all corners of the floor, the following decision received the assent of the Assembly: "That Clause 5 of the report of the Board of Knox College be referred to the Senate of the college, to consider and investigate, and to formulate charges, if necessary; that this Assembly appoint a Commission with Assembly powers in connection with the matter; that the Senate be instructed, when they have investigated and considered the matter, to report to the Assembly's Commission; said report to be made on or before Sept. 30, 1931."

In commenting on the report he presented to the Assembly, Rev. William Barclay (Hamilton) said, "One cannot contemplate for a moment that, at the very heart of the student life of our Church, there should be bitterness and unrest, bringing results which would be disastrous, if such a condition were allowed to continue."

It is understood that the trouble in Knox College is a deep personal antagonism between Dr. Eakin, the principal, and another member of his faculty.

Describing a proposal to "temporarily amalgamate" Knox College and the Presbyterian College at Montreal as "a desirable measure of economy and a temporary neces-

sity," James Rodger, Chairman of the Board of Administration, failed to win the approval of the Assembly. Many speakers were heard on this issue, on which the Assembly was sharply divided. The resolution was vigorously opposed by Montreal commissioners, and Principal F. Scott Mackenzie made the discussion the occasion for asking a final ruling from the Assembly to declare the Montreal college a permanent institution. The resolution was "laid on the table" indefinitely.

After the business of the Assembly had concluded on the evening of June 10, the Moderator said: "It is six years ago tonight since many of us assembled in this church in a meeting which those who were present, I am sure, will never forget. At 12 o'clock, Standard Time, six years ago, we met to declare that the Presbyterian Church in Canada was to 'Carry On.' The spirit and determination pervading that assembly was deeply felt by all present. I stood over here in a corner some place, while this noble church—every seat and corner and foot of standing room—was filled with enthusiastic Presbyterian men and women from all parts of our Dominion.

"We solemnly pledged ourselves, in the name of the great King and Head of the Church, to maintain those great principles that had characterized the Presbyterian Church for so many centuries in the history of the race. We did not then know what the future held for us. In a sense it was a restatement of the old affirmation—a great foregathering in the name of the same age-old principle, and in the essence especially of spiritual freedom.

"As I recall that meeting, there was the great inspiring note of rededication. We were not going to permit any authority of the State to blot out our inheritance and spiritual freedom. Before God, we rededicated ourselves to that great undertaking. The intervening years have been difficult enough, and full of hard work. We did not realize the tremendous undertaking of reorganizing a great Church from which so many of our Ministers had departed and to which so many of our people were determined to adhere.

"In those intervening years of work—finding Ministers for minority groups, building churches, manses, and all the material and physical attributes of the Church—we have had time to realize the audacity of our purposes.

"There has, of course, been a certain amount of criticism, of things that might have been done and that have not been done; nevertheless, I think the past six years have been the most marvellous years that the Presbyterian Church in Canada has ever seen. I have been thirty years in Western Canada, and I never saw the Presbyterian Church make such progress in the Canadian West as in the last six years. In 1925 there

was almost nothing left in Saskatchewan. Today we have a fine, flourishing and vibrant Church scattered over those prairies. And, brethren, we are only at the dawning! With more men and money, we will grow faster and stronger by the grace of God.

"I think, therefore, it is timely that we should, tonight, rededicate ourselves to those principles of spiritual freedom, missionary enterprise, ideals and aims to which we pledged, six years ago, our hearts and our resources."

## General Synod of the Reformed Church in America

THE one hundred and twenty-fifth General Synod of the Reformed Church in America was convened in the Grand Ave. Reformed Church, Asbury Park, N. J., on the afternoon of June 4. The first business was the election of a President. The Reformed Church does not have nominating speeches. A name is written by each delegate on a slip of paper, in the "nominating ballot." This resulted in thirty-two names being placed before the Synod. The first electing ballot, with 190 votes cast, resulted in the election of the Rev. Frank B. Seely, D.D., of Kingston, New York, who received 91 votes. The next nearest was the Rev. Gerrit J. Hekhuis, D.D., of Grandville, Michigan. He was promptly elected vice-president.

The Synodical sermon was delivered by the Rev. Milton J. Hoffman, D.D., the retiring president, at the evening session.

