

# 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-SEPTEMBER, 1931  
Vol. 2 No. 5

\$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 Social Significance of Jesus Christ

IT would be misleading to speak of JESUS CHRIST as a social reformer. It is well within the truth, however, to say that He has been the most effective of social reformers. A comparison between the social conditions that prevailed before His advent and those that prevail in Christendom today, supplemented by a comparison between social conditions in Christian and non-Christian lands, evidence His unique effectiveness as a social reformer. Bad as are existing social conditions throughout Christendom, they would be infinitely worse were it not for the heaven He cast into the meal of humanity. Moreover if Christianity should cease to function in this world, there is every reason to believe not only that no further progress would be made along these lines but that what has been gained would be lost. The thought we have in mind has perhaps received its most eloquent expression in the oft-quoted words of JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL:

"When the microscopic search of scepticism which has hunted the heavens and sounded the seas to disprove the existence of a Creator has turned its attention to human society, and found a place on this planet, ten miles square, where a decent man can live in decency, comfort and security, supporting and educating his children, unspoiled and unpolluted; a place where age is revered, infancy protected, manhood respected, womanhood honored, and human life held in due regard—when sceptics can find such a place, ten miles square on this globe, where the gospel of CHRIST has not gone and cleared the way, and laid the foundations, and made decency and security possible, it will be in order for the sceptical *literati*

to move thither and ventilate their views. But as long as these very men are dependent upon the very religion which they discard for every privilege which they enjoy, they may well hesitate a little before they seek to rob the Christian of his hope, and humanity of its faith in that Saviour who alone has given to man that hope of life eternal which makes life tolerable and society possible, and robs death of its terrors and the grave of its gloom."

Wherein lies the secret of CHRIST'S unique effectiveness as a social reformer? Unquestionably it lies in His ability to deal with sin. Other social reformers, except as they have been His followers, have had much to say about imperfect legislation, unfavorable environment, and such like; but they have had little to say about sin, notwithstanding the fact that sin on the part of somebody is the great root-cause of social misery. "Take away from the history of humanity," to cite the late JAMES ORR, "all the evils which have come on man through his own folly, sin, and vice; through the follies and vices of society; through tyranny, misgovernment and oppression; through the cruelty and

inhumanity of man to man; and how vast a portion of the problem of evil would already be solved! What myriads of lives have been sacrificed on the shrines of BACCHUS and LUST; what untold misery has been inflicted on the race to gratify the unscrupulous ambitions of ruthless conquerors; what tears and groans have sprung from the institution of slavery; what wretchedness is hourly inflicted on human hearts by domestic tyranny, private selfishness, the preying of the strong on the weak, the dishonesty and chicanery of society! . . . If all the suffering and sorrow which follows directly or indirectly from human sin could be abstracted, what a happy world after all this would be!" If JESUS had had as little to say about sin as have so many of our modern social reformers, His efforts along the line of social betterment would have been as ineffectual as theirs. His work has proven effective while that of others has proven ineffective because He alone is able to deal adequately with sin. It is this ability that puts Him in a class by Himself among social reformers; moreover it is because He possesses this ability that in Him alone is found any adequate warrant for supposing that a kingdom in which justice shall prevail, in which love shall be the law and happiness the universal condition, may yet prevail on the earth.

But while Christians, because of their faith in JESUS CHRIST, may expect a renewed earth wherein dwelleth righteousness we are not to suppose that as a class they are committed to any specific social scheme. Christianity as such does not take sides between the advocates of the present social order and that proposed, for

### IN THIS ISSUE

Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	4
J. G. Machen	
Primitive Religion.....	7
George P. Pierson	
"They Shall Not Pass".....	10
E. G. Brown	
Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice.....	17
Current Views and Voices.....	18
News of the Church.....	20

instance, by the Socialists. Unquestionably there is much in the present social order, such as child labor, sweat shops, white slavery, alcoholism, unfair distribution of wealth, race hatred, militarism, that must be eliminated before anything like Christianity's hope for this world will have been realized. Equally unquestionable it is that there is much about Socialism (as it is commonly advocated), such as its irreligion, its materialism, its class hatred, that must be eliminated before it can even pretend to be in harmony with a social order that could rightly be called Christian. But Christianity as such does not decide the question whether an ideal social order is to come about through the elimination of the bad features and the strengthening of the good features of the existing social order, or, whether with the retention of what is good in the present social order, there is to be a reorganization of society along economic lines of a different sort. If most Christians oppose Socialism it is not because they are committed to the present social order by reason of the fact that they are Christians. Rather it is because they believe that as an economic arrangement Socialism would not bring about the good results its advocates claim. If they thought that the reorganization of society along the lines proposed by Socialism (or other ism) would produce not merely a social order that is more just and equitable and better fitted to develop a high type of manhood and womanhood than the present social order, but one that is more just and equitable and better fitted to develop a high type of manhood and womanhood than the present social order freed from its bad and strengthened in its good features, we may be sure that they would favor such reorganization.

But while Christianity as such is not committed to any specific social scheme, and while it does not make its appeal to any one class within the social order, yet its social affinities are and ever have been with the poor and oppressed rather than with the rich and the powerful. From this point of view its fundamental note was struck in those words from the prophecy of ISAIAH that JESUS took as the text of what has been called His inaugural address, to wit—"The spirit of the LORD is upon me, because He has anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor; He

has sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD." If it be true that there are laboring men who suppose that Christianity is out of sympathy with them in their efforts to secure better conditions for themselves and their children, this finds its explanation in the fact that they have gotten their conception of Christianity from those who by their unsocial conduct have misrepresented Christianity before the world. There is no warrant for the notion that many working men apparently have that the sympathies of Christianity are with the so-called capitalist class. As a matter of fact, as has frequently been pointed out, the best elements in that social ideal that is preached by Socialism are themselves children of the Christian Church—prodigals, perhaps, strayed far from home and into strange companionships, but children none the less. No doubt there have been, and are, those who, though identified with the Christian Church, have made their way to wealth and power by exploiting their fellows and who surrounded with every comfort are indifferent to the welfare and happiness of others; but that only proves that they are Christian in name rather than in fact; it does not at all militate against the thought that only as the gospel of JESUS CHRIST is accepted and lived can we hope for the full coming of that kingdom in which there shall be no wrong or injustice or oppression, but only that which is just and right and according to the law of love.

"Poor world! if thou cravest a better day,  
Remember that CHRIST must have  
His own way;  
I mourn thou art not as thou mightest be,  
But the love of GOD would do all  
for thee."

It has sometimes been alleged that the emphasis JESUS placed on the salvation of the individual implies that He was indifferent to social conditions. No inference could be less warranted. Rather it indicates that He was wisely concerned about such matters, as the salvation of the individual is the condition of the salvation of society.

Inasmuch as CHRIST's effectiveness as a social reformer finds its explanation in His ability to deal with sin, the method by which we can best promote a better social order is the method of evangelism. All efforts to obtain better social conditions, whether by means of wise legislation or otherwise, ought to receive our sympathetic support. A mere change of environment, however, will not produce changed lives. As an old Jewish proverb has it: "Take the bitter tree and plant it in the garden of Eden and water it with the rivers there; and let the angel GABRIEL be the gardener and the tree will still bear bitter fruit." These things of themselves have no power to change men's nature. JESUS alone is able to do that. Hence it is only as He is made known unto men, and they are brought into right relations with Him, that we can hope for those men and women apart from whom it is vain to expect a truly Christian social order. "Even from the point of view of benevolence," to cite the words of the late JAMES STALKER, "evangelization is the deepest service that one man can render another. For while ordinary benevolence may feed the hungry and clothe the naked, evangelization enables the poor to feed and clothe themselves; because it touches the springs of manhood and self-respect and transforms the whole condition from within; and while it does so on a small scale in the individual and family, it does so no less on the great scale in the nation or race; for the whole course of history ever since the Advent goes to prove that wherever the light of the Gospel shines the blessings of civilization abound also." The enemies of the Gospel are, therefore, the enemies of a better social order. For the same reason those who are doing most toward carrying out CHRIST's last great command, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you," are those who are doing most toward bringing in a better order of society. The need of this age as of every age is an evangelization that teaches men to do all the things that JESUS commanded. In the very nature of the case men cannot take JESUS as their Saviour both from the guilt and power of sin and strive to do all the things He commands without becoming centers of influence that make for social well-being.

## "The Faith Once for All Delivered"

THERE are few passages in the Bible less acceptable to the Liberal or Modernist (so-called) than the one in which JUDE exhorts his readers to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." From their evolutionary point of view there can be no such thing as a "faith once for all delivered." In their life and world view there is simply no place for the song, "The old-time religion is good enough for me," as little as there is for the belief that monotheism was the original form of religion. With them it is axiomatic that their religion is both different from and an improvement on that of their fathers, and that there is every reason to believe that the religion of their children will in turn be both different from and an improvement on their own.

But while this passage is unacceptable to the "Modernist," it readily finds a home in the thought-world of the "Fundamentalist." This is not to imply that the Fundamentalist holds that the religious thinking of one age should be but a repetition of the religious thinking of a former age. Far from it. He is quite free to believe, and usually does believe, that new light is constantly breaking forth from the Word of God, so that future generations should have a better understanding of and appreciation of Christianity than we do, just as we have or should have a better understanding and appreciation of Christianity than did our fathers. None the less, he does hold that Christianity is an objective reality that abides the same as generations come and go, irrespective of what men's subjective understanding of it may be. Moreover, because he holds that Christianity has a content of its own that abides the same through every change and chance of time, he is convinced that in as far as men are taught of the Holy Spirit they will be in substantial agreement as regards their understanding of it—no matter to what age they belong.

In view of what has been related, this passage supplies a rough and ready, but often fairly accurate, test for distinguishing between the so-called Modernist and the so-called Fundamentalist. No doubt the test leaves much to be desired; but

we may at least say that one who reacts favorably to this passage is not a "Modernist" and may be a "Fundamentalist."

That Christianity is essentially unchangeable in its nature finds its explanation in the fact that it is an historical religion. That we have such a religion as Christianity is due to the fact that certain events happened some centuries ago, particularly the birth, death and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST. Historic facts in the nature of the case are unchangeable. They are what they are, no matter how many centuries may come and go. It was because JUDE preached a religion that was based on historic facts that he could speak of his faith as a "faith once for all delivered." R. H. MALDEN in "Problems of the New Testament Today" put it thus:

"The church's attitude toward its beliefs may be summed up briefly thus—certain things have actually happened. They happened unexpectedly. No one foresaw them. No one could have reckoned with them. They are extraordinary to the verge of being incredible. But they did take place. And the effect of them has been to give men an entirely new view of their relation towards God and towards each other. This was felt at once. How far-reaching the effects may ultimately prove to be, we cannot yet say. We dare not affirm that we have fully grasped the significance of the facts. But they are historic facts, and they are therefore unchangeable. Some of our sacred books record the facts. Others attest them, and show how those upon whom they burst first tried to apply them to their lives. Therefore these books can never be supplanted by others. But the foundation of all their value lies in the historical facts, which some of them record directly and others attest in a more indirect fashion."

Doubtless the mere fact that Christianity is based on historic facts does not prove that it should be the religion for all time. But the kind of facts upon which it is based must be taken into consideration—facts such as the death, resurrection and heavenly priesthood of the Lord of Glory. That Christianity is essentially unchangeable in its nature is due to the fact that it rests on a factual basis: that it is possessed of abiding value is due to the nature of these facts. In view of the supernatural character of these

facts, we may be certain that the religion based upon them is not only unsurpassed but unsurpassable.

In this connection we should not overlook the fact that in the New Testament we have not only a record of the supernatural facts upon which Christianity is based but an *authoritative* explanation of those facts. The historic facts are of primary importance; and yet if we had only human explanations of those facts we could hardly speak of a faith once for all delivered. Such a faith must not only be based on facts but on those facts rightly understood. We could hardly have any assurance that we rightly understood the meaning of such facts, however, unless GOD Himself had explained them. Let us not forget that the New Testament contains more than a record of the great facts that lie at the basis of the Gospel with a human interpretation of their significance. The explanation of their meaning is as GOD-given as are the facts themselves. It takes both the facts recorded in the Bible and the Bible's explanation of those facts to give us Christianity. Because both the facts and the explanation are GOD-given ours is a "faith once for all delivered." Our knowledge of Christianity may be and doubtless is very imperfect; but it has a content given it once for all by CHRIST and His apostles that abides the same as age succeeds age.

## "They Shall Not Pass"

WE count it a privilege to print the story contained in this issue. It was originally our intention to print it in installments but a re-reading of the manuscript left on us the feeling that this would greatly weaken the impression it is fitted to make. Whether it will be followed by other stories will depend partly on the response of our readers and partly on our ability to obtain stories of equal merit dealing with the situation in the church today.

### Westminster Seminary

It is expected that the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will be a special Westminster Seminary Number. It is hoped that the friends of the institution will interest themselves in giving it a wide distribution. Copies will be sent on request.

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

## IX. AFTER THE CONVERSION

*"But when He who set me apart from my mother's womb and called me, through His grace was pleased to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia and again I returned to Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Cephas, and I remained with him fifteen days; but another of the apostles I did not see—only I saw James the brother of the Lord"* (Gal. 1:15-19, in a literal translation).

### No Conference with Flesh and Blood

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we discussed the revelation of God's Son in Paul, which is mentioned at the beginning of this important passage. That revelation, we observed, is to be regarded either (1) as the inner aspect—the effect within Paul's soul—of the outward appearance of Christ at Paul's conversion or (2) a revelation soon after the conversion or (3) the revelation to others which was involved in the wonderful change which Christ wrought by the conversion in Paul's life. In accordance with the first and third of these interpretations, it is distinctly the conversion which is referred to here; and in accordance with the second interpretation it is an event immediately subsequent to the conversion and closely connected with it. We shall not go wrong, therefore—especially since the second interpretation is probably incorrect—if we say that it is the conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus that is here treated not only as the turning-point of Paul's life but as the event that gave him the gospel that he was to preach.

"Before the conversion," Paul's argument runs, "I certainly did not become a disciple of the original apostles; for I was then an active persecutor. I was then

certainly not being brought to Christ gradually by any instructions or persuasions of men. My conversion was utterly sudden, and it was produced by an act of God; I received my gospel directly from Jesus Christ."

Up to this point, we have already discussed Paul's argument in the last number. "But then," Paul goes on, "even after my conversion, even after I had received the gospel from Christ, I did not become a disciple of the men upon whom the Judaizers say I am dependent. In the early period, I did not even have any contact with them at all. After my conversion I did not go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me; but the journey that I made was to Arabia, and it was three years before I went up to Jerusalem."

### Harmony with Acts

The word "immediately," in the sixteenth verse, requires perhaps a word of comment. "When God was pleased to reveal His Son to me," Paul says, "immediately I conferred not with flesh or blood, nor (to be specific, to take up the special form of dependence upon flesh and blood which the Judaizers allege against me) did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia." Does the word "immediately" go with the negative part of the sentence only, or also with the positive part? Does Paul mean to say, "What I did not do immediately after my conversion was to go up to Jerusalem"; or does he mean to say, "What I did immediately after my conversion, instead of going up to Jerusalem, was to go away into Arabia"?

If the latter view is correct, then a difficulty might at first sight seem to arise when we compare this narrative with the one in the Book of Acts. In Acts, it is said that after Paul's conversion and the ensuing three days of blindness Paul "was with the disciples in Damascus some days,

and immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that this is the Son of God." If Paul "immediately" preached Jesus in the synagogues, how could he at the same time have "immediately" gone away to Arabia?

The difficulty is not, however, by any means insuperable. Of course, it disappears altogether if Paul's "immediately," in Gal. 1:16, goes only with the negative part of the sentence that follows; for in that case Paul would be saying that he did not immediately go up to Jerusalem, but he would not be saying how soon the journey to Arabia occurred. But even if the "immediately" goes—grammatically at least—with the positive as well as with the negative part of the sentence, still the passage can be understood perfectly well in harmony with the Book of Acts.

"After my conversion," Paul says in effect, "what was it that immediately followed? Certainly it was not any visit to Jerusalem. There was indeed a journey away from Damascus in those early days, but it was a journey *away from Jerusalem—to Arabia—not to Jerusalem.*" The real point of the sentence is to deny that there was a journey to Jerusalem during those early days; it is not to establish the exact moment of the journey to Arabia. As has been well said by someone—in a place that we are unable to lay our hands on for the moment—when Paul uses the word "immediately" in connection with the journey to Arabia, he is thinking not in terms of days or of hours but of journeys. His journey at that time was not to Jerusalem but to Arabia.

Thus even if the word "immediately" goes with the positive as well as with the negative part of the sentence, still a brief period of preaching in Damascus after the conversion and before the journey to Arabia is not excluded. The journey to Arabia, which is not mentioned in Acts, may, therefore, be regarded as having

taken place after the preaching activity mentioned in Acts 9:20. It may be remarked in passing, however, that other hypotheses may be advanced, and have been advanced, as to the place where the journey to Arabia is to be inserted in the outline provided by the Book of Acts.

