

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-JANUARY, 1932
Vol. 2 No. 9

\$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 Outlook for Christianity

EVERY judgment as to the present status of Christianity is necessarily determined by the answer given to the question, What is Christianity? If everything called Christianity is really Christianity, it is safe to say that its status was never as favorable as at the present time. The statisticians tell us that there are more people in the world today who call themselves Christians than ever before. Moreover despite the situation in Russia and public opposition to Christianity in certain circles in Europe and America, there is relatively little professed antagonism to Christianity. Practically everybody, including those who are hostile to the Church in all its branches, claim that their views are "essentially" Christian. There is much criticism of this and that expression of Christianity but there is little professed criticism of Christianity as such. Surely if all that is called Christianity is rightly so called the outlook for Christianity is the most favorable that has been known since Pentecost.

If, then, we define Christianity (as many do in effect) as what is held in common by those who profess and call themselves Christians, we will judge that the outlook for Christianity is exceedingly optimistic. Suppose, however, that some of those who call themselves Christians are not Christians at all—as the Scriptures lead us to expect. Then what is held in common would contain nothing but what is held by non-Christians as well as Christians. But even if it be true (as of course it is not) that all who profess and call themselves

Christians are really Christians, the definition of Christianity that would result would express only the minimum of Christianity, the very least that a man can hold and still rightly call himself a Christian. Otherwise the least adequate forms of Christianity would be excluded. Suppose we ask the question, What is a man? Do we merely want to know what all men have in common? If so we are seeking for a definition of a man that will adequately describe only the poorest, meanest, least developed specimen of a man that exists. Surely, however, when we ask such a question we want to know what a normal or representative man is. It is not otherwise when we ask, What is Christianity? We want to know what normal Christianity is, not the most attenuated form of thought that can possibly be called Christianity. A definition of Christianity that gives expression only to what is held in common by those who call themselves Christian will at the most express only the minimum of Christianity, even if all those who call themselves Christians are

actually such. Inasmuch, however, as "they are not all Israel that are of Israel" it is obvious that it will not express even that. It will merely express what Christianity has in common with natural religion and so will lack everything that is distinctive of Christianity.

The mere fact, then, that so many people profess and call themselves Christians today affords no real warrant for supposing that the outlook for Christianity is highly favorable—true as it is that this fact is in itself fitted to justify the belief that the fortunes of Christianity are now at flood tide.

"Modernists" and "Fundamentalists," moreover, are at least agreed in maintaining that the number of those who profess and call themselves Christians warrants no definite conclusion as to the actual status of Christianity. According to the "Modernists," almost immediately after his death the "religion of Jesus" (i.e. the religion that Jesus is alleged to have taught and exemplified) was transformed, re-fashioned, radically altered by his earliest disciples, under the influence of their pre-Christian beliefs, a tendency that was continued under the influence of the theological notions of PAUL (largely pagan in origin according to the Modernists) and that reached its culmination in the historical creeds of the churches—with the result that the knowledge of real Christianity was almost completely lost until it was re-discovered by the Modernists, dug up as it were out of the debris under which it had been covered for some eighteen hundred years. When it is remembered that according to the

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments.....	3
The Truth About the Presbyterian Church.....	4
J. G. Machen	
The Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church.....	7
John Murray	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	9
J. G. Machen	
Books of Religious Significance.....	15
Letters to the Editor.....	17
News of the Church.....	19

Modernists even such doctrines as the deity and atoning death of JESUS are of pagan origin—doctrines central to Christianity as it is generally understood in Greek, Roman and Protestant circles—it goes without saying that in the eyes of the Modernists the fact that so many profess and call themselves Christians does not mean that real Christianity is widely held. It is not long since Dr. FOSDICK was quoted as having said that ninety per cent of our present-day Christianity is paganism. On the other hand the "Fundamentalists" because they hold that real Christianity is essentially the same as historic Christianity, as it is set forth in the New Testament and the major creeds of the churches, look upon Modernism as an apostasy from rather than a re-discovery of Christianity. Few, if any, "Fundamentalists" would go so far as to say that ninety per cent of present-day Christianity is something other than what they regard as genuine Christianity; but practically all of them do hold that Modernism (or other departures from Christianity equally bad) is widespread to such a degree that no sound inference can be drawn from the number of those who profess and call themselves Christians as to the actual status of Christianity.

It ought to be clear to all—so at least it seems to us—that it is impossible to make any serious estimate as to the present status of Christianity without first answering the question, What is Christianity? As a result much of what is said in the name of Christianity contains no comfort for us as we scan the future. It is no comfort to us to find a man expressing optimism as to the future of Christianity, if what he calls Christianity is something other and different from what we call Christianity. For that would mean that the growth of what he calls Christianity would mean the decline of what we call Christianity. If, for instance, as we scanned the future, we could foresee the universal triumph of consistent Modernism, i.e. of a religion that rejects the cross as an atoning sacrifice and CHRIST Himself as an object of worship and that denies that salvation is by grace through faith, we would be forced to believe that the time is coming when Christianity (as we

understand it) will be a dead religion.

In previous issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY (especially in that of June, 1930) we have indicated what we mean when we make mention of Christianity. Suffice it to say in this connection that by Christianity we mean Christianity as it was all but universally understood previous to the rise of Modernism in the eighteenth century. This means, broadly speaking, that when we make mention of Christianity we have in mind the sum-total of the saving truths taught in Holy Scripture. More particularly that redemptive religion that centers in CHRIST as the GOD-MAN, and that offers salvation from sin as guilt and power and pollution through His expiatory death—immediately and fully as regards guilt but by stages and degrees as regards power and pollution that reach perfection only in the life to come. Understanding Christianity as we do, we are unable to persuade ourselves that the immediate outlook for Christianity is favorable. No doubt when we compare the present situation with that which existed in the early centuries we find much that is fitted to hearten and encourage; but when we compare the existing situation with that which existed a generation ago we find much to depress and discourage. And that because we find it impossible to conceal from ourselves the fact that in recent years there has been a wide-spread apostasy from real Christianity—an apostasy that seems to be growing rapidly, that is influential in all the churches and that is the dominating or almost the dominating influence in some of the churches. If the present tendencies continue unchecked, the immediate outlook for what we call Christianity is dark.

But while, from our point of view, the immediate outlook for Christianity is unfavorable, we would not be understood as implying that the situation warrants any weakening of our confidence as to the *ultimate* triumph of Christianity. That would be true only if we had lost confidence in the truthfulness of Christianity. We, however, are not of those who believe that advancing knowledge has disproved the truth of Christianity, as we define it. If we did, we would no longer call ourselves Chris-

tians as we hold that our definition of Christianity is the only one that can be historically justified. Because we believe Christianity to be true, we are confident that the gates of hell will not prevail against it.

But while our confidence as to the ultimate triumph of Christianity is inextricably bound up with our conviction of its truthfulness, it does not rest on this alone. It rests also on the conviction that the CHRIST who stands at its center, and makes it what it is, is more than a teacher and example, that He is also the living and reigning LORD. If Christianity were but one system of thought and life among others struggling for the suffrage of men, we would have small confidence in its ability to maintain itself—not because it is intellectually indefensible but because it must make its appeal to sinners and so to those who are prejudiced against it both as a system of thought and a way of life. Christianity is not merely a system of thought and life, it is a redeeming activity at work in the world. CHRIST not only taught, He acted; moreover He not only was, He is; and as age succeeds age He remains the same yesterday, today and forever.

We do not pretend to say what the immediate future has in store for Christians. It may be that the love of more and more will wax cold. It may be that Christians are facing persecutions as bad or even worse than those of the early centuries. It is a cross, not a crown that CHRIST promises His followers on earth. But be the immediate future of Christianity what it may, JESUS being what He is the Living LORD, clothed with the power of God, we may be sure that the religion that centers in Him will, despite all opposition, make its way to ultimate victory. They reckon apart JESUS CHRIST who suppose that Christianity, as the church of all ages has understood it, is a spent force and about to be classed as a dead religion. In this confidence let us go forward. PAUL's exhortation has lost none of its significance with the passing years: "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the LORD, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not vain in the LORD."

Editorial Notes and Comments

Report of the Joint Committee on Organic Union

THE Joint Committee on Organic Union of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church has issued a tentative report with a request for comments from the membership of said Churches, as indicated with some detail in our news columns. Our readers will also find apt and telling comments in the articles and communications written by our contributors. In this connection we content ourselves with directing attention to two or three of the major considerations that lead us to think that the organic union of these churches on the basis proposed would be unwise and that it ought to be virgorously opposed by all those who are intelligently concerned about the future of these churches as instruments for the promotion of the gospel of the grace of God in its purity and integrity.

If the Joint Committee had proposed (in effect) that these Churches be organically united on the basis of the existing standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. we would heartily concur. What the Committee has done, however, is to propose (in effect) that the union be effected on the basis of the existing standards of the United Presbyterian Church. Should the union as proposed be consummated, it would mean not that the United Presbyterian Church has been merged with the Presbyterian but that the Presbyterian Church had been merged with the United Presbyterian. Our objection to this is not at all sentimental. It is grounded in our conviction that the Confessional Statement adopted by the United Presbyterian Church in 1925 (and which will express all that any minister or elder of the proposed new Church will need to believe) is a weak and inadequate statement of the Reformed Faith as compared with the Westminster Confession of Faith. In our judgment it has been arrived at, not so much by displaying additional attainments in truth under the guidance of the Holy Spirit since the Westminster Standards were formulated (as its Preamble hints) as by eliminating important revealed truths that are essential to the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards. It seems to us therefore that the adoption of the proposed Plan of Union would involve a rather radical revision of our doctrinal standards of an undesirable sort.

What makes matters much worse, the Preamble of the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church states that subscription to them is subject to the principle that the law of God requires forbearance in love "toward any brethren who

may not be able fully to subscribe to the Standards of the Church, while they do not determinedly oppose them, but follow the things which make for peace and things wherewith one may edify another." When it is remembered that this Preamble is part of the proposed doctrinal basis of union, it will be seen how little a man will need to believe in the united church in order to be in good and regular standing as a minister or elder. What boots it that the Westminster Confession of Faith together with the Larger and Shorter Catechism are retained as part of the doctrinal basis of union, since no one will be required to believe more than is demanded by the Preamble and Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church?