On Friday, the second day, the contentious matter of church union was settled. The Permanent Committee on Closer Relations with other denominations reported through its chairman, the Rev. Malcolm J. MacLeod, D.D., as follows:

"1. That the General Synod authorize the Committee on Closer Relations with other Denominations to meet with the other negotiating committees of the Presbyterian family, if such a conference is called to draft a basis of organic union.

"2. That the Committee shall keep the churches informed as to the progress of Union movements."

This report brought about a prolonged and heated discussion. At least twenty-two delegates made addresses of longer or shorter duration. A substitute motion introduced by the Rev. Winfield Burggraaf, of Milwaukee, called for the termination of the activities of the Committee in so far as movement toward Church Union is concerned, at present. This motion was discussed at length and after some confusion was declared adopted. It was debated that this would end the activities of the Committee entirely, but on motion it was determined that the Committee should continue to act as the second recommendation called for; namely, to keep the churches informed as to the progress of Union movements.

It was very evident that a majority of

those present were convinced that the time for such thoroughgoing movements as suggested by the Committee was not yet, but it was also recognized that in the future it might be conceived to be possible that the sentiment would change. Generally speaking the vote on Church Union was regarded as a victory for the western branch of the church, generally regarded as more conservative in outlook than the eastern portion of the Church.

Considerable opposition to the Federal Council of Churches was visible, chiefly from the western delegates. On Saturday morning, however, the Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert, representing the Federal Council, assured the delegates that the Federal Council should not be held to accountability for the report of its committee on Birth Control or its booklet "The Fellowship of Prayer" which has been severely criticized as modernistic.

Discussion of the report of the Committee on International Justice and Good Will was begun Saturday and continued to Monday. On Monday there was warm discussion, participated in by a number of the delegates. The resolutions were presented seriatim and were in the main adopted. Several of them, however, were stricken out, among them being one to the effect "That refusal to bear arms for conscience sake should not debar individuals from American citizenship." Another that was stricken out was one authorizing General Synod to change the name of the Committee to "The World Peace Commission of the Reformed Church in America." The final resolution, which asked General Synod to appropriate the sum of one thousand dollars for the budget of the Committee was amended so that the Committee is permitted to solicit funds by private appeals.

Rev. F. Raymond Clee presented a resolution, which was adopted, asking General Synod to dismiss the Committee on Closer Relations with Other Denominations and to appoint a committee of seven to keep Synod informed as to the progress of the Union movement of other denominations.

Although several overtures had come to the Synod asking that relations with the Federal Council be severed, the impression made by Dr. Cavert was so strong that the Committee on Overtures brought in no recommendations, and its report was adopted without a vote being taken on this contentious issue.

Two invitations had been received for the next Synod—one from the Central Church of Grand Rapids, Mich., and one from the First Church of Kingston, N. Y. In view of the Bicentennial of the birth of Washington, and the relation of Washington to the Kingston Church, it was decided that the Synod meet in Kingston.

After two stanzas of "Blest be the Tie that Binds," the 125th Synod was dissolved on Tuesday evening, June 9th.

## Cumberland General Assembly

THE General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was held in Evansville, Indiana, from May 21-26. It was opened with a striking sermon by the Moderator of the preceding Assembly, the Rev. O. A. Barbee, of Owensboro, Ky. He preached on the subject "Can a child of God ever be lost?" from Ephesians 2:8. In a clear and able manner he demonstrated the eternal security of the believer, as it is revealed in God's Word. Among the noteworthy passages in his sermon was "I believe the Cumberland Church has a divine mission, and that it cannot fulfill that mission by trying to wear the clothes of religious educationists who believe everything not essential, nothing much that is essential, and whose hobby is organic union."

The Assembly elected as its Moderator the Rev. J. L. Elliot, of Denton, Texas, who made an excellent presiding officer.

Standing committees were appointed as follows:

Education: Revs. C. R. Matlock and T. E. Bright, with Dr. W. F. Cannon, J. W. Johnson and Rev. E. L. Freeman.

Publication and Sunday School work: Revs. W. T. Ingram and T. M. Hendrix, with S. C. Boswell, D. F. Terrell and J. H. Schuler.

