

# 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-AUGUST, 1931  
Vol. 2 No. 4

\$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.

## The Cosmic Significance of Christ

IN a previous issue (September, 1930), under the title "CHRIST and Christianity," we pointed out the place that CHRIST occupies in the religion that He founded—a place so central that CHRIST Himself is Christianity to such an extent that apart from Him there is and can be no such thing as Christianity in any proper sense of the word.

It is evident, however, that we cannot see in CHRIST a proper object of religious worship—in harmony with the New Testament and the great historic creeds—without seeing in Him one who sustains relations to the universe as a whole as well as to mankind. If we saw in JESUS simply the first Christian—so that to be a Christian is to believe *like* JESUS rather than *in* or *on* JESUS—there would be no occasion for our thinking of Him in cosmical terms. It is otherwise, however, when we see in Him an object of worship. Unless JESUS occupies a position in the universe as a whole that warrants our calling him God, we can worship Him only at the cost of rendering to a creature what belongs only to the Creator. This means that what we regard as the Christian attitude toward JESUS is rooted in the conviction that He not only occupies the central place in Christianity but a central place in the universe as a whole.

What has just been said might seem to imply that the place that CHRIST occupies in the universe as a whole is a truth we infer from what the Scriptures teach rather than a truth explicitly taught in the Scriptures. No such implication is intended. It is true, of course, that most frequent mention is made of the relations

that He sustains to men as teacher, friend, example, saviour, master, and such like, but at the same time they clearly teach that He occupies a position in the universe as a whole that is nothing short of central. JOHN and PAUL spoke not only for themselves but for all the writers of the New Testament when with JESUS in mind they wrote: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with GOD, and the Word was GOD. All things were made through Him and without Him was not anything made that was made" (John I: 1-3); "Who is the image of the invisible GOD, the first born of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him

all things consist" (Colossians I:15-17).

It is not enough, then, that we think of CHRIST as the Saviour of the world and as the LORD and Life of humanity. We gladly admit that those who see in Him their Saviour as well as their LORD and King have laid hold on that which is most vital for them; and yet it is by no means a matter of indifference whether men see in Him at the same time—as did JOHN and PAUL—the creator, sustainer, and goal of the universe as a whole.

There are various considerations that indicate the importance of our keeping in mind the place that JESUS CHRIST occupies in the universe as a whole. The following may be mentioned:

1. Unless we see in JESUS one whose rank in the scale of being places Him by the side of GOD, and so one whose place in the universe is such a place as GOD occupies, we cannot believe in the incarnation as taught in the New Testament; because the thought most essential to such an incarnation is the thought that GOD himself in the person of His Son assumed the flesh of our humanity, and "so was and continueth to be GOD and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, forever."

2. Back of the conviction that JESUS is Saviour of men and their rightful LORD and King, in the New Testament meaning of these terms, lies, expressed or unexpressed, the thought of the relations He sustains to the universe as a whole. Deny these wider relations and only those who fail to think their convictions through would be able to see in Him their Saviour and LORD—for time and eternity. Only one who sustains such relations to the

### IN THIS ISSUE:

Some Supernatural Marks in the Old Testament.....	4
E. Van Deusen	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	6
J. G. Machen	
Authority in Religion.....	8
Wm. Bittle Wells	
Books of Religious Significance.....	11
Questions and Answers.....	13
Letters to the Editor.....	14
Current Views and Voices.....	16
Ministerial Changes.....	18
News of the Church.....	19

universe as a whole, as according to the New Testament JESUS sustains, could be our Saviour and LORD in the full rich sense in which He is set forth as such in the New Testament.

3. The place that JESUS occupies in the universe is the presupposition of Christianity's claim to be the final religion. Unless we see in JESUS one whose position in the universe makes Him a proper object of religious worship, it is readily conceivable that as MOSES and the prophets have been surpassed, so JESUS will be surpassed; and hence that Christianity is only possessed of a temporary significance. Such a notion, however, is inconceivable if He be really a proper object of worship; for in that case the universe contains nothing higher than He, so that the religion that centers in Him is necessarily the final and absolute religion. This thought is common to the writers of the New Testament. It is in the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, that it finds fullest expression. Its author argues that Christianity is the final religion because of the superiority of JESUS not only to all who had preceded Him but to all who might come after Him. If JESUS were but a creature it were conceivable that the religion He established should be superseded by another and more perfect religion; but since He is "the effulgence of God's glory and the very image of His substance, the one also who made the worlds and who upholds all things by the word of His power" we may be sure that such a supposition will never become a reality.

4. Unless we keep in mind the cosmic significance of JESUS it is almost certain that we will misconceive the relation between nature and grace, science and faith, ordinary knowledge and revealed knowledge. To realize that CHRIST is creator and sustainer and goal of the universe as well as the saviour of mankind is to realize that these things have a common source, and, hence, that they are related organically rather than mechanically. This means that grace has not been added to nature or revealed knowledge to ordinary knowledge as house is added to house in the building of a city; rather that grace has been added to nature and revealed knowledge to ordinary knowledge as the scion from the good olive tree is added to the wild olive tree into which

it is grafted. Nature and grace, ordinary knowledge and revealed knowledge, are not to be conceived as independent still less as antagonistic entities. They are related vitally and organically; and that because JESUS is the source and head both of the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace. It follows that there can be no real contradiction between science and faith, i. e., between what may be learned from the study of nature and what may be learned from the Scriptures. There may, of course, be a real contradiction between certain interpretations of nature and certain interpretations of the Scriptures; but in view of the fact that JESUS is ultimately the author of both, it is obvious that when both are rightly interpreted there can be no real contradiction between them. Those who are aware that JESUS is Creator as well as Saviour will not be in constant fear lest discoveries in science will disprove the contents of Christian faith. They may be fearful lest men through wrong interpretations of nature be led to reject the Christian faith, or *vice versa*, but they are certain that ultimately it will be clear to all that there is no real contradiction between true science and true faith. Doubtless there is a contradiction, for instance, between Naturalism in all its forms and Christian faith, but that finds its explanation in the fact that Naturalism is grounded in a wrong or at least inadequate interpretation of nature, not in the fact that there is a contradiction between nature rightly interpreted and the teachings of CHRIST and His apostles.

5. A perception of the place that JESUS occupies in the universe as a whole promotes a right attitude toward this world and its activities. If we think of Jesus exclusively as related to mankind the tendency will be strong within us to suppose that He came into the world to save sinners out of the world and that He is indifferent to the fate of the world itself. In that case it is more or less inevitable that we will underestimate the earthly spheres of art and science, literature and politics, domestic and social economy, and that we will sympathize with those who say that "to be converted and then go forth to convert others" is practically the whole of Christian duty. It is indeed

better that we neglect this world and its activities than that we neglect JESUS and His gospel. If we had to choose between being mere secularists, mere worldlings, and being monks and nuns, it would be the part of wisdom to take our stand with the latter. "For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." But we are under no necessity of making such a choice. This world is not evil in itself. JESUS Himself created it. Moreover, His prayer for His disciples was not that they be taken out of the world but that they be kept from the evil in the world. Still further the object of CHRIST's saving work was not simply individual sinners, it was humanity itself together with the world humanity inhabits. He came to save the world itself and His task will not have been fully done until "the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption." With all its sin, "the earth is the LORD's and the fulness thereof." Hence our watchword as Christians should not be separation from the world but only from what is evil in the world. We are indeed pilgrims in this world, but pilgrims with many tasks to perform ere we leave it. Moreover we should remember that this world belongs to our LORD and Saviour and that it is our privilege to enjoy its blessings with thanksgiving. "For all things are yours; whether PAUL, or APOLLOS, or CEPHAS, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are CHRIST's and CHRIST is God's."

6. Finally, it is important that we think of JESUS in cosmical terms that we may be assured that our confidence in Him is not misplaced. If He were some lesser person it is conceivable that His words should fail of realization; but being what He is we may be altogether sure that He will fulfill His promises and that it will happen to us as individuals and as a race even as He said. It was because PAUL thought of JESUS in cosmical terms that he lived his life in the persuasion that nothing could separate him from the love of GOD, which is in CHRIST JESUS, and that at its close enabled him to say "I am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day."

## Christian Thought and Life: Its past, its present and its future

*FOR the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST; who gave himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:11-14).*

**A**LFRID PLUMMER, an outstanding English commentator of the last generation, ably and succinctly expounded the significance of this noteworthy passage thus:

"This passage might almost serve as a summary of St. PAUL's teaching. In it he once more insists upon the inseparable connection between creed and character, doctrine and life, and intimates the close relations between the past, the present and the future, in the Christian scheme of salvation. There are certain facts in the past, which must be believed; and there is a kind of life in the present which must be lived; and there are things in store for us in the future, which must be looked for. Thus the three great virtues of faith, charity and hope are inculcated. Two Epiphanies or appearances of JESUS CHRIST in this world are stated as the two great limits of the Christian dispensation. There is the Epiphany of grace, when the CHRIST appeared in humility, bringing salvation and instruction to all men; and there is the Epiphany of glory, when He will appear again in power, that He may claim as His own possession the people whom He hath redeemed; and between these two is the Christian life, with its 'blessed hope,' the hope of the LORD's return in glory to complete the kingdom which His first Advent began."

One hesitates to add comments to Dr. PLUMMER's striking and illuminating paragraph. It may serve however to bring out more fully the worth and significance

of this passage—remarkable even for PAUL—if we point out that it stresses three of the outstanding characteristics of the Christian religion, to wit—Christianity is (1) an historical religion, (2) an ethical religion, (3) an optimistic religion.

There is a need today, such as did not exist when Dr. PLUMMER wrote, to stress the fact that Christianity is an historical religion in the sense that it rests on a factual basis, upon events that happened in time, and that apart from these historic facts there is and can be no such thing as Christianity. It is characteristic of the whole trend of "modern" religious thought that it sits loosely to the question whether Christianity rests on a factual basis. It does not necessarily deny that the events recorded in the New Testament actually happened, but it does maintain that the value of the New Testament remains very much the same whether or no these events actually happened in the manner recorded; and that because it is interested in the ideals and principles of which these alleged facts are the symbols rather than in the facts themselves. There is need, therefore, of stressing the thought that the facts themselves (particularly those having to do with the birth, life, death and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST) belong to the very essence of Christianity. No doubt there is some truth in the representation that the value of the Bible for moral and religious instruction remains the same whether or no its alleged facts actually occurred. We as sinners, however, need something more than moral and religious instruction. We need a living Saviour who actually made atonement for our sins. Unless the facts recorded concerning CHRIST in the New Testament actually happened we have no such Saviour. Our hope for time and eternity is grounded in the conviction that JESUS CHRIST actually "gave himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity."

While the occasion for stressing the fact that Christianity is an ethical religion is not the same as the occasion for stressing the fact that it is an historical religion, there is constant need of emphasizing this fact. Whatever else Christianity may be, it is an ethical movement and no orthodoxy of thought, no punctilious observance of religious rites, no gen-

erosity in support of (or labor in behalf of) religious movements or organizations, will lead it to look with approval on one whose way of life is a way that it defines as a way of sin and iniquity. While Christianity teaches no one has ever been saved, or ever will be saved, on the ground of what he is or what he has done, yet this involves no undervaluation of the good life. It was to "redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession" that JESUS "gave Himself." Christians are, therefore, ever under obligation to avoid ungodliness and worldly lusts and to live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world. There is no substitute for right living in the Christian scheme of things. This follows from the very nature of the case. The Christian salvation is a salvation from sin. Those who have no desire to be saved from sin ought to have nothing to do with JESUS CHRIST. Why employ means fitted to bring about ends we do not desire? The time is coming when all true Christians will be completely freed of sin. To doubt that were to doubt Him who "gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity." Whatever the Christian may be now, ethically speaking, the time is coming when he will be perfect in this respect.

Finally Christianity is an optimistic religion. It cherishes high hopes and expectations for the future. It believes that the days to come are going to be better than any that have been. This optimism is grounded in the living and reigning CHRIST and finds its culmination in the belief that CHRIST is to return in glory to complete the work inaugurated in the days of His flesh. This is the great event that awaits us in the future. It will be as truly an historical event as was His coming nearly two thousand years ago. The doctrine of the second coming is not a secondary Christian belief. It is not only basic to Christian thought but determinative of the Christian outlook. Adequate Christianity exists only where it is given full and open recognition. To speak of a pessimistic Christian is little short of a contradiction in terms. How can one be pessimistic while "looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the great God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST?"

# Some Supernatural Marks in the Old Testament

By E. Van Deusen

THE absolute uniqueness of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures forbids their classification with any other writings. The Bible is in a class by itself and cannot be treated merely like other books. Nor can its clearly unique character and content be accounted for by any simply naturalistic explanation. Nothing short of supernatural intervention can logically account for the more than just human ideas and history which it records; anything less would be an attempt to explain an effect by an inadequate cause. Every effect must have not only a cause but an *adequate* cause. The ignoring of this fact has caused unmeasured error. This unique supernatural "watermark" is seen in the Old, as well as in the New, Testament. Of its many evidences in the former, brief consideration is here given to three—(a) the conception of God, (b) the teachings regarding man, and (c) Old Testament Ethics. The Book itself is the best witness as to its own supernatural character.

First—Its Conceptions of God: The Old Testament is unique in its *lofty* conceptions of God.

(A) *Monotheism* permeates these entire Scriptures, although they were produced amid otherwise universal polytheism and idolatry—including that of Semitic peoples also, except Israel. They proclaim throughout "The Lord, He is God; there is none else beside Him" (Deut. 4:35). This monotheism is the more impressive when one notes that polytheism and demonism were never cast off by any people through its own inherent effort and apart from the distinctive spiritual teachings of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. Even the monotheistic conceptions of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, though real, were practically undivorced from the prevalent polytheism, were in essence measurably impersonal, and were impotent to bring either the philosophers or the people to any effective apprehension

of the one sole, personal God of the Hebrew revelation.

(B) God as "a Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth" is asserted throughout the Old Testament; "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth" (Exod. 34:6); "The high and holy One who inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy" (Isaiah 57:15). No other mortal writing, uninfluenced by the Bible, even approaches these lofty and uplifting conceptions of the Deity.

(C) God as men's loving Lord seeking His creatures love in return is a matter of revelation, and unknown apart from the Scriptures of both Old and New Testaments. In Jeremiah 31:3 He says "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee." Again, "I was found of them that sought me not—All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." This divine wooing merits recognition and gratitude: "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endureth forever" (Psalms 106:1); "Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men" (Psalms 107:8). That God is seeking men, that "We love Him because He first loved us" is another of the unique conceptions of the Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures.

Second—Its Teachings regarding Man: The Old Testament's witness as to man is also unique.

(A) Man's *Origin*: Speaking in a straightforward, concise, matter-of-fact way, with restraint yet assurance, these Scriptures ascribe the origin of man—and of his earthly home, with its furnishings—to an intelligent, willing, beneficent, personal Creator—God. "I have made the earth, and created man upon it" (Is. 45:12); "The hearing ear and the seeing

eye, the Lord hath made even both of them" (Prov. 20:12); "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4). This idea was unknown apart from the Bible; the conception is not in the cosmogony of any nation untouched by the Hebrew influence.

(B) Man's *Duties* to God: Obviously, whatever "nature" might show as to the existence, power, goodness and wisdom of God, it cannot disclose the mind and will of God as to man's moral and spiritual life; this, if known, must perforce be "revealed" to him. The relationships between God and men, as expressed in the Old Testament, involve duties of man to God that are quite unknown outside of the Bible's teaching; e. g., *Love*—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5); *Thanksgiving*—"Sing unto the Lord—give thanks at the remembrance of His holiness" (Ps. 30:4); *Joy*—"Glory ye in His holy name; let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord" (I Chron. 16:10).

(C) Man's *Destiny*: The Old Testament—though speaking less fully than the New, after the teaching of Him who "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel"—yet answers with assurance the age-old question "If a man die shall he live again?", indicating in general yet clear terms something of the conditions and circumstances of that future existence. "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory" (Ps. 73:24); "I will behold Thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness" (Ps. 17:15); "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death" (Hosea 13:14); "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I

see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold" (Job 19:25-27); or again, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever" (Daniel 12:2-3).

Third—Its Ethics: Compared with other nations of antiquity, the socio-ethical standards of Israel were of such superiority as to indicate their supernatural source.