It will require a two-thirds vote of the Presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to put the proposed Plan of Union into effect. It should not be overlooked, however, that, if the Plan of Union is adopted, amendments or alterations in the Standards of the new Church will be made according to the method now in vogue in the United Presbyterian Church. This means that it will be obligatory for the General Assembly to transmit to the Presbyteries any overture respecting amendments or alterations submitted to it by one-third of the Presbyteries, and that the overture shall become the law of the Church if it receives a majority of the votes cast provided not less than two-thirds of the Presbyteries vote on the matter. If there are approximately three hundred Presbyteries in the new Church, this would mean that it would be possible to amend its Standards by a majority of the votes cast in two hundred of those Presbyteries. It should be noted that the outcome would be determined not by the number of Presbyteries voting in favor of the overture but by the number of votes cast without regard to Presbyteries. Under such a system a relatively few of the Presbyteries could force a vote on an amendment and the outcome be determined by the votes cast in a few of the large city Presbyteries. Should the proposed Plan of Union be adopted, we are of the opinion that it would not be long before an amendment in the form of a brief statement, lacking everything distinctive of the Reformed Faith, would be proposed as a substitute for the doctrinal basis of union now recommended.

In our judgment conservatives in the United Presbyterian Church should oppose this Plan of Union. Surely they cannot be wholly unaware of the fact that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is at present dominated by those who are at least friendly to the Auburn Affirmation. Even granting that the rank and file of the United Presby-

terians are sound in the faith (as we are disposed to think notwithstanding the strictures we have passed on their creedal statement) what will such a relatively small body be able to do to stem the tide toward Modernism in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.? Let this Plan of Union with its easy method of securing amendments be adopted, and, unless we are mistaken, it will not be long before an effort will be made to bring the doctrinal standards of "The Presbyterian Church of America" into harmony with the Auburn Affirmation—an effort which if successful will necessarily force every true evangelical to sever his connections with that Church.

It seems to us that, under cover of a merger of churches that in the abstract is commendable, an effort is being made to unite these churches according to a concrete Plan of Union which, if adopted, will tend to serve the interests of the liberals and the indifferentists already strong within both churches. We hope the effort will fail unless rather radical modifications are made in the Plan as proposed before it is presented to the General Assemblies of these Churches with the recommendation that it be transmitted to the Presbyteries.

The Westminster Departmental Graded Materials

IN our last issue we offered certain comments on the booklets for students and teachers entitled "Learning to Know God: Pioneers in the Christian Quest," published by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. for the use of "Intermediate Pupils," in which we maintained that in disseminating such lesson materials said Board had acted in the service of unbelief. Responses received at this office indicate that our judgment at this point is shared by many and that there is going to be an insistent demand that a situation in which such a thing is possible be remedied. Our comments had to do only with the contents of the booklets named. We expressed no judgment as to the nature of the lesson helps as a whole as furnished by said Board. We mention this because a few of our readers seem to have read our comments so carelessly as to understand us to imply that the lesson helps as a whole are of the same character as the booklets mentioned.

But while we are not to be understood as maintaining that these booklets are fair samples of the lesson helps as a whole as issued by the Board, this does not mean that we think the rest of the material issued by the Board is all it should be. Far from it. That these materials as a whole are exceedingly defective is indicated by "A Study of the Westminster Departmental Graded Materials" by the Rev. H. CLARE

(Continued on page 15)

The Truth About The Presbyterian Church

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

III. THE PRESENT SITUATION

The Proposed Plan of Union

SINCE the appearance of the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, a great attack has been launched against the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. by the Joint Committee on Organic Union.

We do not at all impugn the motives of the Committee. We acknowledge gratefully, moreover, the fact that the proposal is tentative merely, and is submitted to open examination by the Church at large before the General Assembly meets next May. Nevertheless, however laudable may be the motives of the Committee, the proposal which it has made does constitute, in fact though not in intention, an attack upon the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

The last attack was made in 1920, by a plan which sought to unite many ecclesiastical bodies on the basis of a Preamble couched in the vague language so dear to the popular Modernism of our day. That attack was defeated in the presbyteries. Since then, the destructive tendency has continued its undermining work for eleven years. It now comes forward with another public proposal.

The present Plan of Union involves the virtual abandonment of the Westminster Standards and the substitution for them of the creed which the United Presbyterian Church adopted in 1925. In form, indeed, the Westminster Standards are retained together with that United Presbyterian creed. But since the Preamble of that creed, which is to be adopted with the rest, states that where that creed differs from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail, what we really have here is the substitution of a new doctrinal standard for our historic Confession of Faith.

That new doctrinal standard is vague and unsatisfactory, as are most creeds

produced in this unbelieving age; it contradicts important elements in the Reformed system of doctrine, and is ambiguous, if not definitely destructive, with regard to the authority of the Bible. It contains, indeed, many things that are true. If it had been produced on the way upward to some better presentation of Bible teaching, there is much that might have been said in favor of it. But the important question about any step that is being taken is the question whether it is a step up or a step down. And certainly, from the Christian point of view, this step is a step down. To abandon the Westminster Standards for this vague and unsatisfactory statement is to make vast concessions to unbelief. It is the very opposite of the true creed-making function of the Christian Church.

But whatever measure of good there may be in the body of the United Presbyterian creed, the Preamble, which is the most important thing in it, is almost wholly evil. It begins indeed, with apparent adherence to the authority of the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. But that is apparently contradicted in the very next sentence, which seems to make the "living Church" an authority. No one reading these two sentences consecutively can be quite sure whether the author of the creed holds to the Christian or to the Modernist view as to the seat of authority in religion.

Then the Preamble proceeds, in the second paragraph, to indicate that subscription to the Standards means nothing in particular; since "forbearance in love" is to be exercised toward those who are not able fully to subscribe to the Standards but merely do not determinedly oppose them. So a minister does not need to believe in the Standards after all. He can keep silent about the truth that they contain. Nay, he can

even oppose them! Only, he must not *determinedly* oppose them. Can anyone imagine a statement more diametrically opposite to the whole letter and spirit of the New Testament, or more utterly abhorrent to a man who is on fire with a zeal to proclaim the gospel of Christ?

What we have in this Preamble—at least when its language is taken in the light of the present condition of the Church, which it is evidently intended to condone—is Modernism. Only, there are different forms of Modernism; and this is Modernism in a particularly confused and shallow form.

We cannot believe that the consistently evangelical part of the United Presbyterian Church would be very sorry to desert this unsatisfactory modern creed, and return to the great historic standards of the Reformed Faith, which belong to them just as much as they belong to us.

The Policy of Secrecy

Returning now to our presentation of the state of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., we ask our readers to remember what we have said in the first two articles of the series. We have observed that the entire machinery of the Church is dominated by a Modernist-indifferentist tendency which is in striking contradiction both to the Bible and to the Church's Confession of Faith. Of the ministerial members of the Permanent Judicial Commission, which is practically the supreme court of the Church, exactly one half (four out of eight) are signers of a Modernist document, the Auburn Affirmation, which attacks directly the full truthfulness of Scripture and declares that that doctrine, with four other central verities of the Christian faith, is non-essential even for the ministry; and evidences of any consistent or vigorous evangelicalism in the other members of the Commission are, to say the most, very slight. Similar is the

condition in the other agencies of the Church. Signers of the Auburn Affirmation are prominent in those agencies, and men who have taken any vigorous stand against the point of view of the Affirmation are given scarcely any representation at all. It is not too much to say, therefore, that unless the mission boards are radically reformed, the organization of new boards that can honestly appeal for the support of Bible-believing Christians is one of the crying needs of the hour.

The present anomalous condition of the Church has been brought about, we observed further, by a policy of concealment in councils and courts. If the destructive forces had been exhibited in their true light, they might have been checked long ago; but as it is they have carried on their undermining labors in the dark.

This policy of secrecy is particularly disgraceful in cases of judicial process, where it runs counter to all the fair and honorable traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race, to say nothing of the teachings of the Word of God. In that field, the evil is actually being practiced today; a secret trial has just been completed in the Synod of Pennsylvania. Such procedure is an offence to fair-minded people everywhere, and it is a disgrace to a church bearing the name of Christ. Yet if the proposed new Book of Discipline goes into effect, the evil will be made universal and obligatory; and a secret inquisition will thus be set up in the Presbyterian Church. The same outrageous provision is found in the Book of Discipline of the proposed united Church.

But the tendency to check open discussion has also proved to be disastrous when applied to the legislative and administrative functions of the Church. We traced a few of its workings in the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. We pointed out how it was operative in the destruction of the old Princeton Seminary—the last important stronghold of a genuine and vigorous evangelicalism among the theological seminaries controlled by the Church—and how in general it was made to operate against any fair hearing for the rank and file.

The Anti-Publicity Action

The same tendency—to come to the more immediate subject of the present article—has found special expression in an action of the last General Assembly, meeting in May, 1931. At that Assembly, a resolution was passed directing the Stated Clerk to the effect that he devise means by which “the injudicious or premature publication of matters subject to serious difference of opinion or matters subject to sensational or misleading interpretations may be prevented,” and that “Standing Rule No. 29 . . . shall be so interpreted as to carry out the spirit” of this resolution (“Minutes,” pp. 84, 85).

Standing Rule No. 29 provides that “all reports of Special and other Committees shall be delivered to the Stated Clerk on or before April 1, in each year,” that they shall be printed by him, that copies shall be sent in bound form to commissioners, and that “*all reports included in the above bound form are thereby released for public comment or quotation*” (italics ours. See “Minutes,” p. 372⁷⁴). It is especially this last provision of the Standing Rule which, apparently, is to be interpreted in a way to prevent premature publication.

Now in a day when even the Word of God is so frequently “interpreted” to mean its exact opposite, we need not be surprised that a mere standing rule of the General Assembly should meet a like fate. But when that excellent standing rule does meet a like fate, when it is “interpreted” so as to defeat its purpose, the result is that any really free and effective discussion of measures proposed for adoption by the Presbyterian Church is either definitely checked or at least committed to the discretion of an administrative officer.

The purpose of that standing rule was that measures proposed to the General Assembly by various committees shall be discussed not merely by commissioners but by the Church at large. One medium by which they become known to the Church at large is provided by whatever independent church papers there may be. An even more effective and far-reaching medium is provided by the secular daily press. The use of these two media of communication is checked

by the present action of the General Assembly.