Missions and Church Erection: Revs. A. D. Rudolph, O. W. Baucom and Guam Sing Quah, with Warren G. Belew and Elder C. J. Williams.

Ministerial Relief: Rev. A. N. Eshman, E. B. McEuen, Rev. J. R. Haws and Rev. R. L. Layman.

Tithing and Budget: Revs. Paul Brown and J. W. Stiles; L. O. Crawford, John Keith and Rev. R. N. Green.

Endowment: Revs. S. T. Byars, B. L. Bates, Thomas Campbell, Dr. J. L. Bone and J. I. Williams.

Young People's Work: Revs. J. Miller Cook and H. C. Cooper; H. S. Ellis and B. A. Davis.

Mortuary: Revs. J. W. Duvall and C. P. Parkhurst; S. B. Phillips and W. S. Chestnut.

Evangelism and Revivals: Rev. W. R. Reid, Mrs. Bessie Copeland Morris, George Ogden and DeRoy Pearson.

Prohibition and Law Enforcement: Revs. A. A. Collins and Neely D. Crawford; R. W. Haynes and William Stucker.

Sabbath Observance: Revs. J. E. Bell and D. B. Smith; A. F. Rochester and Roy Beckton.

Overtures: Revs. O. A. Barbee, W. O. Wayman and A. D. Saulsbury, H. M. Spaulding.

Judiciary: F. A. Seagel, chairman emeritus; Revs. Henry J. Graf and G. T. Carr; Jeff D. Clark.

Auditing and Finance: Revs. T. N. Hays and L. E. Baird; B. B. Looney, and F. W. Groce.

Resolutions: Revs. O. A. Gardner and J. M. Downen; A. F. Weaver and B. F. Pember-ton.

The Assembly passed a strong resolution regarding Prohibition, declaring its belief that purchasers of liquor were morally as culpable as the seller.

The Assembly voted that all congregations throughout the church be asked to put the name of the church so that it may be seen by all who pass. The committee on evangelism called attention to the fact that 745 congregations did not report a single conversion last year. All the 3,986 conversions for last year were reported from 409 congregations. The Cumberland Church is a very evangelistic church, and these facts came as a shock to many.

That the Cumberland Church is not standing still is evidenced by the General Summary Statistical tables of last year and this year. They are as follows: Total number of churches last year was 1,154, this year 1,160; Sundays preaching last year was 2,002, this year 2,497; number of elders reported last year was 4,668, this year 4,695; number of deacons reported last year, 1,917, this year 2,034; total number of baptisms reported last year was 2,183, this year 2,512; total number of additions reported last year was 3,511, this year 3,947; total number of conversions reported last year was 3,986, this year 4,343. Total number of church members reported last year was 63,353, this year 68,099. Total amount paid to pastors last year was \$263,764, this year \$259,876; total amount spent for buildings last year was \$108,788, this year \$38,365; the amount of Budget last year was \$20,120, this year \$15,823; total amount paid to all other purposes last year was \$65,851, this year \$71,454; total value of church property reported last year was \$3,102,162, this year \$3,252,051; the total value of manse reported last year was \$309,700, this year \$322,350.

These figures show that there was an increase in all the figures except as to the amounts paid to pastors, amount spent for buildings and the amount of the Budget. In spite of the financial depression, the Church advanced in most particulars.

The Assembly, after a week of labor and inspiration, was dissolved and another Assembly required to meet in 1932, in Chattanooga, Tenn. Invitations were received from Toronto, Ontario, and Alabama City, Alabama.

### Philadelphia Fundamentalists Organize

ONE of the results of the Convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association held in Philadelphia some weeks ago, has been the formation of a local organization, "The Philadelphia Fundamentalists," whose mottoes will be "Set for the defense of the Gospel" . . . "Holding Forth the Word of Life." Its officers are: President, Rev. A. V. Kimmell, (First Brethren Church); Vice-President, Rev. Merrill T.

#### IF THE LABEL

on the address of your copy says "July 1931" or any month prior to July, your renewal is due. Almost everyone wants to have the paper continue to come, but it is easy to postpone and to forget. Why not send the dollar now, and be assured of receiving the rich material the Editors plan to bring you in the coming year?