One important result already emerges from a consideration of this question. We observe already, namely, that the author of Acts has not made use of the Epistle to the Galatians in the construction of his narrative. The very difficulties which face us in our effort to put the two accounts together really constitute an important argument in favor of the early date and independent historical value of the Book of Acts. A later writer, composing his narrative at a time when information about Paul's life had become scanty, and being driven, therefore, to use the scattered autobiographical passages in the Pauline Epistles, would have made the harmony between his narrative and that in the Epistles altogether easy. Difficulties in the harmonizing of two narratives, on the other hand, arise when the narratives, no matter how trustworthy they may be, are independent of each other. It is really a fact of enormous importance for the defence of Luke-Acts, and not for the attack upon it, that differences of opinion arise, and may legitimately arise, as to the way in which the narrative in Acts is to be put together with the narrative in Galatians in the construction of as complete an account as possible of the life of Paul.

#### Arabia

Paul went away, he says, into Arabia. By "Arabia" he means, no doubt, the country of the Nabatean kings, of whom the one who was reigning at this time was Aretas IV. Since that country extended almost to the gates of Damascus, it is not necessary to suppose that he made a long journey into the great peninsula which we now commonly speak of as "Arabia." His journey may have been long or it may have been short; we simply do not know how long it was.

Moreover, we do not know how long a time Paul spent in Arabia. We only know that the time was less than three years; for Paul tells us that three years after the conversion he went up from Damascus to Jerusalem, and we learn

from Acts 9:20, 22, 23 that some of that period was spent in preaching in Damascus.

So far as what Paul tells us in Galatians is concerned, we might suppose that the stay in Arabia lasted only (say) a few weeks. Let it not be objected that so short a stay would not have been thought worthy of mention; for the importance of the journey to Arabia in Paul's argument is found not in the journey itself but in the contrast in which it stands with a journey to Jerusalem, which Paul is concerned to deny.

One consideration, perhaps, points to a somewhat longer stay in Arabia. It appears in the fact mentioned in Acts 9:26, that when Paul finally went up to Jerusalem the disciples there were afraid of him. Would they have been afraid of him if the three years since his conversion had been spent almost exclusively in his preaching (in a place so near as Damascus) of that faith which formerly he had laid waste? Is not their fear of him better explained if he had spent a large part of the time since his conversion in the remote region of Arabia?

This consideration, though it has some weight, is scarcely conclusive; and the wisest thing for us to do is to say frankly that we do not know how large a proportion of the three years was spent in Arabia and how large a proportion in Damascus.

#### Meditation or Preaching

What did Paul do when he was in Arabia? Two answers to this question have been given. Some have thought that he carried on a preaching activity there; others have thought rather that he engaged in meditation upon the implications of the wonderful new conviction that had come into his life through the appearance to him of the risen Christ. If we had to choose between these two views, we should certainly choose the second. Even if Paul preached in Arabia, he certainly did not neglect meditation and prayer; he was not like some modern pastors who are "too busy" to engage in intellectual and spiritual preparation for their sermons. Indeed, even in the later busy period of his life, when the care of all the churches rested upon him, Paul always gives evidence of being a man of thought as well as a man of action. Indeed, he was a man of action because he was a man of

thought; his wonderful life-work, which has changed the entire history of the world, was possible only because of great convictions meditated upon in the depths of his soul.

Happy would it be for the Church if we had more preachers like Paul in this respect today! There is a tremendous bustle in the lives of the typical preachers and pastors of the present time, but a singular lack of power. Perhaps one reason is that the preachers in question are neglecting to have recourse to the springs of power. Real preaching is born in long and laborious study of the Word of God and in the agony of the preacher's soul.

Paul may have engaged in preaching activity in Arabia; but we are inclined to think that the time which he spent there was predominantly a time of meditation and prayer, and of the study of the Old Testament Scriptures (which never ceased to be for Paul the authoritative Word of God) in the light of the wonderful new revelation that he had received from Christ.

#### The Place of Paul's Conversion

Certain it is that after the stay in Arabia he "returned again to Damascus." The form of expression here is not without importance. Paul has not told us so far where the conversion took place. The Book of Acts says it took place near Damascus; but the Book of Acts is under fire in modern criticism. The tendency of certain modern skeptical historians is to keep Paul as far as possible from Palestine and from those who had known Jesus during His earthly ministry. Thus a few of these historians have even denied that Paul ever was in Jerusalem prior to his conversion. Such denial of course is possible only on the basis of a thoroughgoing rejection of the testimony of Acts. Thus if it had been only the Book of Acts that places the conversion of Paul near Damascus, the narrative in Acts would hardly have escaped criticism at this point. Rather might the historians to whom we have referred have been inclined, in defiance of Acts, to place the conversion of Paul at a point far more conveniently remote from Palestine than Damascus was. But as a matter of fact Paul himself, in Galatians, one of the universally accepted Epistles, says that after his conversion he "returned again

to Damascus." If he "returned" to Damascus, he must have been there before, and the conversion must have taken place in or near that city. Thus the assertion of Acts as to the place of the conversion is incidentally confirmed. We may well surmise that if Paul had had occasion to give other details many more elements in the narrative in Acts would similarly have been confirmed.

### Paul and Peter

Three years after the conversion, Paul went up from Damascus to Jerusalem. The manner of his departure from Damascus was remarkable. According to his own account in II Cor. 11:32, 33, as well as according to the account in Acts 9:23-25, he escaped from his enemies by being lowered through the wall of the city in a basket.

He went up to Jerusalem, he tells us in Galatians, "to make the acquaintance of Cephas"—calling Peter, here as usually, by the Aramaic name of which "Peter" is a translation—and he remained with him fifteen days. We cannot be sure of all that occurred within that fifteen-day period. But one thing can be said with some confidence—Paul did not neglect the opportunity of listening to what Peter had to tell concerning the words and deeds of Jesus. When Paul speaks, as he does in Galatians, of his apostolic independence, of the fact that he has not received his gospel from the original apostles or from any other mere men, he does not mean that he was indifferent to factual information which came to him by ordinary word of mouth from those who had been with Jesus when He was on earth. Much of such information had already come to him before his conversion; for the public ministry of Jesus was not a thing done in a corner, and Paul was intensely interested in it, though only as an enemy. But after the conversion the fund of such information would be enormously increased, not only through Paul's contact with humble Christians in Damascus, but also, and particularly, when he came into personal contact with the chief of Jesus' intimate disciples. The incidental way in which Paul writes in his Epistles here and there about events in the life of Jesus or elements of His teaching shows clearly not only that such incidental references proceed from a far

larger store of knowledge which he possessed himself, but also that they are parts, chosen as need arose, of a store of information which he had given to the churches in his initial teaching.

### Paul and Jesus

What Paul does mean, when he says that he received his gospel not through a man but through Jesus Christ, is that neither Peter nor any other disciple of Jesus made him a Christian by taking him and leading him, through instruction or persuasion, to see that his hostile view of what he had heard about Jesus was false and that really this was the Messiah and the Saviour. That conviction—that new attitude toward the information which he had received—came, Paul says, from Jesus Himself, when He appeared to him on the road to Damascus; and directly from Jesus, moreover, not through Peter or any other mere man, did he receive his commission to preach that gospel of the truth of which he had thus become convinced. To some extent at least, Paul had heard the gospel even before his conversion. But it was not that hearing of the gospel which made him an apostle. What made him an apostle was the direct impartation of the gospel to him by Jesus Christ, partly confirming the truth of what he had already heard, but partly also leading him, no doubt, into a new fulness of truth.

To make Paul indifferent to the details of Jesus' life, to make him indifferent to what he heard from Peter and others about what Jesus had said and done, is to interpret certain passages in Galatians with entire disregard, not only of the Book of Acts, but also of certain other passages in Paul's own Epistles. In particular, it is to neglect the important passage, I Cor. 15:3-8, where Paul appeals, in support even of the central fact of the resurrection, not only to his own testimony but also to the testimony of Peter and of the Twelve and of the five hundred brethren who saw the risen Christ. And in I Cor. 15:11 Paul says in the clearest possible manner that his gospel was the same as that of the original apostles. "Whether, therefore," he says, "it be I or they, so we preach and so ye believed."

Surely it is a mere caricature of New Testament exegesis if we represent Paul as saying to Peter, during those fifteen

days which he spent with him three years after the conversion, when Peter quite naturally started to tell him something about his intercourse in Galilee with the Lord: "Stop, Peter; you must not tell me anything that you heard Jesus say or saw Jesus do while He was with you on earth, because if you do you will impair my apostolic independence." On the contrary, the two men of course spoke of those wonderful events of which Peter was the best possible eyewitness; and it is natural to surmise that it was during that fifteen-day visit that Paul "received" the precious summary of the death, burial, resurrection and appearances of Christ which he reproduces in I Cor. 15:3ff. No doubt he had already learned in Damascus some or all of what appears in that summary; but authoritative confirmation of it—perhaps even the summary formulation of it which we have in the passage just mentioned—was in all probability received from Peter during that important first visit of Paul to Jerusalem after the conversion. Certainly it did not at all make Paul a disciple of Peter, as the Judaizers apparently said he was; it did not impair in the slightest his independent apostolic authority or overthrow the thesis, which he is establishing in this first great division of this Epistle, that he was an apostle not from men nor through a man but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead.

### A Message from Mongolia

The following message has been received by China Inland Mission from three intrepid pioneer missionaries—Miss Mildred Cable and the Misses Eva and Francesca French:—"Camp near Edzingol River, Mongolo. Greeting! From the wilds of Mongolia, twelve days from a post office, we entrust this card to a merchant, hoping it may reach its destination. For the first time since the days of the Nestorians the Christian missionary has come among the tent-dwellers of Edzingol. The darkness, ignorance and Satanic bondage is indescribable, and it is with a burdened spirit we are driving the point of the plough through the tangled masses of Lamaistic superstition which loves darkness and hates light. Who will come to tell these people of Christ in the Mongolian language?"

# Primitive Religion: Evidence That It Was Monotheistic

By Rev. George P. Pierson, D.D.  
(Missionary to Japan for forty years)

As we open the book of Asia and read its most ancient records we become acquainted with two facts, the fact of an original monotheism and the fact of a subsequent decadence. As we open the Greatest Book of Asia we become acquainted with the same two facts, an original monotheism and a subsequent decadence—each of these great books confirming the other.

If we inquire into the cause of this continuing decadence we find it to be the rejection of an original revelation and the appeal to human reason.

Should we further inquire, what has this to do with our day and generation, perhaps the following paragraphs will contribute towards an answer.

**T**HE great Asian races of remotest antiquity were manifestly monotheistic. That they subsequently lost their original faith, and, with only human reason, experience and external nature to go by, became pantheistic, polytheistic, even atheistic, we shall endeavor by quotation of expert testimony to show.

The strands of evidence, as far back as we can trace them, converge; they do not fray out into ragged shreds of dreams, ghosts and shadows. Happily we have records of what the ancients of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Persia, India, China, Korea and Japan believed. We are attempting, it should be remembered, to make out the headlands through the mists of the early dawn, but headlands are there.

## Mesopotamia

There is in the theologies of Mesopotamia "an instinct to hold to a superior god." "Asshur had peculiarly exalted traits which might have been conceived of a god like the God of Israel" Sayce. "Some see in Ilu, the Babylonian supreme deity, the Hebrew EL." (Ebvard.) "The Akkadian An, heaven, corresponding to the Hebrew EL was the parent of all and An dwelt alone."

When history becomes more distinct a decline had ensued between the Rivers; polytheism had come into vogue. The boundless realms of nature were thought of as having each its own spirit-ruler—An, of the sky and heaven beyond the visible sky; Ea, of the sea or rather of the primeval deep out of which all things arose; Bel, of the air and the earth beneath—Bel who revealed himself in the sun. Or else a dualism was imagined, as between Merodach, the god of light and order, and Tiamat the dragon of darkness. Or else, as the old Sumerian animism had it, "Each object or force of nature had its 'zi' or life that, e.g., made the arrow to fly, the knife to wound, the stars to move. A personality was given these 'zi', so that they became spirits—most of them harmful—peopling earth and sky. Only magical charms could overcome them, charms known only to 'shamans', the sorcerer priests."

Meanwhile the mass of the people sank into gross superstition. Beneath the earth lay Hades where spirits of the dead flitted about in the darkness like bats with dust their only food. To designate a race Semitic is tantamount to calling it, originally at least, monotheistic. Hebrews, Moabites, Ammonites, Arabians are easily shown to have been worshippers of the One God. Among the Hamite Phoenicians, too, the names of God, Elyon, Shaddai, Adonai, are all of them protests against polytheism. "The ancient races of Phoenicia," says Philo, "in time of drought lifted their hands heavenward to EL. Him they considered the only God, the Lord of heaven."

The story of the decline of these nations is what we read as children. What rebuke these nations invited on themselves in multiplying idols, and what disappointment and degradation the worship of their man-made religions induced, is history only too well authenticated.

## Egypt

Egypt is not Asia but in ancient relations one with Asia. That the original Egyptians made up of Hametic and Shemitic peoples, with a history as old as Babylon's, were at first monotheistic admits of little doubt.

In the Leyden Museum is kept the record of an extremely ancient Egyptian hymn in which God is called the "One of One." De-Rougé says that the doctrine of the unity and oneness of God existed in the Nile Valley more than 2000 years before the Christian era.

The sacred texts taught that there was a single Being, "the sole producer of all things both in heaven and earth, Himself not produced of any, the only true, living God, self-originated who exists from the beginning." "The outstretch of His being knows no limits. He cannot be seen. He listens to prayers. He turns His countenance to men according to their conduct. He is alone and there is none beside Him." He was a pure spirit, perfect in every respect all-wise, almighty, supremely good.

"It should be noted that the above views of the Divine nature were not worked out

by sages or philosophers, but seem to have underlain the religion of Egypt from the first."

Three marked features of the ancient religion in its later waning stages, made the final change into polytheism easy:

1. It is a well known fact that a single god had a multitude of names. The Litanies of the god Ra—the supreme god, acting in the sun—contain seventy-five different names under which he was invoked. One entire chapter of the Book of the Dead is devoted to the names of Osiris; it is even thought by some that Ra and Osiris may be identified "with one another. Different names easily become different persons.

2. Further the gods of the popular mythology were understood to be either personified attributes of the Deity or parts of the nature He had created, Num representing the Creative mind, Ptah the Creative hand or act, Maut matter, Ra the sun, Osiris perhaps divine goodness.

3. The rise of polytheism in Egypt has also been explained thus:—When Menes brought Egypt together under his scepter, the land was divided into nomes each having its capital town, and each town having its principal god designated by a special name. Although for a while it was always the same doctrine, which appears under different names, namely the doctrine of a single, primeval god of one substance, self-existent and unapproachable, yet the descent from different names to different beings was easy.

"The priests themselves," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "believed in one deity alone and in performing their adorations to any particular member of the pantheon, addressed themselves directly to the sole Ruler of the Universe through that particular form, e.g., Ptah, Amon; as we might address the Deity as Creator Almighty, or other title." However it was a dangerous practice to Monotheism, for degeneration followed. "The sublimer portions of the Egyptian religions are demonstrably ancient and the last stage, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, heathen or Christian, by

far the grossest and most corrupt." (Renouf.)

#### Persia

Geographically connected with the Mesopotamian peoples are the wilder of Northern Asia who in backwardness of development at least we may associate with the peoples of Oceanica and Africa. One would look last among such, with their fetishes, totem poles, witch-doctors, and demons, for any trace of monotheism. Much to our astonishment, however, we read that they were primitive pantheists, who saw behind the appearance of things a vague supernatural power recognized as, e.g., "Supervisor," "Existence," "Strength" by the Koryaks of North Siberia; the "Sky-spirit, Jok," by the Alaskan Indians; "Jumbel" by the Lappers, "Num" by the Samoyeds, "Manito," "Orenda" by the North American Indians and so on. "The Scythians," said Herodotus, "worship one god only, the sun, regarded not as a mass of fiery matter but inhabited by an all-seeing, all-sustaining spirit." One of their eight gods was "Papaeus" which is clearly Father.

"In the whole area of Northern Europe and Asia by the side of the secondary divinities, or rather spirits more or less deified, is found a supreme God, Creator and Preserver of the universe," says Quatrefages.

That a subsequent gross religion of fear has characterized these backward races for centuries and millennia seems unquestionable. Our only contention here is that there is and persistently has been the idea among these races of a diffused, supernatural, cosmic power; which idea is manifestly an ageless tradition among peoples where tradition is of supreme evidential value.

In the Zend Avesta, the ancient religious record of the Medes and Persians, there are two great persons in constant conflict. Ormazd a real person, the principle of good, and Ahriman a real person, the principle of evil. This would seem to indicate an eternal dualism, and so to argue against a primitive monotheism, but two important facts are to be remembered:—Ormazd, though now in conflict, is to come off conqueror; this is practically monotheism. Again in the first two of the Gathas hymns—a part of the Zend Avesta—while it is true that there are recognized two classes of spiritual intelligence, one good, pure benignant, the other, bad, impure, malevolent, they place at the head of the good intelligences a single, perfect Being, but they do *not* place any single malevolent being at the head of the bad intelligences! They exhibit to us Ormazd as "Creator, Preserver and Governor of the universe, the holy God, the Father of all truth, the Master of purity."

There appear indeed later a hierarchy of celestial beings and genii presiding over fire and light, air, earth and water, but the farther back you go the simpler and purer

Persian theology—Aryan theology—becomes; and the nearer you approach the Christian era the greater is decadence observable.