Some spirituality is prerequisite to any real and effective morality; and throughout Israel's history—sometimes well-nigh eclipsed by their backslidings—were a consciousness of Sin and of accountability to a personal and holy God. To understand Old Testament ethics, three facts must be remembered:

(1) That Old Testament history is the expression of a *divine redemptive purpose* working to a certain end. Purpose and objective permeate and shape Old Testament history, which is the record of the outworking of God's redemptive aim—against man's disobedience. His plan involved—(a) physical and (b) moral preservation of a representative race through which would come at length the world's divine Redeemer; it was to be a spiritual leaven in earth's lump of iniquity; only as the momentous issues of eternal life or eternal death are appreciated, will one see how all-important was the preservation of this lineage, amid conditions that ever threatened its destruction. The *immediate* aim was the moral and spiritual training of a family-race—to reveal God and His will to men, and man and his sins to himself; the *ultimate* aim was the reconciliation and redemption of men. And the final welfare of mankind was and is superior to any temporal and seeming private pleasure or profit; this principle is recognized daily in the legal right of "eminent domain."

(2) Old Testament Ethical Laws were adapted to the spiritual capacities of sinful men; they seized upon the best to reach the better. There is a subjective, as well as an objective, side to ethics; men are not automatons, but self-determining beings. Moral law must be ap-

This paper is published in the interest of a cause. Obviously it can serve that cause only as it is known and read. If you are in sympathy with its aims, and have found it helpful, please tell others about it.

plied to men as they are, and Old Testament ethics were very practical in their application to human conditions. God—and men—use the best instruments at hand, and their imperfections are no reflection on the plan or method; a pupil's faults are not those of the teacher. Men are not forced, because of high ethical standards, to do right. The Mosaic law was a pedagogue to lead men in time to the higher spiritual sanctions of the Messiah.

(3) *Admonition is not approval*: Admonition fills a large place in the Old Testament record; it provides concrete cases of *warnings*, as well as of *examples* to follow. Much teaching in the Old Testament is by "the case method." Because the Scriptures record unrighteous deeds, does not imply their approval; they are rather moral beacons marking the shoals of sin. No lesson is more insistently taught in the Old Testament than that—save for God's gracious intervention—the harvest will be as the sowing.

With these three guiding thoughts in mind for interpreting the ethical aspects of Old Testament history, we can but note a few points of uniqueness and superiority:

(1) *Gratitude and Love the ground of ethical obedience*. One mark of supernatural—(vs. evolutionary)—origin is that—unlike pagan religions—Judaism did not try to strengthen its ethical appeal by use of the solemn sanctions of the future life. Ethical obedience was desired to be the expression of gratitude to a loving Lord who led Israel out of a land of bondage into "a land flowing with milk and honey." While recognizing the peril and penalty of sin, yet love rather than selfish fear was the desired motive for keeping the moral law.

(2) Old Testament morality *progressive*, not static. In contrast with the static nature of pagan moralities, the pedagogic purpose and method of revelation produced a progressiveness in Old

Testament morality; e. g., the Mosaic law, while recognizing the common practice of Slavery, yet humanized and greatly modified it, until at length it practically ceased. Here again is another mark of a more than human origin.

(3) *Humanity in war*. In war, Israel was enjoined "When the host goeth forth against thine enemies, then keep thee from every wicked thing" (Deut. 23:9)—and this in an age of cruelty, rapine and license; amid base, sensual, idolatrous and spiritually debased peoples, Israel was commanded regarding the spoils of war, "—in any-wise keep yourselves from the accursed thing, lest ye make yourselves accursed when ye take of the accursed thing" (Joshua 6:18). As to war prisoners, the Syrian king's advisers said "Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings" (I Kgs. 20:31); and again, the king of Israel "prepared great provision for them (his war prisoners); and when they had eaten and drunk, he sent them away, and they went to their master" (II Kgs. 6:23).

(4) *Revenge and Oppression were forbidden*. "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against thy people" (Levit. 19:18); "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth" (Prov. 24:17); "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant" (Deut. 24:14); "Oppress not the widow, nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor; and let none of you imagine evil against his brother in your heart" (Zech. 7:10).

(5) *Generous spirit toward strangers*. Strangers were also provided for: "Judge righteously between every man—and the stranger that is with him" (Deut. 1:16); "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him" (Exod. 22:21); "—neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger" (Lev. 19:10); etc.

In brief, the Old Testament evinces its uniqueness and supernatural source in varied ways, as in the otherwise logically inexplicable *unity* of its writings, in its exclusively lofty conceptions of *God*, in its teachings on such high and vital themes as *man's* origin, duties and destiny, or in its superior *ethical standards*.

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.  
Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

## VIII. THE CALL OF GOD

*"For ye have heard of my manner of life formerly in Judaism, 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 in order that I might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia and again I returned to Damascus." (Gal. 1:13-17, in a literal translation.)*

### The Conversion

IT has been shown in the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY that Gal. 1:12 enunciates the thesis which is to be proved in the first main division of the Epistle. "I received the gospel," Paul says in effect, "not by instruction from men but by direct revelation from Jesus Christ."

The first proof of this assertion is found in Paul's life before his conversion: certainly he was not then coming under the influence of the original apostles, but was an active persecutor. "Ye have heard," Paul says, "of my manner of life formerly in Judaism, 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."

We learn something more about those traditions from Phil 3:5, where Paul himself, in one of the Epistles that are universally accepted as genuine by modern criticism, says that he was "as touching the law a Pharisee." Since he was a

Pharisee, it is natural, when he speaks of the traditions of his fathers, for us to think especially, though perhaps not exclusively, of the Pharisaic additions to the written Law.

"Such," Paul says in effect, "was my life before my conversion. Far from coming nearer to Christ, I was if anything moving farther away. I was an active persecutor of the Church of God; I was as far as possible from becoming a disciple of those from whom the Judaizers say that I received my gospel."

Then came the conversion. It was not according to Paul what it is according to modern naturalistic historians, the result of a psychological process; but it was utterly sudden, and was brought about by a sovereign act of God. "When He who set me apart," says the Apostle, "from the very beginning of my life—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 . . ." Three acts of God are here mentioned. In the first place, God set Paul apart from his mother's womb. Although Paul did not know it, God had really, from the very beginning of his life, designated him for the special work of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles. In the second place, God carried out that plan, which He had had for him from the beginning, by calling him through His grace. There is no doubt whatever but that this divine call is to be regarded as having taken place definitely and specifically at the conversion. The word "call" in such connections does not refer to the plan of God from all eternity; and it does not refer to the general divine ordering of a man's life in the execution of that plan: but it refers to the majestic divine act by which at a definite moment of time the divine purpose becomes effective in those who are saved. Such a "call" is more than a

mere invitation; it is, rather, a call which brings its answer with it; it is what the Shorter Catechism calls "effectual calling." That sovereign call of God came to Saul of Tarsus when he saw the Lord Jesus on the road to Damascus and became instead of a persecutor a servant and an apostle.

### The Revelation of God's Son

But if the call refers to the conversion, what is referred to by the revelation of God's Son which is mentioned next, as the third of the things which God did in the case of the Apostle. At first sight, it might seem to be something subsequent to the call and hence something subsequent to the conversion. Paul says: "When He who (1) set me apart and (2) called me (at the conversion) was pleased (3) to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles . . ." At first sight, it might seem as though three successive acts were here mentioned: (1) the setting apart, (2) the call, (3) the revelation of God's Son. Thus the revelation of God's Son in Paul would not be identical with the conversion but would be some later event in the Apostle's life.

There are, however, other indications which tend to show that this view is incorrect and that it is really the event on the Damascus road which is referred to here as it is referred to by the "call" which has just been mentioned. The trouble with regarding the revelation of God's Son as an event distinct from the conversion is that it seems to be treated as the turning-point in Paul's life, the event with reference to which all subsequent events in the experience of the Apostle are to be dated. Paul tells what did *not* happen immediately after this event, then he tells us what happened three years after it, etc. But surely the event which is treated in this way as the

turning-point in Paul's life can only be the conversion.

At any rate, it would seem clear that if the revelation of God's Son is not the conversion it must at least be placed very soon after the conversion and in close connection with it. We might think, for example, of possible revelations within the three days of blindness which the Book of Acts mentions as having followed immediately upon the event on the road to Damascus.

But is it really necessary, from the form of the sentence, to regard the revelation of God's Son as being subsequent to the "call"? That does not seem to be by any means perfectly clear. Paul first designates God by means of the two outstanding things which He had done for him in his life taken as a whole up to the time of the writing of the Epistle; he designates God as the One who had set him apart and had called him. When he tells what the One so designated had done to fit him particularly to be a preacher to the Gentiles. It is perhaps not necessary to reflect upon the question what the temporal relation is between this third act of God and the other two acts. Paul may mean simply to say: "When the One who can be designated as the One who set me apart and called me was pleased (whether before or after or simultaneously with the calling) to reveal His Son in me that I might proclaim Him among the Gentiles . . ." In that case, the revelation of God's Son in Paul might be regarded as having taken place on the road to Damascus and as being, like the call, identical with the conversion.

#### Paul's Meeting with Christ on the Damascus Road

It must be admitted, indeed, that another difficulty seems to arise against this identification. If the revelation of God's Son here spoken of was a revelation *in* Paul, it seems at first sight to be designated as an inner, rather than as an external, revelation. But if so, how can it be identified with that meeting of Paul with Christ which is described in the ninth and twenty-second and twenty-sixth chapters of the Book of Acts? In that meeting, not only the Book of Acts (which is under fire in modern criticism) but also

Paul himself in one of his universally accepted Epistles says that he actually saw Christ, so that the revelation at that time was an outward and not merely an inward event. In I Cor. 9:1 Paul says, (plainly with reference to the conversion): "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"; and in I Cor. 15:8 he says that Christ "appeared" to him, the verb "appeared," which is here used, being the passive voice of the verb "to see," which is used in the other passage, so that "appeared" in Greek is the same as "was seen." Moreover, Paul evidently regarded his meeting with Jesus on the Damascus road as being entirely different from such an experience as that which he describes in II Cor. 12:1-4.

That does not mean that this latter experience did not possess high value; it does not mean that it was a mere illusion. But Paul speaks of it with the utmost reserve and with the utmost reluctance. He was caught up into the third heaven, he says, but whether in the body or out of the body he does not know, and the words that he heard were unspeakable. Indeed, he even hesitates to use the pronoun "I" in speaking about that experience; he ventures only to say, with regard to the recipient of it: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago . . ." When he speaks about his meeting with Christ on the Damascus road, on the other hand, there is none of this reserve. Far from having to be forced to speak about that meeting, as about the strange experience described in II Cor. 12:1-4, he made it basic in all his preaching; he presented it publicly to his converts (or, as it is perhaps more accurate to say, to those who by the presentation of it became converts) "among the first things" (I Cor. 15:3). Evidently he regarded it as a plain matter of fact, attested by the senses like any other event. It was not merely an inner experience, according to Paul, but a happening in the external world.

If that be so about Paul's meeting with Christ on the Damascus road, how can it be that event that is referred to in our passage when Paul says that God revealed Christ *in* him? Paul plainly regarded the event on the Damascus road as an external event, whereas in our passage the revelation of God's Son is designated as a revelation *in* him and not as a revelation *to* him.

#### Revelation to Paul or to Others?

This difficulty, when taken with the difficulty already mentioned, that the revelation of God's Son seems, at first sight at least, to be presented as subsequent to the call and not identical with it, made it not altogether surprising that so able a scholar as Bishop Lightfoot adopted an interpretation totally distinct from those that we have so far considered. Lightfoot held that the revelation here referred to is not at all a revelation either to Paul or within Paul's soul, but a revelation through Paul to others. The wonderful change in Paul's life, since it was wrought by the grace of Christ, was a revelation of Christ to all who might behold it. On this interpretation, the use of the preposition "in" in the phrase "in me" would be similar to that in verse 21 when Paul says, "They glorified God *in me*." "When God was pleased," Paul would be made by this interpretation to say, "to reveal His Son in me by the revelation of His Son's power in my whole life . . ." An objection to this view is usually found in the fact that the passage seems to put the revelation of God's Son in Paul as something prior to the proclamation of God's Son by Paul to the Gentiles—something which had that proclamation as its purpose—whereas if Lightfoot's interpretation is correct the revelation of God's Son in Paul would seem rather to be identical with that proclamation of God's Son or continuously contemporary with it. This objection is perhaps not quite decisive, and the interpretation against which it is raised is at least not beyond the bounds of possibility.

However, the commoner view, that the revelation of God's Son in Paul does refer to the Damascus event or to something immediately subsequent to that event and closely connected with it, and that it does refer to a revelation that had Paul as its recipient, is also not impossible. Why may not Paul be referring here to an inner aspect of what he designates elsewhere as an external event? If the conversion was wrought by a revelation of God's Son *to* Paul, does that exclude the fact that it was also a revelation of God's Son *in* Paul?

A special reason for the use of the preposition "in" here is perhaps to be

found in the parallelism with the immediately following phrase, "among the Gentiles." In that latter phrase we have to use the preposition "among" in English. But in Greek it is exactly the same preposition as the preposition "in" which occurs in the phrase "in me." Quite possibly the parallelism is intentional. "God revealed His Son *in me*," Paul says, "that I might preach Him *in the Gentiles*; God revealed Him in the little sphere of my life that I might proclaim Him in the large sphere of the Gentile world."

### The Value and the Limitations of Exegesis

Thus three interpretations are possible in this difficult passage. By the revelation of God's Son in Paul, Paul may be referring (1) to his meeting with Christ at his conversion, (2) to a revelation closely following upon the conversion, or (3) to the revelation of Christ to the world which was found in the wonderful change which Christ wrought in Paul's life.

Which of these three interpretations is correct? We confess that we do not know, though we lean rather strongly to the first. That confession of our ignorance may be painful, but at least it is honest.

In making the confession, we are particularly desirous of not being misunderstood. We are not falling in the slightest into the current agnosticism about the interpretation of the Bible; we are not acquiescing at all in the current impression that the Bible can with equal propriety be made to support (1) Christianity and (2) a non-doctrinal religion which is almost the diametrical opposite of Christianity. We are by no means acquiescing in the notion that everything in the Bible may be "interpreted" to mean its exact opposite, and that there is no disputing about interpretations any more than there is disputing about tastes. On the contrary, we believe that in the great body of its teaching the Bible is as plain as day, and that no honest man who really attends to it can reasonably be in doubt as to what it means. It is perfectly clear, moreover, that the real issue in the Church of the present day concerns not the question what the Bible means but the question whether, meaning what it plainly does, the Bible is true or false.

But if there are many things in the Bible that are plain, there are some things that are obscure, and it is important not to be too cocksure in our views about those things. Sound and cautious exegesis will demolish many a sermon, but it is salutary in the end; and few things are more needed than sound and cautious exegesis is needed today. Contact with the really great exegetical tradition of the Christian Church will preserve us from many vagaries; it will keep us from many dan-

gerous by-paths; it will save us from the sad waste of time into which some devout people fall.

Let us not be ashamed, therefore, to say sometimes with reference to the interpretation of the Bible: "We do not know." But on the other hand, let us never rest complacently in that ignorance, but let us strive rather by diligent study and by earnest and prayerful meditation to learn more and more of what God has said to us in His Word.

## Authority in Religion

By William Bittle Wells

*"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." (Col. 2:8.)*

THE religious world today is characterized by an ominous confusion. It is to be found not only in all the various religious groups, but equally in the individual. Much of it, if not all, can be attributed to the fact that there is no agreement as to what is the final source of authority in religion.

When the chief priests demanded of Jesus, "By what authority doest thou these things?" they struck the key-note in all religion. Take away external authority, which is the foundation stone upon which the whole structure of any religion rests, and we have only a shell left, devoid of any semblance of vitality.

In spite of this self-evident truth, the rejection of accepted authority in religion is being advocated by many who have in the past, at least, been called "Christians." Of course, those who hold to "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" find in the Scriptures the only and final source of authority. Strange as it may seem, however, the great majority of men and women have not been really concerned about this subject, and have been willing to leave it to others for settlement. Unfortunately, however, while assuming this mistaken attitude, they are being misled by pseudo-science, which, although being disclaimed by the real scientist, has yet fastened its false and terrible tentacles upon the weak in faith.