Just how far it is to be checked, and in what way, is left to the discretion of the Stated Clerk. We do not know how he will employ the arbitrary power which has been placed in his hands. He may do what I believe was suggested tentatively at the General Assembly—copyright the “Blue Book”—so as to be able to prevent the reports from being copied in any papers except those that are favored by the ecclesiastical machinery. It is almost unthinkable, indeed, that he should venture upon anything quite so outrageous and tyrannical as that. But even if he uses his power in some less tyrannical way, the granting of that power does involve an attack upon the very vitals of Presbyterian liberty.

Autocracy vs. Democracy

What we have in this action of the 1931 Assembly, as over against the Standing Rule which it nullifies, is a conflict between two widely differing notions of the government of the Presbyterian Church.

The notion which underlies the Standing Rule is a democratic notion. According to that notion, the Church—so far as human instrumentalities are concerned—is governed by its entire membership; its presbyters, officers, commissioners to the General Assembly are servants of the people, and the people have a right to know exactly what its servants plan to do. According to the present action of the General Assembly, the real business of the Church should be conducted in committee rooms or around board tables, and the people are to have very little real power.

What this action of the General Assembly really means by “premature” publication of reports, or what it will be understood by many persons connected with the ecclesiastical machinery as meaning, is, we fear, publication at such time as to jeopardize the customary process of rushing through the General Assembly the measures favored by the agencies, committees and boards.

A case in point is provided by the report of the Special Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage to

the General Assembly of 1931, a report which, we surmise, occasioned the anti-publicity action with which we are now concerned. Publication of that report so aroused the opposition of the Church at large that the report was modified before it was presented to the Assembly.

Was the publication "premature"? The answer all depends upon the point of view. It was premature from the point of view of those who favored the proposed action; but from the point of view of those who were opposed to the action it was altogether timely; it prevented the Assembly from following its custom of passing Committee measures down to the presbyteries without any general discussion.

We do not at all impugn the motives of the Stated Clerk in welcoming the passage of this anti-publicity resolution; and we hope that he may use wisely the power that has been granted to him. But however wisely or unwisely the authority granted to the Stated Clerk may be used, the granting of the authority is a very serious sign of the times. The resolution speaks of the "spirit" of the action. Well, it is the "spirit" of the action to which we object. The spirit of the standing rule nullified by this action was a spirit of fairness and openness and liberty; it was the fine old spirit of the Reformed Faith: the action nullifying the standing rule will, we fear, with however good intentions on the part of the Stated Clerk, encourage that spirit of concealment and ecclesiastical expediency and tyranny which is becoming increasingly dominant in the Church.

Monopoly in Church Papers

This latter spirit was manifested also in another report that was made to the last General Assembly—the report of the General Council's Committee on Program and Field Activities. That committee presented as part of the "ideal solution" of the problem of publicity for church causes the following:

"(b) To secure the consolidation of weekly church papers so that there should not be more than two in the field, and that such papers should be assisted to become vital and adequate, although not official organs of the

work of the entire Church. Such a result to be achieved both by mutual cooperation in the furnishing and publishing of suitable material and also by the furnishing of financial assistance by the General Council and the Boards in the form of paid advertising, the amount and character of such advertising to be determined in the light of the number of subscriptions to such papers, further and active assistance to be afforded by the General Council in the promotion of the circulation and use of such papers" (*Minutes*, p. 224).

What is the meaning of this extraordinary proposal? The answer is only too plain. The proposal means that if this policy is carried out a monopoly of subsidized church papers is to be established in the Presbyterian Church, such papers to publish what the official boards and agencies regard as "suitable material." The consolidation of existing weekly church papers is to be secured so that there shall "*not be more than two in the field*" (italics ours). Thus the "ideal solution" of the problem of publicity, as the Committee sees it, is that *all* the church papers are to be controlled by, or complacent towards, the ecclesiastical machinery.

It is true, the subsidized church papers are not, according to the proposal, to be official organs of the entire Church; but any thought of real editorial independence on the part of such subsidized church papers is of course quite out of the question. What we have here is an attempt at monopoly in its most oppressive form.

The time is particularly favorable for such a proposal. There are now only three weekly church papers of general circulation in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. One, *The Presbyterian Advance*, is under the editorship of a signer of the Auburn Affirmation; another, *The Presbyterian Banner*, has for many years been opposed to the ecclesiastical contention of the evangelical part of the Church; the third, *The Presbyterian*, was formerly the evangelical organ, but in 1930 removed forcibly the editor, Dr. Samuel G. Craig, and adopted the customary attitude of subservience or complacency

toward the present condition of the Church.

These are just the sort of papers that will serve the ends of the gentlemen now controlling the ecclesiastical machinery; and if any one of them can be merged with either of the others, the two remaining papers, after being subsidized and made monopolistic, will provide just the kind of "publicity" to prevent any disturbing objection to the prevailing Modernist-indifferentist drift. It is no wonder that the General Council's Committee thinks that if such a condition can be secured, *The Presbyterian Magazine* (now under the editorship of a signer of the Auburn Affirmation) can be dispensed with. If papers like *The (new) Presbyterian*, *The Banner*, and *The Presbyterian Advance* can be made monopolistic, there will be no danger lest the real condition of the Church become known.

The Despised Evangelicals

At first sight, it might look as though the Modernist-indifferentist control of the Church were impregnable. It could be shaken only by a true enlightenment of the rank and file; and to prevent that enlightenment an increasing efficiency is being attained by the ecclesiastical machinery. Measures of the most far-reaching importance are being sent down to the presbyteries without debate; in the presbyteries no general, but merely a local, discussion is possible. Objection to the wasting of the Church's heritage is discouraged on the absurd ground that it should be made, if at all, only by way of formal judicial process. Judicial process is made worthless as a means of establishing truth not only by the partisanship of the highest Judicial Commission, but more particularly by the secrecy of the Church courts. Such secrecy will be made universal and obligatory if the new Book of Discipline goes into effect; men who hold to the unpopular and disturbing evangelical position will be dealt with in a secret inquisition and deprived even of the right of an open trial. The one official journal, *The Presbyterian Magazine*, is edited by a signer of the Modernist Auburn Affirmation; so is one of the

(Continued on page 12)

The Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church

By John Murray, M.A., Th.M.

[We are happy to be able to publish this incisive and informing article from the pen of Mr. Murray, who is in charge of instruction in Systematic Theology in Westminster Theological Seminary. Another article by him, concerning especially the "Preamble" to the Confessional Statement, will appear in our next issue.]

BY constitutional action consummated on June 2nd 1925 The United Presbyterian Church of North America in accordance with its claim that it is the "right and duty of a living church to restate its faith from time to time, so as to display any additional attainments in truth it may have made under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," adopted the abovementioned confessional statement. This statement does not profess to be a substitute for the Westminster symbols for according to the preamble the church "declares afresh its adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, as setting forth the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures." It claims to be supplementary to them, containing the substance of the Westminster Standards and certain present-day convictions of the Church. These convictions are presumably either in accord with these Standards, but not at all or at least not sufficiently expressed in them, or at variance with them. "Wherever it deviates," the preamble says, "from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail."

It is our purpose in this article to review from the more or less theological point of view this Confessional Statement, and that more particularly in order to institute a comparison between it and the Westminster Standards, to which in the judgment of this Church it forms a supplement, and of which at certain points it supplies the corrective. We agree that on certain topics the Statement does express the substance of the Westminster Symbols, and do not call for comment on our part. We agree also that some of the additional convictions expressed are acceptable statements of Christian truth and duty. It

is necessary to concentrate attention on a few articles and statements that merit criticism.

Art. II "Of Divine Revelation"

This article we feel is distinctly faulty in that the clear-cut qualitative distinction between natural and supernatural revelation is not drawn with clearness and definiteness. It is true that the insufficiency of the revelation in nature, the mind of man, and the history of nations is declared; but the impression created by the weak comparative in the words, "that a clearer revelation came from men who spake from God," is that the difference in content is one of degree and not one of kind. Any statement of the content of divine revelation that fails to distinguish very expressly and sharply between the revelation that is natural and universal, but falling short of salvation, and the revelation that is special, supernatural, and redemptive is decidedly culpable and justifiably liable to suspicion. This holds with special force in these times when, under the influence of the evolutionary bias in the study of comparative religion, the lines of distinction between heathen religion and Christianity tend to be obliterated. When the Westminster Standards were framed, there may have been less ostensible occasion for emphasis upon this distinction; and yet how favourably does the Confession compare in the matter. "Although the light of nature and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary unto salvation: therefore it pleased the Lord, at

sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself and to declare that His will unto his Church," etc. (Conf. of Faith. I.1.) Here one has the satisfaction that the line of distinction is boldly drawn.

Art. III. "Of Holy Scripture"

We must confess to considerable hesitancy with regard to the import of the words that the writers of Holy Scripture "though moved by the Holy Spirit, wrought in accordance with the laws of the human mind." We are thoroughly appreciative of them in so far as they guard against a purely mechanical theory of inspiration. It is true that the Scriptures have come to us through human instrumentality, and that they bear unmistakable marks of this as well as express testimony to it. It is true also that Scripture having that human aspect involved for the writers labour in accordance with the laws of the human mind. But what we dispute is the legitimacy of making a statement of the way in which the Word of God came to us through human instrumentality in terms of this one mode of activity, namely, operation in accordance with the laws of the human mind. When we think of Scripture as the product of men who wrote as the organs of the Divine Spirit, we must leave room for a great multiplicity of process and activity, and it is just because this statement appears to us too narrow to allow for that multiplicity and variety that we take exception to it. We must not confine God's activity in this matter, nor His use of human organs as the channels of His revelation to the laws inherent in the human mind. If the words we criticise were not intended to do this, then we are glad; but at the same time contend

that that ought to be explicitly expressed, and the possibility of the interpretation we have criticised entirely eliminated.

This article concludes by speaking of the Scriptures as "an infallible rule of faith and practice, and the supreme source of authority in spiritual truth." Why does it speak of the Scriptures as "an infallible rule of faith and practice," when the preamble speaks of them as "the only infallible and final rule of faith and practice"? Does it not, so far as the "Statement" is concerned, leave open the possibility of another infallible rule of faith and practice, and if so is not the permission of the possibility of such an interpretation too precarious? The Westminster Standards do not leave open this possibility; but we have been told in the preamble that wherever "the Statement" deviates from the Westminster Standards, its declarations are to prevail. Does this not constitute a deviation?