"In a time far beyond the reach of the usual appliances of human history, in a region somewhere in the heart of Asia there appears the early vision of a family from which go forth towards the East the lords of India, and towards the West the successive races that peopled Europe." (Upham.)

"What was the religion of this Aryan family before it split to find such different destinies, when they all lived together as a single, simple people? We find," says Dr. Fairbairn, "two points of radical agreement, the term expressive of the idea of God in general, and in the proper name of God."

When the grand division of the Aryan race took place—one of the great significant facts of history—the Indo-European migration proceeding Westward became Zends, Persians, Slavs, Greeks, Latins, Celts, Teutons and other families. "The conception of a Supreme Divinity, wise, powerful and good is common to the four great divisions of the Aryan race, Iranians, Hindus, Greeks, Romans."

#### Greece and Rome

Special names of gods go no farther back than Homer and Hesiod. Max Muller says "When we ascend the most distant heights of Greek history, the idea of God as the Supreme Being stands before us as a simple fact."

Plutarch says of the Romans, "Their early religion was image-less and spiritual. Numa, their religious law-giver, forbade the Romans to represent the Deity in the form of either man or beast, it being impious to represent things divine by what is perishable like images and statues. We can have no conception of God but by the understanding."

To what degree of decadence Greek and Roman religions fell, Socrates bears witness, still more clearly Paul.

#### India

The sacred books of India, the four Vedas each containing hymns, ritual and philosophy, were written during a period of a thousand years beginning about 2000 B.C. In the first of these books the Rig Veda, are traces of monotheism. "Varuna, besides the loftiest figure in the Hellenic pantheon stands like a god beside a man. Varuna comes near monotheism. The god of the distant, pure, serene heaven, he dwells alone above the highest heaven, primitive Creator, watcher of wrong, guardian of right, loosening the bond of sin." There are those who identify Varuna with the Persian Ormazd. The religion of the Vedas points to a time when polytheism was non-existent.

"During the first Vedic period the Indians were conscious that the 'Adityas' did not

represent a multitude of separate deities but only the fullness of the creative powers of the one God, and that in each of the 'Adityas' it was always the one God who was worshipped." (Ebard.) The teaching of Brahma is not found in the first two stages and sets of sacred scriptures in India. Karma and transmigration are not taught in the beginning of Hinduism.

When the Aryan people—a devout race—came out from the shadow of the awe-inspiring Himalayas into the plains of the Indus, they brought with them a high conception of the deity. The Aryans had had doubtless contact with the old Persians and they in turn were near in time and space to the earliest races we know—those who dwelt between the Rivers.

Whatever of good the Aryan race may have brought to India the establishment of caste (1866 sub-castes), the blighting philosophy of Brahma, and futile formulae and ritual must be charged, against the new religion. All these spell decadence.

Nothing more fearful than the philosophy of Brahm has been conceived by the beclouded mind of man—a vast, cosmic, silent, motionless, dark ocean of be-ness fills all space—Brahm, the impersonal, unknowable, eternal, immaterial, causeless spirit of the universe, abstract potentiality. "Then begins in Brahm a stirring, an awakening of desire. From this emanates the spiritual parts of gods and men and the spiritual Soul that remains the witness and spectator, i.e. God as the Power which acting upon the inchoate mass evolves the Cosmos. Then vast hierarchies of spiritual beings come into existence. Angels and astral beings wholly evil." From these man has derived the gods and demons of his religions. After all this the universe retraces its course in a great cycle, going into dissolution and finally settling into the dark ocean of being whence it arose, until another round begins, once every 310,040,000,000,000 earth years, man is a part of Brahm. To think of himself as an individual is ignorance, illusion, sin.

Brahmans think in a circle; theists in a straight line. Then atheistic Buddhism arose and attempted to reconstruct Brahmanism but it retained the doctrine of karma, the doctrine that in successive rebirths we must become the sum of all we have done in the previous life. This fatalistic immortality of my guilt-condemned unatoned self is a doctrine only one degree less horrible than that of Brahm. To find a way of escape from the doom and fear of endless rebirths—8,400,000 there are—is man's chief end. Buddhism was too hopeless and lifeless to live in India, so it died and Hinduism revived; partly thru the adoption of the triad-Brahma, Vishnu (becoming incarnate in the immoral Krishna) and Siva.

"Hinduism has declined by four descents

from its pristine estate and is now in the fourth and debased condition called Kaliyug."

Meanwhile the mass of the people sank deeper and deeper into cruel superstition.

#### China

That the original religion of China was monotheistic is evident from documentary evidence.

The Emperor Yao 2357-2255 B.C. built a temple to God. His successor "offered the customary sacrifices to God" which implies such sacrifices had been offered for generations before.

A thousand five hundred years before the time of Confucius who lived about 500 B.C., the word "Shangti" (God) is used in the oldest classics. He is the supreme God of heaven, the supreme Ruler, one and indivisible, incapable of change. He has no equal and can have no second. He rules absolutely and solely over all in heaven above and earth beneath. He is tolerant and just. By His decrees kings are made and rulers execute judgment. This from the Book of History and The Odes.

The doctrine of the two impersonal principles of nature the Yang (the principle of light, warmth, productivity, life, heaven) and the Yin (the principle of darkness, cold, death, earth) were unknown in those days. There was no image or idol. "There is not a word in the sacred books Shu and Shih about sacrifice to other spirits—not a word indicating that there was one among them equal to or second to or anything more than a servant to Shangti," says Dr. Legge and he adds emphatically "Five thousand years ago the Chinese were monotheists—not henotheists, but monotheists," he repeats. Nor is there any trace of this conception of Shangti being the result of ages of speculation.

But from the age of Confucius instead of the personal Shangti the term Ten, heaven, comes into use with its pantheistic implication.

One thousand five hundred years later still, pantheism prevailing, the supreme and all-inclusive thing became "li," that is the eternal principle of right and truth.

Much might be written about the good spirits used by the Yang and the evil spirits used by the Yin, about the demons of the mountains, water and ground, about the propitiation of the good spirits to prevent the evil spirits from doing harm, about the system of magic and divination, about the classics based on the Yang-Yin order of nature, the philosophy underlying Confucianism, emperor-worship, ancestor worship, government and family affairs—all constituting a Chinese wall against Christianity; and all, together with the excesses of the popular fear of demons, witnessing to that creeping paralysis of a decadent soul

evident in the religious history of other great races as well.

#### Korea

According to the oldest Korean record in primeval ages there was a divine being named Wanin who was the Creator (chaiso). There is no mention of spirit worship at that time; such worship was introduced at least a thousand years later. The purest religious notion Korea possesses today is "Hananim," Heaven Master, Lord of Heaven, a being entirely unconnected with either of the imported cults, Confucianism and Buddhism, and far removed from the worship of evil spirits that have terrified and prostrated the people down through the centuries.

#### Japan

The first deity mentioned in the Kojiki, Japan's oldest record is Ame-no-mi-naka-mushi-no-kami, which means literally the god the Lord of the centre of heaven. It is claimed by a Japanese scholar that "naka" does not imply localization in the centre of heaven but that all things depend on Him, further that he is both immanent and transcendent. He is without beginning or end, increase or decrease. No shrine has ever been erected to him. From the days before the coming of Confucianism or Buddhism there prevailed, however, animism and local divinities and legion would be too low a figure by which to designate the number of later deities through the centuries of decadence.

The Ainu people of Japan are the remnant of what was originally a great prehistoric race. They have no literature—only tradition. Dr. Batchelor, who has rendered this people unique and distinguished service in a half century of devoted missionary work, says they were originally monotheistic. Indeed their word for God, "Pasui Kamni," the weighty God, who covers or over-shadows, is the name used still for God by the missionaries.

#### Conclusion

From some such study as we have imperfectly attempted two things must be evident:—first, that quite apart from the testimony of Scripture, the ancient races were originally monotheistic; and, second, that in the course of the centuries a continuous deterioration has taken place, this decadence being increasingly notable the more remote from Mesopotamian lands and the nearer to the Christian era we journey.

Man lost his original knowledge, but his insistent religious nature has ever compelled him to search for the lost God. Where else could he search for Him than in the sky, or the air, or the earth, or in himself. It is this unceasing quest that has produced the man-conceived religions of the world, drawn from these four sources.

Nothing in the history of our race is so heart-breaking as the spectacle of man with

his weakened reason—weak at its best—with only himself and his environment as fields of search, after age-long world-wide despairing failures, still groping amid his crumbling temples and ancestral tombs for the secret of it all, dying unsatisfied, bequeathing his doubts to his children. "Creative thinking" apart from a Revelation has not been and cannot be a success. Fallen man as a religion maker has been and must be a failure. True religion is made in heaven.

We conclude then that Asia is a demonstration of appalling magnitude of the folly and wickedness of rejecting an available Revelation and choosing "reason." What we know of heaven and all we know of earth witness to the disaster of such a course.

The archangel rejecting the intimate glory of the very presence of God and appealing to his own inexperienced reason, fell from his high estate and became—Satan. Our first parents, rejecting the plain revelation they had from God and leaning to their own understanding, fell and dragged the race with them.

What happened is recorded in Romans I, that most terrible indictment of our human kind:—

"They knew God"—original Monotheism.

"They glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful"—revelation rejected.

"They became vain in their imaginations"—reason invoked.

"Their foolish heart was darkened"—the reasoning faculty atrophying.

"They changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image—the truth of God into a lie—and worshipped the creature"—reason diverted from God to nature.

"They did not think God worthy to be kept in knowledge. God gave them over to a reprobate mind"—their reason disapproved by God and they rejected.

The books of Asia proves what the Supreme Book of Asia confirms, the necessary disaster involved in rejecting a Revelation and appealing with weakened faculties to nature, experience, imagination—all under the blight of sin.

The men of Asia will rise up in the judgment against our generation; for they seek and have not the knowledge of God, the quickening of the Spirit, the Divine Teacher, while we seem ready to surrender these and start all over again the sad experiment of the unhappy religion-makers of Asia.

\* \* \* \* \*

The idea of a progressive Gospel seems to have fascinated many. To us that notion is a sort of cross-breed between nonsense and blasphemy.—C. H. Spurgeon.

# "They Shall Not Pass"

By Eva Geraldine Brown

DR. NORTH was a scientist, a rather noted psychologist, and for the past three weeks his interest and curiosity had been growing. The situation appealed to him. He was consciously entertained. During the anthem he watched the two, seated there in their ministers' robes, in the high, carved chairs on the platform so close in front of him. And when, later, the young man gave out his text, Dr. North studied the elder and endeavored to read his mind.

"If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me."

Francis Allen was slender and dark. He was straight as a reed, and he bore himself with a grave young dignity. He was a very sincere looking boy, this recent assistant and stepson of the famous older divine. But some of the others had been sincere,—and had been absorbed and digested.

"It seems to me that the great trouble with the world today is that the church has lost both her vision and her courage. I do not speak of our own denomination merely. Today, if ever in the history of the world, 'the Son of God goes forth to war.' He has to! Our churches have lost the dream, and we are forfeiting the respect of the world—justly."

Dr. North glanced quickly at the boy, then back at the older clergyman. But, secure in his knowledge of public acclaim, the great Dr. Wentworth was listening from a vast and most competent calm. Dr. North sized the two men up. He measured the elder's known dominance against the clear courage, the utter truth of this very earnest young man. And because, in spite of his regular attendance, he was not an admirer of Wentworth, he smiled a slow, thoughtful smile.

"This time," he reflected, amusedly, "you've caught something you can't digest!"

He glanced down the aisle to the minister's pew. She was present. Wentworth had shown good taste. Breeding showed in the lines of her face, in the way she held herself. It was her first appearance at church. The two had returned that afternoon from a three weeks' bridal trip. But her son was not like her, thought Dr. North. And he judged that his own suspicion was true. Wentworth had taken young Allen on faith. Most of the time he had known the woman who was now his wife, the boy must have been at school; and nothing in her conventional charm, in their social position, or Allen's young looks, would have threatened such radical truth. Wentworth, behind his exterior calm, must be viewing the thing with dismay. Of course, he had handled such matters before, but—

"The others were all detachable. As long

as this boy's in the family—and proposed by himself as assistant here—he can't very well turn him out. I don't want to miss this! It's in my line,—psychology, simple and pure!"

He listened with interest, testing the boy, weighing his logic, his calibre, foreseeing certain things, trying to guess, balancing forces, environment, the elusive but almost hypnotic charm of the older, established man. Then he tired of it, let himself be absorbed. The boy had a freshness, a trenchant young force. He caught you and swept you along.

But, after the sermon, the analyst's eyes turned to study the older man. Distinguished, graceful, he sat at ease, his beautiful profile cameo-cut against the high, carved chair. His gray hair waved slightly. His eyes were still. Calm attention was all that showed. But the long, slender fingers drummed noiselessly on the arm of the pulpit chair.

"And that," Dr. North informed himself, "conveys a lot to my mind. In a very charming, tactful way,—with considered arguments neatly put,—he will issue definite orders,—in the form of affectionate talk."

He measured Francis Allen again.

"Which will not be taken. And after that, we shall see what we shall see."

After the service, he moved toward the boy. Most of the congregation had gone, but three girls came drifting down the aisle and smiled at him as they passed. They were in his own clan,—May Enderby and Elfreda North and Helen Payne. May was vividly dark, a tiny thing with an impish charm of her own.

"I can't resist him!" he heard her say. "I adore that distinguished look of his! He's so good he just screams to be ruffed up, and I've just simply got to be bad!"

She slipped ahead of the other two. Young Allen turned to greet her, and she met him gushingly.

"Saint Francis, how very fortunate! I was hoping I'd see you right away. You see, there's the dearest baby! It's the cunningest thing you ever saw, and won't you be godfather? There's a dear! He's going to be named for you."

The other two girls looked somewhat surprised. Francis smiled, in real pleasure, and retained the girl's small hand.

"I'll be only too glad," he answered her. "Who is it? Someone in the church?"

May considered gravely, her head on one side, a spark of fun in her eyes.

"I don't know, exactly. I'll let you decide. You see, our cat has six kittens. And two of them are so precious they deserve the very best."

Francis failed to get it, looked puzzled. Helen's laughter pealed suddenly, but Elfreda looked annoyed. With the same grave consideration, May gave further details of the case.

"I was going to name him for both of you,—for you and Dr. Wentworth,—Francis Edward, you know. But one of the others is Edward! He's only a tiny baby, but you never saw such a little thing with such very marked dignity. He's so little he hardly walks straight at all; but he wobbles along in a dignified way, and he laps his cream with due thoughtfulness, and looks at the others playing around with the most indulgent look! It's just Dr. Wentworth over again,—that 'Bless you, my children!' expression that makes you like him so! His fat, wobbly legs do interfere, but youth is a fault that can be outgrown. He's destined for very great things!"

"May!" Helen Payne looked rather shocked, but laughter lighted her eyes.

Elfreda was silent, looked at the boy. Swift distaste, bruised young dignity, an attempt to be pleasant drawn over disgust,—he was such a transparent thing!

"Well you know he is! He's so—suitable!"

She folded her hands, as if in prayer, assumed a pious look, raised her eyes, spoke with reverent earnestness.

Helen pulled at her cousin's arm.

"May, you idiot! Come on home! You're shocking him half to death!"

"But I haven't told him about his own!—There's another one I've named for you. He's the cunningest thing you ever saw." Even May hesitated now, but impishness claimed its way. "He's got the most loving little heart, and such darling, caressing little ways,—and he's gentle and playful and good!"

Francis smiled, but his lips were stiff. He wore his robes! As a minister, there was due him some respect.

"May, you're dreadful!"

May looked surprised.

"Well, he *has*! You saw him! You know yourself he's simply adorable! And he's made for a preacher's assistant. Nice mannered, good looking,—and *biddable*! Don't you love that word? I found it last week in some old fashioned book. It's so very nice and expressive! He does what he's told in the nicest way, and laps up his cream with a virtuous look, and makes up to all of us!"

Helen Payne now exerted force. She was a tall and competent girl and May was no match for her.

"That's enough of that!" she gave judgment. "Mr. Allen, May's simply and wholly depraved. But as long as you are a minister,

here's your chance to accomplish reform."

She pulled so strongly the other girl went, but over her shoulder May flung at him, "He's your godson, anyway!"

Elfreda was left alone with the boy.

"I'm sorry. May does like you. But sometimes she goes too far."

Her gray eyes were sweet with friendliness. She had a lovely voice. Elfreda North, he reflected, was a very attractive girl. He looked after her with approval as her uncle took her away.

At three o'clock the next afternoon Dr. Wentworth sat waiting at his handsome office desk. He had sent for the boy. He must win him,—and explain what he needed to know. He was not disturbed. Young Allen would learn. He had force and charm and delightful ways. The mother and son were devoted. This exceptional chance in his own great church, the advantage of well balanced guidance, the force of his own magnetic power,—he could do great things for the boy. He should like it. He had no son of his own. His colorless wife of many years had never borne him a child. And real pleasure warmed tentative reaching out into dawning possessiveness.

He rose as young Allen came through the door. He put out his hand for a hearty clasp, motioned the boy, with affectionate charm, to the chair set close to his own.