This condition is being fostered by those teachers of the Gospel who have forsworn their original faith, and broken their sacred vows to preach the true Word of God. Yet, like blind leaders of the blind, these apostate Ministers are seeking to be prophets in their own right, and pose as

the equal or the superior of the great Apostle Paul, whose writings, in incongruous self-defense and with a strange inconsistency, they must and do disclaim.

This incoherent state of mind and consequent condition in the church generally take on unusual significance because they are so wide-spread. We can account for it, possibly, on the ground that, to some extent at least, society is intellectually disintegrating. The explanation of this condition is to be found in the fact that we are living in a purely scientific age. Logic, therefore, is at a low ebb. As proof of this, the churchman today accepts and seemingly believes in things that are diametrically opposed.

An excellent example of this is found in the statement by a prominent preacher, who says:

"In religion as in all fields of thought and endeavor, the final authority is the experience of the individual in his search for truth. . . . This point of view is not so startling, after all, because an external authority has just as much authority as we individually are disposed to give to it. . . . That is to say, the final appeal is within and not without."

This statement might well be passed by were it not for the fact that it emanates from one who is supposed to be a Christian, and who, accordingly, is supposed to accept the belief, held by civilized and uncivilized peoples alike, that there is some kind of a God—an ultimate authority, apart from, independent of, and infinitely transcending the individual consciousness—who rules over all. Thus we have the anomalous and contradictory situation wherein one rejects the authority of the Scriptures to which he is ostensibly devoting his life, and which he is paid to support and expound; and who, in making an appeal for individual authority in religion, must, of necessity, displant



God from that role, without which there is and can be no God.

Yet, befuddled as he is, the churchman today, apparently without a thought, and certainly without a protest, accepts a statement that can be shown to be without foundation either in fact or in experience.

Indeed, that very experience which we are told is the final source of authority has taught even the youth that there is no finality about experience; that there are great variations in it; and that there is an authority outside of, and greater than, himself.

The experience of the youth has taught him that if he disobeys he will be punished, just as he will be burnt if he sticks his hand into the fire. But the *source* of authority is not in his experience in connection with the punishment, but in the parents in whom is invested authority. If he sticks his hand into the fire that does not mean that his *act* or his *experience* is the *fire*, itself. It only develops the fact that the fire is there, just as authority is there whether he gets burnt or not. But if he never gets burnt, never has any experiences alone these lines, could he say, logically, that there is therefore no fire! That because he has never experienced it, therefore there is no such thing as tuberculosis; that because he has never seen a dynamo, and has never experienced its results, that therefore there is no such thing as electricity! To admit this, we would have to concede that facts outside of individual experience do not exist. But even such concession upon our part will not in the least alter the fact of fire or authority or other things that exist regardless of individual experience. And if youth has not learned the significant lesson that authority has more authority than youth is disposed to accord to it, then certainly the home is a complete failure.

It is true that experience might, and, as a matter of fact, often does testify of authority. But it does not necessarily do so. This is so because the testimony of experience is very often false. It could not, therefore, be authoritative in itself, nor, purely as an experience, could it be dependable.

For example, I may say that my experience tells me that, beyond peradventure of a doubt, you cannot hear a man in Portland, Oregon, who speaks in New York City. I tell you that I can "shout my head off," so to speak, and I cannot be heard by a man a mile away, whereas you say you can hear a man speak who is three thousand miles away. If my experience is the final source of authority, my conclusion is that you are greatly deceived because what you say is entirely outside my experience. But you reply that I am the one who is deceived, because I judge from a very limited experience which is wholly untrue to facts.

Hence we may or may not *discover* authority through experience. It depends

entirely upon the individual and his circumscribed relations to special conditions or to the world at large. Experience itself has shown that the reaction of individuals to the same experience varies in accordance with their experience. So we are compelled to ask, What experience? How much of an experience? When did the combined experiences take place? What was the state of mind when the experiences happened? Who can vouch for the fact that they were real experiences and not hallucinations? What previous experience did the persons have? How old are they? Where have they lived all their lives? What do they really know?

My own very limited experience does not tell me that there is any life after death. I have never died, and I have never seen anybody who did die and who came back. Is my experience, then, final and authoritative? If it is, then I am certainly in a bad way. But most assuredly my experience is not final, conclusive or authoritative. It is valueless. My experience also tells me that there is no such thing as the new planet, Pluto, which I read about in the papers. Others say that they have seen it. Now you ask me *not* to go by my own experience, and to *believe* what others tell me. But I cannot do that if "the final source of authority in all fields of thought and endeavor is in the experience of the individual in his search for truth." Therefore, we are forced to the conclusion that one's experience may be wholly an error.

"Let us ask," says Julian Andrieu, "What we mean by an error? With Spinoza we would say that erroneous ideas consist in the fancies and opinions which the senses suggest to the mind in a confused, imperfect, and ill-ordered manner. To this sort of knowledge Spinoza gives the name of *vague experience*. This vague experience is further complicated by the employment of signs which flatter the fancy and of which we form ideas like those which the objects themselves presented at first to our imagination."

Descartes tells us that he was obliged to confess that life is full of delusions; that testimony may be false or mistaken; that reason lands us in endless fallacies; and that the evidences of the very senses may be misunderstood.

If these things be true, what reliance, if any, can we place upon our experience as a source of authority? In the light of experience itself as attested to by the general experience of mankind, the best that we can say is that experience is *sometimes* a guide to, or a testimony of, authority. But that the experience of the individual could not be authoritative in any final or definitive sense is fully demonstrated by the acknowledged fact that the experience of today will be totally at variance with what experience will say in the future.

We have all about us examples of this in science, and the true scientist now hesitates to quote any experiences as a final authority, knowing that all theories today are in a state of flux.

Modern philosophy, as expounded by Hume and Kant, agrees on this point. Alfred Weber sums it up as follows:

"Since experience always furnishes only a limited number of cases, it cannot yield necessity and universality. Hence a judgment *a posteriori*, i.e., one based solely upon experience, cannot constitute scientific knowledge. In order to be necessary, or scientific, a judgment must rest on a rational basis; it must be *rooted in reason* as well as in observation; it must be a judgment *a priori*."

Accordingly, the experience alone of the individual in his search for truth could not produce a scientific or dependable judgment because it could not rest upon a rational basis. Certainly, then, it could not be authoritative. But we must not lose sight of the fact that we are considering two distinct things: experience *and* authority. They are not the same. And, as we have seen, neither is authority derived from experience.

The danger that besets this generation is exactly along these lines. Experience and authority are being confused, and youth is being taught the vicious doctrine that youth itself, or what is worse still, the experience of the youth, is the final source of authority. As a result of such teachings, a young woman in San Francisco recently killed her mother because the mother protested against the daughter going out night after night. With overweening egoism the daughter said: "Yes, I killed mother. I would not let her dictate to me."

Take away authority from the parents, and let it be in the experience of the youth, and eventually we shall have chaos in our national life. But the parents, even in the home, are not the final source of authority. If they are notoriously remiss in their duties, the State steps in, takes the child away from them, and places it under the care of the State. The parents may, and often do, protest. They must learn, however, that there is, in turn, an authority outside of, and greater than, themselves, to which they are amenable: the welfare of society as a whole.

We assent to the fact that the State, politically speaking, is the final authority. Assent, however, does not indicate the source of authority, but simply the recognition or consciousness of authority. The Anarchist does not assent. Therefore, shall we say that there is no authority for him? The authority exists regardless of his assent.

The State exists *de facto*. Accordingly, it is the "community" or what we call "society" that has created authority; that

has invested itself with it. The individual has not done it. In every age society has overridden the individual in this respect; has disregarded the assent or the consent of the individual.

Why do we have laws? It is because the individual is not the final source of authority as a matter of fact or in his experience. It is because society found out that the individual cannot be depended upon either to think or act aright.

But even with laws, there comes a difference of opinion as to what they mean, and we have judges, created by "society" to interpret the law, and to punish the individual whose experience goes contrary to the good of the many. Thus the United States Supreme Court is the final authority in America.

The racketeer of today, however, considers that he, and not the State, is the final source of authority. He defies the laws. He is, in short, the living exponent of the argument that the individual in his experience is the final source of authority. Witness the horrible examples in Chicago. Under the theory of individual authority the racketeer is right, and society in its attempts to defend itself absolutely wrong. The racketeer is just as sincere as the snake is when it bites you: get out of the way or suffer the consequences.

The upshot of the matter is that the capacity of individuals to seek truth varies. One is a moron. Another, a philosopher. Another, an Anarchist. Another, a pseudo-scientist. Another, a crank, and so on. In short, we have all sorts and conditions of men. Consequently, we have all sorts and conditions of capacity to see the truth.

There is no common denominator except human nature, and nobody has yet pretended to understand that fully. Take all this confusion in opinion, in beliefs, in ideals, in desires, in governments, in religion, in science, in everything under the sun, and where do we arrive with such a statement that the experience of the individual in his search for the truth is the final authority?

If this were the truth, no authority whatever would be possible. Life would come to a standstill. In fact, society has been able to make progress only because the individual is *not* the final authority. Even in matters of state the individual cannot be trusted, and we have seen in our own day the last of the authoritative kings on earth.

Therefore, if we are guided by facts and not by fancies, we must inevitably come to the conclusion that the individual, either as a matter of fact or in his experience, cannot be the final authority in anything. And, last of all, in religion.

Why? Because either *we are*, or *we are not*. Accordingly, there must be absolute truth. Not a changeable truth. Not a pro-

gressive truth. But a fixed, unchangeable, everlasting and complete truth, as certain as the stars in heaven—absolutely absolute.

The individual of necessity craves, searches for, and depends upon this ultimate truth. He seeks an authority higher than himself. He knows, if he knows anything at all, that, compared to the outward forces of authority that must and do exist, his own experience is meagre, mean, futile, insignificant, and pusillanimous. He knows that if he looks to himself or his experience as the final source of authority he cannot find God, but must find himself in God's place. Therefore, the experience of the individual in his search for truth could not be authoritative in religion because it would not be a judgment "rooted in reason."

This must, indeed, be the case because the human race has come into existence with an inherent idea that there is, there must be some force, some power, some authority higher than itself. Who will, who can, deny this in the face of the fact that every race under the sun, from the dim beginnings of time, no matter how ignorant or savage, has reached out, groping, for that higher power, that final authority. The ancient Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Fiji Islanders, every civilized and uncivilized race in the world,—all have produced undying testimony to this fact. All peoples, all nations, have had some kind of a God—whether it be the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," the "Great Spirit" of the American Indian, or a God of sticks and stones. But there always has been, and, so long as the human race endures, there always will be, some kind of a God to which this "dust" can turn.

Therefore, it is not only futile, but it is an assault upon our intelligence, to assert that the individual in his experience is the final authority. If such, indeed, be the case, then life as the world has lived it, and all of humanity's premonitions and desires are delusions and snares. But even granting this to be a fact, that does not alter the established and unalterable fact that humanity *has* reached out, and *does* reach out, for an authority higher than itself. The facts must forever remain, and they must and do establish beyond cavil that the final source of authority according to humanity itself, and not according to individual opinion, which at best could have no standing in this instance, *is to be found outside the individual and in a higher and supernatural power.*

The world, it is true, has advanced greatly along certain lines. But in endowing this progress, God did not leave Himself without a witness on the matter of transcendent importance to humanity. That witness is the Holy Scriptures. It is the authority from God, Himself, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men spake as they were

moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter; 1:20, 21.)

Paul in 2 Timothy 3:16, emphasizes this same origin of the Scriptures: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine; for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." And that there might not be any misunderstanding as to Paul's authority for what he says, he states in I Corinthians, 14:37, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

This claim as to the peculiar character of the Scriptures was emphasized by Isaiah: "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever." And the Psalmist, in praise and worship of Almighty God, in that uniqueness of spirit which has ever been unmatched, sang with a joy and knowledge that could come from God alone: "Thy word is true from the beginning, and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." (Ps. 119:160.)

But it remained for Jesus Christ, "The same yesterday, today and forever," "Who is gone into heaven, and is now on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him" (I Peter; 21:22), to give the final touch as to the status of the Holy Scriptures.

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, *All power is given unto me in heaven and earth*" (Matt. 28:18). With all power, all authority and all knowledge, the Son of God gave utterance to that sure, ringing, *certified testimony* (John 10:25) which is, and which must be, the ultimate from God, Himself:

#### "The Scripture Cannot Be Broken"

It was this complete knowledge, through divine insight, that led Jesus to give that other testimony which settles for eternity this question as to the final authority in religion. When it came to the final and complete test as to such authority, and the great testing time likewise for Jesus, Himself, Jesus did not refer to God nor to His own power and authority. He did not do so because God had given man a final source of authority, and for Jesus to refer to God the Father, apart from His revelations, would have meant that Jesus had put aside the authority that the Father had given not only to man, but to Jesus, Himself, as well.

There was, then, one source of authority for Jesus in religion, and only one. In all the circumstances there could have been only one. That is, Jesus Christ, as the Son of God, knew within Himself, in keeping with His wisdom and omniscience, that the Holy Scriptures are the sole source of authority in religion. And He could not be false to the truth.

(Concluded on page 15)

# Books of Religious Significance

## Book Notes

SUMMER is usually considered the time of year for relaxation in reading. Sermons, or books of obviously sermonic content are appropriate for this season. *Radiant Religion*, by the Rev. A. Z. Conrad, D.D., well known as the eloquent and evangelical Minister of the Park Street Congregational Church in Boston, is based upon what the author terms Christ's favorite salutation: "Be of good cheer!" The object of the discourses contained here is to add to the joy of living, to make men and women more heroic in facing the troubles, burdens and problems of daily life. They admirably fulfill their purpose. The volume is published by Harper and Brothers, New York and is listed at \$1.50. . . . The Rev. William Carter, D.D., the gifted Minister of the Throop Ave. Presbyterian Church, of Brooklyn, is the author of *The Other Side of the Door*, a selection of sermons from among those preached in his Church and given a world-wide distribution through the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle*. Having been requested to bring these sermons together in one volume, he has done so. The result is a book of strong, popular discourses. The work is published by the Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, and is priced at \$1.50. . . . *Christ and His Men* is the title of a book that has, from all reports, created a near-sensation among students and young people in Scandinavia and central Europe. It was written by the late Pastor Olfert Ricard in the Danish language and has gone through twelve editions in that tongue. It is translated by the Rev. Harold C. Jensen of the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The present reviewer cannot read Danish, but he can testify that the English translation is both gripping and beautiful. This interpretive study of Christ and His disciples will haunt the mind of whoever reads it for many a day and night. It is published by the Augsburg Publishing house, which may be addressed care of the Rev. H. C. Jensen, Dannebrog, Nebraska. . . . Those who are seeking for good Christian fiction will be pleased to know that the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., of Grand Rapids, Michigan, has just published a story by Bertha B. Moore, entitled *The Rock of Decision*. It is a fine tale for "grown ups," but is especially the kind that will be likely to have a profound effect upon teen-age boys and girls. It can be recommended without reserve. The price is \$1.50. . . . *If Thou Shalt Confess*, also published by Eerdmans, is a little but worth-while book by Jan Karel Van Baalen, intended for young people who are considering their relation to Christ and His Church. Written from the partic-

ular standpoint of the Christian Reformed Church, there is food in it for all. It sells for seventy-five cents. . . . The Rev. Norman B. Harrison, D.D., Presbyterian Pastor, Bible Teacher and Evangelist, has sent forth another of his rich studies in the New Testament books. This one is entitled *His Very Own*, and is a verse by verse quiet, reverent study of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. It is devotional but not shallow, and should be an exceptional aid in bringing out the riches of the great epistle which portrays the Church as the fulness of Christ. The volume is published by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, and sells for \$1.00 net. . . . The Rev. A. H. Finn is known throughout the English-speaking world for his writings in defense of the Bible. He has now produced a small but mighty volume concerning *The Author of the Pentateuch*. The work is not technical or difficult. Its simplicity and conciseness, however, do not mean that it is merely a handbook of other men's arguments in popular form. It is original, vigorous and well reasoned, just the kind of book that will help intelligent laymen to deal with talkative doubters. It is published by The Bible League, 45 Doughty Street, Bedford Row, W.C. 1, London, England. It is priced at two shillings (about fifty cents). . . . *What it Means to be a Christian* is the title of an interesting and helpful book by the Rev. Charles O'Neale Martindale, a Minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church. It is a brief but copious encyclopedia of the Christian life. It can be ordered from the Author at Morgan City, Louisiana. The cloth edition is \$1.35 and the art paper eighty cents. . . . The venerable and scholarly Professor John Alfred Faulkner, who occupies the chair of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, has written an arresting work entitled *Burning Questions in Historic Christianity*. While what Dr. Faulkner writes is from the standpoint of the conservative Methodist, and while some of the material included will especially absorb those who are the ecclesiastical and spiritual heirs of the Wesleys, yet what he writes should instruct and edify Christians of all denominations. Such subjects as Did apostolic Christianity and the ancient Church borrow from the "mystery religions"?; Were the early Christians Premillennialists?; Is the historical foundation of the Papacy sound?; and Was Wesley a Premillennialist? are sure to arouse interest and discussion if possibly not agreement upon all points. It is a distinctly worth-while book. It may be secured from the Abingdon Press, New York, and is priced at \$2.50. . . . *The Speaker's Bible*, which was

a series begun by the late James Hastings, is being continued by the Rev. Edward Hastings, M.A. The present volume takes up two epistles of Paul—that to the Philipians and that to the Colossians. It is brilliantly edited, and contains much that will be of interest and use to those preparing sermons and addresses. In a book of this nature, so made up of extracts and quotations from hundreds of writers, it is manifestly impossible to say that everything will be acceptable to the conservative Christian. But there is a great deal of first-class, useful material in the book. At the end of the volume is an index of commentaries, sermons and other works on these epistles, which is a valuable feature. The book may be ordered from Blessing Book Stores, Inc., Agents for America, Chicago. The volumes are priced at \$3.50 net.