If the designation of the Scriptures as "the supreme source of authority in spiritual truth" implies, as it to us very definitely suggests, that the authority of scripture applies only to the sphere of spiritual truth, then we hasten to register our emphatic protest. It is impossible to isolate the teaching of Scripture on what is generally called moral and spiritual truth from its teaching on other questions. If it is the Word of God and infallible in the realm of spiritual truth, it is the Word of God and infallible throughout on all questions of which it speaks, and in all its statements in the sense in which they were intended. Consequently it must be authoritative, and supremely authoritative on other questions, besides those in the realm of spiritual truth, in so far as it treats of them. For example, what it expresses or clearly implies in the realm of nature and history is infallible and therefore authoritative. The attempt to limit the authority of Scripture to spiritual truth pure and simple, besides being wholly unscientific from the exegetical and dogmatic standpoints, is distinctly pernicious in its tendency to overthrow the very principle of the authority of Scripture as the only rule of faith and practice.

Art. IV "Of Creation"

In this article we simply comment upon the last sentence that man was created "free and able to choose between good and evil, and therefore morally responsible." The ground upon which the "therefore" of the last clause rests is probably all the foregoing definitions of that in which man's spiritual nature consists, and not simply the assertion that he was created "free and able to choose between good and evil." But even if this latter assertion is not the sole ground affirmed, yet it must be included as part of it, and coming next to the final conclusion will we think bear the greater part of the burden in the thought of the reader.

Now it may be instructive to be reminded that the power of contrary choice is not the ground of moral responsibility. We do not hold that the power of contrary choice was given man at the beginning to constitute him a free agent and thus ground his moral responsibility. Man would have been a free agent and therefore morally responsible, even though he had been immutably confirmed in holiness and righteousness. He was given the power of contrary choice for purposes of probation. Since the fall man is wholly indisposed and made opposite to all good, and unable by reason of innate corruption to choose what is well-pleasing to God, so that with respect to those things that are of highest moment, he has not the power to choose between good and evil. Yet with respect to these things and in that realm he is undeniably a free agent and morally responsible. In glory "the will of man is made perfectly and immutably free to do good alone,"¹ and yet the glorified saints are free agents and morally responsible. One cannot but entertain the fear that the framers of this statement have not grasped the real significance of the very vital distinction drawn in the Western Church between freedom or liberty and ability. Liberty on which responsibility is grounded is voluntary self-determination, self-motion, and this remains even where man has the moral ability for only one course of action. Freedom just means that man acts according to his

¹ Conf. of Faith, IX. 5.

nature or character without external compulsion. It was one of the errors of Pelagius that he failed to understand this, and very closely related to this were his fundamental theses that ability limits obligation and that man has plenary ability to do all that God requires of him. It is lamentable to observe that the Pelagian virus has surreptitiously and in an apparently harmless way found its way into the thought of branches of the Christian church where Pelagianism in its bald form is expressly repudiated. We must ever be on our guard against it for it is simply naturalism, and naturalism is the sworn and ever-active foe of Christianity.

Art. IX "Of Salvation"

Here our salvation is rightly traced to its ultimate source in the infinite love of God which moved Him to enter into a covenant of grace with His Only-begotten Son. But it does, to say the least, appear strange that the reference to this covenant should be wholly lacking in any reference to election and predestination to life. In the Reformed theology the covenant made with the Son is conceived of as in subordination to the decree of election and predestination to life of those elected. Our Westminster Standards are explicit in this regard. "God doth not leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery into which they fell by the breach of the first covenant, commonly called the Covenant of Works: but of his mere love and mercy delivereth his elect out of it, and bringeth them into an estate of salvation by the second covenant commonly called the Covenant of Grace." "The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him with all the elect as his seed." "The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that He freely provideth and offereth unto sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by Him; and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in Him, promiseth and giveth His Holy Spirit to all the elect to work in them that faith with all other saving graces etc."² "God having out of his mere good pleasure

² Larger Cat. Qs.30-32.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XIII. FALSE BRETHREN AND A TRUE GOSPEL

Then after fourteen years again I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking along also Titus; and I went up according to revelation; and I laid before them the gospel which I am preaching among the Gentiles, and privately before those who were of repute, lest perchance I should run in vain or should prove to have run in vain. But not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. But on account of the privily brought in false brethren, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, in order that they might bring us into bondage—to whom not even for an hour did we yield by way or subjection, in order that the truth of the gospel might remain with you (Gal. 2:1-5, in a literal translation).

The Case of Titus

THE first part of this passage has been treated in the last two articles. We noticed last month that Paul conferred with the leaders of the Jerusalem Church not because he needed to receive any commission from them or through them (since his commission came to him directly from Christ), but in order to stop the propaganda of the Judaizers, who had falsely appealed to the original apostles against Paul. The same thing will become even clearer through our present study.

"But not even Titus who was with me," says Paul, "being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." The Judaizers at Antioch—supposing our provisional identification of the event of Gal. 2:1-10 with the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:1-29 to be correct—had demanded that all Gentile converts be circumcised. "But as a matter of fact," Paul says, "not even the Gentile Titus who was there with me in Jerusalem itself, the very centre of Judaism, was compelled to be circumcised. In his case at least, venturing as he did into the holy city, compromise might have

seemed to be in place. But as a matter of fact there was no compromise at all. Not even he was circumcised, to say nothing of the Gentiles who were out in the Gentile world."

What does Paul imply by the word "compelled"? Does he mean that the pillars of the Jerusalem Church demanded that Titus be circumcised, but that he (Paul) simply refused to accede to their demand? Certainly he does not mean that. If it had come thus to a breach between him and the Jerusalem leaders, the "right hand of fellowship," which he mentions in verse 9, would have been impossible. What is much more probable is that the Judaizers demanded the circumcision of Titus but the leaders agreed with Paul in refusing to do as they asked. However, we must not attempt to read too much between the lines. All that Paul clearly tells us is that his going up and laying his gospel before the leaders of the Jerusalem Church did not necessitate even the circumcision of Titus, a Gentile who was right there with him in Jerusalem itself.

False Brethren

"But," Paul continues, "on account of the privily brought in false brethren . . .". The grammatical structure of what follows is exceedingly difficult. The words, "on account of the privily brought in false brethren," constitute a prepositional phrase. A prepositional phrase is usually adverbial; it usually modifies a verb. At any rate, it makes no sense by itself. If I meet a man on the street and say to him simply, "On account of the privily brought in false brethren," he naturally thinks that something has interrupted me, and that I was going on to tell him something that *happened* or that ought to happen on account of those false brethren.

Now the trouble is that Paul seems to use the prepositional phrase here in just such a disconnected way. It is true, a

good many words follow the prepositional phrase in the rest of verse 4 and in verse 5. But these words are all of them in two relative clauses; and these relative clauses do not complete the meaning of the prepositional phrase, but are simply adjectives modifying the noun "false brethren" within the prepositional phrase. The skeleton of the verses is: "But on account of the privily brought in false brethren, who came in privily, to whom we did not yield for an hour . . ." It will at once be seen that the sentence, provided it be regarded as beginning with verse 4, is never brought to completion. Paul does not tell, as he would have had to tell in order to complete the sentence, what happened on account of the privily brought in false brethren. There is no verb for the prepositional phrase to modify.

A Broken Sentence?

In view of this difficulty, a number of commentators say simply that verses 4 and 5 constitute an "anacoluthon"—that is, Paul begins a sentence which he breaks off before it is completed, such long and such weighty relative clauses having been brought in as modifiers of the noun in the initial prepositional phrase that that phrase is never given the verb that it was originally intended to modify. If this view of the structure be correct, opinions may differ as to what Paul was intending to say when he began the sentence. Probably he was intending to tell something of the trouble or discussion which arose in the Jerusalem Church on account of the Judaizers' contention that Titus should be circumcised. But inasmuch as he has already, in one of the relative clauses modifying the noun in the prepositional phrase, told what the upshot of the discussion was—namely that he did not yield for a moment—he does not pedantically go back to review the discussion itself. Instead, he breaks the

sentence off with a kind of impatience and goes on to something else.

An anacoluthon is not always a defect in style. Sometimes it may express very well the writer's feeling of impatience; sometimes it is more impressive, because of what it does not say, but only leaves the reader to supply, than the most regular sentence-structure would be. It is used in some passages very effectively by Paul.

But this particular anacoluthon, if anacoluthon it be, is of a rather unusual kind. It is not surprising, therefore, that many commentators have sought to avoid finding it in the passage. That can be done, if at all, only by taking the prepositional phrase, "on account of the privily brought in false brethren," with something that *precedes*, so that verse 4 would not begin a new sentence at all.

A Test Case

Some, for example, have supposed that the prepositional phrase modifies a verb "was circumcised," to be supplied from the preceding sentence. "Not even Titus," these expositors would make the passage mean, "was *compelled* to be circumcised; but it happened—that is, Titus was circumcised—on account of the privily brought in false brethren."

This interpretation must certainly be rejected. Paul could hardly have circumcised the Gentile Titus at Jerusalem; for that would have been a desertion of his great principle. It would have been totally different from the circumcision of the half-Jew Timothy at Lystra (Acts 16:1-3). Titus presented a test case; and to have yielded with regard to him would certainly seem to involve betrayal of the cause. Moreover, if Paul *had* yielded, surely he would have been obliged to explain his action in far clearer terms than would then be found in Gal. 2:3-5; he could hardly have said simply: "Not even for an hour did we yield by way of subjection."

A far more likely suggestion is that which regards not the circumcision of Titus, but the non-circumcision of him, as the thing which is explained by the prepositional phrase at the beginning of verse 4—the thing which took place "on account of the privily brought in false brethren." "Not even Titus," Paul would say in accordance with this interpretation, "was compelled to be circum-

cised; and that—namely, the non-circumcision of Titus—was on account of the privily brought in false brethren." In other words, if the false brethren had not been there, Titus might have been circumcised; but their general contention about the Gentile converts made the question about Titus a test case, so that yielding even in that case became impossible.

This interpretation also must be pronounced improbable. In the first place, it may well be doubted whether Paul would ever have agreed to the circumcision of Titus even if the Judaizers had not been there; and, in the second place, the supplying of the idea of non-circumcision with the prepositional phrase is very unnatural and very unlikely to occur to any ordinary reader.

An Explanatory Phrase?