MacPherson, (Central North Broad St. Presbyterian Church); Vice-President, Rev. Herbert Hogg, (Berachah Church); Secretary, Rev. Clarence E. Mason, Jr., (Weston Memorial Baptist Church); Treasurer, Peter Stam, Jr., (Narberth Presbyterian Church).

There has been up to this time no organization in Philadelphia which linked together all Ministers and laymen who believe in a supernatural Word and a supernatural Saviour. Most certainly there is a real need for such a connecting link, and for the closer fellowship and mutual strengthening which such a work would make possible.

In line with this need, the Purposes of the new organization are:

1. To unite all Ministers and laymen who believe in a supernatural Word and a supernatural Saviour.
2. To defend the historic faith of Christianity.
3. To witness to the saving power of the Gospel of Christ, "Holding forth the Word of Life."

As a first step in carrying out these purposes, a program is planned, including:

1. An hour of Christian Fellowship monthly at a six o'clock supper.
2. An hour of Prayer and Bible Study, immediately following the supper, in charge of a capable Bible expositor.
3. An eight o'clock public meeting, open to all who are interested, addressed by the best speakers that can be secured.

All Ministers and laymen, who sign the Doctrinal Statement of the "Philadelphia Fundamentalists," become members upon vote of acceptance.

There are no dues. The work will be supported by free will offerings of God's people. There are no salaries. All officers are gladly giving their time, in addition to their regular duties as pastors or business men.

It is planned to hold monthly meetings, beginning late September or early October, in the Central North Broad St. Presbyterian Church, Broad and Green Streets, and Captain Reginald Wallis of Dublin, Ireland, a man of winsome personality who has been having a remarkable ministry especially among young people, is expected as the first speaker.

Backing this movement is a strong ad-

visory Board of Ministers and laymen, including leaders of the conservative forces in the various denominations, Bible Institutes and Seminaries, and religious publications. This board consists of Rev. A. F. Ballbach, Rev. Charles G. Bauer, Rev. L. F. Bausman, Rev. Lew Wade Gosnell, Rev. H. McA. Griffiths, Rev. Robert R. Littell, Rev. Wm. L. Pettingill, Rev. W. W. Rugh, Rev. W. C. Sanderson, Rev. Benjamin S. Stern, Rev. B. Smith Stull, Rev. T. R. Waggener, Rev. Warren R. Ward, Rev. Robert M. Webster, Rev. Paul E. Woolley, J. Davis Adams, John T. Boughey, George T. B. Davis, Philip E. Howard, E. Schuyler English, Frederick M. Paist, Wayne P. Rambo, William H. Richie, Alfred Schmitthener, John L. Steele.

Prayer has been requested that this new movement may be of great blessing and strengthening to the district it touches. Those wishing to help or secure literature may write the President, Rev. A. U. Kimmell, 2259 North 10th St., Philadelphia.

The organization takes on special significance due to the fact that, so far as is known, this is the first local fundamentalist body to welcome to its membership all those who earnestly accept "that blessed hope" the personal and visible return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" regardless of differences between evangelical Christians concerning details of His coming.

### "Experts" Arrive to Rescue Christian Missions

CONSIDERABLE resentment has been expressed by veteran missionaries of various denominations because ten so-called "experts" from the "New York Institute of Social and Religious Research" recently arrived in Shanghai for a month's stay. They are making what they think is an "exhaustive study" of missionary activities in China, India and Japan at the request of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry. The churches which are said to have asked to have their mission activities "studied" are the Congregational, Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Reformed in America, United Presbyterian and Northern Baptist.

The investigators are the Rev. Dr. H. Paul Douglass, Dr. W. A. Anderson, Miss Josephine E. Budd, Robert W. Bruere, the Rev. Dr. Stanley Ross Fisher, Dr. William G. Lennox, Dr. Edgar W. Knight, Dr. T. H. P. Sailer, Guy W. Sarvis and Miss Anna Seesholtz.

It has been suggested that these religious "junketers" will spend a few weeks here and there in Asia, gain a few superficial impressions, and return to America with imposing plans for basic improvements in missionary activity, mostly in line with modernist ideas of "cooperation and union." So far as can be learned, these self-appointed inquirers were not invited to make any study of its missions by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.