H. McA. G.

*THE CLEANSING OF LIFE* by Daniel Russell. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan. Pp. 185. \$1.50.

THE author of this book is the pastor of the Rutgers Presbyterian Church of New York City. The volume deals with the problem of the purification or sanctification of life in an eminently sane and helpful manner. It represents a type of book of which there are altogether too few and we wish for it a wide reading. While suited to the needs of all, irrespective of age, it will be found particularly profitable to those not yet far advanced in the Christian life. It merits a place in every Sunday School library; also a place in every Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. library where the letter "C" stands for the word "Christian" in anything like the New Testament meaning of that word.

This book consists of ten chapters, nine of which deal with the problem in a piecemeal fashion and one of which stresses the unity of the life that stands so greatly in need of cleansing. Chapters on the cleansing the Imagination, Memory, Conscience, Will, Motives, Affections, Mind, Attitudes, Courage, are followed by one on the Cleansed Life. The range and scope of the book are thus indicated.

Dr. Russell in his "Foreword" modestly says: "The distinction of this small book, if it has any, lies in the fact that it makes no attempt to be more wise than the Scriptures. This will commend it to those who love the old ways. Perhaps it will commend it also to some who, trying strange paths, find themselves in the fog, with the water brooks dried up and the going rough." But while he adheres to the old ways to such

an extent that he can write, "The way to the cleansing of life is Christ's way. There is no new way. It is two thousand years old. But it remains the one sure way to make the angel dominate the beast within our hearts," it is not to be supposed that Dr. Russell writes in ignorance or indifference to the new ways that are so widely commended. While nowhere obtruding his knowledge of psychology or philosophy or criticism within his pages, it is clear that he is no stranger to their claims and conclusions.

This is by no means a theological book (in the ordinary meaning of the word) but a sound theology underlies it and pulses through all its pages. It recognizes that there is need of expiation as well as of cleansing of the soul and nothing is more commendable about the book than the stress it places on the great thought expressed by John when he wrote, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." Dr. Russell does not balk at the thought of a supernatural deliverance from sin and death and hell and realizes that central to that supernatural deliverance is the death that Christ died upon the Cross. "If at first," he writes, "we balk at the clear teaching that we must be born again, we shall come back to it when once we have thought ourselves through to final conclusions. We shall find that our unguided speculations have led us nowhere. We shall come back to the Gospel of Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling block, unto the Greeks foolishness, unto the natural man a hopeless riddle, but unto them which believe, both Jews and Greeks and modern men, the power of God and the wisdom of God."

In concluding he writes: "Many clergymen and more laymen have abandoned, or have never believed, the view of Atonement here set forth. It is not a view which is in popular favor. But it is discarded only at the cost of throwing overboard the clear teaching of the New Testament. And the fact that it is not in popular favor proves nothing as to its truth. Though it is not emphasized today, it will be tomorrow. Time's revenges are time's reversals. Men will grow weary of the endless reiteration that Christianity is merely a 'way of life.' Their hearts will tell them, first of all, that it is a redemption—or it is nothing. Christian thought will turn again with new joy and enthusiasm to its central verity. It will demand from its leaders and interpreters the essential meaning of Calvary without glosses or reservations. It will demand a Christ lifted on a Cross, the glory of a world's sole hope gathering around that head sublime. . . . All have need of His sacrifice, for all are sinners. All may have access to it, for whosoever will may come. All should most certainly avail themselves of it, for the acceptance of God's great plan for the cleansing of life means forgiveness;

it means peace; it means the fulfillment of our destiny. Without it we are fatherless in time and homeless in eternity. With it we enter into our heritage as sons of God. And if sons, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, with power and purpose and divinity, both now and in the life to come, as our inalienable legacy."

This is not a "high brow" book. The ordinary reader will not need to consult his dictionary in order to understand it. But it deals in an interesting and intelligent as well as helpful way with a matter of universal human concern.

"Purification before the great God  
"Is greater than life and is stronger  
than death;  
"Is the hope of the wise and the prize  
of the saint."

S. G. C.

*THE GEOLOGICAL-AGES HOAX: A Plea for Logic in Theoretical Geology by George McCready Price. Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. 126. \$1.25.*

THE object of this little book is to make clear to the general reader that there is no warrant for the notion that the age of rock formations can be determined by the fossils they contain. It is Mr. Price's contention that the view commonly held by geologists that the time when certain rocks were deposited can be learned from the nature of the fossils they contain—and conversely that the time when certain plants and animals lived can be learned from the nature of the rocks in which their fossil remains are found—rests upon pretended knowledge to such a degree that it "must be looked upon as a hoax, a practical joke on a confiding public."

If Mr. Price is right in this contention—a contention that he has set forth more fully in previous books, particularly in his volume of some 700 pages entitled *The New Geology*—important consequences follow. In that case one of the main supports of the theory of evolution is removed; and most of what has been written about the alleged geological "ages" through which this earth has passed must be classed as fiction rather than history.

It is no doubt true that the name of Price is anathema in "orthodox" geological circles. The thing of importance, however, is not his standing in geological society but the validity of the arguments he adduces against the time value of the fossils. Denunciation is hardly an adequate substitute for evidence, but it would seem that as yet "orthodox" geologists have made no other reply to Price. If an answer to Price, refuting his contention is not soon forthcoming from "orthodox" geologists, the impression will become general not only that they are unable to refute his arguments, but that they are aware of that inability. We hold no brief for Mr. Price—possibly he is as poor a geologist as he is a theologian

(he is, we believe, a Seventh Day Adventist)—but we have been greatly impressed by his arguments and if they are refutable we would like to see them refuted. A reply to Mr. Price from the side of the "orthodox" geologists is, it seems to us, long overdue.

Mr. Price maintains that the "orthodox" geologists are guilty of circular reasoning, arguing as the occasion demands that the fossils determine the age of the rocks or the rocks the age of the fossils. More particularly he argues that no sound conclusions can be drawn as to the age of a fossil from the rock in which it is found, or *vice versa*, because of the order of sequence in which the rocks are actually found. According to Price the rocks have not been deposited in anything like an invariable order, the "older" rocks sometimes being above the "younger," in fact are found in all sorts of relations over large areas. "The fossils do not occur in any definite order, as has been alleged; hence it is nonsense to attach any time-value to any particular fossil or set of fossils." In accounting for the fossils he attaches large significance to the story of the Flood as recorded in Genesis. While he does not maintain that the Flood accounts for all the fossil deposits yet he does maintain that a great world catastrophe of that sort is supported by scientific evidence and offers the best explanation of the facts that call most loudly for explanation.

The reader will find this an interesting book whatever the extent of his agreement with its author's conclusions. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Price as a geologist it must be confessed that he possesses in a rare degree the gift of popular exposition.

S. G. C.

*THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES by Frank E. Allen. The Christopher Publishing Co., Boston. 827 pages. \$3.50.*

OUR examination of this book leads us to think that it is a volume of great worth. It is an effort—and a very successful one—to set forth the doctrines and lessons of the one book that contains an authentic history of the first generation of the Christian Church while keeping the machinery of exegesis in the background. While it has back of it the labor of the scholar it is fitted to meet the need of the general reader as well as Ministers and teachers. The arrangement of the material is admirably adapted to the requirements of Bible students. Outlines precede and questions follow each chapter. Dr. Leander S. Keyser writes an appreciative Foreword in which he praises its style as well as its contents. In concluding, Dr. Keyser states that "for practical purposes it is the best expository and applicatory treatment of the Acts with which I am acquainted." We share Dr. Keyser's estimate of the volume and take pleasure in commending it to the attention of our readers.

S. G. C.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Can Christians Deny the Deity of Jesus?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Does I Corinthians 12:3 imply that those who deny the deity, the virgin birth of Jesus, are not Christians, that such have not the Spirit and therefore do not and cannot say, "Jesus is Lord"?*

T. D. R.

**I**COR. 12:3 reads as follows: "Wherefore I make known unto you, that no man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema; and no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit."

In reply to the above question, it may be well to say in the first place that we do not regard the denial of the virgin birth of Jesus and the denial of His deity as having exactly the same significance. Certainly there are those who deny or at least refuse to affirm the virgin birth of Jesus who profess faith in His deity. We think indeed that such a position is untenable, but we would not go so far as to imply that belief in the virgin birth is essential to constitute one a Christian. While we hold that the only Jesus, through whom men may be saved by faith, is the Jesus who was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet a knowledge of and a belief in the manner of His birth is not absolutely indispensable to salvation. The real Christ is able to save and does save all those who put their trust in Him even though that trust be in many respect unintelligent. It is not merely the wise who are called. Thoroughness of understanding is not a condition of salvation.

But while we would not say that this verse teaches that those who deny the virgin birth of Jesus are not Christians, it does seem to us that it teaches that those who deny His deity are not Christians. In this connection it should not be overlooked that the designation of the term, "Lord" to Jesus, in the sense in which it is employed in Paul, is equivalent to an assertion of His deity. It is so often used in a weaker sense in modern English that we are in danger of overlooking this fact. When Paul called Jesus "Lord" it was equivalent to calling Him "God" and so of asserting that He was to be worshipped and adored. There is no evidence anywhere in the New Testament of any lower view of Jesus among the early disciples. Christians have always been worshippers of Jesus. Only those who as they stand in His presence say "My Lord and my God" can justify their claim to the

Christian name. It is inconceivable, therefore, that a Christian should fail to call Him Lord still less that he should call Him anathema.

Here too, however, we must be on our guard against making intellectual capacity the condition of salvation. It is not everyone that sayeth unto Christ, "Lord, Lord," who shall enter the kingdom of heaven. It is the attitude we assume toward Christ rather than the words we employ to designate our conception of His person that is determinative. That attitude may exist where the understanding is confused. This is not to say that ignorance or error is advantageous to salvation; but it is to say that we should be on our guard against applying this text to individuals in any mechanical way. Just as it is the Holy Spirit alone who can enable us to say, "Jesus is Lord" in the full, rich sense in which Paul employed the phrase, so, in many cases at least, it is the Holy Spirit alone who is in a position to say whether the attitude of the soul toward Christ is a saving attitude. But where one rejects the deity of Christ, with full consciousness of what that rejection involves, it would be a misuse of words to call him a Christian. At a time when many are being called Christians who reject Christ as an object of faith and worship, the teaching of this verse, it seems to us, should be sympathetically but firmly proclaimed.

## Christianity and Greek Thought

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Is there any basis for asserting that Christianity has been influenced by Greek thought? I have heard it stated that the first verse of John's Gospel is from a Greek source.*

C. K. C.

**W**E take it that our questioner has in mind Christianity as it is set forth in the New Testament. In that case, we may reply with confidence that there is no basis for the representation that Christianity has in any degree derived its content from pagan sources. It is true, of course, that this representation is defended by some of those who seek to give a naturalistic explanation of the origin and development of Christianity. Those who are interested in the scholarly attempts that have been made to explain Christianity by reference to Greek-pagan sources will do well to read Dr. Machen's, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, particularly chapters six to eight. In his

more recent volume, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, Dr. Machen has dealt with the attempts to derive the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus Christ from pagan sources.

As regards the more specific representation that the opening verses of John's Gospel exhibit Greek influence in the origin and formulation of Christianity it may be said that such plausibility as attaches to this representation rests largely on the failure to distinguish between the source of the Logos doctrine itself and the phraseology that John used to express it. The phraseology may have been derived from either Jewish or Gentile sources, since the term "Logos" or "Word" was in familiar uses in both Jewish and Gentile circles to express God's manifestation of Himself in His relation to the world. But when we consider the sense in which the term is used by John it becomes obvious that he cannot have borrowed the doctrine itself from Philo or the phase of Greek philosophy which Philo represents; since it is altogether certain that he uses the term in a sense radically different from that in which it was employed by contemporary Greek philosophers. It seems certain also that he did not borrow it directly from contemporary Jewish speculators as these like Philo used the term to express a somewhat that mediated between the transcendent God and the world of space and time, whereas John used it in reference to one who had a distinctively divine nature and exercised distinctively divine functions. Moreover it is obvious, since we cannot separate the prologue of his Gospel from the narrative that follows, that the source of John's doctrine of the "Logos" or "Word" was not speculation but the historical personality and teaching of Jesus. Moreover Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had already described the person of Christ in terms that included the elements in John's doctrine (see Col. 1:13-20; Phil. 2:5-11; Heb. 1:1-4). Hence there is no need of seeking its source in Greek or Jewish speculation. How could there be when the doctrine of Christ's eternal, divine Sonship and His function as God's revealer was an explicit Christian belief long before John wrote?

Broadly speaking all the attempts to explain the origin and development of Christianity by a reference to Greek sources have their roots in that naturalism of thought and sentiment that is so characteristic of this age. Those who reject the supernatural are, of course, under the necessity of giving a naturalistic explanation of Christianity—if they are to explain it at all. Those, however, who accept its supernaturalism will not feel any need of having recourse to either Greek or Jewish speculations to account for its origin and establishment in the world.

(Concluded on page 15)

## 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 kindly to 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: The Calvinistic belief is logical for it naturally follows from the complete idea of God. A God who has full control of man and his destinies, who can inspire His servants to write detailed prophecies, who can interfere with the natural order of events by supernatural events, by miracles, is the God of Calvinism. A lesser God would not do in Calvinism or Augustinianism.

It is also satisfactory. It unlocks many passages of Scripture and gives a deeper insight into the Bible. Our professor in history said that one thing about Calvinism was true: "It does not appeal to people who do not think."

The Calvinistic belief has been the main nerve of Christianity and of evangelism. Augustus Toplady, a Calvinist, wrote the immortal hymn, "Rock of Ages." John Wesley was a great evangelist. They had considerable controversy. Toplady once called John Wesley an old fox. However, both did much good. But John Wesley had associated with him his brother Charles and Whitfield. Whitfield was a Calvinist. Some of the hymns of Charles Wesley are Calvinistic in implication.

Nevertheless, Bible truth is sometimes perverted. There is one danger in the Calvinistic belief, that is, we may think that God has chosen us for our superior worth and righteousness. There is the danger of spiritual pride. Israelites thought that they were the chosen race. The Jewish religion produced Christianity. A misinterpretation of it also produced Pharisaism which resulted in the present Jewish belief, or unbelief in Christ.

We cannot put the cart before the horse. We ought not to make the result the cause or the cause the result. We are righteous in most respects because God has chosen us rather than God has chosen us because we are righteous. Righteousness is the result of God's favor rather than its cause. Paul guards against this error. He tells us that "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Eph. 2:8.)

Not all of the Israelites belonged to the Israel of faith. Many of them were wicked and unrighteous. Some of Israel's kings; nearly all of them, in fact; and many of Judah's kings were really bad men. They were uncircumcised in heart.