Much more worthy of consideration than either of these two interpretations is that which regards the prepositional phrase, "on account of the privily brought in false brethren," as "epexegetical"—we trust that the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will pardon us for the use of a grammatical term occasionally if we promise not to do it too often—as epexegetical, we say, of the words "compelled to be circumcised" in the preceding verse. The connection would then be: "Not even Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised—compelled to be circumcised, I mean, on account of the privily brought in false brethren." The prepositional phrase at the beginning of verse 4 would thus merely define a little more closely the kind of compulsion which is being denied in verse 3, the kind of compulsion which the Judaizers desired but which as a matter of fact was not carried out.

This interpretation gives an excellent sense, and possibly it is correct. The only question is whether the prepositional phrase can be understood as epexegetical of a word or phrase in what precedes without some clearer indication than Paul actually gives us in the text. The repetition of the word or phrase of which the added phrase is epexegetical—in this case the words "compelled to be circumcised"—is perhaps as much required in Greek as it is in English. We were obliged to repeat the words "compelled to be circumcised"

in order to make the meaning clear in English. Would not Paul have been obliged to repeat them if that was the meaning that he had intended in the Greek?

An Unusual Interpretation

These difficulties in the interpretations so far considered lead us to consider another interpretation, which, it must be confessed, has met with scarcely any favor from the commentators. According to this interpretation, the prepositional phrase, "on account of the privily brought in false brethren," modifies not any word or phrase in what immediately precedes but the verbs in verses 1 and 2; and what Paul is explaining by the prepositional phrase is the thing that most required explanation—namely, his going up to Jerusalem and laying his gospel before the leaders of the Jerusalem Church. "I went up to Jerusalem," Paul would be saying if this interpretation is right, "and laid my gospel before the leaders: That might look like subordination on my part. But as a matter of fact it involved no subordination or compromise at all. So little did it involve compromise that not even Titus who was right there with me in Jerusalem had to be circumcised. On the contrary, it really happened—that is I went up to Jerusalem and laid my gospel before the leaders—not on my account, as though I needed endorsement from anyone, but on account of the privily brought in false brethren, whose propaganda needed to be stopped by a word from the very leaders to whom they themselves appealed."

This interpretation is for the most part rejected with scant consideration by modern commentators, on the ground that the verbs with which it connects the prepositional phrase lie too far back to be in the mind of the reader when the prepositional phrase is read. But the force of this argument is weakened when one sees that those verbs in verses 1 and 2 express the main point of the passage, and the point which was most open to misunderstanding. By denying the circumcision of Titus in verse 3, Paul has stated what his going up to Jerusalem and laying his gospel did *not* involve; it is therefore quite in order for him to tell, as he does according to the proposed interpretation of verses 4 and 5, what those actions *did* involve.

The Dangers of Originality

It is only with very great diffidence that we propose an interpretation which, while not at all original with us, has met with general rejection. The Bible has had many readers during the past nineteen hundred years; many minds have applied themselves to the interpretation of it. Where our mind differs from almost all the others, we are usually inclined to suspect that it is our mind that is wrong, and not the mind of so many wiser and more learned men. We are sometimes amazed at the sublime confidence with which modern expositors or translators put forward idiosyncrasies of their own in the interpretation of the Scriptures as though they stood as firm as Holy Writ itself. A man can sometimes apply criticism very profitably to himself before he applies it to others.

All that we can say is that the interpretation just proposed does seem to commend itself to us anew whenever we come back to a fresh reading of this much discussed passage. We are very far indeed from thinking that it is certainly correct, and have not even ventured to incorporate it in the translation at the beginning of this article.

Fortunately the three interpretations which we have designated as possible—unlike the two decisively rejected ones—are very similar in their ultimate implications. Whether (1) Paul begins at verse 4 a new sentence which he breaks off in an anacoluthon, or whether (2) he is simply defining a little more closely the kind of compulsion which might have been exerted in the case of Titus but as a matter of fact was not carried through, or whether (3) he is explaining further his action in going up to Jerusalem and laying his gospel before the leaders—an action capable of much misunderstanding—in any case, Titus was not circumcised and would not under any circumstances have been circumcised.

Having thus considered as best we can the general structure of verses 4 and 5, we turn now, very briefly, to certain details in those verses.

Plain Language

Paul here calls the Judaizers "false brethren," and the meaning of that term is clear. "Brother" in Paul's Epistles means "fellow-Christian," and thus a

"false brother" is a man who claims to be a Christian or is thought to be a Christian and yet is not, or does not show himself by his present actions to be, a Christian at all. It is not a pleasant term, but the reason why it is not a pleasant term is that the thing that it designated was not a pleasant thing. These Judaizers might have seemed to a superficial observer to be true disciples, but in their heart of hearts, Paul seems to mean, they were Pharisees rather than disciples of Jesus Christ. They were depending upon their own works for salvation, and according to the apostle Paul a man cannot possibly do that if he is to be saved. So Paul calls them false brethren. Unlike the leaders of the modern Church the apostle Paul believed in calling things by their true names.

These false brethren were "brought in secretly" and "came in secretly." The notion which we have translated by the word "privily" or "secretly" is not definitely expressed in the words which Paul uses, but it seems rather clearly to be implied. What Paul means is that these men came into a place where they did not belong.

Into what place were they "brought in" and into what did they "come in"? Our first impulse might be to say, "Into the Church in general," these words being thus merely explanatory of the term "false brethren." But it is natural to give the words a more special reference; it is natural to take them as referring to the action of the Judaizers in coming into the Church at Antioch. Certainly that action as it is described in Acts 15:1 is most aptly designated by these words of Paul. This reference of the words—at least of the word translated "came in privily"—is practically certain if our suggested interpretation of the phrase "on account of the privily brought in false brethren" be correct. In that case, the coming of the false brethren into the Antioch Church would clearly be designated as the occasion for Paul's going up from Antioch to Jerusalem.

Christian Liberty

The liberty which these Judaizers came in to spy out was particularly the liberty of the Gentile Christians, which

Paul can call "our liberty" because he shares it with them. But at bottom it was a liberty possessed by all Christians whether Jews or Gentiles. It was the liberty which a man has when he gives up the vain effort to establish his own righteousness before God and trusts only in the atonement which Christ accomplished on the cross.

That liberty was being attacked by the Judaizers when they asked the Gentile converts to keep the ceremonial law. But it is also being attacked in the modern Church when men seek by their own efforts to attain salvation by exhibiting "the spirit of Jesus" in their lives. Now as always true liberty is to be obtained only when a man depends for his salvation unreservedly upon the grace of God.

To the demands of the Judaizers, Paul says, "we yielded not even for an hour by way of subjection, in order that the truth of the gospel might remain with you."

No inferences can legitimately be drawn from these last words with regard to the time when the Galatian churches were founded. Even if they were founded after that conference with the Jerusalem leaders of which Paul is writing in our passage, still Paul's action at that conference could be said to have been taken in order that the truth of the gospel might remain with them; since that action was taken for the benefit of Gentile converts generally, not only those who had already been won but also those who might be won afterwards. Moreover, the Greek words may possibly be translated, "in order that the truth of the gospel might remain for you" or "unto you," rather than "with you." The phrase does not prove indeed that the Galatian churches had not been founded before the conference, but it also does not prove that they had been founded then. It sheds no clear light, one way or the other, either upon the question of the destination of the Epistle (to North or South Galatia) or upon the question of the identification of the conference (with the famine visit of Acts 11:30; 12:25 or with the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:1-29). Those questions will have to be decided, if they can be decided at all, on the basis of other evidence.

The Truth About the Presbyterian Church—Continued

three weekly church papers, *The Presbyterian Advance*. The other two weekly papers are either subservient or complacent toward the drift of the Church; and it is proposed that the total number of weekly church papers shall be reduced to two, which shall be subsidized and promoted in a monopolistic way. Presentation of ecclesiastical issues by independent papers can be hindered at any time by an arbitrary power given to the Stated Clerk.

Under such a régime, what chance is there for the despised evangelical party in the Church even to obtain a hearing? Be it remembered that the ecclesiastical pressure against it, of which we have been speaking, is reinforced by the vast pressure of the world at large. Adherents of the gospel of Christ—and we mean whole-hearted adherents of it, not those who give it lip-service, or are willing only to propagate it and not to defend it, or do not believe in controversy, or make their preaching "positive and not negative," or use any of the other miserable phrases by which men seek to conceal from themselves and others the real feebleness of their faith and coldness of their love—whole-hearted adherents of the gospel of Christ, we say, are faced today by an overwhelming weight of public opinion. The daily press, though by no means so unfair as the ecclesiastical papers, is for the most part hostile or at least devoid of understanding; it reflects naturally the prevailing popular attitude; it is usually willing to believe the worst of the adherents of an unpopular cause. The secular magazines present for the most part only the opposing view; the schools and colleges have become agencies of propaganda against this unpopular faith. With this vast opposition of the world the machinery of our Church is making common cause. It too uses the current phrases of modern unbelief; it too discourages "controversy"; it too belittles what it regards as divisive contentions; it too, at least in many of its prominent representatives, represents the blessed facts of the Gospel as merely "theories," among

other possible theories, to explain the vague generalities that are so dear to an unbelieving world.

Under such conditions, faced as they are by the opposition of the world, faced by the opposition more bitter still of an increasingly apostate Church, misrepresented, despised, ridiculed, tried in secret courts so that the ridiculousness of the charges against them cannot become generally known, silenced in church assemblies—under such conditions, we say, what help is there for the adherents of a gospel which now as always is diametrically opposed to the thoughts and aspirations and purposes of the generality of mankind?

The answer to that question is perfectly plain. There is no help for believers in the gospel save one, but that help is sure. It is found at the mercy-seat of God.

When shall that help be used, my brethren? When shall we cease numbing ourselves with a baseless optimism; when shall we cease saying that the Presbyterian Church is "essentially sound"; when shall we be willing to face the facts before God?

Facing the Facts Before God

The facts, alas, are perfectly plain to the man who is not afraid to see. Two mighty forces have been contending for the control of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. One is the religion of supernatural redemption that is presented in the Bible and in the Confession of Faith; the other is the naturalistic or indifferentist Modernism that finds expression in the Auburn Affirmation. Between these two forces, there are many attempts at compromise. We do not presume to look into the hearts of men; we do not presume to say just who in the Church is a Christian and who is not; we do not presume to say how far a man can mistakenly serve the cause of unbelief and yet be united to Christ by faith. But whatever may be said about individual *men*, it is perfectly clear that the two *forces* are diametrically opposed; it is perfectly clear that between the Bible and the Auburn Affirmation there can be no peace but only deadly war.