"This is the first free moment I've had. I haven't meant to neglect you, son. I wanted to tell you how pleased I am with the way you have started your work."

Dr. Wentworth loved people. He craved admiration, sought company, was pleased to do little gracious acts, had a genuine friendliness. He had had much experience as a friend. Long years of dealing with human desires had taught him his tact and his poise. But he had another quality. This man was one of the favored few. He was gifted with that compelling force,—pure magnetism and charm. He did love people. He loved to talk, to extend appreciation, to give counsel, to show that he cared. And to charm this boy he brought to bear every weapon he possessed. Tact! Not to wound or offend him. Before any criticism at all, appreciation and praise.

Francis responded delightfully. He gave eager expression to his joy in his new and absorbing work. He told of the courtesies shown him. He wanted,—and not a bad idea at that!—to have invitation cards posted, if possible, in the hotels.

"I spoke of the idea to Dr. North; but, of course, it is something we haven't done. Do you think it's undignified?"

Dr. Wentworth smiled warmly. He loved a crowded church.

"It hadn't occurred to me, I admit. But Dr. North has good judgment. I should like to hear what he said."

"Oh, Dr. North! He's splendid! He said I was rather radical, but he liked my—I can't remember. My enthusiasm, he meant."

"It seems to me a good idea. We will try it out, my boy."

Francis was vivid, all alight.

"Do you know," he confided, "just at first I was so afraid I had dared too much! Of course, if you'd been here—. But I was scared! When I thought of trying to preach to them,—this great, noted church—! And here was I! Just barely ordained! Not even a try in some smaller and easier place. I can tell you I prayed some that first scary day! I was glad that the pulpit hid me. I really did get along all right, but my knees just fairly shook!"

Dr. Wentworth answered this confidence with his rarely charming smile. This was excellent! Made to order! It gave him exactly his chance!

"I think, my boy, you will do great things! You rose to the trial very well." He permitted a shade of anxiety to show in his manner and voice. "Very well, indeed, for one so young. But—you will pardon it, I am sure, since I've had so much more experience,—perhaps,—I could give you a few little hints—."

Francis looked up with young eagerness.

"Oh, yes, sir! I know how high you stand! I have heard of you for years and years. It will be the greatest privilege to have you give me advice."

Whimsically, Dr. Wentworth recalled a quotation, "Oh, wise young judge! Oh, excellent young man!"

"Well, Francis, my boy, I shouldn't want—. You aren't to take it too much to heart. All of us have to learn our trade, and no one expects complete wisdom from those who are just starting out. But, if you will permit it, I noticed last night—."

He paused. He had every desire in the world to do this thing with all tact.

"Yes, sir?"

The boy looked troubled. Had he made some mistake? He had tried so hard. His first sermon before this noted man,—whom vast throngs rose to their feet to acclaim when he spoke in a secular place!

"I shouldn't distress myself at all. It isn't serious. You are young. And charming! It won't be difficult to remove any prejudice."

"Yes, sir."

He thought back worriedly. What had he said? He was very young. Had he made some awful break?

"Won't you tell me, sir, what you didn't like? I shall be grateful to learn of you. I look at them,—at the people in church,—and I feel so humble to think that I,—that I, just Francis Allen,—am trying to tell them the greatest things,—about Christ and eternal life! And then I remember it isn't me. That I stand there for One Who is greater than I,—and as long as I pray and follow Him, He will give me the words to say!"

Dr. Wentworth digested this statement, his eyes on joined finger-tips.

"Well, yes, of course—. But, you see, my boy—."

Francis Allen was very direct.

"I did something!" he cut through evasion. "I'm so sorry! Tell me what."

"It's just—that in a church like this—one has to consider things. We have, as you know, a large membership, and a varied range of types. I am not a conventional Christian. I am moved by the need of the world outside, and the whole world knows I have opened my church to anyone who will come."

"Yes, sir."

("But that's what a church is for! I don't see where there's anything odd in that! And I certainly said in the plainest terms that Christ came to the whole wide world!")

"Not having seen a great deal of you before my marriage to your mother, I have never had a chance to discuss my church with you. And you are evidently somewhat ignorant of certain conditions that obtain here. I am concerned with the welfare of all men,—not just a chosen group."

"Yes, sir,"—a puzzled expression.

"We have among our attendants men of varied and differing faiths."

"I know!" the boy broke in, eagerly. "Jews and atheists! I'm so glad. It gives us a chance to tell them! It is such a splendid thing!"

"And these men have views of their own, you know. It is hard to preserve just the wisest tone to reach such a varied throng. And so I try to—just emphasize certain large principles,—and avoid controversial points. In this way I keep the change to be heard and to influence them for good."

"But, Dr. Wentworth, I don't understand. I mean—I don't know what it was that I did. I said that He came to all the world,—that His call was to all men everywhere! And goodness knows I certainly tried to acknowledge the church's faults! I said we weren't living it! And it's true! We aren't living at all the way He taught. But I made no attack on them."

"No. But, Francis, we live in a modern world. There are things that were useful long ago which no longer apply to us."

The boy's young jaw hardened,—and then relaxed. This was the great Dr. Wentworth! It simply wasn't a possible thing that he meant what it sounded like.

The elder was somewhat at a loss. Things he had thought of didn't quite fit. The conversation had left the track. There were things that Francis must just absorb. He couldn't very well say them. They had to be understood.

"It isn't a serious matter," he smiled. "I don't like to seem egotistical,—but suppose you study my sermons a bit and consider their general tone. You haven't done any special harm. I shouldn't worry at all."

"Yes, sir."

What had he said last night? Dr. Went-

worth was very, very kind, didn't want to hurt his feelings,—but it must have been pretty bad! He wasn't too weak to stand scolding if he'd made such an awful break. But stepfathers—. There! That was probably it. Dr. Wentworth was trying to teach him things in a way to avoid offense.

His face cleared. The people did like him. They had been so cordial and kind. And Dr. Wentworth was splendid! Hadn't he been in the audience that had risen and clapped him loud and long at that meeting a year ago? There was no unkindness behind all this. Just the fatherly wisdom and counsel of a lovable older man. He would follow the method suggested and absorb what he needed to know.

"I can't remember my father," he said. "It's nice—."

He laughed rather shyly, rose, and held out a little book.

"I'm not preaching two Sunday nights, anyway. Next week is the oratorio. Stainer. The Crucifixion. I went to the last rehearsal. It's wonderful,—sweeps you up to heaven! We've got a harp and some violins. And brass,—some sort of horns. But, of course, you've done it all before! I don't know why I'm telling you this! Well,—I'm grateful, sir, for your interest. And you needn't have told me to listen to you. I never have had that privilege,—I mean to your preaching,—I've heard you speak. I'd have done it, anyway!"

"Must you go? I'm at leisure. I thought perhaps you might get acquainted a bit."

"I'd love to stay, but I'm wanted. I have a marriage at four."

"A marriage? Among our people?"

"No, sir. Two young Italians way down on Market Street."

The elder waved a dismissing hand. Things had turned out very well.

Dr. Wentworth entered the pulpit. Francis settled himself in his chair and prepared himself for a treat.

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

May Enderby shook her small dark head and smiled her impish smile.

("Do others first, or they'll do you! You needn't look so virtuous, Nell. You watch him sit on Francis! He will as sure as fate!")

Helen gave her a scandalized nudge. May talked so much in church!

And then began the sermon,—one of the typical sermons of this widely noted man. Beautiful language, made more so by the lovely, haunting voice. Culture, history, science. Abraham Lincoln, Edison, the beauty of Buddha's unselfishness, Lindbergh, morality, nature, the achievements of modern mind. Primeval oceans, great, strange beasts,—romance and drama and poetry,—a colorful tissue of words.

Young Allen waited and waited. He raised his eyes to a Figure in blue Who stood in a

stained glass garden and held out His arms to a child.

"But he isn't preaching! He must be tired! I suppose he's been so busy—?"

Francis frowned in bewilderment as at last Dr. Wentworth clicked off the light and returned to the center chair. And Dr. North, watching keenly, felt a twinge of sympathy.

"Here endeth the first lesson," he reflected. "I wish the boy were to preach to-night. I'd like to see it work."

The First Church was packed to the doors that night. Their music was noted. The gathered throng was sure to be thrilled and pleased. Dr. Wentworth prayed,—a very short prayer. He greeted the vast congregation with a few warmly welcoming words. Then he seated himself, and the singers rose and a short, deep silence fell.

Dr. Wentworth was fond of music. He yielded himself with real delight to the solemn harmonies. But to Francis deeper meanings came. Calvary rose in reality,—passion and love and bitter strife of the evil and the good.

"Oh, men and women, your deeds of shame,  
Your sins without reason or number or name,  
I carry them all on the Cross on high.  
Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?"

Young Allen's eyes saw another scene. As the solemn inquiry searched the church, the boy's face lifted with passion, unconscious of the throng.

"Yes! It is all the world to me! Take me! Use me! Do what You will! I will follow You—even to hell!"

Dr. North sat and watched him. And long buried dreams of his own youth stirred. Tolerant irony dropped away. The Dream and the Vision rose again with a beauty that ached and called.

"You," said the scientist, deep in his heart, "are the loveliest thing I have ever seen. The shade of the Cross is over you. Sooner or later—Calvary. You will never compromise!"

And a girl watched, too, with her heart in the look.

"I love you! I love your cleanness, your fineness, your courage, your truth! Oh, God, please make him care for me! I know I'm not nearly good enough. But I'll try! Oh, dear God, I'll take care of him! I won't ever let him yield!"

Was it chance, she wondered, or was it—God? Young Allen moved a little and glanced down into her eyes. A quick little thrill passed through her. In fancy, she gathered her life and soul and held them out in her hands.

"They are yours,—all yours,—to take or to leave! We needs must love the highest when we see it,—not Lancelot nor another.' If you never care, I can't go back! I'll never go back to dance and flirt. You cheapen all that has made my life, and I choose to follow the Grail!"

But Francis Allen was far away,—in Palestine, in another age. He stood on a Hill, at the foot of a Cross, and with passionate loyalty shared the pain and the Vision of Him Who died. And the girl, understanding, took back her gift. She was content to have it so. It was the soul of him she loved, that young white flame of devotion which would never yield nor betray.

"Oh, God, if I lose him,—take care of him! Don't let him change! Make him love a girl who will guard and take care of—That!"

Again his eyes sought the visioned Cross. The throng sat motionless, awed and still. The music searched and appealed.

Sunday again. Dr. North, in his pew, and privately very much bored.

"These Ministers!" he reflected. "I think they grow steadily worse! These guest-preachers certainly give you a chance to size up the general trend. Here's another 'very noted divine.' 'We have the great pleasure and privilege—!' If they *must* try to hold forth on science one does wish they would study it first! No dentist gives lectures on criminal law! No surgeon would try to discourse on paint! But these Ministers know more than God!"

His keen, dark face lit with a sudden content.

"There's the trouble! They do think they know more than God—. Oh, look it up, man! Be accurate! Darwin wasn't an atheist! You're fighting windmills! Go read his life! He said he believed in a Great First Cause. For the rest, the man was agnostic; and in place of attacking religion, he preferred not to talk it at all! Huxley and Haeckel, if you like, but Darwin's a wobbly crutch! And Gulick,—a Christian. Romanes came back. But you never heard of them! And how about me? I don't class with the great, but I have my modest fame. To hear this fool, you'd honestly think one must choose between science and God!—Inertia! What lazy things we are! Why do I come here and sit like a fool and listen to all this rot? Because it is simply 'the thing to do!' Wentworth is charming. This church is ours. We are the cultured, wealthy set, and the First Church is so 'correct!' Our people come here. We come ourselves. And what in the devil *for?*—Wentworth paints words into pictures. He's never tiresome, but then his charm—. He has the appeal of an actor, and you yield and don't analyze. He could put all that forceful impressiveness into 'Mary's little lamb!' What we buy isn't knowledge. It certainly isn't religion. . . . But he's good to look at,—distinguished. He's a most impressive *appearance*; and we pride ourselves on his fame. He's so 'broad!' What is 'broad,' anyway? Syrup controlled and confined by a jug is pleasant and useful stuff. It meets a need.—Now, break the jug! Let's do away with 'authority!' Your syrup is 'free of confining creeds.' What's the

result? A sticky mess! Nothing useful or pleasant or good. A mess that needs cleaning up!"

He glanced at Francis Allen with a humorous dismay.

"Young man," he thought, "what happens when Force strikes a passive mass? In other words, if you make us *think*,—is it possible we may *do*? You are a terrible prospect! Life, stirring and kicking and—squalling perhaps—in the midst of our sacred dry bones! Young and extreme,—and crude at times,—but unmanageably *alive*! . . . And how you do *not* like his sermon! What's the fellow saying now? 'The question of the Virgin Birth is one insusceptible of proof. Each man must form his own beliefs. There is no reason why either side should feel less than Christ-like on this point. We should meet in Christian love.' Well,—that's well enough. What's wrong with that? Disputes on doctrine are barren stuff. Better leave arguments alone and get busy on service work. . . . But Allen isn't agreeing. Don't most of the clergy feel that way? I wonder what's on his mind?"

"See saw, Marjory Daw!" whispered the irrepressible May. "What's such things between friends? Why bother with any God at all? We have Ministers! That's enough!"

"Too much enough!" said Elfreda North. "These men don't believe in God at all! Just wait! Your 'St. Francis' isn't dead! Look at him! Glory! *Glory!* Please look at Francis, May!"

"I don't need to!" said May. "I've laid my bet. He'll get spanked and put out in the end, of course, but he'll break things before he goes. He's not 'modern!'"

Elfreda North was beautiful. She made you think of a fresh wild rose. Under her small green velvet hat curling tendrils of light brown hair touched her creamy satin skin. Lovely gray eyes, a natural flush, a straight little nose and a tender mouth,—but she had her grandmother's chin. And that soft mouth set in unwonted lines.

"I'm tired of this stuff!" she whispered. "If they try to shut Francis Allen up—I'll tear down the Sunday School and gym, and let them cook in the street!"

"How?" May looked at her, skeptical.

"Because I own it! The land, I mean. I'd nearly forgotten. The church does forget. But grandmother didn't give that lot. She gave them its use for seventy years and she paid for the building, too. But she always thought the church would move and she willed the lot to dad. That seventy years is nearly up. Dad's dead. I'm his 'only heiress.' I've decided Francis stays! . . . That is,—don't you dare to tell him this,—if he has the nerve to fight!"

"But he will, if you give him half a chance! Tell him, Freda! I love a scrap! Tell him to go ahead!"

"No," said Elfreda. "The others gave in.

I want to see if he'll crumple, too. I don't think so! I want to know!"

Next day, in the Minister's study, the two clergymen sat again.

"But it doesn't make sense!" the boy argued. "If Christ was 'conceived by the Holy Ghost,' that certainly means He's God. If not, He was born in the usual way and He's nothing but a man. That would make Mary—Good heavens!—not even respectable! He certainly wasn't Joseph's son,—and, unless He was born of the Holy Ghost,—don't you see how it reasons out? He'd either have to be God or not. He couldn't be God,—and *not* God, too,—and both at the self same time! That's not religion! It's common sense! He *couldn't* be God,—and *not*!"

It had been a long and wearing talk. Dr. Wentworth's tact was getting thin. But for the family tie they shared, it was time for a hinted threat. He was very much in love with his wife. And she greatly cared for this boy. If he just hadn't brought the youngster here—. But such thinking was now too late.

"It can never be proved," he said again. "Opinions differ. And Christ Himself was not an intolerant man."

Suddenly inspiration came.

"In fact, the question was settled then. The disciples brought Him a case in point. 'We found a man,—not one of us,—casting out devils in Your name, and because he didn't follow us'—. You remember what he said?"

"Yes." The boy's answer came instantly. "But that's nothing to do with this!"

Dr. Wentworth's voice took its pulpit tone.

"We forbade him—because he followed not us.' And He said, '*Forbid him not.*'—There is Christ's considered verdict. He did not seek to bind.

"'Forbid him not. There is no man which can do a miracle in My name which will speak lightly of Me.' He did believe in Jesus! It isn't the same at all! You don't have to follow men or the church! You do have to follow Him!"

It was useless to try to avoid it. Dr. Wentworth grew dignified, hurt.

"I have tried to settle this otherwise. To appeal to your judgment and loyalty. But, my boy,—it is, after all, my church. I must set its tone as seems to me right. We are doing a great and important work. We are reaching people who have no church. I cannot—I greatly dislike to insist—but I cannot permit—"

"It isn't your church! It belongs to Christ! And I belong to Him, too!"

Dr. Wentworth, for once, slipped a bit from his poise.

"You believe it,—the angels, the virgin birth? The miracles and the rest?"

"Of course, I believe it! Do you suppose—? Or—do you mean that you don't!"

Caution governed the elder's reply. With a boy as fanatic and reckless as this it was well to be circumspect.

"We cannot expect that all men's minds will agree with us on truth." (Very neatly put! Undoubtedly true,—and incapable of recoil.)

Francis looked at him searchingly. He was puzzled and very much distressed. This wasn't sympathy. Conflict! It tensed in the atmosphere. Behind the elder's composure he felt the chill of steel. And, rising in flooding, mastering force, his own passion illumined him.

"No," he said, in a strange, low tone, "I had forgotten He found them, too,—the traitors and hypocrites."