Let us not pride ourselves then in being born into Christian families, but admit that

we are personally sinners and that we need a Saviour and that Christ is Son of God and Saviour.

We need the cleansing power of Christ's blood before we become converted. We need it after we become converted, for we are not then as good as we ought to be. "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." (Is. 64:6.) "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." (Rom. 7:18.)

A misinterpretation of Calvinism results in spiritual pride.

WILLIAM F. BISSELL.

Saxton's River, Vermont.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I can with the utmost sincerity add my tribute of hearty appreciation of your paper, which I have taken from the first number. When it comes I usually sit down and read most of it through. It is not a family paper. It has nothing for the children; and many grown-ups would find that its contents require too much thinking. But that very feature makes it welcome, as it gives more of such mental pabulum than the other papers find room for.

Dr. Machen's way of teaching is admirable, because he makes his points as clear as daylight. He evidently agrees with Horace: *Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio*; and hence he fully elaborates his points.

I have just read with close attention and with deep gratitude Dr. MacLennan's address at the second commencement of Westminster Seminary. One thing in it I wish he had changed, and that is the wrong translation of *Khpuyya* in I Cor. 1:21. Paul did not say that "preaching" was foolishness, but *the thing preached*, the proclamation, the message. Of course it was. Just think of telling the Romans in their pride of power, and the Greeks in their pride of intellect, that their only way of salvation was to put their trust in a Jew who had been crucified between two robbers after being handed over to the Roman governor by his own people! Could anything well seem more foolish? But because that foolish message has behind it infinite power and infinite wisdom, its heralds have seen it "lift empires from their hinges."

Sincerely yours,

ADDISON HOGUE.

Washington, D. C.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have too long delayed writing a note expressive of my appreciation of your splendid work as Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I find no publication to compare with your paper. In fact it seems to be the only Presbyterian paper with the conviction and courage to advocate orthodox Presbyterianism; and capable of presenting the cause of true Presbyterianism in a scholarly way. I am sure that you (and perhaps others) have made tremendous personal sacrifices in your labors to establish CHRISTIANITY TODAY. May our Heavenly Father bless and reward your efforts and give you the joy of seeing your unselfish labors crowned with success.

I do not attempt to commend any particular article or feature of your paper, for I read and enjoy all. CHRISTIANITY TODAY contains each month rich treasures of information and inspiration.

Very sincerely yours,

C. A. STONE.

Chicago, Ill.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In writing this letter I feel somewhat in the position of Elihu in Job 32:6-9, I am abashed because of my youth but I must speak because "there is a spirit in man" whatever his age or attainments. Not long ago I read in CHRISTIANITY TODAY the letter by Robert Williams and the excellent replies by yourself and Mr. Schrader and although approving your stand in general, there is one point at which I beg to differ with you. You say, "If the time ever comes when the Confession of Faith (though remaining as it is), is so much 'more honored in the breach than in the observance' that it is obvious that it does not express the convictions by which the Church lives, we believe that those who are truly devoted to the Bible and the Gospel it contains will be in duty bound to separate themselves from the Presbyterian Church." If that is not the situation which *now* confronts the people who stand for historic Christianity and has confronted them for several years past, I am laboring under a delusion; and I scan the array from the vantage ground of barely five-and-twenty years when one's eyes are undimmed by prejudice, when seeing, one believes. The ship called Presbyterianism is sinking and the voices that say "stick to the ship" are false voices out of the storm. The true command is, "Man the Lifeboats and leave the proud derelict to her fate, we must pull for shore." I feel sure that all right-minded young people who have been brought up in Presbyterian homes would be glad to see a separation, youth demands clear cut issues. Separation would necessitate that we leave the properties of the Church to the enemy. I am not unmindful of this fact but have not all the faithful minorities of the past been un-

der a like necessity? Better be in a clear position and hold simple Gospel meetings, for the purpose of hearing an inspired message and singing the hymns of Zion, in a barn or lodge hall, than dwell longer under a cloud and hold services in a building of beautiful architecture and of majestic proportions. What we need is freedom from the shackles that "bind and hold us still to earth," and a new Church putting the emphasis on the things of the spirit. God haste the day when a witness shall spring up in every large community in the form of a Church composed of those who know and love the Word of God and are willing to be separated to clarify their testimony. There can be no revival until there is separation, there is no union between Christ and Belial.

Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL H. STUART.

Beuchel, Kentucky.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I must send you a line to congratulate you on your report of the General Assembly and your remarks on "organic union,"—and other problems before the Church. There is an old Scottish phrase some "fine feedin'" in it. The paper grows better all the time. Kindest regards from us all.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN STEWART, M.D.

Halifax, Nova Scotia.

## Authority in Religion

(Concluded)

The question came up at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. Then, as today, Satan tried to side-track this fundamental point, well knowing that if he can get men and Ministers (!) quibbling and compromising on this great question, he has won a far-reaching victory.

The testing time came. So Satan took Jesus into the wilderness, after He had hungered for forty days, to tempt Him, and, if possible, to break Him. Satan said: "If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread." (Luke 4—Matt. 4—Mark 1:2.) Jesus answered him, saying, "IT IS WRITTEN that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

Here we have it! The final source of authority: "It is written." For this we have the word of that same Jesus who said that "The Scripture cannot be broken."

But the Devil was not content with this single test. He took Jesus, therefore, into a high mountain, and showed Him the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. Satan said: "All this power will I give thee \* \* \* if thou wilt worship me."

Again Jesus had recourse to the testimony

and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and said unto him: "Get behind me, Satan, for *it is written* thou shalt worship the Lord thy God."

Now there comes at this point possibly the most significant thing that could happen from a worldly standpoint with reference to authority in religion. The Devil knew, of course, that Jesus was right in quoting the accepted authority from God. So Satan took Jesus to Jerusalem, and placed Him upon a pinnacle of the temple. Now, he says, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence, for *it is written* He shall give his angels charge over thee."

Verily, the powers of the lower world believe God and tremble. (James 2:19.) And Satan, though reluctantly forced to do so, is compelled to quote the Scriptures, and thus acknowledge the authority that God has given man.

Jesus, once again, turned to the Word of God, saying, "*It is written* thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God."

"IT IS WRITTEN":

This is the great dictum of God, through Jesus Christ, that must thunder down the ages, spreading dismay among the ranks of those who are compromising with the world in its efforts, led by that same Satan who failed with Jesus, to discredit the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and to place puny man in the awful place of God's throne.

## Questions and Answers

(Concluded)

### Was Paul Wrong About Christ's Return?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Did Paul have a delusion about the return of Christ? Is there any truth in the statement that Paul realized his mistake in his later days and no longer entertained the hope of the Lord's return?*

C. C.

**I**N our judgment both of these questions should be answered with an emphatic negative. We do not believe there is any warrant for the notion that Paul believed differently about this matter during the later years of his ministry than he did at its beginning. It is true, of course, that the doctrine of the second coming occupies a relatively larger place in the earlier than in the later epistles of Paul; but that finds its explanation in the misunderstandings that had arisen in regard to it, and which demanded his attention, not in the fact that it occupied a less important place in his

later thinking. Paul would have had radically to revise his whole system of thought before he could have given up the hope of our Lord's return. This belief was not a mere appendage to his system, something that could be lopped off without serious loss; rather it entered into the very substance of that system to such an extent that its excision would have thrown it into disorder and confusion. A Paulinism in which the thought of our Lord's return is regarded as a delusion would be like a house without a roof, like an arch without a key-stone. If Paul was deluded in his belief as to Christ's return we may be certain that it was a delusion he cherished to the end of his days.

The charge that Paul had a delusion about Christ's return is usually based, in the first instance, as the allegation that he taught that Christ would return during his own lifetime. But while there are passages which indicate that he cherished the hope that such might be the case, there are none in which he taught that such would be the case. In this respect he never claimed to be wise above his Lord: "But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only." But while the charge is usually based in the first instance on the allegation that Paul taught that Christ would appear during his own lifetime, it is usually based in the second instance on the more general allegation that Paul was deluded in thinking that there is ever to be a return of Christ. Suffice it to say in this connection that the question whether Paul was deluded in thinking there is ever going to be a second coming of Christ is essentially one with the question whether Paul was deluded in thinking that Christianity was from God and as such the one true religion. If Christianity is a true religion we may be certain that Jesus Christ is going to return, "in like manner" as He ascended; but if Christianity is a false religion there is no warrant for supposing that the future contains any such event as His return. In view of the place that the second coming occupies in Christianity every bit of evidence that may be advanced in proof of its truthfulness may also be advanced in support of the belief that Christ is actually to return to this earth. In a word the truthfulness of Christianity carries with it the notion that there is full warrant for cherishing the "blessed hope."

**O**H, if I could praise Him! Yea, I would not rest content with a heart submissive and dying of love for Him. And, howbeit I never win personally in at heaven's gates, oh, would to God I could sent in my praises to my incomparable Well-beloved, or cast my love-songs of that matchless Lord Jesus over the walls, that they might light in His lap, before men and angels!—*Samuel Rutherford.*

# Current Views and Voices

## THE WORD OF GOD TO SCOTLAND

By the Rev. John McConnachie, M.A.

[This article, which appeared originally as a leading editorial in the "British Weekly", has deservedly attracted wide attention. It is perhaps less of a plea for a return to historic Christianity, however, than appears at first sight as its author, if we mistake not, writes under a Barthian conception of the Word of God according to which at the most the Bible contains the Word of God rather than is the Word of God. Be this as it may the article gives expression to a message that the Church in America as well as the Church in Scotland will do well to give heed.—Ed.]

WITH the advancing weeks there is a growing doubt in Scotland whether the Forward Movement which is being organised among us is on right lines. In Committee and Presbytery the question is being asked, "What is this Forward Movement?" The literature issued so far has dealt in generalities and has not gripped. It has said much about the tasks and opportunities of the Church, but little of the Church's inward sores and needs.

### I.

There is a strange absence of any sense that *the Church is in a crisis*—an hour of judgment. Her authority is challenged, and by many repudiated. Her deliverances on such questions as Sunday observance or gambling are taken as so much stage thunder or professionalism. The crowds pass her doors. They do not hear a Word of God from her, but only some poor human words. Yet the people are not altogether careless. They are certainly not happy. They may not have any religious questions, but the question of questions, the question of their own sinful existence, presses upon them. They live and know that they must die. They live in strain and contradiction and dispeace. The quest after a Word of God is again appearing, and not among religious people only, but in profane thought. The doctrine of relativity has drawn its last consequences, and yet the feeling persists that behind the visible world there is an invisible Being. Has He a Word in answer to the question of man's existence, or is He for ever silent? We see the people turning aside from their spiritualism, and occultism, and theosophy unsatisfied.

### II.

The only answer to this question is a Word of God, a Word out of the Homeland to the Prodigal Son. Why cannot the Church give to the people the one answer which they need, this Word of God?

Because we preachers are also in the crisis. We do not have this Word ourselves. The world is sick because it has no Church which knows what the world does not know, and which stands over it with the Eternal Word of Another on its lips. And the Church is sick because we preachers are sick. The spirit of our time, its empiricism,

criticism, psychologism, relativism, rationalism, has deeply infected us and undermined our sense of absolute values, so that we can no longer speak with authority of a Word of God. Many of us have succumbed to modernism. We have capitulated to the spirit of our time. We cower before the modern mind and struggle to come to terms with it in our thought and language. We know that the modern mind does not like such words as sin, repentance, fear of God, wrath of God, humility, or even justification by faith; and we avoid them, or provide pale substitutes. We know that the modern mind does not like the "offence of the Cross," and we smooth off its jagged edges. We are aware that the modern mind does not take to the idea of a particular historical revelation and a unique Incarnation, and we flatter men by telling them they are all sons of God. In place of the somewhat exacting doctrine of the Cross we preach a mild and comforting idealism, mixing a little mysticism with morality, or a little morality with mysticism. We pick and choose from the Bible, "decoding," as Dr. Fosdick has taught us to do, the eternal meaning from the temporal setting, constructing our own code key, of course, and imposing our modernist meaning on the Word of God. The Bible does not judge us, we judge the Bible. Much of our preaching is Pelagian or semi-Pelagian. In Reformation days, when the Word of God was listened to, the preacher's message might be summed up thus: "Christ has done everything for you. To Him alone be the glory." Much if not most of the preaching to-day might be summed up in the sentence, "Christ has done something for you. It is up to you to do the rest." Man is no longer a lost sinner whom Christ has saved. He is a very good fellow who with the help of God and of the preacher can be distinctly improved. The Kingdom of God is no longer what it was to our fathers, a Kingdom of God, which is to come to us, and which has come nigh in Christ: it is something which we are to create, and build, and spread at home and abroad by our human efforts, and share in the glory ourselves. Every man his own saviour! The world at last to save itself! Not a word in which the world is inclined to show much interest!

### III.

This is the preacher's crisis here in Scotland. We are all deep in it, even those of us who may have not an inkling that we are in the crisis. We do our work as faithfully as we can. We knock our sermons together week by week with more or less skill in joinery. But we do not—at least the most of us—feel that we have a Word of God to deliver which has taken hold of us like an armed man, a *verbum alienum*, the Word of Another, and a greater than ourselves, Whose thoughts are not our thoughts, Whose ways are not our ways.

The Word of God for Scotland to-day, therefore, if it is to be the Word of any Forward or Godward Movement, must be a *Word of Repentance*. It must ever be so, for the Church as a Church of Sinners, a Church of the Mercy of God, lives by repentance. I do not mean a narrow, introspective, hair-shirt repentance, but a *metanoia*—a change of mind, a movement of the Spirit to think things through again, to think more deeply, to think in God.

It must give us preachers a fresh view of ourselves, not as prophets or as priests, but as *ministri verbi*—servants of the Word. We must shed our self-importance. For we have nothing of our own to give, we cannot hope by any zeal or cleverness of our own to bring men nearer to God. All our zeal for reviving the Church or engineering a Forward Movement is worthless in itself. God only can make His Word effective, and He will do it when we let His Word be His Word, and do not want to make it our own. We must die to live. We must take upon our lips again the old words of the Reformers—sin, repentance, justification by faith. The starting point of the Reformation was the collapse of all ecclesiastical security face to face with the reality of sin. How a sinful man can find a gracious God. And from there all Re-formation of the Church, all forward moving must start again. The Reformation is not completed.

Through repentance also we must gain a fresh view of the Church. "We have had a great Union, we are a great Church, with great tasks; let us have a Forward Movement" is the motive at the back of this present Movement in Scotland. It is not a defect in a Church to seek to make itself visible, and let its Word be heard, so long as it is a Word of God. But it has its dangers. If there is any earth-born desire in this Movement to glorify the Church as a thing in itself, to have it recognised as an earthly or national magnitude, it will most surely fail. The Church of Christ by its very nature is a Church under the Cross, the Church of a Crucified Christ. It can have no human importance, no human goals. It cannot claim worth, or influence, material or spiritual power in itself or for itself, but only in view of the service of Christ. The Church, like the Christian, must die to live. It must be nothing in order to be great. It



has no authority save that of Christ. "The Church cannot squint," says Karl Barth, "with one eye on God and with the other on some human necessities or lofty goals."

## IV.

The Word of God for Scotland must be, secondly, a *Word of Obedience*. No note needs to be so firmly struck in the Church to-day as the note of obedience, that as God has saved us He has established a claim upon us. His Word is a Word of Authority, and it demands obedience. We have been so frightened to offend, so concerned for the liberty of the Christian man, that we have left out one-half of the teaching of the reformers. Justification implies sanctification, the obedience of sanctification. "A Christian man is the free lord of all and subject to none," said Luther. But he followed this up by saying, "A Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all and subject to everyone." We have understood and put into practice the first half; we have still to understand and put into practice the second half. That is the uncompleted part of the Reformation which the Church of to-day must carry out. God claims our obedience as Creator, in the ordinances of nature in which we have been born, as sons and daughters, fathers and mothers, masters and servants. There is a wide field here for the exercise of a Christian obedience which would constitute a true Forward Movement in Scotland, where obedience and discipline are rapidly becoming unknown words. God claims our obedience, also, as Reconciler. He has justified us as sinners, and He claims us as His possession. The claim is laid on us in our baptism and covers our whole Christian life. A Christian does not exist except as he finds himself in relations that demand obedience. He is always for another; never for himself. Yet the Christian life is not a task, and the Church's life is not and ought not to be a task, but a demonstration to the praise and glory of God.