It is perfectly clear, moreover, that in this warfare the anti-evangelical contention has so far won the victory. Of what avail is it to point to general professions of adherence to the faith of the Church by this ecclesiastical official or that? The simple fact is that the *policy* of the church organization as a whole is exactly that which so effectively serves the purposes of unbelief in all the churches of the world—discouragement of controversy, tolerance of anti-Christian propaganda, bitter intolerance of any effort to make the true condition of the Church known, emphasis on organization at the expense of doctrine, neglect of the deep things of the Word of God. Let us not deceive ourselves, my friends. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. includes, indeed, many true Christian men and women; but in its corporate capacity, through its central organization, it has ceased to witness, in any clear and true sense, to the Lord Jesus Christ.

With this drift away from the Faith, there has gone a lamentable moral decline. Life and doctrine, here as always, have been shown to be closely connected. When Christian doctrine is neglected or denied, Christian living sooner or later is abandoned too.

We are not referring to the sins of human weakness to which all Christians are subject. Those sins, alas, are always with us; and with regard to them it must ever be said: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." But we refer to the blatant and settled sins of our ecclesiastical habits—not the sins of this individual or that, but the sins that seem to be inherent in the entire corporate life of the Church.

Loving Words or Loving Deeds

At this point, two errors need to be rooted out of our minds and hearts and lives.

The first error is the ancient error which applies a laxer standard of morality to the Church than the standard that is applied to the world. Unfairness and oppression and dishonesty

are somehow thought to become virtues when they serve ecclesiastical ends; an odour of sanctity in the Church is thought to take the place of humble moral considerations which prevail generally between man and man.

That error must be rooted out of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. if it is to be a Christian church in fact as well as in name. Secret courts, depriving a man of his right to an open trial, are disgraceful and outrageous in the world at large; they are even more disgraceful and outrageous in a church that bears the name of Christ. Wrong does not become right merely by being within ecclesiastical walls.

The second error which needs to be rooted out of our minds and hearts is the error that makes loving words a substitute for loving deeds. We hear much about love in the Church today; but is it really love? Oh, no, my friends. If a man really loved the Church of Jesus Christ, if he really loved with his whole heart the little ones for whom Christ died, he would never repeat the vain swelling words of a foolish optimism; he would never cry "Peace, peace," when there is no peace; he would never conceal from the Church its deadly peril; he would never exalt the smooth working of ecclesiastical machinery above the simple principles of openness and fair play; he would never cherish the wicked and heartless dream of a monopolistic church union; he would never consent to force a single congregation into a church union against its conscience or seek to take its property from it if it declined to conform; he would never deprive any man of his right to an open trial. Instead, he would present the real facts without fear or favor; he would love with a love like that of the Apostle Paul, who wrote to the Corinthian Christians a truthful letter that cost him many tears. Above all, in this crisis of the Church's life he would come before God in a very agony of prayer—not the prayer that is an evasion of witness-bearing but the prayer that makes even weak men brave. He would pray that those who are leading the Church astray may be convicted of their deadly error; he would pray that the great attack just launched in the name of church union

against the Faith of our Church may by God's grace be brought to naught; he would pray that the coldness and indifference of us who hold to the old gospel might be burned away in the flame of the divine love; he would pray that such a thing as secret courts may hardly so much as be named among us; he would pray that the Church may renounce the things of darkness and may return to the light and openness and liberty of the gospel of Christ.

Who, in this time of crisis, will engage, very earnestly and very humbly, in such a prayer?

The Confessional Statement of the U. P. Church—Continued

from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."³

The consequence of this defect appears later on in the same article in the obscurity and ambiguity that surround the statement that "the Son standing as the representative of sinners and their Mediator with God freely consented to secure for them a full salvation." For whom did Christ secure a full salvation? Assuredly we must always maintain, as this article very truly does, that the salvation wrought out by Christ is "sufficient for all and adapted to all"; but when we come to speak of full salvation being rendered secure, we cannot universalise this specific quality, neither can we afford to deal with it in indefinite and loose language. We cannot too carefully and unequivocally refer it to those and to those only who are actually saved. The clause at the end of the sentence, namely, "for all who believe on him," is so far removed that it is only a possible answer to the question we have asked. According to the construction of the sentence as a whole we are not shut down to that as the only possible interpretation. Consequently we hold there is obscurity and ambiguity where positive clearness and definiteness are demanded.

³ Shorter Cat. Q.20.

Art. XIV "Of the Atonement"

From what we have just said we naturally pass on to the consideration of this topic. This article defines atonement in terms of ransom, propitiatory sacrifice, substitution for sinful man, satisfaction to divine justice and holiness, and explicitly affirms that atonement thus defined is for all and made for the sin of the world. That is to say atonement defined in such terms has a wider reference with respect to mankind than the circle of those to whom as a matter of fact it is efficaciously applied; we can put no other interpretation on the words that "this atonement though made for the sin of the world, becomes efficacious to those only who are led by the Holy Spirit to believe in Christ as their Saviour." In other words the atonement as such has a universal reference, though its application is limited to those who believe. We can call it then surely with justice a doctrine of universal atonement. Probably our suspicion of the statements of article IX was not mistaken.

It becomes imperative to compare this doctrine of the atonement with that of the Westminster Confession. It runs: "The Lord Jesus by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God hath fully satisfied the justice of His Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him." "To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same," etc.⁴

When in a later chapter the Confession gives further definition of the nature of this satisfaction, it says, "Christ by His obedience did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to the Father's justice in their behalf."⁵ The doctrine is plain that those for whom Christ discharged the debt and made satisfaction are those who are justified and the justified are the effectually called. "Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely

⁴ Conf. of Faith VIII. 5, 8.

⁵ Conf. of Faith XI. 3.

justifieth."⁶ And effectual calling refers us back to an earlier chapter. "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life and those only He is pleased in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by His word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ."⁷ And again, "God did from all eternity decree to justify all the elect and Christ did in the fulness of time die for their sins and rise again for their justification."⁸

The teaching of the Westminster Confession is therefore unmistakable. It defines atonement as sacrifice, reconciliation, redemption, satisfaction to justice, discharge of debt, and states clearly that atonement thus defined is intended for those and for those only whose salvation it infallibly secures. They are the justified, the effectually called, those given to Christ by the Father, those whom God hath predestinated unto life, namely, the elect. The elect and the elect only are saved, and they are saved because by His atoning work Christ infallibly secured their salvation. "Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam are redeemed by Christ. . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved but the elect only."⁹

This is the doctrine of definite or limited atonement. It means that the atonement in its precise connotation was intended for a limited number of the human race, namely the elect. It is not, of course, limited to them in its sufficiency and suitability. It is suited to the condition of all, adequate to the needs of all, sufficient for the salvation of all, and freely offered to all. But what is to be marked is that the Westminster Confession does not say that the purpose of the atonement was the making the salvation of all men possible, nor the making a provision sufficient for all, but the infallible securing of the salvation of the elect and the purchase of an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for them.

⁶ Conf. of Faith XI. 1.

⁷ Conf. of Faith X. 1.

⁸ Conf. of Faith XI. 4.

⁹ Conf. of Faith III. 6.

Atonement as such is for those and for those only who are as a matter of fact saved. In the words of scientific theology impetration and application have the same extent. We cannot see that the definition of the "Confessional Statement" can be made in any way to square with this fundamental tenet of the Reformed Theology.

With the profession of a universal and thus the denial of a particular or definite doctrine of atonement a wedge is driven into the Reformed system of doctrine, the ultimate effect of which is to disrupt what is most precious in it. Immediately it changes the nature of the atonement itself, for an atonement that applies equally to all is an atonement that does not actually redeem any. To impugn or impair the scripture doctrine of the atonement is to touch the heart of our Christian faith. In the words of Dr. Warfield, "not only is the doctrine of the sacrificial death of Christ embodied in Christianity as an essential element of the system, but in a very real sense it constitutes Christianity."¹⁰ But an atonement that does not infallibly save is not the atonement that Christianity knows; it is not the atonement which is the rock of the believer's confidence and security. The Church of Christ must guard more jealously and define more skilfully, if she is to hold fast the faithful word as she has been taught.

Art. XI "Of God the Father"

We do not feel sure that this article in its teaching on the universal fatherhood of God represents accurately and safely the interpretation and formulation which the Biblical evidence warrants. But for the present we refrain from discussion. One statement in this article, however, demands comment. It is that beyond the Father's universal benevolence, "He so loved the world of humanity as to provide a common salvation at the cost of immeasurable self-sacrifice." This surely, occurring in a definition of the relation that God the Father sustains to all men, means that it was the love the Father had for all men in His relation to them as creative or providential Father that moved Him

¹⁰ B. B. Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, p. 435.

to provide salvation through the gift of His only-begotten Son. Now it is just this that we controvert. Whatever may be the character of the benevolence, or philanthropy, that is exercised by God towards all men we do not hold that this is the source and fount of the infinite sacrifice of the well-beloved Son. It is in the special, discriminating and electing love of God of which those and those only who are actually saved are the objects that we must find the spring of our salvation. God loved an innumerable company whom no man can number out of every nation, and kindred, and people, and tongue, and having set His everlasting and invincible love upon them, He sent His Son to redeem them, so that with infallible certainty and security they might be all without exception presented faultless before His presence with exceeding joy. "This is the Father's will which hath sent me" says our Lord "that of all which He hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day." If we try to universalize the love that issues in redemption by sacrifice, we have immediately got away from the particularism which alone is consistent with the character of God's love as electing, predestinating and redemptive, and which alone is true to scripture and satisfying to the enlightened human mind.

In conclusion we venture three general observations.

(I) This "Confessional Statement" we feel convinced attempts at several points to tone down in, or eliminate from the plan of salvation that consistent particularism which is so distinctive a feature of our Westminster Standards and which is the *sine qua non* of consistent Calvinism. In this we think it unfaithful to Scripture and to the Reformed Faith and directly prejudicial to the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of God.

(II) It exhibits frequently that vagueness and ambiguity so characteristic of the present-day theological temper. In this way it defeats the very purpose of a confession, and so far from being an attainment is a backward step from the progress the church is expected to make in the clearer and fuller

understanding and enunciation of revealed truth. At crucial points it beclouds the vision where it has been the supreme service and glory of our Reformed symbols to clarify it. And not only so; on vital issues it diverges from them.