This was too much! Noble patience assumed high dignity.

"Perhaps—since you feel as you do toward me—you would rather leave the church? It can probably be arranged, you know,—if you think it what you wish."

The whip,—not yet wielded, but plainly in sight!

There came a tap at the door.

The two men stood frozen. The elder relaxed, assumed his benevolent charm. The boy took a book from the table. He opened it,—seemed to read.

"How lovely!" It was his mother! "I didn't suppose you'd both be here! I've come to drive you home."

"So late?" said her husband, in real surprise. "Excuse me, my dear. I've some things to take. I'll be back in a little while."

Francis said nothing. His face was flushed. His mother came quickly to him, an anxious frown on her face.

"You haven't quarrelled?—Oh, Francis! When he's been so good to you!"

The boy was silent. The strange new tie seemed to rise like a wall between.

"Francis!"

She caught his arm,—shook him a bit.

"I know that he meant to speak to you! Oh, he didn't say it to criticize! He told me your sermons were hurting the church,—he must ask you to talk on less radical lines—. Have you quarrelled? Answer me!"

His mother! He looked down in tortured appeal. But he sensed the truth. She had chosen. She would side with the older man. In the silence they heard a closing door. Steps, slow and stately, returning, could be heard along the hall.

"You look like your father! There were times—. Francis, I'm just ashamed of you! After he got you this wonderful place! Preaching all that abusive stuff! Why can't you preach on the love of God, and the beauty of nature, and nice, sweet things? You just simply break my heart!"

She resorted to tears. The footsteps paused. Probably, overhearing, he disliked to return at once. Then they receded. Far down the hall, they heard a door again.

"Why don't you answer me?—Francis, dear! Say you'll apologize! He's so good,—and so very fond of you! I can't bear to have you two fall out! Promise me you'll

be guided and do what seems to him best!"

"I—can't! But I don't know what to do! I thought he *meant* he believed it! He says the Creed,—and he prays our prayers—! But he wants me—! I *won't!* I never will! I'm not Judas,—to sell with a kiss!"

"Francis! You *are* like your father! He had just such obstinate ways! I am very deeply displeased with you! If you care at all for my wishes, you will make up with him at once!"

The boy gave her rather a pitiful look. Where was his champion? Where was his pal?

"Mother!"

But she was a woman in love. She was very much annoyed with her crude young son,—afraid of offending her lord.

"It would be pleasanter, I think, if you came home on the car. And it would give you a chance for some wiser thought before you make matters worse."

She turned, her delicate head held high, and relentlessly went away.

Sunday again, and the great First Church with its usual crowded pews.

"Who shall say," Dr. Wentworth asked, movingly, a great, warm tenderness in his voice, "that all are not acceptable to His Father heart of love? The Buddhist climbs by one well worn trail,—the Jew by another. Each his own way, come Christians and non-believers,—all who reach for good and truth. The Nazarene taught us tolerance. Or,—I do not like that scornful word,—rather He taught us sympathy and all inclusive love. Those who follow Him should live in peace. Much harm is wrought by dogmatic strife. For those who would follow Him—what is the need of dissension about His birth? Those who worship Jesus as very God,—and those who see Him as noble man—should unite in a loving fellowship,—not waste time in heated disputes. . . . He taught us the greatest thing in the world was love of our fellow men."

"I knew it!" May whispered. "He makes me tired! Francis looks like he hadn't a friend! Why don't you tell him? Old Neddy's nuts when it comes to his clubs and things!"

"No!—I want Francis to fight it out! I want to see what he'll do!"

Dr. Wentworth had certain plans. Not too abruptly, he started work on the thing he meant to do.

"In days of old there was much less light. The Bible then had great value. But wisdom progresses. It doesn't stand still. Science has thrilled the whole marvelling world with its wondrous discoveries. When science discards the Bible, we must grant it a hearing, at least. . . . All the world is controlled by laws. Law governs the whole of the universe. But beauty also has place. The lovely stories about the Christ,—those fairy like legends,—have their place in the treasures of the mind. . . . Is it not a

strange comment on mental trends that a young Jew killed as a criminal. . . . When He died the little group stood at the cross. He had failed in sharing his visions and hopes. . . . Not a person believed He would rise again. They stood there and watched Him die. . . ."

May bounced in her seat, touched Elfreda. "Please tell him! Or drop Dr. Wentworth a hint! He'd *die* if he had to give it up! Land's sky high and it's all built up. But Francis—, *Please*, Freda! Look at him! He's not—defiant now. *Don't* let him crumple! I think he'd fight if he thought he had a chance!"

Elfreda merely shook her head. She would not look at him. But, across the church, she shot a glance at her uncle, Dr. North. He was watching Dr. Wentworth with a meditative calm.

During the week young Allen's moods had been many and plainly shown. Anger and indignation,—poorly veiled scorn and resentment,—succeeded by visible gloom. And then a gentle quietness with a somewhat tragic look. The older man felt decided relief. This boy was obsessed with the old fashioned stuff. Until this heartbroken quiet, he had dreaded complete revolt. The boy had a gift for making friends. Cautiously he had felt around. There were those who might follow him. But this strange, new patience,—this careful respect,—this meek and unsmiling quietude,—held no hint of anger or spite. And he warmed toward his stepson inwardly, though he didn't as yet relax. Like the others, this boy was yielding. Presently all would be well.

At their Sunday dinner he thawed a bit. He was always a kindly man.

"Finished your sermon, Francis?—I haven't meant to be harsh with you. You will come to see these things."

"Yes," said the boy, very quietly. "I have it finished, sir."

"And what," (Not a sign of revolt, thank God! No heat, no flare of resentment,) "are you preaching on to-night?"

Francis crumbled a bit of cake.

"On—statistics—and being exact."

Surrender! Absolute, unalloyed! No danger in stuff like that! But what in the world—. Oh, industry,—and poverty, probably.

"May I be excused? I am going out. I won't be back to supper. I will see you at the church."

"Good-bye, dear!"

The king had extended grace. The queen mother followed suit.

Francis looked at her wistfully.

"Good-bye, little mother of mine."

He was gone,—on a note of tragedy. Dr. Wentworth was sorry. He put out his hand to his wife.

"My dear, I wish this were over. It pains me to cause him distress."

But his wife rose and came behind him. She put her hands under his handsome chin.

She tipped it up, bent and kissed him on that calm and lofty brow.

"I love you! Whatever you do is right. He's been a silly, rebellious child, and you had to spank him, my dearest dear. And after punishment little boys cry. Then they're good. And we all love each other. And things are all happy again."

Restless and worried, Elfreda drove. Out into the country,—back again,—out through the park,—by the river drive,—and into town again.

Was he beaten? The boy was so quiet! He was young,—and the man was so strong! Suppose she called him up, took him out, and simply *made* him talk? He mustn't give in! He *mustn't!* It would simply break her heart!

But Elfreda North was of soldier stuff. She would pray for him,—but she wouldn't cheat! Francis must fight it out alone. It was his testing! He must fight! For his honor as a man!

A sudden longing assailed her for the dim, rich hush of the church. She whirled through the traffic, parked her car, and climbed slowly up the steps.

"It's Your fight! Help him! Don't let him yield! I'll tear things open if just he fights! But I'll die if he gives in!"

She opened the outer door, closed it, and slipped through the vestibule. Softly she swung the inner door and passed soundlessly into the church. It was very still. The sun was low, and great buildings screened its light. The windows stood out against shadow-draped walls. The place itself was dim. The carpet was thick. She made no sound. But half way down the aisle she stopped. She was *not* alone as she fancied. At the side of the pulpit a figure knelt, one hand reaching up to the pulpit's edge and the open Bible there. Did he feel love suddenly blessing him? Elfreda looked at the still young form and tiptoed out of the church.

She was early. The ushers hadn't come. But, already robed, he greeted her as she entered the vestibule. What was he thinking? This stillness,—it baffled her, made her afraid.

"Do you like it here?" It was banal, of course, but perhaps it might gain her a clue.

"Yes," he said, gravely, "very much. You are all so kind and patient. I have loved it,—being here."

"Have loved,"—not "I love,"—now what did that mean? Terror rose in her heart.

"You don't mean—? You haven't received a call!" (Hastily she steadied herself. Oh, if he only cared!) "Of course, our assistants are popular,—but in your case it's rather soon!"

"No,—not that. You knew the others. Will you tell me about them, please?"

"They were nice,—well bred and—nice young men." She managed mischief. "They would be! We don't handle second rate goods!"

He smiled just a little. So quiet! Oh, what was he going to do?

"Did you like them?"

Now, why had he asked her that? Why did he want to know?

"They were charming. And very nice to me. What more could anyone ask?"

There was sudden coquetry in her smile, a challenge of lovely girlhood to the admiration of youth. But he failed to play up,—didn't even see. Hurt by his grave detachment, she suddenly wanted to cry. She pretended an errand. She left him and went back to the Sunday School rooms.

"I suppose," he thought, "they were—'biddable.' And had their due reward! Well," his mouth set with decision,— "I don't happen to be for sale! I can't see ahead, but that's not my part. One thing at least I'm not facing,—that look that broke Peter's heart! 'What will you do with Jesus Christ?' Follow Him! Straight through hell itself!—If he likes, he can put me out of here. And no other church—. Well,—I've settled all that. But, once more, I'm preaching to-night!"

"And Judas, also, which betrayed Him, stood with them." "I am not ashamed of Christ Jesus, my Lord."

Dr. North looked up in consternation. War! Red and open, with no disguise! Though no defiance was in the tones. Only a quiet meekness; a far, still purpose; a something that hadn't been there before.

"I am sorry. I yield you deference, sir. There is no challenge nor spite in my heart. But this is a thing that has to be done. A thing that I *have* to do." His expression and attitude said all this,—as plainly as actual words. Very effective,—though Allen, of course, would never play for effect. Still, such a meek regretfulness, such wistful wishing it needn't be done, would ward off resentment and win him friends among the older crowd.

"Fool!" Dr. Wentworth thought, too late. "Why didn't you guess? You might have seen! That isn't surrender! It is despair,—but despair that means to act! And he's clever! . . . I mustn't risk him again. He's entirely too keen, and too well informed on the arguments on his side!—I won't break him. That Lakeville chapel will do. He's too young—. They'll take him if I insist. He sees his danger. He'll take the place. I could ruin him if I chose. . . . I'll preach at both services till he goes. There's no help for this that is happening now,—but I'll see that it doesn't again!"

"Christ," said the boy, "was a very explicit Teacher. There is nothing uncertain about His words. He told us that He Himself alone was the way, the truth and the life. He told us that 'No man cometh to the Father *but by Me.*' He told us nowhere,—and at no time,—to follow Confucius, or Buddha, or idols or heathen gods. It would not accord with His teaching at all should

we carve by the cross above our door a Buddha or a Baal."

Sudden awareness tensed the church. The boy let the words sink in.

Dr. Wentworth sat rigidly still. By the greatest effort of his life, he controlled his frantic impulse to look and see what they thought. He mustn't look! With determined will, he locked an exterior calm. He *saw* that Buddha! *So did the church!* He sensed horrified dissent! Politely he listened,—seemingly. He wished for an earthquake or a flood,—a riot,—anything as excuse! But his self control still served him. Even his fingers were still.

". . . A large number of people seem disposed to regard the doctrine of the Virgin Birth as an immaterial difference of opinion. They say this question should be left to each person to decide on individually, and we should get on in peaceable and amicable agreement in our churches and 'not feel other than Christ-like' one to the other. 'Christ-like.' He said, 'No man cometh unto the Father but by Me.' 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood ye have no life in you.' 'I am the Door. He that entereth not in by the Door, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.' I would urge you to study Christ's words for yourselves. He claimed absolute mastery, Godhood. Not once, but again and again. It is not a fair thing, when a man is dead, to ascribe to him views and teaching quite other than those which were his. He cannot defend himself when dead,—unless—his followers speak. . . . If a person holds perfectly honest views one must yield them at least respect. I am not an atheist, not a Jew,—nor a heathen of any sort. But to all these, if only they are sincere, I accord entire respect. We differ; but each man holds as truth the things which he claims to profess. One doesn't respect a see-saw. A man should have real beliefs! I submit a plain proposition. I wish to submit a statement which no one *can* contradict!"

Dr. Wentworth slightly relaxed.

"Do it then! I wish you would,—in this heterogeneous church! Here's where he gets into trouble. It isn't as bad as I thought!"

"A thing either *is*,—or it *isn't!* Christian, atheist, Buddhist, Jew,—so far, at least, you will all agree to the truth of what I say. Christ is God,—or He isn't God! Whatever else you may think of Him, I know you'll agree to that! He can't be God and *not* God, too. He either *is*,—or He's not! That isn't even religion! It's the simplest common sense! The first law of logic tells us that. A thing cannot possibly be true,—and *not* be true,—that very same thing,—at any given time. I find it impossible to see how harmony is to be obtained between those who worship Him as God, and those who regard Him as merely a man and deny His Deity. If Jesus Christ was mere mortal man, after the centuries that have passed, what is He now? Mere matter! Untrace-

able scattered atoms of dust and whiffs of vapor and gas! If He's dust and vapors, it's rather—quaint—to hear the men who believe that say that He is 'God's only Son.' That's what they do when they say the Creed. If He's dust, that's bad religion. And, as logic, it's absurd! Any such proposition as that just doesn't make sense at all!"

Dr. North's mouth twitched suddenly. He added to previous liking a new and amazed respect.

"No, it doesn't! So *that's* what you had on your mind! Beautiful thinker I am, I must say. Call myself a psychologist, and swallow a thing like that!"

"There are those who would say He was put to death,—died a failure and that was the end. In the Presbyterian Church today some two million members at least *profess* to accept Him as very God. Episcopal figures are much the same. When efforts were made to alter their faith,—I mean the official Articles,—a petition was signed by one-sixth of the church that the Articles stay in their present form, and—as they were, *they are.* It would seem the will of that church at large to retain their old beliefs. And the Baptists . . . Lutherans . . . Methodists . . ."

He gave definite figures,—church after church,—clinched them and drove them home.

"I have also been interested to look up the financial end of His failure. I find that last year, for all purposes, the following bodies raised, for one year, the following amounts. . . . Millions . . . millions . . . millions. . . ."

The figures rolled massively.

"Help!" gasped Dr. North, mentally. "The artillery booms! Grenades and bombs! Bayonets! Hold it! *THEY SHALL NOT PASS!*"—And all to destroy—a goose!"

His mouth twitched. Delighted amusement lit his keen, ironic eyes.

Dr. Wentworth, tortured, yielded and looked. But no one observed the fact. All those eyes, whatever their creeds, were fixed on the younger man. Even Van Dorn, the atheist! Intent,—not unfriendly—? Good heavens! Was that *wanting* that made him so sad?—Dr. North smiling! Davis,—and Hamilton Enderby! . . . Where did he get all those figures? "Statistics,—and being exact!"

In impotent anger he sat and endured. To-night, yes! But wait till to-morrow! But even after the boy had gone, he must put off his rational preaching for months. It wouldn't be possible now. He had planned to be foremost among them all,—most modern and startling,—most widely discussed. But he simply had to wait. It was wholly out of the question to attempt his program now. "The boy has the orator's vividness. They listen, whatever their views."

His wandering glance touched Elfreda North,—then focussed, abruptly intent.

Sheer adoration illumined her! Love burned, unashamed, in her worshipping eyes as she drank in his stepson's words! Elfreda North, as he very well knew, was the richest girl in his church. And she had an obstinate will of her own. He had known her all her life. . . . There had been that child in the Sunday School class, some little stray waif from the poorer streets whom Katherine Dunning had snubbed. Elfreda had marshalled her forces. The Dunning child went away.

As if drawn by his thinking, she shot him a glance, and her warmth and her loveliness chilled. Her eyes surveyed him appraisingly. Her dimple flickered. She raised her chin, and turned back to listen to Francis with a little defiant founce! She had flung her gage! With acute dismay he reflected on what it meant. The seventy years were nearly up! She owned that lot! And a girl in love—. This was utter catastrophe!

Did Francis care? But who wouldn't? And what would her family say? Dr. North? He was listening, an affectionate smile on his face. The Norths and the Paynes and the Enderbys! They had married and intermarried. They had the wealth of his church! If Elfreda wanted to marry him—!

Dr. Wentworth was noted for "poise." He knew how to reckon costs. To do the imperative gracefully, one yielded before one *must*. He had pictured his new views much acclaimed, had foreseen discussion, some bitter words, his name in the papers, still greater crowds to pack his church to the doors. But the boy's knife-edged logic would have to be stilled. He had a confoundingly able mind! And he couldn't be stilled if Elfreda North—! It was well he had learned in time!

And then, belatedly, the full glory of it struck him. If Elfreda married Francis,—why, this youngster was *his son!* "My daughter, young Mrs. Allen—" It meant marriage with the Norths! And they ruled not only this church of his, but the city and the state! He smiled, with infinite tenderness, at his much disturbed little wife.

Then he turned analytic attention to the others in the church. Alertly he studied their faces. Listening spell bound, wholly absorbed, men and women, the rich and the poor,—young Allen held them all!—Elfreda North had not been correct. Dr. Wentworth did worship,—had a very definite god. All his life he had served it, and its name was "The Praise of Men."