The Word of God for Scotland must be, further, a *Word of Hope*, the Word of a coming God—a God Who is always coming.

## V.

In the literature of our Forward Movement we hear much of "the greatness of the Church's task"; but we catch no note of a coming God, no sense that *the Church is ever standing on the brink, not of death, but of life*. The note of Hope is strangely absent. If we are to have a true Forward Movement—that is, a Movement in which God comes forward to meet us—we must hear less of the Church's "tasks"—the Church of Christ is not a jaded Sisyphus, working out its own salvation—and more of the *magnalia Dei*—the wonderful works of God. More living in the promises; more "looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God."

## The Orthodoxy of Tomorrow

Editorial in "The King's Business"

THE oft-repeated saying that "the heresy of today is the orthodoxy of tomorrow" is pleasing to the heretics; but, unfortunately for them, it is not true. A falsehood never becomes truth; wrong is never right. If there is no such thing as truth that is absolute, final, and fixed, then divine revelation is ruled out and human reason is left to its unaided speculations and dreams. Instead of moving onward to become established or commonly accepted dogmas, the heretical philosophies of men always travel in circles. The heresies of Celsus in the second century are, in the twentieth century, not truths but the same heresies, even though the modernist clothes them in somewhat different language. What the liberal calls "the modern mind" is no different from the skeptical attitude of unbelievers in former centuries. No; heresy is heresy always, and orthodoxy ever remains orthodoxy. Philosophy and science shift their ground frequently, but the firm foundations of Christianity stand unchanged.

Bishop Candler, in the *Essentialist*, contradicts the idea that heresy becomes orthodoxy in the following language:

This favorite dogma of heretical men proceeds on the erroneous idea that revealed truth is of a changeable nature like mutable systems of science and the fickle speculations of philosophy. But about the truths of a divine revelation there is a certain finality that in the nature of the case cannot belong to any of the conclusions of unaided human reason. . . . All church history contradicts the cant which declares that "the heresy of today is the orthodoxy of tomorrow" . . . In all the forms of heresy there is nothing to give it permanent acceptance by devout men of well-balanced minds. Our present day rationalists, sometimes miscalled "modernists," are in this state of "unstable equilibrium." They agree not among themselves, and often one of them reverses all his teachings within the brief space of ten years.

## "Self-Satisfied Religiosity"

Editorial in "The Christian"

AN English journal quotes from a United States paper an announcement which suggests the harm that can be done to the Christian cause by ill-advised publicity. A body of religious people in Springfield, Massachusetts, inserted the following advertisement in the local Press:—

The young man in business—whether office, shop or factory—owes it to himself and his future to go to church regularly. Success and a certain amount of religion seem to go hand in hand.

Apart from the feeble half-heartedness of the last sentence, the whole idea of commending Christianity purely on grounds of material prudence is altogether obnoxious, and helps to lend support to the views of those who attack Christian people on the ground that an association is often made between religion and worldly considerations. Whether or not it could be shown that, in practice, the righteous man prospers, the only worthwhile Christian is he who is prepared to lose all, if need be, for the sake of the faith he professes. In the present generation, probably, America is more prone than we are in this country to lay emphasis upon the desirability of "getting on;" and, moreover, the passion for advertisement has unfortunately persuaded large numbers that everything, even righteousness, can be achieved by publicity. This fallacious persuasion will certainly be cured by the witness of experience, though, meanwhile, the United States may come to be afflicted in part by a mood of smug self-satisfied religiosity which is the worst possible substitute for the true Christian belief that demands self-sacrifice.

## The Theatre in the Church

By LA MARECHALE

(Catherine Booth-Clibborn)

From the "Christian Fundamentalist"

IN recent years the acting of Bible scenes, not only in the world but in the Church, is becoming very popular. Many earnest Christian workers are much perplexed regarding the righteousness of such acting.

Let us examine the matter which touches so intimately the Kingdom of God and its sacred interests. Here are a few of these dramas:

"The Ten Commandments"

"The Queen of Sheba"

"The Sin of David and Bathsheba"

"Mary Magdalene"

"The King of Kings"

"The Prodigal Son"

In every play someone must impersonate sin, or the fruit of sin. Can any Christian take pleasure in watching someone acting sin, making sin attractive and fascinating—sin which cost the very Blood of the Son of God who "died to redeem us from all iniquity?" . . . .

Oh! let us not forget that it is only as we continually humble and dedicate ourselves before God in secret prayer that we dare stand between the living and the dead as His ministers and draw on Divine resources. God has chosen one way to convert sinners—the "foolishness of preaching." (1 Cor. 1:21.) That is one thing that the world, with all its art, cleverness, and cunning devices cannot counterfeit—preaching the Gospel in the power and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Has your preaching failed?

## Ministerial Changes

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

#### Call

Merchant P. Bush, San Leandro, Cal. to Second Church, Lincoln, Neb.

#### Calls Accepted

H. R. Austin, Genoa, N. Y. to Fair Haven, N. Y.;  
 Robert H. Blackshear, Morningside Church, New York, N. Y. to Peekskill, N. Y.;  
 Lleyd R. Bream, San Antonio, Tex. to Rocky Grove Church, Franklin, Pa.  
 Ura A. Brogden, Farmington, Tenn. to Cherry Creek Church, Sparta, Tenn.;  
 W. H. Chambers, Altona, Ill. to 7th Church, Chicago, Ill.;  
 Austin B. Dickerson to First Church, Coalinga, Cal.;  
 Ralph F. Doescher to First Church, Woodlake, Cal.;  
 J. M. Eckard to Pleasant Plains, N. Y.;  
 Samuel G. Frazier, Mt. Hope, Ala. to Cahutta, Ga.;  
 J. C. E. Fry, W. Hollywood, Cal. to become Field man for Board of Pensions;  
 L. K. Grimes, D.D., Westminster Church, Milwaukee, Wis. to North Church, N. Tonawanda, N. Y.;  
 M. D. Hardin, Jr., Ithaca, N. Y. to Trimousburg, N. Y.;  
 Edward H. Jones, Gettysburg, Pa. to State College, Pa.;  
 J. C. Kubs, to Randolph Heights, St. Paul, Minn.;  
 Harry M. Markley, D.D., Bartlesville, Okla. to Nebraska City, Neb.;  
 Rollin R. Marquis, D.D., supply to First Church, Vincennes, Ind.;  
 H. C. McMican, Creston, Neb. to Fonda, Ia.;  
 E. W. Roberts to Bisbee, Ariz.;  
 John P. Sinclair, Artesia, N. M. to Caldwell, Kans.;  
 Charles Wagner, Athens, Wis. to Wales, Ia.

#### Installations

Leigh R. Barrett, stated supply Hoberg and Ozark Prairie, Mo.;  
 G. L. Boyd, Corry, Pa.  
 E. B. Cary, First Church, Lebanon, Ore., July 22;  
 H. A. Larsen, Hamburg, Ia., July 15;  
 Charles R. Lawrence, Benton Street Church, Ottumwa, Ia., June 21;  
 W. V. McAdoo, Bethel Church, Peoria, Ill., July 12;  
 Aaron G. Miller, First Church, Lakeview, Ore.;  
 A. Theodore Smith, First Church, Klamath Falls, Ore.;  
 A. T. Thayer, King's Ferry, N. Y.

#### Changed Addresses

D. B. King, 1407 Ninth St., Wichita Falls, Tex.;  
 E. E. Loft, Harriman, Tenn.;  
 F. L. Provan, 300 S. 4th Ave., Anamosa, Ia.  
 C. Duane Wickard, Warren, Pa.

#### Resignations

Richard Archer, Great Bend, Kans.;  
 S. W. Brister, People's Church, Denver, Colo.;  
 J. L. Howie, D.D., Clinton, Mo.;  
 R. Frank Jones, 8th Ave. Church, Denver, Colo.;  
 Chas. B. Leeper, First Church, Otis, Colo.;  
 Clinton Reed, First Church, Arvada, Colo.;  
 A. B. Shepard, First Church, Coldwater, Kans.

#### Deaths

A. G. Martyn, D.D., Independence, Ia., July 20;  
 Richard L. Purdy, Bennet, Neb., June 29.  
 H. G. Stotzer, D.D., Fairmont, W. Va., June 9;  
 Geo. W. S. Wenrick, Los Angeles, Cal., July 12;  
 W. McAfee Wilson, Walla Walla, Wash., June.

### Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

#### Calls

S. R. Vanover, Irvington, Ky. to Stuart Robinson Church, Louisville, Ky.;  
 W. K. Waters, Buechel, Ky. to Kansas City, Mo.

#### Calls Accepted

W. B. Doyle to Stony Point, Tenn.;  
 Cecil H. Lang, Little Brick Church, Knoxville, Tenn. to First Church, Kilgore, Tex.  
 J. Lee McLean, stated supply Capon Bridge, Va.;  
 R. Helmes Showalter to Hillsville, Va.;  
 W. R. Smith to Bickley, W. Va.;  
 J. E. Wayland, Supply Pastor First Church, Staunton, Va. to Salines Church, Malden, W. Va.;  
 Raymond G. Wickersham to Norwood Church, Jacksonville, Fla.

#### Installations

E. Raynard Arehart, Mizpah, Bonhomme and Des Peres Churches, St. Louis, Mo., July 26 and Aug. 2;  
 Bernard E. Bain, Ivanhoe and Wardensville, Va., July 26;  
 George E. Houck, Stony Run and Beulah Churches, Mustoe, Va.;  
 Peter Marshall, Covington, Ga.;  
 Stuart H. Salmon, Ripley, Tenn.;  
 A. B. Williford, Windy Cove Church, Millboro, Va., July 19.

#### Changed Addresses

W. S. Smith, Route 1, Allisona, Tenn.

#### Resignations

J. R. Williams, East Point, Ga.

#### Deaths

J. B. Branch, McCormick, S. C.

### Reformed Church in the U. S.

#### Call

G. Zenk, Ebenezer Church, Shafter, Cal. to Hope Church, Lodi, Cal.

#### Calls Accepted

John E. Gieser, First Church, Youngstown, O. to First Church, Toledo, O.;  
 Albert Harward, Trinity Church, Kans.;  
 J. Lerch, Jr. to Trinity Church, Mercersburg, Pa.;  
 William O. Miller, First Church, Tamms, Ill. to Grace Church, Sharpville, Pa.;  
 B. E. Reemsnider to Grace Church, Fort Wayne, Ind.;  
 S. V. Rohrbaugh, Payne, O. to Mohican Church, Londonville, O.

#### Ordinations

John P. Kochner, Lakewood, O.

#### Installations

Bend A. Behrens, Salem Church, Rohrsertown, Pa., July 9;  
 William C. Filler, First Church, Cedar Rapids, Ia.;  
 A. I. Krutzmann, Salem's Church, Allemann, Ia.;  
 Trangott Steiner, Marvell, Ark., July 8.

#### Changed Addresses

J. C. Gieser, 4422 Asbury Drive, Toledo, O.

#### Resignations

Marcus L. Bach, Fairview, Kans.;  
 L. D. Benner, Zion Church, Norwood, O.;  
 Edward L. Mohr, Harmony Church, Zwingle, Ia.

#### Deaths

J. Hauser, Melbourne, Ia., June 27;  
 James Keppel, Tiffin, O., July 8.

### United Presbyterian

#### Call

John G. Dick to Cedar Creek, Little York, Ill.

#### Calls Accepted

S. Boyd Johnson, Niagara Falls, Canada, to West Charlton, N. Y.;  
 Beniamino Re, Portland, Ore. to Italian Church, Milwaukee, Wis.

#### Installations

Robert H. French, Clifton, O., June 19;  
 William T. Mabon, Second Church, Springfield, O.;  
 T. Victor Scott, Hebron Church, Argyle, N. Y. Presbytery.

#### Changed Addresses

H. J. Bell, Albia, Ia.

#### Deaths

R. A. Jamison, D.D., Apollo, Pa., July 8;  
 Robert J. Kyle, Cedarville, O., July 19.

### Christian Reformed Church

#### Calls

John Beebe, Madison Ave. Church, Paterson, N. J. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.;  
 R. H. Haan to Aetna, Mich.;  
 J. T. Holwerda, as Home Missionary, Hampshire, Tex.;  
 John F. Schuurmann, Calvin Seminary to Lincoln Center, La.;  
 E. J. Tanis to LaGrove Ave. Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. (declines).

#### Calls Accepted

Joseph Van de Kieft, Aetna Mich. to Dutton, Mich.

### Presbyterian Church in Canada

#### Calls

H. R. Williams, Mt. Brydges (Presbytery of London) to Centerville and Millbrook (Presbytery of Peterborough).

#### Inductions

J. D. MacKenzie, Avonmore, Ontario, July 31;  
 H. R. Pickup, Renfrew, Ontario, Aug. 5.

### Reformed Church in America

#### Calls

H. Bellman, Grand Haven, Mich. to Hope Church, Los Angeles, Cal.  
 George Hankamp, Pella, Ia. to Lynden, Wash.;  
 Albert Hellenga, Lucas, Mich. to Ninth Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

#### Resignations

T. G. Vanden Bosh, Ada, Mich.

# News of the Church

## "Contempt of Court" Sentence Vacated

INFORMATION given a clergyman in confidence in his professional capacity is inviolate and need not be revealed even on the command of a court, according to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, which on June 26 reversed the conviction of the Rev. Emil Swenson of Minneapolis, on a charge of contempt of court.

In February Mr. Swenson was called as a witness in a divorce suit before Judge Paul W. Guilford in Hennepin County District Court. He was asked to repeat the substance of a confession made by the defendant, a member of his church. When he refused, he was ordered by the court to testify and replied: "The rules of the Church forbid me to reveal information imparted to me confidentially and in good conscience I have to refuse to answer the question." Held in contempt of court, he was sentenced to pay a fine of \$100 or serve 30 days in the county jail. He appealed the case.

The Supreme Court adjudged that a clergyman has the right to refuse to divulge information given him in confidence. The opinion said: "It is the duty of the court to protect the privilege, and there is little danger of the witness, under the claim of privilege, screening others from justice."

The law protecting confessions in Minnesota passed in 1923 says: "A clergyman or other Minister of any religion shall not be allowed, without the consent of the party making a confession, to disclose a confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules of practice of a religious body to which he belongs." Judge Guilford in sentencing the pastor declared that he was not exempt because the Lutheran Church does not make the confession obligatory, but rather that in the Roman Catholic Church the confession was required and circumstances were different.

The 1931 session of the Minnesota Legislature has amended the 1923 law so as to make it clear that it applies to clergymen of all denominations.

## Andover Finally Lost to Evangelicalism

CONSERVATIVE Congregationalists (few in number) have lost their court battle to maintain the orthodoxy of old Andover Theological Seminary. According to one observer, the recent judgment of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts "is not only a body blow to the pitiful minority of loyal Congregationalists, but to the legal

rights of the founders of any institution to perpetuate fixed doctrinal standards."

Andover was founded in the days when Unitarianism was beginning to make great inroads on Congregationalism. Wealthy men, true to evangelical traditions, poured hundreds of thousands of dollars into Andover to combat the heresy. Every possible legal precaution was taken that the new institution should never be captured as Harvard had been. A supposedly "air-tight" creedal statement was written into the constitution, and every prospective officer and professor of the seminary was required to accept it before election, and adhere strictly to its provisions after election.

For many years Andover contributed richly to the cause of Congregationalism in New England and throughout the nation. She was the backbone of orthodoxy in the home of liberalism. Then, the enemy insidiously penetrated the Board and Faculty. Three times within fifty years its affairs were in serious litigation in the courts. The trustees tried the experiment of affiliation with the theological school of Harvard University, her ancient enemy, but evangelicals succeeded in having the Supreme Court dissolve that relation. Since 1926 the Seminary has been inoperative, but the legal battle has gone on.

The decision of a few weeks ago has been described as a compromise. Andover is to be affiliated with Newton Theological Institution (Baptist) in an interdenominational seminary. Each will maintain its own corporation, but co-operate in a united program. The court decision says that Andover's professors must be "persons whose theological views are in conformity with those obtaining among Trinitarian Congregationalists generally," but that "instruction given in the seminary by such professors is not hereafter to be called in question because of inconsistency with the creed or requirements of the constitution or statutes." This amazing declaration upon the part of a Supreme Court of one of our states seems to welcome, and to put the stamp of the courts approval upon the hypocrisy of any who may "subscribe" to the Andover standards and then repudiate them in the classroom.