(III) No one who dearly prizes the attainments in the accurate formulation of Christian truth that the historic Christian Church has under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and through so many centuries of controversy been able to achieve, and more especially the attainments that the Head of the Church has been graciously pleased to grant to the Reformed Church, and who with his whole soul desires to bear testimony to that truth through so much labour and sacrifice formulated and preserved, can suffer his testimony to be lowered and prejudiced by subscribing to this document. If he wants to preserve his own theological integrity, and the deposit of truth entrusted to him, he must out of loyalty to God and his own conscience refrain; it would be suicidal and traitorous.

Editorial Notes and Comments— Concluded

WELKER, Th.M. as published in *The Presbyterian* (Dec. 17th and 24th, 1931).

According to Mr. WELKER a great weakness of these materials is "their almost complete failure to provide definite and adequate and trustworthy instruction in the great essentials of the Christian faith such as: The lost condition of all mankind by nature; God's call or invitation to men to accept His salvation; true repentance; saving faith; the substitutionary and sacrificial atonement of CHRIST; justification; sanctification; the divine inspiration and infallible authority of the Scriptures; the triune nature of the GODHEAD; the true deity of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; the exclusive saviourhood of our LORD; the person and work of the Holy Spirit; the personal, visible and glorious return of our LORD."

The extent of Mr. WELKER's dissatisfaction with the lesson helps being furnished by our Board of Christian Education is indicated by the recommendations he urges upon said Board, to wit:

"(1) That only such persons be engaged to prepare our lesson helps as are thoroughly familiar with our Confession of Faith and can subscribe fully and freely to its teachings.

"(2) That provision be made at once for

much more definite, adequate and trustworthy instruction in the great essentials of the Christian faith.

"(3) That as a general practice only such prayers be printed in our lesson materials as are definitely offered in the name of the LORD JESUS CHRIST.

"(4) That Bible stories only be used in the Beginners and Primary story leaflets and that, in the main, sacred pictures only

be used in the picture rolls.

"(5) That provision be made in the materials for the Intermediate, Senior and Young People's departments for the systematic printing of suggested Bible readings and for the regular presentation of portions of the Shorter Catechism.

"(6) That provision be made at once for a new, careful and impartial study of the pedagogical merit of these publications."

Books of Religious Significance

CALVINISM, by Abraham Kuyper with an Introductory Chapter by Dr. Henry Beets. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. pp. 298. \$2.50

IT is difficult to speak adequately of this book without appearing to exaggerate its merits. The hand of the master appears on every page. Calvinism is here presented not so much as a dogmatic or ecclesiastical movement as a life and world system as over against Paganism, Mohammedanism, Romanism and Modernism. To what a small degree this book is a theological treatise, in the ordinary sense of the word, is indicated by the fact that its contents consist of six lectures on Calvinism a Life-system, Calvinism and Religion, Calvinism and Politics, Calvinism and Science, Calvinism and Art, and Calvinism and the Future. There are few books that we are disposed to commend more unqualifiedly than these lectures on Calvinism by the former Prime Minister of Holland.

It was Dr. Kuyper's conviction that if Christianity is to maintain itself as over against Modernism principle must be arrayed against principle, world and life view against world and life view. "As truly as every plant has a root," he declares, "so truly does a principle hide under every manifestation of life. These principles are interconnected, and have their common root in a fundamental principle; and from the latter is developed logically and systematically the whole complex of ruling ideas and conceptions that go to make up our life and world view. With such a coherent structure, Modernism now confronts Christianity; and against this deadly danger, ye Christians, cannot successfully defend your sanctuary, but by placing, in opposition to all this, a life and world view of your own, founded as firmly on the base of your own principle, wrought out with the same clearness and glittering in an equal logical consistency. Now this is not obtained by either Christian works or mysticism, but only by going back, our hearts full of mystical warmth and our personal faith manifesting itself in abundant fruit, to that turning

point in history and in the development of humanity which was reached in the Reformation. And this is equivalent to a return to Calvinism. There is no choice here. Socinianism died an inglorious death; Anabaptism perished in wild revolutionary orgies; Luther never worked out his fundamental thought. And Protestantism, taken in a general sense, without further differentiation, is either a purely negative conception without content, or a chameleon-like name which the deniers of the God-man like to adopt as their shield. Only of Calvinism can it be said that it has consistently and logically followed out the lines of the Reformation, and has established not only Churches but States, has set its stamp upon social and public life, and has thus, in the full sense of the word, created for the whole life of man a world of thought entirely its own" (p. 284). It will be thought by some that Dr. Kuyper claims for Calvinism much of what belongs in common to a large part of Protestantism; but none, we are sure, will be disposed to question the breadth and power of his discussion of what, even its enemies be judge, has been one of the most significant movements in human history.

The Wm. B. Eerdmans Company has rendered a distinct service in publishing a new edition of this masterly book—a book that was first published some thirty years ago but which has gained rather than lost in significance since its first appearance. The introductory chapter by Dr. Beets deals with "Calvinism's advances and set-backs since the 'Stone Lectures'" were published. It supplies us with a well-considered survey of world developments, favorable and unfavorable to Calvinism, during the last quarter of a century.

Shortly after the first publication of this book it was reviewed in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* by the late Henry Collin Minton, at one time Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It seems to us that we cannot do better than conclude our notice of this book with the paragraph with which he concluded his more scholarly consideration of it, to wit:

"We heartily wish that these lectures

could have a wide reading throughout the circles of American Presbyterianism. Many a crazier thing has been recorded than for some rich lover of the faith to buy up a whole edition of this book and put it in the hands of our younger ministers. It is invaluable as a source of sound information and as a tonic for an enfeebled allegiance. Many may say that the lecturer is extreme in his opposition to Modernism; there may, indeed, be more good in the *Zeit-geist* than he is able to see. [Were Dr. Minton writing today we do not think that he would even imply that Dr. Kuyper may have been extreme in his opposition to Modernism.] And yet, it is well to have all disguises torn away and the real core of anti-Christian Naturalism exposed. Certainly it is a great service that a man of such wide knowledge of the world, of such broad and vigorous grasp of thought, and of such robust faith in the life system which he essays to interpret and present, hailing from one of the early cradle-lands of Calvinism, should cross the Atlantic to deliver this wholesome message to his confreres in the Reformed Churches of America. And this message is timely just now. Many of those who, with small capital, slander Calvin and travesty Calvinism have the slenderest conception of who the one was or what the other has done. Calvinism is a world and life view which may challenge comparison, philosophically, scientifically, politically, historically, Scripturally, with any other which the mind of man has ever entertained. As well talk of revising the solar system as talk of de-Calvinizing free civilization or of revising its essential elements out of reflective Christianity. It is little to the point to inquire who is John Calvin that he should stand between us and God; it is much to the point to ask whether or not John Calvin caught and taught the truth of God. That he did, Dr. Kuyper firmly believes. The teaching of the intellectually organizing genius of the Reformation at Geneva was not simply a theological dogma; it was not simply a religious creed. It is a body of truth fitting perfectly into its place in the grand unity of all Truth, and so, in the organic evolution of historic processes; it has given an impulse and has left an impress in every sphere of human thought and in every department of human life, which the advancing ages only accentuate, and which the course of time can never erase."

S. G. C.

JOHN CALVIN: THE MAN AND HIS ETHICS, by Georgia Harkness. Henry Holt and Company. pp. 266. \$3.00.

ONE of the things that bears witness to the greatness of Calvin and the significance of Calvinism is the fact that their enemies do not find themselves able to ignore them. Consult the index to almost any outstanding modern book in the sphere

of religion, ethics, philosophy, science, politics, economics or what not and the chances are that you will find some reference to Calvin or Calvinism. Many of these allusions are misleading, even unintelligent, but they are rarely missing.

The author of this book is not only a woman but an ordained minister of the Methodist Church. She is confessedly opposed to Calvinism as a theological system. This does not mean, however, that she is blind to the greatness of Calvin or to the significance of Calvinism. While she thinks—mistakenly in our judgment—that such significance as attaches to Calvinism today is independent of its theological ideas, she can write as follows: "The thin, imperious theologian who taught predestination and ruled Geneva was one of the strongest personalities of all time. Frail in body, gigantic in intellect, and iron-clad in soul, he laid the stamp of his personality on future Calvinists, and others. He was a man of great faults and great virtues; and these faults and virtues were crystallized into a moral code which after four centuries is still effective in our social order." Again she writes: "The sixteenth century was a great century. It was the century of Raphael and Michelangelo, of Spenser and Shakespeare, of Erasmus and Rabelais, of Copernicus and Galileo, of Luther and Calvin. Of all these figures that gave greatness to this century, none left a more lasting heritage than Calvin."

While this book contains a chapter on the theology of Calvin—perhaps the least satisfactory in the book—its center of interest, as the title indicates, is the man and his moral ideals. Special significance attaches to what is said relative to Calvin's teachings as to the domestic relations, to economics and to politics. Considerable attention is given to Weber's theory that Capitalism is one of the fruits of Calvinism as well as to the claim that our political liberties are rooted in Calvinism.

It seems to us that this book is not inaccurately described by the phrase that its author uses to describe Calvin, i.e. it is a book of "great faults and great virtues." The author tries to be fair to Calvin and Calvinism and succeeds about as well as one can who is so little in sympathy with her subject of study. We have read it with interest and we trust not without profit and commend it to the attention of students of Calvin and Calvinism, especially to those who are accustomed to hear Calvin mentioned only that he may be condemned. While it exhibits evidence of wide study and research on the part of its author, we have discovered nothing to indicate that she is acquainted with the writings of present-day Calvinists. Apparently she has not so much as heard of Warfield and Kuyper, not to mention men like Barth and Brunner. That Dr. Harkness is poorly informed concerning the present-day status of Calvinism is indicated

by the fact that she can write: "Today, the adherents of Calvinistic churches number in their membership many thousands, and in churches indirectly influenced in form or doctrine by Calvin are many other thousands." Had she used the word "millions" instead of the word "thousands" her statement would have been much more accurate. While this book seems to us inadequate and somewhat misleading even as a study of Calvin's moral ideals and their application yet its treatment of Calvin is so fair and just as compared with that to which we are accustomed from non-Calvinistic sources that we are disposed to think that its influence will be decidedly wholesome—especially as we are of the opinion that it will appeal for the most part to non-Calvinists.

S. G. C.

PATHWAYS TO THE REALITY OF GOD.

By Rufus M. Jones, Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College. Author of "Studies in Mystical Religion"; "New Studies in Mystical Religion"; "Spiritual Energies," etc. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1931. \$2.00.