"Well," he thought, "if that's what they want—!"

Without a struggle, he put aside the thing he had meant to do.

"I do not believe he was virgin-born. No reasoning person believes such stuff. But the superstition has some strange spell, and it hasn't lost its power."

Dr. Wentworth believed in himself,—in his vision, his courage, his fineness, his

tolerance and his love. And he adjusted accordingly.

"There is so much suffering in the world, and men long for a personal, human God. They crave a conception of One Who Cares,—and can suffer and understand."

A wave of pitying tenderness rose. With a just self-appreciation, he viewed his own sympathy. He was conscious how tender his great heart was,—how he loved and understood men.

"If in their loneliness and need,—in their poverty, pain and suffering,—men find real comfort in Christ as God, why should one take it away? Life's greatest good is true happiness. (That's a good thought! I can use it!) And whatever lifts and refines and heals should never be lightly attacked."

Francis had done with statistics. He was preaching out of his heart.

"And to-day," said his lovely, grave young voice, "He stands with scarred hands extended. He wants us! Your fathers died for His faith! To us to-day comes the sacred call,—the duty to carry on. Shall we bear the flaming Torch on high,—to light all the darkness of all the world,—or turn to our own selfish pleasure and let the great Light die? To-day we are threatened on every hand. If we are honest, we must admit the terrible lust and poverty and suffering and crime. They are all about us. *'Thou art the man!'* The call is to *you*,—to you yourself! I stand here to-night to call you out to the service of the King! Oh, don't let's fail! He needs us so! Give Him your lives, your wealth, your all! He calls you! The great dead call you, in the words of another war:

"To you, from failing hands, we throw  
The Torch! Be yours to hold it high!  
If you break faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow  
In Flanders fields."

For a moment he stood there, his hands flung out in involuntary appeal. The thought flashed achingly through his mind, "I may never preach again, Oh, Lord! Give me one soul to-night!"

Elfreda North, quite unconscious of self, flamed back to his white young Fire. And Francis saw her. Their young eyes met,—and questioned,—and suddenly clung. He was not alone. He forgot her wealth; but he felt the fiercely protective love outstretched to his loneliness. And to her,—to her utter sympathy,—he finished his appeal.

"What will you do with Jesus Christ? You are Christians! His honor is in your hands! Will you fling aside self and follow Him,—or crucify Him again? I want you! He calls you,—pleads for your lives! He wants your love and your loyalty! Please God, we may give Him,—our all!"

The boy ended, slowly turned away. He clicked off the reading light. He had done his utmost, given his all. And now he would pay the price.

Dr. Wentworth looked at Elfreda North. He remembered all he had meant to do. And now—he knew that the victory was already with the boy. He raised questioning eyes to the balcony, where a flag showed a golden cross.

"There is Something—," he thought, confusedly. "Something—? So many have believed—. Is it—possible? But it couldn't be! Angels,—and miracles,—and blood—. Oh, the thing is so absurd! And yet—? Why *do* men do these things? Francis—. He's simply drowned and sunk in this one consuming urge! A peasant—dead two thousand years—. And this vivid, modern boy! It's the strangest—. Oh, hold to your sanity! You aren't as crude as all that!"

He turned to look at his stepson as the boy sank into his chair. The slender figure drooped just a bit. The dark head bent in that queer, new way,—with that odd—humility. The boy looked so very, very young,—and all his laughter and eager light were so pitifully gone!

The spell still lay on the crowded church. The place was utterly still. And a sudden aching tenderness surged up in the childless man. It was simply unendurable that the boy should look like that! Hoarsely, the Minister found his voice, and the church heard him say, "Amen!"

The boy whirled to face him,—fairly flamed! His young smile reached out impulsively, met and *welcomed* the older man.

"You blessed young fool!" thought Dr. North. "You believe that you've really got him,—that old gas bag and weather-vane!"

And he shot a scornful, ironic look at the famous "broad" divine. But his keen penetration wavered at the look on Wentworth's face.

"Good Lord! Is it humanly possible that for once it's not a lie?"

Dr. Wentworth rose. He raised his hands. "Let us pray."

His rich voice filled the church.

"Oh, God, Thou knowest how frail we are. Thou knowest how evil is mixed with good. For the thing that we do, oh, Lord, forgive! For we know not *what* we do!"

A pause. A pause that endured so long that people raised wondering eyes. Then Dr. Wentworth's voice again,—but now in a strained, stiff tone.

"By Thy cross and passion, by Thy death and burial, by Thy glorious resurrection and ascension, . . . Good Lord, deliver us. . . . For Jesus' sake. Amen!"

Dr. North stared at him helplessly. Wentworth's face was expressionless. There was nothing there to see.

"I wonder—? But no one will ever know. Wentworth has shifted his pose, at least. Allen has won, and from this time on—we stand for Christ as *God!*"

Through an open window a small breeze blew. It touched the banner. The gold cross stirred. For a moment it seemed to tremble,—then it hung there, shining and still.

## Questions and Answers

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Did Christ believe in demons?*

*Sincerely,*

C. C.

IT seems to us perfectly clear that according to the Scriptures the unseen world contains not only one supreme representative of evil (designated by such names as the devil, satan, the prince of darkness, and the God of this world) but many subordinate ones commonly called demons. Moreover it is equally clear that these demons are represented as in many instances at least as having taken possession of men and using them for their purposes. It is said that there are about eighty references to demons in the New Testament. What is more, it seems impossible to deny that according to the gospel representation Jesus Himself believed not only in the reality of Satan but in what is known as demon possession. It has often been alleged that Jesus merely accommodated Himself to the prevailing belief and that He no more shared the beliefs of His contemporaries in these matters than the modern physician shares the hallucinations of his more or less demented patients though he humors them in order the more effectually to help them. Such a view seems to us wholly untenable. It not only imputes to Jesus a conduct unworthy of Him but it involves a mode of interpretation that might with equal justice be applied to His miracles or anything else that did not meet our approval and so a mode of interpretation by the employment of which the Gospel narratives could be transformed into untrustworthy legends. What is more such a view suffers shipwreck on the fact that so far from merely accommodating Himself to a popular idea He actually gave it His formal approval. Witness, for instance, the fact that He made it a part of His disciples' commission to cast out demons (Matt. 10:8; compare Luke 10:17, 18); also the fact that His belief in the reality of both Beelzebub and demons underlies His argument with the Pharisees as recorded in Luke XI:14-26. It seems to us that if we are to trust our sources at all Jesus did believe in demons. Either, therefore we too must believe in the reality of Satan and evil spirits (though not necessarily in present-day demon possession) or we must believe that Jesus Himself was an ignorant and deluded man as regards these matters. In our judgment Jesus not only believed in a kingdom of evil but His belief was in accord with reality.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Did the Jews have any thought of immortality other than the anticipation of the immortality of their race?*

*Sincerely,*

C. K.

WHILE the thought of individual immortality was not as fully revealed in Old Testament times as in New Testament times (see 2 Tim. 1:10) yet it seems to us beyond reasonable doubt that the Old Testament saints cherished the hope of personal immortality as was pointed out by Mr. Van Deusen in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY (p. 4, Col. 3).

It may not be out of place to add that from the standpoint of recent criticism the question we are considering is somewhat out of date. A few decades ago the naturalistic critics were accustomed to question if not deny that the Old Testament, at least in its older parts, contained any recognition of personal immortality. Such is no longer the case. Now it is rather customary to confess with all heartiness that the Jews from the very beginning of their recorded history cherished the conviction of the persistence of the soul in life after death. The reason for this change of front can hardly be said to be a better understanding of the Old Testament passages which testify to a belief in life beyond the grave. It is due rather to a better understanding of the beliefs as to a future life that were cherished by the peoples in close contact with whom the Jews lived. The naturalistic critic is unwilling to recognize anything of a strikingly exceptional nature in the religion of Israel. How then could he consistently admit that the Egyptians and Babylonians held highly developed views as to human immortality but that the Jews were strangers to such beliefs? As a result the naturalistic critics have been led to search the Scriptures anew to find out whether it is really true that the horizon of Israel's religion was bound by the grave. It is not surprising that they now find, spread all through the Old Testament, evidence of a settled belief in the continuance of life after death. Today there is little need of arguing that the Old Testament saints cherished the hope of a blessed immortality. Few if any up-to-date scholars deny that such was the case.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Is Paul instead of Christ the center of orthodox Christianity today? I would appreciate an answer to this question.*

*Very sincerely yours,*

C. K. C.

OBVIOUSLY Paul is not the center of orthodox Christianity today in the sense that orthodox Christians worship Paul and depend on him for their salvation. We take it, therefore, that what our questioner has in mind is whether the Christ of orthodox Christianity is not the Christ that Paul preached instead of the Christ that actually

lived. In other words that his concern is with the question whether it was not Paul rather than Christ with whom orthodox Christianity originated. The question raises a large issue. It is hardly too much to say that it raises the main issue between "liberal" and "orthodox" Christianity. It is generally admitted that orthodox Christianity is in essential accord with Paulinism. According to the "liberals" however, the Christ of Paul is other than the Christ of history. The Christ of Paul is a supernatural being, an object of worship through faith in whom men obtain salvation. The Christ of history, however, according to the "liberals," was not an object of worship but merely a moral and religious teacher and example. Hence they maintain in effect, and often openly, that while Paul was the founder of orthodox Christianity, real Christianity is a religion of a quite different sort. Roughly speaking, they maintain that almost immediately after the death of Christ "the religion of Jesus" (meaning the religion which He taught and exemplified) was transformed, refashioned, made over, under the influence of the beliefs of His earliest disciples. The religion of these earlier disciples, it is further alleged, was in turn overlaid and transformed by the theological constructions of Paul; with the result that it is Paulinism rather than real Christianity with which Church history for the most part deals and which has found expression in orthodox Christianity. It is impossible for us to deal adequately with so large a question in these columns. Those who are interested in a thorough-going discussion of this question are referred to Dr. Machen's great book "The Origin of Paul's Religion." Suffice it for us to say in this connection that we hold that there is no such cleavage between Paul and the earliest Christians or between the earliest Christians and the actual Jesus, as the "liberals" would have us believe. As a matter of fact not only in the mind of Paul but in the minds of the earliest Christians, and not only in the minds of the earliest Christians but in the mind of Jesus Himself, the religion that He founded was a religion that had Himself as its object of worship and the source of its salvation. It may be true that Paul was the chief human agent that Christ employed to establish orthodox Christianity in the world; but it is emphatically not true that Paul himself was the founder of orthodox Christianity. Paul himself vigorously repudiates the honor the "liberals" would thrust upon him. He denies that he is a teacher of a new gospel and represents himself as but repeating the common gospel which had been taught from the beginning. Not only is orthodox Christianity essentially one with what Paul taught, it is also in full accord with what Christ Himself taught. Paul was an humble follower of Christ not His supplanter. The Christ he preached and the Christ who actually lived and died and rose again are one and the same.

# Current Views and Voices

## The Middle of the Road

Editorial in "The Toronto Globe, Canada"

**E**XTREMISTS have never been popular. But they have often been powerful. Extremists have been responsible for the greatest advances in discovery, invention and moral progress in the history of the world. Unpopularity is often a good test of greatness and righteousness. "Woe unto you," said the Lord, Jesus Christ, "when all men speak well of you," and He added with convincing exposure, "For so did their fathers to the false prophets." False prophets have never lacked popularity.

Extremists are intolerant, and intolerance is the worst of all crimes in the decalogue of the neutral; yet intolerance may be the difference between life and death. The surgeon who is not intolerant of any contact with enemy germs, for himself, his instruments, his assistants and nurses, and his patient, may do his work successfully; but let in an infection that will destroy all the good he has done. Intolerance of infection is the only safety for the patient whose life hangs in the balance. . . .

The Bible is the most extreme book in the world. We may say, and say it reverently, that GOD is the greatest extremist in the universe, and we may well be thankful that He is. He is a jealous God; jealous of all that would injure those for whom He gave His Son to die that they might live. God's word never deals in greys but in blacks and whites. Its inspired writers had positive convictions, and did not hesitate to express them.

The strange phenomenon of today—perhaps it has always been so—is that men are ready to have positive—even intolerant convictions on everything except the greatest thing—RELIGION. They caution one another not to be "dogmatic" on the subject of religion—God, and Christ, and sin, and salvation, the Saviour, Heaven and Hell. Yet God's own Word is exceedingly dogmatic on these questions. It leaves us in no shadow of doubt in its declarations. When Christ taught the people were astonished at His doctrine; for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes. The entire Bible speaks with the same authority for it is equally the word of God. . . .

The middle of the road! It is a pathetic position for a Minister of the gospel and the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who have the conviction and courage to move over to one side, and that the right side, will find themselves in the company of their Lord and Master. He never liked neutrality. He will not like it at the end, when men and Ministers who have pro-

fessed His name come before Him for judgment.

Were words ever more cutting and revealing than the last of the messages of the glorified Christ, in the last book of the Bible to the seven Churches? The very name of Laodicea has become one of opprobrium because of it. . . .

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; so then because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." . . .

The middle-of-the-road attitude is always self-satisfied, and always blinded. God pleads with men to come out of it into vision and life and safety.

The middle of the road is broad. The side of the road is narrow. But the one is death, and the other is life. It is better to be in a narrow place with Christ than anywhere else without Him, for there is "No other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." . . .

### A Solemn Question

In these days when infidelity, popularly known as "Modernism," denies the Virgin Birth of Christ—His atoning sacrifice, His triumphant resurrection—and His coming again—and in fact every fundamental doctrine of HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY as believed by THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES of CHRISTENDOM what shall be my attitude toward it? Shall I consult my own selfish interests and take the middle of the road attitude, where traveling is easy and popular—or shall I take the side of the road with CHRIST? No matter what the cost. . . .

### The Minister's Responsibility

"If the watchman see the sword come, and warn not the people: If the sword come and take away any of the people from them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." Ezekiel 33:6.

### A Christian College

C. P. HARRY in "The Lutheran"

**A** CHRISTIAN COLLEGE aims to develop men and women of sound Christian conviction, who meet the world with a clear understanding of what is implied in Christian truth and who live according to Christian principles.

To this end a Christian college needs a faculty composed exclusively of evangelical believers. Every member of the faculty must maintain the requisite scholarship; but at the same time it must be realized that scholarship without genuine Christian conviction has no place in a Christian college faculty.

The *administration* of the college must be carried on according to Christian principles from the president to the ashman. Every salary should be sufficient, but not large. Those employed in any capacity by the college should be able to rely on the college for care in sickness, distress or old age. When change in personnel is necessary the interests of those affected as well as those of the college will be considered. Investments should be made only in those securities which are both safe financially and sound from every moral point of view. The entire administration of a Christian college must be straight-forward, honest and in good will.

The *equipment* should be sufficient to do the best work in its field, but should not be needlessly elaborate. The center of interest should be the chapel, rather than the gymnasium, the stadium, the library, or the laboratory. These last should not be neglected or inadequate, but first should come the chapel with its worship at the heart of the institution.

### Christian in Every Part

In the *curriculum* every course should be definitely and clearly geared-in with Christian truth. In sciences men would come away with the conviction that they were studying not merely marvelous and profitable natural phenomena, but the works of God. In history they would know that behind all the economic and environmental or hereditary forces which sway human lives Divine Providence is at work. Economics would show up the essentially un-Christian character of much of our life to-day and would lead to conviction as to what should be done about it. Even in physical training, the health and strength of the body would be felt to be God's gifts and instruments in His service. Bible study and the problems and projects of the Church would hold a large place in the curriculum and would be presented with convincing vitality and force.

The *students* should be selected so that at all times the student body should be composed predominantly of evangelical believers. Students should be examined before admission in regard to their spiritual health and their relation to our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Care should be taken that the number of students who hold an unsound faith or whose spiritual life is unhealthy should be kept down to such an extent that there would be every chance that predominant Christian standards and associations would lead them to Christ. This does not mean anything of a denominational character or even church membership, but actual personal Christian faith. There is no reason why a Christian college should accept every

Tom, Dick and Harry who applies, regardless of spiritual condition and fitness to participate in the work of a Christian college, any more than it should accept them regardless of mental or physical fitness.

#### Christian Activities at Par Value

Christian activities would be encouraged and properly coached along with other customary college activities. In addition to the usual athletics, fraternities, literary societies, publications, musical clubs, and the like, there would be a definite and well-coached program of voluntary Bible study, prayer, personal evangelism, deputation work, discussion of world and church problems—all definitely related to and participating in the work of the Young People's Societies of the church and the student Christian organizations.

Such a college might not be popular. The student body might be small. But it would be a college where men and women might go and obtain education and direction in sound Christian living in the modern world. And it would be a college such as a Christian Church could well sacrifice much to maintain.

#### Hitch-Hiking for Heaven

Editorial in "Christian Standard"

IT is a dull drive these days that is not decorated with a half-dozen boys or men with thumbs in air and an interrogative expression on their faces. We understand that a veritable legion of these devotees of human nature have made their way back and forth across this continent by piecing one such borrowed ride to another, and we heard recently of one who was fortunate enough to be picked up by a man who was going all the way from Ohio to the Pacific Coast, the complete journey he desired. Despite warnings and lawsuits, the practice will probably persist.

And there are hitch-hikers along life's highway who wish to get to heaven.