## A Call to Repentance

A GROUP of business men in Lethbridge, Alberta, has recently drafted an extraordinary declaration addressed to Canada and the United States. The declaration has been signed by a long list of Canadian and American nationals doing business in that city; other copies with other signatures are in circulation. The declaration explains itself, and is as follows:

We, the undersigned, managers and senior members of business and professional enterprises in the City of Lethbridge, Alberta, hereby declare:

(a) The following undisputed facts:

1. That there now exists a world-wide and prolonged business depression for which no natural or necessary cause can be given.
2. That this depression is accompanied by an overproduction of most of the world's staple products.
3. That coincident with this overproduction is the distress of unemployment and individual want seriously affecting millions of families in all the great civilized and producing countries of the world.
4. That the world as a whole, and especially its so-called civilized nations, have at their disposal everything needed to produce the highest degree of prosperity ever conceived by the mind of man.
5. That the best intellects the world possesses confess their impotence either severally or jointly to find a solution for the problem which has thus presented itself.

(b) Our belief:

1. That the foregoing facts constitute the most astounding phenomenon in the history of the world.
2. That this phenomenon calls for an explanation which divine wrath alone can give.
3. That it is for our sins that this distress has been brought upon us.
4. That God Almighty has allowed us to erect this, our Modern Tower of Babel, to the end that He may show forth His power.
5. That we shall find no relief until we confess our sins to each other and humble ourselves before Him and ask for His forgiveness and His wisdom.
6. That relief will come promptly and fully whenever we do humble ourselves.

(c) Our confession:

1. That we business and professional men, both individually and as a class, are responsible for this distress and this punishment.
2. That we have not loved our neighbours as ourselves nor considered their distress as our distress.

(d) Our desire:

1. To have our respective Governments appoint a day of prayer and fasting.
2. To have our respective national leaders lead us to humility and prayer for grace and wisdom to the end that we may find the Divine solution of our problems and relieve distress the world over.

3. To have our brethren throughout our land join us in this declaration and its promulgation.

(e) Our promise:

To do our part heartily as unto the Lord as our respective national leaders may appoint for us to do to accomplish fully the purposes for which this Declaration has been made.

This is regarded as significant of the growing conviction that the nations need to be brought to repentance. It is sad, however, to observe that this manifesto has no reference to Jesus Christ, no acknowledgment of Him as Lord of the Nations, and no recognition that He alone is the Doorway to God for forgiveness and reconciliation.

### The Irish Evangelical Church

THE Irish Evangelical Church is composed, for the greater part, of men and women who were formerly members of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. They seceded from the latter body because of their conviction that it had departed radically from the teaching of the Word of God and its own Standards.

For many years evidences of the drift towards Modernism in the Irish Presbyterian Church had not been lacking. In sermons, books and pamphlets by Ministers of the Church, and by the use of thoroughly Modernist text-books and tuition in the Assembly's College, the propaganda had been carried on. Our Lord was robbed of His true and essential deity, was pictured as one who did not understand Himself. In Gethsemane and on Calvary He did not know why He was suffering. May the day never come when we can hear such statements without anguish of spirit and without protest! We may here point out that the General Assembly later published much of this revolting teaching under its authority.

The drift in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland was further evidenced by the appointment at the General Assembly of 1925 of a committee to consider a change in the questions put at ordination and in the formula of subscription to the Westminster Confession.

The Rev. James Hunter, M.A., opposed the proposal but it was carried by a majority vote. Mr. Hunter was a member of the committee appointed.

At that time (May, 1926), Mr. Hunter warned, "Two years ago, a letter signed by about fifteen students of the Assembly's College was read before the College Committee, protesting against some of the questions asked at ordination. They objected to the term 'Word of God' being applied to the Bible, and they wished to accept the Confession and Catechisms only in a general way. A deputation was appointed to confer with them, and one of the deputation

encouraged them in their attitude and held out a hope of a change in the law. Accordingly, at last Assembly (June, 1925) a Committee was appointed to consider this very matter—a change in the questions put at ordination and in the formula of subscription to the Confession of Faith. The report of this Committee is now ready for the Assembly, and its proceedings throw a flood of light on the revolutionary notions of those who are now attempting to alter our creed. The convener of the committee (the head of the College, Professor Paul) presented a sheaf of suggestions, and the first surprise was that the question about the Word of God was shunted to third place. When asked why it should not occupy the prominent place it had always held, his answer was that 'experience' came before the Scriptures. This is the Modernist position. But the Mohammedan has experience also. Experience that does not originate from and is not conformed to the Word of God is both sinking and shifting sand. The next move was to drop the word 'infallible' as applied to the Word of God. 'There is no external infallibility,' he affirmed. This is the slogan of the new teaching. But man is as his word is, and God is as His Word. If God be infallible so must His Word be. Make the Word of God as short as you please—only a line, nay only a word, like the great word 'It is finished' from the Cross—that Word of God is infallible. You must write 'god' with a small 'g' whose word is not infallible. When it seemed difficult to score out 'infallible,' a pious phrase was adroitly inserted before it, thus, 'under the guidance of the Spirit infallible.' This lowers the Bible to the level of any other book. Professors' lectures are infallible in the same way. Professor Paul strongly objected to the expression 'Word of God' as applied to the Holy Scriptures. In the first chapter of the Confession of Faith the expression is used four times (besides the simple term 'the word' twice)—'Holy Scripture or the Word of God,'—'. . . to be received because it is the Word of God,'—'it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God,'—'that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all.' And in Holy Scripture the expression occurs with great frequency. The whole 119th Psalm is indeed a glorification of the Word of God.—'Thy word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against Thee.' There is no mystery about the source whence the students derived their dislike for the name 'Word of God'; it came from the atmosphere of the College. And we are too likely to cease hearing from our pulpits the solemn 'Let us hear the Word of God,' if something does not happen soon.

"In the statement of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which it is proposed to put by way of question to Ministers at ordination, the word 'Trinity' had objection taken to it, as also the word 'person' of the distinc-

tions in the Trinity. There is nothing said of the personality of the Holy Spirit. Any old-fashioned Unitarian could subscribe to the proposed questions without any difficulty. Similarly, that Christ died for our sins is all that would be permitted about the atonement. When it was moved that it do read—'died a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins,' no seconder could be found. What is the use of a fusionless creed? Would it not be nearly as safe to become Non-subscribing Presbyterians?

"On account of the frequency with which the Virgin Birth of our Lord is being denied, some thought it wise to propose that a question should be put at ordination on this subject. It was accordingly proposed that this question be put to Ministers at their ordination. Five voted for introducing it, five against, and the chairman gave his casting vote against. Of the five for inserting the question, three were elders and two Ministers. One Minister said to the elder who proposed the addition, 'Is this a saving truth?' . . . There is no use in mincing words over this one big problem—where we stand in relation to the Word of God. Any false doctrine may be introduced, and any saving doctrine may be dropped if you weaken the authority of Holy Scripture. Chillingworth's famous saying still stands true—'The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible is the religion of Protestants.'"

In May, 1926, appeals were issued at intervals to Irish Presbyterians, and a meeting of those interested in maintaining the Truth was summoned by Mr. Hunter. So the Presbyterian Bible Standards League was formed. The Belfast Presbytery and the College Committee (of both of which Mr. Hunter was a member) were irate at the issue of these appeals. A sub-committee of the College Committee held an investigation on May 24th, 1926, seven students of the preceding year being summoned as witnesses. One of the members of this sub-committee (an ex-Moderator) had pronounced himself very strongly from his own pulpit on Sabbath, May 23rd, 1926, on the matter with regard to which he was to sit as an impartial judge the next day. Most of these witnesses were kept a few minutes each, while the examination of one of their number lasted about 50 minutes, the reason being that he made (to use the words of the Moderator of the General Assembly, who presided) "very serious allegations against Professor Haire." Yet the report of this sub-committee as given at the meeting of committee on June 1st, 1926, and the report of the committee as published in the daily press, affirmed all the evidence to be in favour of the professor.

The Assembly of 1926 "passed from the question" of the change of the Formula, but left a committee on the change still in existence to continue its labours, and took no real

steps towards remedying matters in Assembly's College.

Early in the winter of 1926-27, charges against Professor J. E. Davey of Assembly's College were tabled before the Belfast Presbytery by Rev. Jas. Hunter, M. A., and others. To sustain the charges quotations were given from two books written by Prof. Davey, and from his lectures to his students. Prof. Davey was charged with teaching what was contrary to (1) the doctrine of Imputation, (2) the Divine Character of the Lord Jesus, (3) the infallible truth and divine authority of Holy Scripture, (4) the doctrine of the Trinity, and (5) with teaching that God is the author of sin. A portion of the third charge follows:

Whereas it is in accordance with the Word of God that the Holy Scriptures are "immediately inspired of God," and are "of infallible truth and of divine authority" (Westminster Confession), and it is a heinous offence to hold and teach what is contrary to this doctrine, we charge the Rev. Prof. Davey, of the Assembly's College, with teaching what is contrary to the said doctrine, and we specify the following facts to sustain the charge:—

That in a publication issued by him entitled "Our Faith in God," he makes the following statements on page 99: "The Old Testament idea of God as the potentate who holds rebellious men in derision, the arbitrary and self-centered despot who seeks His own glory, is not the conception of God which Christ gave us, but something like its antithesis." On page 111 of the same book he makes the statement: "I know of no way of accepting truly the Christian faith which does not rest upon a willingness to change it any day for a better, if the other faith in question could be proved really more satisfactory, and more entitled to our acceptance." On page 114 of the same book he makes the statement: "Are Christ's theories of the authorship of Deuteronomy or of the 110th Psalm final for us, or His views about astronomy, or even about angels and demons?" On page 116 of the same book he makes the statement: "It is not the Galilean Jew who is final, but something which tabernacled in Him and expressed itself in the forms of its time, both in thought and practice." On page 120 of the same book he makes the statement: "We may, perhaps, in some things be driven to modify or ignore certain views of Christ, e.g., in His theological or scientific statements, where they seem to conflict with His Spirit, or with investigated facts. In points we must question the words of the historic Jesus, it is only to exalt the living and eternal Son of God, whose Spirit even yet leads us on into all truth, and still takes of the things of Jesus and interprets them to us." On page 127 of the same book he makes the statement: "Intellectually and aesthetically Christ is not our final revelation, though His Spirit is our greatest help towards the attainment

of an ever greater truth and beauty. And if in these spheres of mental activity Christ is not a final revelation, still less are our Scriptures so."

These charges were dealt with by the Presbytery at 14 sessions in February and March, 1927. The stirring scenes of the morning of the first session (Feb. 15, 1927) left no doubt in the minds of the accusers as to the light in which they and their charges were regarded by the Presbytery. Professor Davey was acquitted on each of the charges by a large majority, though before the Presbytery itself it is said that he made statements sufficient to convict him clearly in any court loyal to the Word of God. At the closing session (March 29, 1927), the Presbytery resolved by a very large majority to inhibit all under its jurisdiction from every kind of public reference to the case, until the appeals had been heard by the Assembly. One member of the dominant party went so far as to insist that the matter should not be mentioned even in public prayer.

The General Assembly of 1927, like the Belfast Presbytery, met on the matter behind "closed doors." It dismissed the appeals, sustained the decisions of the Presbytery (the voting on the first charge being 707 to 82), and, like the Presbytery, heaped praise upon Professor Davey and poured out its wrath on his accusers.

In the months that followed the meeting of the Assembly, there were numbers who prayerfully considered their relationship to a church whose courts had so set themselves against the Lord and His Word. The determining question was, "What saith the Scriptures?" Very clearly did they see that no other course remained open to them but separation from a church which, had ceased to be a "pillar and ground of the truth." Accordingly, in the July and August of 1927, Rev. James Hunter, M.A., and others demitted their positions in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

On September 17th, 1927, a small number of those interested met. On October 15th, 1927, at a similar meeting it was decided to unite together in the purpose of forming a new organization under the name of the "Evangelical Church." Articles of Faith were adopted at a meeting on 12th November, 1927. At the same time, events of perhaps even greater importance than the foregoing had been taking place. In October and November, 1927, believers in some districts began to meet in homes in their own district. Indeed most of the congregations began as "the church in so-and-so's house." At the first public conference, held on March 31st, 1928, representatives from five branches of the Church spoke of the work in their own districts. June, 1928, saw the beginning of *The Irish Evangelical*, a monthly paper. Now (1931) there are nine places of witness, and the beginning and the growth of the work is most encouraging.

The Irish Evangelical Church remembers that there has been apostasy in Ireland before this,—apostasy which in God's Providence was succeeded by great revival. It is the hope of its leaders that another great revival will come, again sweeping away unbelief and bringing back faith in God's revelation through His infallible Word.

### The South African Church Stands Fast

THE discussion of Creed-subscription, which is being constantly agitated by Modernists, does not always result in making it easier for unbelievers to "subscribe" to Creeds in which they do not believe. Here and there are Churches that resolutely refuse to lower their theological and ethical standards. At its recent Synod held at Bloemfontein, the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, agreed to *add* to instead of taking *from* the strictness of subscription by its Ministers. By a vote of 109 to 29, it was decided that to the articles, which compel Ministers to sign a declaration before being admitted as such, the following be added: "I declare and confess uprightly and with a good conscience before the Lord (1) That the Bible is God's Word; (2) That the Bible in all its parts is inspired by God and is, therefore, in all its parts infallible; (3) That the miracles of the Bible cannot be explained by human reason and must be accepted with childlike faith; (4) That the story of the creation and the fall of man as contained in Genesis is infallible and inspired; (5) That history as set forth in the Old Testament itself must be maintained against the Evolution theory of the Higher Criticism; (6) That Jesus Christ is not only in an ethical sense holy and without sin, but He is, also, intellectually without mistakes, untruth and deceit; (7) That the teaching of Jesus Christ about Moses as a writer of the Pentateuch, about Jonah and the whale, about David as the author of Psalm 110, about the whole Scripture is infallible; that Jesus is always the truth."

This decision comes as an encouragement to those who hold to the Bible as God's infallible Word.

### Help for the Protestant Churches of Europe

A PLAN has been devised by a number of business men in Switzerland for the relief of Protestant churches in Europe. Many of the Reformed Churches on the Continent are still suffering from the ruin caused by the war. Appeals for direct aid to other countries have produced substantial sums, and might yet accomplish more; but these efforts would help a limited number of churches, and there taken end. The Swiss bankers' plan is to lend—only to lend

—money to churches for such objects as the repair of their buildings, and the re-establishment of their confiscated pension funds. Help in this way is fitted to restore the spirit of self-reliance. As the money comes to be repaid, with interest, over a period of years, still more churches will be helped. Thus a moving cycle of benefit will go on, and an increasing number of churches will experience the relief afforded by the plan. Finally, a generation hence, there will remain no mean fund to be applied first in repayment to such donors as may have stipulated for return. Otherwise the fund will be devoted to the endowment of international religious objects. Out of the million dollars aimed at, Switzerland has already furnished her allotted share. So also have Holland and Sweden. North America is making progress with her part. Great Britain and Protestant Ireland are counted on for \$250,000, whereof the aim is that Scotland shall provide something like \$50,000.

### A Modernist Creed

THE attack on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, in which both ritualists and rationalists join forces, has induced some of the Modernists to develop an attack of their own on the Creeds. Men who, while occupying high position in the Church of England, refuse to believe in the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His descent into Hades, His bodily Resurrection and Ascension and His Personal Return at the Second Advent, and who have no use for the doctrine of the Fall or of the propitiatory, atoning Sacrifice of Calvary are known to be naturally restive at the recital of the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, to say nothing of that commonly known as the Creed of St. Athanasius. Their unbelief has led to the formulation of a new Creed which is now publicly commended, as "a simple alternative Creed," by Dr. Major, the Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford and well-known English Modernist, in a letter to *The London Times*. It is as follows:—

"We believe—God is spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

God is light: and if we walk in the Light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

God is love: and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

Jesus is the Son of God: and God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We are children of God: and He hath given us of His spirit.

If we confess our sins: He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

The world passeth away and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.—Amen."