There are those who leave the study of the will of God to others, who take no pains to read God's word for themselves and to meditate upon it and thus to develop their own powers of spiritual knowledge and discernment. Whether they call him such or not, they are glad to let the Minister or the Bible-class teacher or father or mother be their priest to discover and declare what is God's will. But it is clearly the intention of God that we should every one read and study and meditate upon His will as expressed in His book. To do otherwise is to hitch-hike.

So, too, with singing and other expressions of the joy and happiness and gratitude that should well up in the heart of every Christian and demand expression in praise to God. What a pitiful sight to see those who will sit back with immobile faces—even with critical countenances—while some

choir or the remainder of the audience is pouring forth what should be the spontaneous expression of an overwhelming happiness on the part of each individual Christian. Not to join with the whole soul in expressing praise to God, whether in congregational singing or when some specialist is pouring out the feeling of the hearts of all, is to hitch-hike.

And giving, serving, working in the church—how many thousands are hitch-hiking! Here we are with the privilege of a great partnership or fellowship with God, and we are content to lie back and let some one else have the joy of giving of means, let some one else get the happiness that comes from personal service, let some one else experience the thrill of accomplishment and of developing talents that are invested for the Lord. We think we are doing our duty if we put a quarter on the collection-plate and "attend services"—what a misnomer!—with fair regularity. We count that as faithfulness to the church. That is hitch-hiking. Some one else is taking the real responsibility of doing the great, sacrificial work that must be done, and done personally, if the cause of the Man of the cross is to go on.

In the matter of personal conduct, we do the same. Some one must develop the spirit and practice of forgiveness, of peacefulness and self-control; some one must take the aggressive. We wait for the other person to do it. We hitch-hike it here too. Some one must stand true to moral and spiritual ideals. We go with the crowd. If they dance, we dance; if they gamble, we gamble; if they swear, we swear.

In evangelism, too, we shift the responsibility. It is the privilege of every Christian to tell the gospel story and make converts. It is a joy only those know who have actually engaged in it. Yet we go on leaving it to professional evangelists. We expect the preacher to do it for us. If he does not succeed at it, we lay all the blame upon him. If his converts do not "stick," we blame him. What a different situation it would be if we were not hitch-hiking here!

And prayer—how we do relinquish our rights and privileges here! All of us have the glorious privilege of coming to the Lord with our own problems and our own personal longings, and of telling Him face to face with an intimate meditation what we wish. Yet day after day goes by and we rush on about daily tasks, too busy to talk to God, too sure of our own ability, too doubtful of God's interest or God's power to spend time with Him. We think it sufficient that some one else prays for us. We think it enough that a very general and often very heartless public prayer is offered by the preacher—a prayer often directed more to the audience than to God—and we take care of all the "memos" and conferences, with no time for a conference with our very best Friend, our most zealous Lover.

"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." No one else can live your Christian life for you. Every loss in Christian activity is a loss in Christian character. Those who hitch-hike toward heaven are in grave danger of getting on a conveyance that does not go there, or of failing to get a "lift" for the last stage of the journey.

#### Is It Union?

Editorial in "The Christian Register"  
(Unitarian)

MUCH has been said in the newspapers about the recent final action making formal union between the Congregationalists and the Christians. We know well the inner feeling of many Congregationalists, and not so well that of the Christians, and the plain truth is they lack enthusiasm about this "great consummation."

Our feeling is like theirs. What is great about it? We cannot see it at all. The Christians have been a declining communion, without any definitive sense of mission, for a long time, and their relation to the more vigorous Congregationalists is like absorption. One thing is sure, many believe it is not assimilation, which is the proper connotation of two uniting bodies.

The virtual union, now officially sealed, has been in operation in fact for two years, and we know from many signs that the anticipated glory of the move has not shone, but dimmed, in this time. One reason is, the foundation is not rock. They agree that the test of Christianity and of the union is not a doctrine but a way of life. That, if we may say so, is a common fallacy, for a way of life has to be marked,—we have to go *some* way, and the marking is the doctrine. Without direction there is confusion,—a crowd rather than a fellowship or a church.

No permanent good was ever done for religion by such negation and neutrality as that which is at the center of this so-called union. Our opinion is friendly and yet we must say we are disappointed. The Congregationalists these later years have been much in the modernist way of dealing with religion, and we wish they were as clean-cut in their position as they once were. Where do they stand to-day? They have fallen into the ways of these latter times, it seems to us, when much is sacrificed in evangelical churches for so-called co-operation and federation and union.

Do they not forget, do we not all forget, that religion must have a structural form, that is, a philosophy or a theology, or else it will collapse gelatinously? It seems almost futile for us to keep on saying these things against the vacuity of organized Protestantism, but say them we must. For us they are the truth that must prevail, and until it does we shall soften and slump.

# News of the Church

## Annual Statistical Report of Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

**T**HE Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in its annual statistical review made public recently by Dr. Lewis Seymour Mudge, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shows an encouraging spiritual advance in the increase of new communicant members. Those added on confession of faith during the church year ending March 31, 1931, totaled 97,825, as compared with 70,724 during the preceding year. There were also added by certificate 59,192, as compared with 53,050. Restorations to membership were 11,682, as compared with 10,308. Deaths totaled 23,476, an increase of 168. Due, however, to rigid requirements for the retention of names upon local membership rolls, there were suspended 74,700 for disciplinary reasons. A total of 49,858 were dismissed to Presbyterian and other churches. The net gain in membership, therefore, was 15,023, and the total membership stands at 1,999,131. All Presbyterian statistics relating to membership are based solely on the number of communicants in good standing and not on the Presbyterian population or baptized members.

Most encouraging also, is the condition of the Sunday-schools of the denomination, which show a net increase of 24,466, the enrolled membership totaling 1,620,496.

For the first time since 1928 the number of Ministers passed the 10,000 mark, there being now 10,014, an increase of 27 over the preceding year. The movement to strengthen local churches by dissolving those having only a nominal existence and by combining those serving practically the same constituency, has reduced the number of congregations to 9,242, a net decrease of 85 for the year and of 323 since 1926. The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. continues a national body, with churches fully organized and operating in every State in the Union, grouped in 46 synods and 293 presbyteries. The churches are officered locally by 51,588 ruling elders and 22,057 deacons.

Reduced giving to church causes is attributed to the general financial depression. For the first time since 1925 the total contributions fell below \$60,000,000, being \$58,171,381 for the past year. This is a decrease of \$4,876,682 from the preceding year and of \$7,941,729 from the high water mark of 1929. The major decrease was that of

\$4,079,496 in local congregational receipts. These items necessarily fluctuate annually, due to local conditions and demands, building enterprises, repairs, etc. In support of the official Boards of the church, the benevolence contributions totaled \$8,420,235, which is only \$550,742 less than during the previous year. These benevolence contributions were chiefly distributed as follows: National Missions, \$3,841,579; Foreign Missions, \$3,364,382; Christian Education, \$842,684; Pensions, \$324,985 (for current needs but outside of the Service Pension Fund). The Board of Pensions reports a total of \$12,125,715 paid on the pledges to the \$15,000,000 endowment campaigned for three years ago, payable in five years. To the American Bible Society \$37,702 was contributed; and to the Federal Council of Churches \$8,403. A total of \$1,026,046 was raised by self-supporting synods for benevolences within their own jurisdiction. The per capita giving by Presbyterian communicant members to their own benevolence Boards was \$4.32, a shrinkage of 31 cents.

### Presbyterian Record for the Year

Total communicant members, 1,999,131.  
 Net increase in membership, 15,023.  
 Total Sunday-school members, 1,620,496.  
 Increase in Sunday-school members, 24,466.  
 Total churches, 9,242.  
 Decrease in churches, 85.  
 Total Ministers, 10,014.  
 Increase in Ministers, 27.  
 Total contributions, \$58,171,381.  
 Decrease in contributions, \$4,876,682.  
 Decrease in congregational expenses, \$4,079,496.  
 Contributions to official benevolence Boards, \$8,420,235.  
 Decrease in giving to benevolence Boards, \$550,742.  
 Given to National Missions Board, \$3,841,579.  
 Given to Foreign Missions Board, \$3,364,382.  
 Given to Christian Education Board, \$842,684.  
 Given to Pension Board for current needs, \$324,985.

### 10 Largest Presbyterian Synods

The ranking order of the 10 largest Presbyterian synods remains the same as in 1930, as follows:

Synod	Membership
Pennsylvania	370,799
New York	263,557
New Jersey	171,149
Ohio	159,954
Illinois	132,599
California	97,571
Indiana	68,665

Michigan	67,362
Iowa	67,097
Missouri	56,411

### 10 Largest Presbyteries

The 10 largest presbyteries in ranking order are:

Presbytery	Membership
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	69,119
Chicago, Illinois	51,087
Los Angeles, California	50,245
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	43,327
New York City	36,848
Brooklyn-Nassau, New York	36,073
Philadelphia North, Pennsylvania	34,525
Corisco, West Africa	33,007
Detroit, Michigan	32,603
Newark, New Jersey	27,185

### Presbyterian Churches with Over 2,000 Members Each

Following are the Presbyterian churches with a membership of more than 2,000 each:

Locality	Church	Membership
Seattle, Wash.	First	8,160
Los Angeles, Calif.	Immanuel	4,334
Denver, Colo.	Central	3,225
Indianapolis, Ind.	Tabernacle	3,210
Pasadena, Calif.	Pasadena	3,141
Tulsa, Okla.	First	3,120
Oklahoma City, Okla.	First	3,118
Portland, Ore.	First	2,848
Chicago, Ill.	Fourth	2,658
Glendale, Calif.	First	2,617
New York City	Madison Ave.	2,606
Philadelphia, Pa.	Bethany Temple	2,569
Tacoma, Wash.	First	2,548
Hollywood, Calif.	First	2,547
New York City	West End	2,512
Pittsburgh, Pa.	First	2,502
Detroit, Mich.	Immanuel	2,488
Rochester, N. Y.	Central	2,481
Rochester, N. Y.	Brick	2,416
Chicago, Ill.	First	2,402
Wichita, Kans.	First	2,384
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Central	2,318
Harrisburg, Pa.	Pine Street	2,315
Kalamazoo, Mich.	First	2,308
Kansas City, Mo.	Linwood Blvd.	2,270
Uniontown, Pa.	Third	2,257
Chicago, Ill.	Buena Memorial	2,183
Chicago, Ill.	Drexel Park	2,158
Minneapolis, Minn.	Westminster	2,110
Long Beach, Calif.	First	2,109
Oak Park, Ill.	First	2,082
Buffalo, N. Y.	Central	2,078
Detroit, Mich.	First	2,060
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Lafayette Ave.	2,058
Toledo, Ohio	Collingwood Ave.	2,047
Philadelphia, Pa.	St. Paul	2,041
Wilkinsburg, Pa.	First	2,040
Detroit, Mich.	Woodward Ave.	2,017
Springfield, Ill.	Third	2,014
Philadelphia, Pa.	Bethany	2,012

### WESTMINSTER SEMINARY

The opening exercises will be held on September 30th at 3 P. M. in Witherspoon Hall. The address will be given by Dr. Frank R. Elder, of Cincinnati, Ohio. All are cordially invited.

**COMPARATIVE SUMMARY**  
of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America for the Last Five Years  
(Year ends March 31)

	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931
Synods .....	46	46	46	46	46
Presbyteries .....	299	294	295	293	293
Ministers .....	9,961	10,013	9,966	9,987	10,014
Licentiates .....	215	225	194	208	180
Local Evangelists .....	156	166	141	138	120
Candidates .....	1,294	1,246	1,267	1,265	1,221
Licensures .....	194	194	193	195	172
Ordinations .....	169	187	167	205	215
Installations .....	711	719	643	654	601
Pastoral Dissolutions .....	641	647	613	595	583
Ministers received .....	114	132	96	87	82
Ministers dismissed .....	75	49	41	40	30
Ministers deceased .....	219	201	233	194	213
Elders .....	48,916	49,730	49,651	50,079	51,588
Deacons .....	20,908	21,462	21,577	21,652	22,057
Churches .....	9,497	9,432	9,361	9,327	9,242
Churches organized .....	64	54	46	52	44
Churches dissolved .....	105	78	121	92	80
Churches received .....	3	3	2	5	2
Churches dismissed .....	.....	4	3	1	3
Every member plan churches.....	6,424	6,424	6,281	6,469	6,511
Stewardship instruction churches.....	.....	.....	3,630	3,739	4,285
Stewardship enrollment churches.....	.....	.....	992	956	1,117
<b>Communicants</b>					
Added, Profession .....	90,416	106,545	113,995	70,724	97,825
Added Certificate .....	64,713	68,522	67,631	53,050	59,192
Restored .....	11,028	11,107	11,708	10,308	11,682
Dismissed, etc. ....	54,657	55,996	52,221	48,259	49,858
Susp. Roll .....	67,060	65,722	67,305	75,580	74,700
Deceased .....	22,182	22,960	25,257	23,308	23,476
Whole Number .....	1,927,268	1,962,838	2,004,467	1,984,108	1,999,131
Net increase or decrease.....	18,157	35,570	41,629	20,359	15,023
Resident .....	1,777,828	1,816,104	1,859,614	1,830,463	1,847,243
Non-resident .....	149,440	146,734	144,853	153,645	151,888
Baptisms, profession .....	31,017	35,404	36,720	23,299	31,494
Baptisms, infant .....	42,333	44,624	45,470	36,572	41,718
Sunday School members.....	1,596,515	1,614,013	1,595,313	1,596,030	1,620,496

**Contributions to Causes by the Churches**

(Summarizing Columns 11-16 of the Statistical Tables for the year 1927;  
Columns 9-14 for the years 1928-1930 inclusive, and Columns 9-12 for the year 1931)

	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931
National Missions .....	\$5,093,460	\$11,924,305	11,540,610	10,694,436	12,484,894
Foreign Missions .....	3,924,903				
Christian Education .....	1,681,721				
Pensions .....	1,124,057				
Misc. benevolences .....	3,857,702				
General Assembly* .....	412,881	430,243	428,606	437,757	469,152
Current Receipts .....	.....	34,682,203	35,951,737	35,283,966	34,783,132
Special Receipts .....	.....	13,843,576	14,498,949	14,012,865	10,434,203
Congregational expenses .....	46,612,753	.....	.....	.....	.....
(See Note B. p. 909).....	75,430	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total†</b> .....	<b>\$62,782,907</b>	<b>\$64,598,530</b>	<b>\$66,113,110</b>	<b>\$63,048,063</b>	<b>\$58,171,381</b>

**Receipts of the Boards from the Churches**

(Summarizing Columns 17-21 of the Statistical Tables for the year 1927;  
Columns 16-22 for the years 1928-1930 inclusive, and Columns 13-21 for the year 1931)

	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931
National Missions† (Cong.).....	\$4,559,914	\$4,195,640	\$4,404,123	\$4,114,784	\$2,548,903
" (W. & Y. P.).....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,292,676

(Continued on page 22)

**Evangelicals in Protestant Episcopal Church Reassert Beliefs**

**T**HE Evangelical Association in the Protestant Episcopal Church, U. S. A., has issued a strong statement of faith directed against both the fronts which disturb that church. "We are pressed in spirit by the exigencies of these times of doubt to reassert our adherence to evangelical principles. Current teaching and preaching seem to have well-nigh smothered evangelical faith and practice. We are brought to a point where an Evangelical seems to be a stranger in his own house. Yet the official teaching of this church is on our side. Evangelical religion assigns to Holy Scripture absolute supremacy as only rule of faith and practice. It refuses to yield to the church or Catholic tradition or the Prayer Book, unless it can be shown that what is said is in harmony with the Scripture. This Scripture is inspired and is in truth the Word of God. It does not merely contain the Word of God. Man is in a state of guilt, imminent danger, and condemnation before God. For his healing he demands nothing less than the blood of God the Son applied to the conscience, and the grace of God the Holy Ghost entirely regenerating the heart.

"We hold that an experimental knowledge of Christ crucified and interceding is the very essence of Christianity and that, in teaching men the Christian religion, we can never dwell too much on Christ Himself and can never speak too strongly of the fullness, the freeness, presentness, and simplicity of the salvation there is in Him for every one that believes.

"We do not put the church above Christ. We refuse to admit that Christian Ministers are sacrificing priests. We refuse to admit that the sacraments are the grand media between Christ and the soul,—above faith and above preaching and above prayer. We protest against the idea that, in baptism, the use of water in the name of the Trinity is invariably and necessarily accompanied by regeneration. We protest against the theory that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice. Above all we protest against the notion of any corporeal presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Lord's Supper under the forms of bread and wine as an 'idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.'

"We protest against the worldliness seen in ungodly amusements allowed in church buildings, and the utterly unscriptural schemes to raise money for the church. Evangelicals are not indifferent to social service, but insist that it is a by-product of the Gospel. They exercise a brotherly spirit toward all evangelical bodies of Christians and say grace to all those who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity."

(Concluded from page 21)

Foreign Missions (Cong.)	3,691,636	3,667,962	3,806,946	3,565,968	2,073,478
" (W. & Y. P.)					1,291,404
Christian Education	833,418	817,029	926,000	881,723	842,684
Pensions	626,524	524,736	423,877	360,403	324,985
American Bible Society		39,346	42,538	38,689	37,702
Federal Council		9,162	8,864	9,410	8,403
Total	\$9,711,492	\$9,253,875	\$9,612,398	\$8,970,977	\$8,420,235
Benevolence Quota (Column 15)	\$11,424,967	\$11,766,180	\$11,234,899		

## Receipts of the Boards and Agencies from Living Givers

## Annual Report of the Budget and Finance Committee of the General Council

	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931
Nat'l. Miss.	\$2,861,140.02	\$2,883,316.94	\$3,681,813.58	\$3,257,999.36	\$3,053,652.37
For'n. Miss.	4,027,455.40	3,996,071.36	4,149,189.03	3,926,333.87	3,623,186.72
Chr. Educ.	857,460.39	836,558.95	921,038.34	867,613.05	833,598.55
Pensions	538,774.29	475,512.83	396,062.21	352,303.68	324,103.68
Am. Bible Soc.	43,647.14	39,946.92	42,172.11	38,310.33	37,447.61
Fed. Coun.	14,234.59	9,915.99	10,233.89	9,340.95	8,569.77
S.-S. Synods	1,309,444.21	1,334,133.57	1,097,715.64	1,073,818.65	1,026,046.76
Total	\$9,652,156.04	\$9,575,506.56	\$10,298,214.80	\$9,525,719.89	\$8,911,605.46

Philadelphia, Pa., July 30, 1931.

\*Includes in part Synodical and Presbyterian expenses.

†Does not include interest on Permanent Funds of the Boards, or income of the Colleges, Universities and Theological Seminaries, or many of the legacies and individual gifts to the Boards or amounts contributed toward the liquidation of their deficits. These items are displayed in full in the Reports of the Boards, and the Appendix to the Journal.

‡Includes receipts of self-supporting Synods and Presbyteries.

§Corrected total for 1929.

Note A: Eight foreign Presbyteries are included in the above tables. Their churches number 208; their Ministers 221; their membership is 49,384, and their total contributions amount to \$90,554, of which \$3,857 are for benevolences. The per capita giving of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. for all purposes, exclusive of these Foreign Presbyteries, is \$29.79. The per capita giving for benevolences only is \$6.40, and the per capita giving to the Boards, \$4.32.

Note B: This represents contributions to the Boards and to miscellaneous benevolences, not distributed in columns 11-15 of the statistical tables of 1927. The amounts were shown as footnotes in the several Presbyteries where this condition existed. This item does not appear in subsequent years on account of the change in the statistical page.

Note C: In 1926-27, 74.25 percent of the "basic budget" of \$13,000,000 was realized in receipts from living givers. In 1927-28, 79.79 percent of the "basic budget" of \$12,000,000 was received; in 1928-1929, 85.82 percent; in 1929-30, 79.38 percent; in 1930-31, 74.26 percent.

Note D: Four years ago the Laymen's Committee conducted a nation-wide campaign to raise \$15,000,000 for the Pension Fund, payable in five years. The Stated Clerks of the Presbyteries were requested to ask the particular churches to report their payments toward this Fund under the column for denominational benevolence. It is very evident that a great majority have not done so. The amount of money actually paid in to the Laymen's Committee during the year ending March 31, 1931, was \$1,198,189.67. The total amount paid in toward the \$15,000,000 fund is \$12,125,715.76.

## Embargo Directed at Church in Spain

THE Spanish Government, on August 20, published its long-awaited decree prohibiting the sale, transfer or other disposition of church property throughout Spain.

The decree was proposed shortly after the burning of convents in May.

"Movables, immovables, royal concessions and benefits of Catholic Church orders, institutions and establishments cannot be sold, transferred or alienated," the decree states.

It prohibits notaries from authorizing or registering any legal instrument pertaining

to sales of church property. Commercial agents are prohibited from effecting sale transactions and Spanish or foreign authorities from authorizing the withdrawal of church stocks or funds.

Although it places an embargo on all church deposits and properties, the decree, effective August 21, contains a clause allowing clerics the privilege of carrying on small accounts to conduct daily business.

Seven Roman Catholic newspapers of anti-Republican sympathies have been closed in the northern provinces, and similar action is planned against extreme journals in other sections.

## Christian Schools in China—What of Their Future?

In August, 1929, the Ministry of Education of the Nanking Government, China, promulgated Regulations for Private Schools which state that:

"A private school founded by a religious body is not permitted to give religion as a required subject, nor is religious propaganda permitted in the class instruction. If there are any religious exercises, students shall not be compelled or enticed to participate. No religious exercises shall be allowed in primary schools."—Chapter I, Article 5.

It is our understanding that the prohibition of religious exercises in primary schools has since been extended to junior middle schools, and that there has been a ruling by the government that schools cannot function unless registered, and in registering they must state their purpose and word that statement in such a way as to omit all reference to Christianity or missionary purpose.

Last spring a conference was held to decide the attitude of the Church of Christ in China toward these regulations. A protest was sent in to the government on July 1, signed by Church of Christ in China. The reply of the Minister of Education has just been received and is very discouraging, though the Chinese Christian leaders had feared that little if any concession would be made. After considering the points raised in the petition, it concludes:

"To sum up: There is not only one religion. If we allow each religion in the name of education to vie one with the other to propagate religion, the natural tendency will be to create divisions and strife. The Ministry of Education, in order to guard against such a possible future calamity, is obliged to impose these restrictions which do not apply only to Christianity but to the other religions as well.

"Hence to have elective religious courses in junior middle schools and to have the privilege of worship in primary schools embodies obstacles too difficult to permit the Ministry to grant the request. Moreover, we hope that you will consider in a sympathetic way this our humble opinion regarding the restriction upon propagation of religion in schools. Let this be considered final and not subject to further review.

"(Sgd.) Moling Tsiang,  
"Minister of Education."

A conference of Church Leaders was thereupon called to meet at Hangchow to consider the attitude which the Christian Church should take with reference to the maintenance of Christian schools in the face of this Government decision. We have as yet no report of that conference.

## A Floating Sabbath

**I**N October or November of this year the League of Nations Conference on the Reform of the Calendar will be held, when important decisions which nations may embrace can be expected.

From the religious viewpoint there may be little significance in a change of *dates*, such as took place in September, 1752, when eleven days were dropped from the Calendar after the second of that month, and the 3rd of the month was numbered or dated as the 14th.

But the presently proposed reform of the Calendar is based on a month of twenty-eight days, so that there is one odd day each year and two in a leap year. These odd days are to be regarded as "blank" days, and, on the supposition that the Reformed Calendar as at present mooted were to come into force at the end of 1931, the situation would be as follows. The last Sunday of the year 1931 falls on 27th December, and the year expires on Thursday, so that the first Sunday of 1932 falls on 3rd January. Under the new Calendar (if ever it will materialize, and its supporters are determined it will) the last day of 1931 (Thursday) would be called a Blank Day, and New Year's Day in 1932, which according to present reckoning is a Friday, would become Thursday, and therefore the first Sunday of January, 1932, would be 4th January. That is, under the proposed reform, between the last Sunday of the old year and the first Sunday of the new there would be an eight-day week instead of the present. In the case of a leap year the interval between the last Sunday of the old year and the first of the new would be a nine-day week. If, then, Christians were to observe the "Sunday," or first day of the week of the Reformed Calendar as their Sabbath, the continuity of the Sabbath Day as the first in every seven would soon be lost.

On the other hand, if Christians are to keep to the first day in every seven as the Sabbath day, then, according to the above examples and suppositions, the Sabbath day in 1932 would fall on the Saturday of the Reformed Calendar, and on Thursday in 1933, thus creating a *floating* Sabbath so far as the affairs of the world would be concerned.

The Jews, through Dr. J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, and others, have with undisguised anxiety placed their views definitely before the Committee.

## Christian Political Party Formed in Germany

**A** CHRISTIAN political party was born in 1925 in Wurtemberg, a state in southern Germany with many people noted for their piety and their loyalty to the Word of God. A group of earnest Christians in Wurtemberg made an appeal to their fellow-Christians in 1925 to elect only such men

to the city councils who had shown by their conduct that they were Christians and that they intended to apply the principles of God's Word to economic and social and political affairs. The result was the election of a few Christian councilors and the beginning of a new Christian political organization.

In the neighboring states of Baden and Bavaria a similar movement originated about the same time, and in the fall of 1927 these groups got together, and organized a new political party, based upon the Word of God. One of the leaders in the movement says that the new organization was born in an atmosphere of prayer, an unusual thing in politics!

In one of the main planks of the platform it is stated that the recognition of God's sovereignty in the home, in society at large, and in the state, determines our attitude as Christians in all social, economic and political affairs, and compels us to acknowledge the sovereign will of God at all times in politics.

This young party polled 900,000 votes last September and elected fourteen members of the German parliament.

In the speeches and discussions of the party the leaders evidenced familiarity with the work of Dr. Abraham Kuyper, the famous Calvinistic statesman of the Netherlands.

The leaders in this movement testify themselves that the distress of the nation since the war has convinced them that what Germany needs is a return to the Word of God and the faith of the fathers. True religion alone can save the nation from chaos and revolution.

## Protestant Alliance Marks 400th Anniversary of Reformation in England

### The Reformation Today

**F**OUR hundred years ago this month the first faint streaks of light heralded the dawn of the Reformation in England. No great movement leaps into completeness in a single night, nor in a year. Great personalities are caught up in the tide of popular expression and find themselves at the crest of a mighty wave unknowingly nor heeding the prominence into which they have been thrust. Such a one was Luther. Such a one, also, might have been gentle Thomas Bilney, the father of the Reformation in England.

Historians are apt to fix a movement to the most popular personality (historically) which has sprung from it. For instance, Roman Catholics tell us Henry VIII. invented Protestantism in England; as though he forced it on the people of England! Protestant historians, too, are inclined to magnify the more picturesque personalities of the Reformation. This makes it difficult for us to measure the debt we owe to the men like Thomas Bilney and the other martyred scholars.

At the feet of Bilney the first Reformers at the Universities learned of the new light spreading up through Europe. Manuscripts hidden for hundreds of years found their way across the Continent. Bilney was converted by reading the New Testament in the Greek printed by Erasmus in 1516. For his views he was burned at the stake in Norwich on August 19, 1531.

The four hundredth anniversary of that date will fall on the nineteenth of the present month. About this time, also, the first monastery was suppressed by Henry VIII., and the king took the title of supreme temporal head of the Church of England. The great Reformation had begun in earnest. In this year, and the two years that followed, many persons were burned.

Does England understand what she owes to these events? A demonstration of National and Historic interest is being organized by the Protestant Alliance, in Norwich, on Saturday, September 19, to mark the events I have mentioned, when a Tablet will be erected to Thomas Bilney in the Lollards Pit, Norwich, where he was burned. It is most important these events should be widely known, because never has there been such a widespread challenge to Reformation principles as there is in this present year, and never has there been such an excellent opportunity offered to counteract that challenge. . . .

—Lionel Fowler in the *Reformer*.

## Philadelphia Church Takes Steps to Preserve Its Heritage

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. in 1929 sent down to the presbyteries the following overture:

Overture D. On the Incorporation of Particular Churches.

Shall Form of Government, Chapter XXVIII, Section III, be amended to read as follows:

"Each particular church shall cause a corporation to be formed and maintained under the laws of the state where it is located, so as to enable it to receive, hold and transfer property and to facilitate the management of its temporal affairs. The charter or articles of incorporation shall declare that its property is held in trust under the Constitution of and for the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

To this Overture the presbyteries made answer as follows: Affirmative: 139; Negative: 131; No Action: 14.

A majority vote of all the presbyteries is necessary for the passage of such an overture. This overture was therefore defeated. The Tioga Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, however, enacted the following Declaration of Trust "insuring not only pure Gospel Preaching but sole legal possession of the Property by the lay members of Tioga Congregation until the return of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Ordinance, or Declaration of Trust under which the property of the Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is held.

Enacted pursuant to the provisions of Article Two of the Charter of The Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Whereas, contributions and gifts have been made in large sums by the present members of The Tioga Presbyterian Church, in recent years, which have been expended in building, equipping and beautifying the present church edifice, including the installation of a new pipe organ: and

Whereas, said gifts and contributions were made to this church corporation at a time when its charter expressly provided, as it now provides, that:—

"the faith and government of the said church shall conform to the faith and government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, whose General Assembly met in Minneapolis in May 1886, and shall be connected with and deemed to be under the care of the General Assembly of said Church," and also—

"That all such property, whether real or personal, which shall hereafter be bequeathed, devised or conveyed to the said corporation shall be taken, held and enure to the said corporation, subject, however, *exclusively* to the control and disposition of the lay members of the said Church and Corporation, or of their Board of Trustees as hereinafter provided for—"; and

Whereas, at the times when said contributions and gifts were made the government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America was that of a representative democracy with a series of ecclesiastical judicatories consisting of the Session elected by the congregation; the Presbytery consisting of ordained Ministers or teaching elders and ruling elders elected by and representing particular church sessions; the Synod consisting of an equal number of teaching and ruling elders elected by and representing Presbyteries; and the General Assembly consisting of an equal number of teaching and ruling elders elected by and representing Presbyteries, all as set forth and defined in a "Form of Government" adopted in 1788 and not essentially amended or changed thereafter; and

Whereas, at the times when said gifts and contributions were made, the faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America was founded upon the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments as interpreted and explained in certain Doctrinal Standards consisting of "The Westminster Confession of Faith," and the larger and shorter Catechisms adopted in 1729, and amended in 1788, 1886-87, and 1902-3; and

Whereas, said Doctrinal Standards teach or permit individual belief and faith in such essential doctrines as The Trinity of the Godhead; The Virgin Birth and Deity of Jesus Christ; The Personality of the Holy Ghost; The Supernatural Authority of the Holy Scriptures; The Substitutionary Atonement; The Premillennial Second Coming of Christ; and the Resurrection of the Body; and

Whereas, said gifts and contributions were made by persons who believed in said faith and said government, and with an understanding that neither said faith nor said government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America would ever be essentially changed, and that the exclusive control and disposition of the lay members of this church corporation over its real and personal property, as guaranteed by its Charter, would never be removed, revoked or in any wise weakened; and

Whereas, persons may hereafter be moved to make gifts, devise, bequests and conveyances of real or personal property to this church, and it is deemed desirable, in order that they may do so, that they be reassured and guaranteed that the same shall never be devoted to the propagation or support of any faith under any system of government other than that hereinbefore set forth and defined:—Now Therefore,

Resolved: That it be, and is hereby solemnly covenanted, agreed, and represented that the property, real and personal of this congregation is now and will at all times hereafter be held and used for the propagation of the faith as particularly described in the foregoing preambles, under a form of government which shall not deprive the lay members of this corporation of any of the powers of control, disposition or beneficial use as recited and interpreted in the foregoing preambles; that so long as this church shall exist as a Congregation under its present name and title or any other, no one shall ever be employed or permitted to preach or teach in said church who does not believe in The Trinity of the Godhead; The Virgin Birth and Deity of Christ; The Personality of the Holy Ghost; The Supernatural Authority of the Holy Scriptures; The Substitutionary Atonement; The Second Coming of Christ and The Resurrection of the Body, to preach or teach a disbelief in which would be a violation of the Trust handed down to us by the founders and our forefathers who did so believe. And also that they will never sell, give, assign, leave in trust, dispose of or vote to transfer in any way, the land and buildings of said Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, located at 16th and Tioga Street and Indiana Avenue and Croskey Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or any other real or personal property which may now or hereafter be held by this church corporation, or any part thereof to

any judicatory of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America or to that of any other denomination whatsoever, or to any individuals or societies for resale to any of the above, nor to any persons or societies whatsoever unless by a signed agreement of three-fourths of the then recorded active members of The Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This does not preclude any action this Congregation may wish to take in disposing of its property in any other manner according to law, upon receipt of money consideration representing a fair market value, such money to be used for the propagation of the Gospel as herein set forth.

Further Resolved: That the foregoing Preambles and Resolution be and they are hereby made an irrevocable, unamendable Ordinance or Declaration of Trust of the Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, binding alike upon the lay members, the Session, the Deacons, and the Board of Trustees of this Church, its and their, and each of their successors, any changes in the faith or government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America which may hereafter be made to the contrary notwithstanding.

Respectfully submitted,

By the Special Committee Appointed,

EDGAR FRUTCHERY, *Chairman*,  
ALLAN SUTHERLAND,  
FREDERICK DITTMAN,  
A. W. CHRISTIAN,

Done at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 7, 1930, at an adjourned meeting of April 23, 1930, duly called.

### "Church of the Air"

A change of policy in its religious programs has been announced by the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. Instead of selling time to religious bodies or individuals, it will put on a Sunday schedule of its own beginning September 13, to be known as the "Church of the Air." The President of the company has announced that it is willing to lose a revenue estimated at more than \$10,000 a week to avoid "responsibility . . . of allotting time on a commercial basis to different religions and different preachers."

Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse has been broadcasting his sermon each Sunday afternoon over this national hook-up.

This policy of the Columbia system is in line with that of the National Broadcasting Company whose service for Protestants is conducted each week by the Federal Council of Churches, Drs. Cadman and Fosdick, being generally the preachers. N. B. C. donates about 32 hours a week to religious broadcasts. Beside the service for Protestants, there is one for Roman Catholics, and a program for Jews is now under consideration.