The Editor of the *English Churchman*

and *St. James's Chronicle*, organ of Evangelicals in the Church of England, immediately launched a vigorous attack upon the new "creed." He said: "Dr. Major claims for this new Confession that it is 'deliberately inclusive and omits all controversial issues' and that 'it stresses those things in the Christian Faith which are of supreme value.' We should prefer to say that it is deliberately exclusive, and therefore highly controversial. This is at once apparent when it is placed and considered alongside the Apostles' Creed. It is wholly composed of passages from St. John's writings, some of them made to stop significantly short of the full sentence. Its words are true and beautiful, because taken from Scripture, but, professing to be a Creed expressive of the 'things in the Christian Faith which are of supreme value,' it is lamentably and, in the light of Revelation, dishonestly incomplete. Its first clause is taken from St. John's Gospel, but the New Creed excludes all mention of St. John's record of the Crucifixion in which the Lamb of God was slain to take away the sin of the world, and lifted up, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life, and in which the Good Shepherd laid down His life for the sheep. The 'supreme value' of that atoning, propitiatory, vicarious Sacrifice—the greatest exhibition of the justice and the love of a God Who knew it to be necessary that His only-begotten, well-beloved Son should take the sinner's place and be wounded for the sinner's transgression—is deliberately excluded. What would the Seer of Patmos say to this exclusion of 'the Lamb as it had been slain,' the efficacy of Whose redeeming Blood was the very core of the Revelation which he received and recorded? It is vain and perilous to profess faith in a faithful and just forgiveness of sins if the shedding of Blood, without which there is no remission, is ignored and excluded. The glory and majesty of the Apostles' Creed stand out in striking relief against the terrible gaps which this new Confession presents. It is only necessary to compare the two to get a fresh and remarkable conviction of the comprehensive scripturalness of the former.

"We learn from Dr. Major's letter that the Creed which he proposes for adoption has already been used in some quarters and has been set to music. He believes that his plea for its adoption will be supported by 'many Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics.' We are not disposed to doubt the accuracy of his estimate, but we are glad to believe that the inadequacy and the dangerous exclusions of the new Confession will be rightly understood by all who rejoice in the true reflection of revealed Truth which is to be found in the ancient creeds of Christendom. Perhaps the very suggestion of the new 'alternative' will enable those who walk in the old paths to recite with greater

fervour and more thankful appreciation the true Confession of Faith which occupies so deservedly a prominent place in our Morning and Evening Prayer."

### "Catholic", "Roman Catholic" or "Romanist"?

THE Roman Church, both in America and in other lands, likes to be referred to as "The Catholic Church." In the Anglican Church Summer Assembly early this month, Sir Charles Marston introduced the following resolution:

"That whereas the word 'Catholic' means universal and is used in this sense not only in the Creeds, but in common speech and in the Book of Common Prayer, its use without a distinguishing prefix as the title of any of the Communions into which the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of Christ is today unhappily divided is discourteous and misleading, and that the Press and Publications Board be instructed, whenever the word is so used in matter supplied to the public press, to take such action as may be necessary to cause a request to be made to the editor of the journal responsible that a correction be inserted in his next issue."

This was, after debate, amended to read as follows:

"That whereas the word 'Catholic' means universal and is used in this sense not only in the Creeds, but in common speech and in the Book of Common Prayer, its exclusive use as the title of any of the Communions into which the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of Christ is today unhappily divided is misleading and without warrant in history."

Immediately Cardinal Bourne, Romanist Primate of England, protested publicly against any other than those in subjection to the Pope calling themselves Catholic. It was a term exclusively reserved to them. He even objected to the term "Roman Catholic."

In the state of New Jersey, early in July, appeared also a Romanist priest in court in connection with a suit involving a benevolent organization, testifying that no one but Romanists could possibly be called "Catholic."

It is interesting to note that if the Romanist claim to the word "Catholic" is conceded, it is thereby admitted that Protestants are not part of the Church Universal. It was immediately pointed out, following the news of Romanist claims on both sides of the seas, that the Reformers did not consider themselves to have ceased being Catholics when they became Protestants, and that, in fact, they denied that the Roman body could be properly termed a Church at all, much less "The Catholic Church." In the Westminster Standards they are referred to not as "Catholics" or even "Roman Catholics,"

but as "Papists" or "Romanists." Leading Protestants strongly maintain that in calling Romanists "Catholics," Protestants are "playing the game" of Rome, which delights to refer to itself as "The Catholic Church" and to its adherents as "Catholics."

### Italy and the Vatican Still at Loggerheads

JUST when it seemed that the troubles between the government of Fascist Italy and the Pope were about over, possibilities for peace were shattered, and trouble flared high again. Renewed charges and counter-charges were issued by the two powers. Rumors began to be heard to the effect that the Pope was considering renouncing the Concordat with Italy, and resuming his attitude of isolation. Because of the Italian censorship, the Pope, on June 29, caused to be smuggled out of Italy on the person of a young priest temporarily attached to a party of travelling American Romanists, an "Encyclical Letter" to his faithful subjects, on the subject of "Catholic Action." ("Catholic Action" is the name of the organization which Prime Minister Mussolini of Italy declared was being prepared to overthrow his government, and which he ordered disbanded in the beginning of the dispute.) The Pope's letter began "We must needs speak to you, Venerable Brethren, about events which have recently occurred in this, Our Episcopal City of Rome, and throughout Italy, that is to say, in the very territory of which We are Primate— . . . . These occurrences are summarized in a very few and very sad words. There has been an attempt made to strike unto death that which was and that which always will be dearest to Our heart as Father and as Shepherd of Souls; and We can, We even must, subjoin 'and the way in which it was done offends Us still more.'" Then, in not a very few, but in very sad words indeed, the Pope stated his case to the world. He declared that the "Catholic Action" societies had abstained from any and every sort of political activity; there had been many acts of violence, even bloodshed; truth and justice had been violated, and the press muzzled; the so-called revelations of the Fascisti regarding the purposes of "Catholic Action" he declared to be fabrications. He charged further that there have been acts of violence and irreverence amounting to persecution. (The spectacle of the Pope of Rome complaining of persecution has aroused amusement in the minds of many who reflect upon how willing Rome has been, in the past, to use "the thumbscrew and the stake for the glory of the Lord.") It has also been pointed out that while Rome talks of "persecution" one of her chief grievances against the government is that Mussolini has permitted freedom of religious belief. Rome wants Protestantism in

Italy prohibited by law,—and when this is not done, complains of persecution!) The Pontiff also declared that when he had asked for specific names and evidence concerning those who were supposed to be undermining the Italian State, "There has never been any reply to Our request." He charged Mussolini with being the wolf in the fable, and compared "Catholic Action" to the lamb. He virtually asserted that Fascism was becoming a religion in itself, teaching disrespect to constituted authority (that of the Roman Church) and even permitting "others to indulge in insulting words and actions against the person of the Father of all the faithful, even to cry out 'Down with the Pope, and death to him.'" This is real teaching of parricide! . . ." After making this wrathful declaration, however, the Pope circumspectly hastened to say that he had no wish to condemn the Fascist Party as such, and that he had not ordered his faithful followers to leave it. It is generally said that had the Pope attempted so to order them, he would have received a surprise at the insignificant number of those obeying. Toward the close of his letter, indeed, the "Holy Father" expressed himself as having "very grave worries about the future"—surely rather incongruous with his claim to be an infallible mouthpiece of God. He closed with the assurance that "We pray the God of all mercies, through the intercession of His Blessed Mother who so recently smiled on us from the splendors of her pluricentenary celebration, and the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, that He make us all to see that which is proper to do and give us all the force to put it into effect."

The effect of the Pope's letter was, as expected, a widening of the breach between the two parties to the controversy. The Fascisti repeated their charges and denials of bad faith. At last advices the matter was not in an acute stage, but in such a condition that it might again become acute at almost any time.

### Protestant Gains in Italy

SAN SEBASTIANO is a little place in the neighborhood of Rome having a population of about fifteen thousand. Recently, 110 families have left the Roman Church as a result of political complications. After a short period of uncertainty they decided to join a Protestant church. They requested the general superintendent of the Italian Methodist Church at Rome to send a preacher. A preacher was sent and after a month 300 inhabitants of San Sebastiano joined the Methodist Church. Shortly afterwards a beginning was made with the building of a church. The movement has now spread to the surrounding country. Rome sent a priest and seven "paters" to the apostate village, but this did not lead to the desired success. The movement is still spreading.

### Armenian Refugees Ordered from Greece

IT is reported that 30,000 Armenians, resident as refugees in Greece, have now been notified by the Greek Government that it can no longer accommodate them, as Greece itself must shelter one million refugees from Asia Minor. The international bureau for refugees, which in honour of Nansen bears the name of "Office International Nansen" has entered into negotiations with the French Government looking toward the transfer of this group of Armenians to the thinly populated departments of France, where a special committee for the assimilation and naturalisation of Armenians in France will promote their interests. The aim is to make the refugees French citizens, especially as there seems to be no prospect of the recovery of the Armenian race in a land of its own.

### German Church Discipline

THE Thuringen Evangelical Church has imposed a fine of 200 marks (about \$50) on the religious-socialist preacher Kleinschmidt at Eisenberg, on the ground that, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Synod, he took an active part in political life and spoke at a great number of social-democratic electoral meetings. The church regulations in Thuringen contain two sorts of punishment, light and heavy; of the former the most severe punishment is a fine not exceeding a month's salary; of the latter, suspension or deposition. It is an exception that a church gathering should impose a fine upon a preacher, and this is the first case in the history of the Thuringen church. It is reported that the deliberations on the question lasted from nine o'clock in the morning till eleven o'clock at night. The sentence was based on the consideration that the church regulations were there to be upheld and not made ridiculous.

### "Movies" and the Law of Scotland

AFTER an unusually long period of consideration, Lord Mackay has given his decision in the action raised by the Lord's Day Observance Association against the Magistrates of Edinburgh, with a view to interdicting them from granting licenses for the opening of Pictures Houses on the Lord's Day. His judgment, which is set forth in a closely reasoned exposition of Scots Law on the question, is to the effect that the action was incompetent and irrelevant. It was generally expected that the action would fail on the ground that the Acts bearing on Sabbath observance had fallen into desuetude. But Lord Mackay declined, with a good deal of emphasis, to accept this plea. Desuetude, he affirmed, re-

quired for its operation a very considerable period, not merely of neglect but of contrary usage. The fact that no prosecutions had taken place in Scotland for half a century was not, he held, to be taken as proving that infringements of the law had been ignored; it might equally well be regarded as an evidence that in all important matters the community had observed the provisions for Sabbath observance. The ground on which Lord Mackay based his decision was that there is nothing in the law of Scotland which may be construed as definitely prohibiting the presentation of a moving picture on the Lord's Day within an enclosed area, and causing no disturbance to Church or Church-goers without its walls. He saw no reason why the Magistrates in granting the required license might not impose conditions which would satisfy the requirements of the statutes. They could forbid, for example, the sale of chocolates, or lay down that no queues be permitted to stand in the streets before or during divine service. In Lord Mackay's opinion, therefore, the prevention of cinema entertainments on the Lord's Day cannot be secured by the existing law of Scotland; but the Acts have not fallen into desuetude.

### Church of Scotland Assembly

THE recent Assembly of the Church of Scotland was moderated by the Rev. Dr. John A. Graham, many years a Missionary in Kalimpong. The proceedings of the Assembly were varied. Among its outstanding decisions was the appointment of a committee consisting to the extent of one-third of women, to consider a petition presented by a number of prominent women within the Church, asking that women be ordained to the Ministry, the Ruling Eldership, and the Diaconate. It was indicated at the Assembly that in the course of a few months the Church of Scotland might be engaged in an "unrestricted conference" with representatives of the Church of England with reference to future relations. The Assembly declined to make any definite pronouncement with regard to "whist drives" in churches, on the ground that the matter had been dealt with in general in the report of another committee. Another step was the decision to remit to another committee "to inquire into the religious value of the appointment of a Sunday for the special remembrance of the blessed dead, and to report on the advisability of including such a day in the Church year." It was understood that this was meant as a corrective to the claims of spiritists, and that it might be regarded as a kind of Protestant All Saints' Day. The Committee on Creed revision made a somewhat hesitating report, recommending that, instead of attempting to frame a new confession, the Church should prepare a brief and popular statement of its faith.

### Chinese "Moral Endeavor"

THE ancient tendency of the Chinese to substitute ethics and moral teachings for religion is strikingly exemplified by the recent news from the former "Celestial Empire" that under the personal direction of General Chiang Kai-shek there has been developed at Nanking an organization called the Officers' Moral Endeavor Association, which has been called "a Y. M. C. A. in disguise."

This association, composed entirely of officers of the Chinese National Army, has a membership of more than 2,000, of whom 600 are residents of Nanking. Although it is only three years old, the association has grown from its original quarters of three small rooms in an old building in the business district to the point where it now owns a spacious three-story building on a twenty-acre site on the main boulevard. In this building are the association's offices, a well-stocked library, a billiard room, a gymnasium and locker room, and the first cafeteria to be established in China. This last was designed and is operated after the most up-to-date American model and is equipped to serve 1,000 people at each meal.

General Chiang Kai-shek has written for the members ten commandments which are prominently displayed in the main reception hall and are supposed to guide the lives of the members. They are as follows:

1. Thou shalt not covet rifles.
2. Thou shalt not fear to die.
3. Thou shalt not ostentatiously show thyself.
4. Thou shalt not be proud.
5. Thou shalt not be lazy.
6. Thou shalt not commit adultery nor gamble.
7. Thou shalt not smoke.
8. Thou shalt not borrow money.
9. Thou shalt not drink wine.
10. Thou shalt not lie.

Colonel L. T. Huang is the executive officer in charge of the association and has handled its relief activities, which have included first aid to more than 60,000 wounded soldiers during the last two years.

Colonel Huang admits that the plans of organization and many of the activities of the association have been evolved after conferences with Y. M. C. A. secretaries in China, but the Officers' Moral Endeavor Association has no religious requirements or activities. Educative and cultural lectures are given daily and there are daily classes in English, Japanese, mathematics and military science. The organization maintains two bands, one of which specializes in Chinese and the other in foreign music, and "singing meets" are held several times a week. A new building, to be completed in October, will be used as a dormitory and will house an additional 250 members.

Presumably this organization was founded

by the Chinese Generalissimo before his conversion to Christianity. Whether the founder will now desire to have it take the strong evangelical position formerly held by the Y. M. C. A. is a matter of speculation.

### Modernism Charged in Lutheran Seminary

THE directors of Augustana Theological Seminary at Rock Island, Ill., were sharply criticized from the floor at the convention of the Augustana Lutheran Synod held at Jamestown, N. Y., last month.

Asserting that some of the directors "know more about philosophy than about Christ," the Rev. C. E. Holmer of Manistee, Mich., attacked the action of the board in declining to issue a permanent call to Professor John Milton until he had taken up studies leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The resignations of Professors A. T. Lundholm and Oscar Olsen were also involved in the debate, during which the board was accused of modernistic tendencies. Others assailed the board and three members defended it.

The Rev. G. E. Brandell, president of the synod, said the board's action was prompted by criticism from the synod and the seminary. He appointed a committee to prepare resolutions dealing with the employment of the three professors.

### Death of Archbishop Soederblom

DR. NATHAN SOEDERBLOM, archbishop of the Church of Sweden, holding the Lutheran faith, died on July 12. One of the outstanding Lutherans of the world, he was one of the best known leaders in Europe in the movement to bring both the nations and the churches together. He was the convener and guiding spirit of the great Stockholm conference in the year 1925, at which all the most important Protestant groups of Europe and America and even the Greek Catholic, Assyrian and Coptic churches were represented.

It is not unlikely that the late archbishop of Sweden was inclined to be too liberal in his views and attitudes. At one time he was professor of comparative religion and in his addresses he made statements which occasioned criticism by orthodox groups.

President Knobel of the United Lutheran Church of America has paid the late archbishop of Sweden this tribute: "No one could meet Archbishop Soederblom without being thrilled by his personality. Those who knew him well held him in constant remembrance because of his brilliant knowledge, his spiritual ideals, and his friendly warmth. The manifest religiousness, the world-wide outlook of all plans, the ready use of languages, the artistic wealth of his nature, the keen executive ability, the tireless activity—all of these combined to produce a man of rarest type."