AMONG the many things of interest that might be mentioned in connection with this book of Professor Jones we shall limit ourselves to two that seem to be of most importance. The title of the book leads us to ask what the pathways are that according to Jones lead to God, and to what sort of a God Professor Jones would lead us.

In a sense it may be said that Jones wishes to lead us along the beaten pathways that all the saints of God have trod. He speaks of such pathways as faith, revelation, inspiration, Christ and prayer. But there are different ways of traveling on these pathways. There is the old familiar way, the way of Augustine, Luther and Calvin. Then there is the way of Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Kant and Hegel.

Jones has chosen the second of these two ways. He would have us think of the inspiration of the prophets and the apostles as at most a heightened form of the inspiration of the poets. In opposition to the "dogmatic bibliolotry" of orthodox theology he sets the position of Coleridge. "The ultimate test, now as in Coleridge's day, will be whether a passage, or a book, finds us, and finds us moreover at our deepest levels." (Cf. p. 162.) All revelation literature must be tested by this standard that Coleridge has set. (Cf. p. 150.) If there is to be any redemption it is not to be effected through the God-man Christ Jesus but through man as such. Christ Himself is one of the "peak-moments" that have appeared somehow on the long course of the "spiritual adventure" which we call the universe. (Cf. p. 145.)

By such ways as these Jones leads us to his God. That God we must now learn to find not so much beyond us as within us.

All the "pathways" have led to be sure to a "Beyond" but to a "Beyond within us" as Boutroux taught us. (Cf. p. 208.)

Summing up the entire position of Professor Jones we may say negatively that it is opposed to historic Christianity and Biblical theism and positively that it seeks to substitute for these a broad philosophy that is idealistic rather than naturalistic in its emphasis.

The argument for this broad idealistic philosophy that underlies so much of the current Modernism of the pulpit remains unconvincing here as elsewhere. The criticism that Jones and his fellow Idealists bring to bear upon the many forms of naturalism tells with equal force against their own position. Jones feels that we need some form of self-transcendence. Unless we did we would "forever remain victims of the 'egocentric predicament.'" (Cf. p. 212.) "We could never have dealings and commerce with a real world beyond our inward seemings." But the self-transcendence of

Jones cannot accomplish the task it is given to perform. The self-transcendence to which Jones holds is not only thought of as in analogy with the self-transcendence that we meet with in our every act of sense-perception but is actually thought of as an extension of the self-transcendence of our every mental act. Such a self-transcendence cannot lead us to a God who is anything more than quantitatively distinct from us. With all his efforts to overcome the quantitative concepts of science when speaking of God the author of this book does not succeed in doing so. Jones speaks of the Indian fakir throwing his coil of rope into the air and then climbing up hand over hand on the rope. We must continue to hold this as a fair illustration of the prevailing argument of the general idealistic philosophy that underlies Modernism till something radically different appears. "Like the tower of Babel, it fails to reach all the way up." (Cf. p. 50.)

CORNELIUS VAN TIL.

bulletin. We have never claimed more for Old Rehoboth than that it is the oldest Methodist Church west of the Alleghenies. I believe that it is the oldest Protestant Church west of the Alleghenies and is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, Methodist Church still in service.

Very truly,

CHAS. A. YORK.

Union, W. Va.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: CHRISTIANITY TODAY has meant so much in my life the past year. It has cleared up so many doubts and perplexities and has helped me to a greater faith and trust in Christ, that I felt I wanted to put it on my list of "Gifts for the Lord," even though it is but a small amount.

Yours for Christ, and His Kingdom.

MRS. FRED SPENCER.

Battle Creek, Mich.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: You may discontinue sending CHRISTIANITY TODAY to my address.

I have been a subscriber for at least a year and have greatly enjoyed your polemics against any who did not agree with you on theological questions particularly.

The reading of your journal has impressed me with the self-styled superiority of your group in matters relating to scholarship and interpretation. Indeed the "faith once for all delivered to the saints" is in your keeping. You are the only people who are teaching and preaching evangelical Christianity. All others are anathema.

The ability you possess to hurl invectives and sarcasm, ridicule and satire is beyond my poor ability to understand or appreciate. You insinuate that all signers of the Auburn Affirmation are unsound, dangerous, unevangelical, unscriptural, and what not. You classify yourselves as *real* scholars who probably have a private wire to the source of all truth and who may have the only right to interpret Scripture correctly according to the background of mediaevalism. You may be absolutely infallible in your system of doctrine as taught in the Scripture. Your particular interpretation of what the Westminster Confession of Faith teaches may be absolutely inerrant and you may desire to make that interpretation infallible. You may deny the right of others to think for themselves and to arrive at conclusions with the help of the Holy Spirit of God Who will guide us into all truth, if those conclusions differ from your own infallible judgments.

But, thank God, we are not under popery or anything that smacks of it but are free to follow the Spirit of the Living God wherever He will lead. When that freedom of the Christian man is circumscribed by dogma or doctrine, or interpretation, or system, or tradition, or legalism, or anything that may rob one of his freedom in God,

Letters to the Editor

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

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Enclosed please find P. O. Money Order for three dollars (\$3.00) for renewal of my own subscription and for two others as per enclosed slip.

No need to say who is sending the other two—just send them.

Am so thankful for your able and fearless contention for the faith.

To talk of peace and fellowship with "Auburn Affirmationists" is as iniquitous and as potent with disaster as Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab (2 Chron. 18:3 and 19:2). The Lord strengthen your hands to war a good warfare through the infallible "Sword of the Spirit."

Yours gratefully,

A. B. WINCHESTER.

Toronto, Can.

really reviews. What he says about the book he is discussing is clear, critical and ample. Dr. Machen's "Notes on Bible Exposition" are worth many times the price of the magazine. They are instructive, lucid and scholarly, as indeed all his writings are. Many of the articles contributed by the various contributors are of a high grade. We have four religious magazines coming to our house, all of them have strong qualities and are worth reading even though one does not agree with their point of view, but in my judgment CHRISTIANITY TODAY in its general makeup and subject matter is superior to any one of them and costs much less.

Sincerely,

D. B. TOMKINS.

Second Presbyterian Church,
Princeton, N. J.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am glad you reminded me that I had not renewed my subscription for CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I thought I had sent in my renewal subscription. Enclosed please find one dollar.

I am in thorough agreement with the aims and ideals of your magazine. I like, too, its general makeup and the high grade of its subject matter. Dr. Craig's editorials and articles are always timely, well written and interesting. I like your section of "Books of Religious Significance." The reviewer

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In the Mid-November issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, page 24, under the heading "The Tallest Church in the World" you carry an item about the proposed new John Street Methodist Church, New York City, in which you state that the present John Street Methodist Church is the oldest Methodist Church in the United States, having been built ninety years ago. One of the churches on the Union charge, of which I am pastor, was built in 1785 and is still in use as you will note from the enclosed

then we will cease being Christian and will revert to Pharisaism.

Your journal is a misnomer. It should be called "Mediaeval Christianity Today." The title you have given it is altogether too suggestive of "Modernism."

Your consistent method of belittling "the other side" is like the game played at the Fall Fairs—"Hit the nigger with the ball and get a cigar." You may get a cigar once in a while but the "dummy" continues to stare you in the face.

Sincerely yours,

C. HARRISON BECKER.

First Presbyterian Church,
Morrison, Ill.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: CHRISTIANITY TODAY is undoubtedly filling a very deeply felt lack among the periodicals of today. The space is not given largely to advertisement as is common but utilized with rich readable material.

Its welcome as a monthly visitor carrying forward the convictions of men standing for New Testament truth cannot be exaggerated. It is one which one may find pleasure in recommending to a friend. There is no doubt but it is in its infancy of success.

May your Seminary which has shown remarkable success continue in usefulness and service in training men to proclaim the unadulterated message of CHRIST as the only remedy for sin.

Yours sincerely

THOMAS B. LINDSAY,

Moderator of Pembina Presbytery,
Hamilton, N. D.

A Defective Creed

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: The proposal to include the Confessional Statement adopted by the United Presbyterian Church as a basis of union with the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., is regrettable. It is not worthy to stand beside the Westminster Standards, the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism. It lowers the Calvinistic banner, weakens the Calvinistic testimony. In five years, it appears that less than fifty copies of the Westminster Confession were sold by United Presbyterians, but thousands of their Confessional Statement circulated. Is that same tendency to spread on a greater scale through the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.? In Pittsburgh, prominent leaders of the United Presbyterians have spoken slightly of the Westminster Standards, and praised their Confessional Statement as a substitute. The preamble to the Confessional Statement says that "wherever it deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail." If this is interpreted broadly, the Westminster Standards will be consigned to oblivion, which is the present tendency of United Presbyterians.

Possibly more than thirty doctrinal statements of the Westminster Confession are omitted in this Confessional Statement. Such doctrines might operate as safeguards, to check vagaries of erratic men; and without them our Presbyterian Zion might resemble a city broken down and without walls. The old Confession's doctrine of war is that of nearly all Christendom, but the subject is omitted in this Confessional Statement. Quaker doctrine can be preached from Presbyterian pulpits, the new creed making no objection. The old creed opposes communism, a subject omitted from this new creed. Communism could be preached from Presbyterian pulpits, the new creed remaining silent. So too, the old creed condemns prayer for the dead, but the new, is dumb again.

But the most serious omission is that of preterition or reprobation, a departure from the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession, which states it thus: (Chap. 3:7) "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." When a proposed revision of this Confession was discussed in the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church, A.S.A., including the omission of this doctrine, Dr. Shedd argued against it, in a book, "Calvinism Pure and Mixed," in 1893, containing about 130 pages. It deals largely with election and preterition, with masterly arguments, for he was one of the most literary and logical of America's theologians. If it could be republished, nearly all of it is apropos for present discussions.

In a chapter on "The Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Decrees" he says that the doctrine of Westminster brings sin within the scope and under the control of the Divine decree. Again, that it includes both the tenets of election and preterition, consistent in doing so; that both are necessary in a creed in order to self-consistence. "What is preterition? It is God's passing by a sinner in the bestowment of *regeneration*, not of common grace. All men are blessed with common grace." "Both tenets must stand, or both must go." He considered it then a grave question, whether the Presbyterian Church shall adhere to the historical Calvinism with which all its past usefulness and honor are inseparably associated, or whether it shall renounce it as an antiquated system which did good in its day, but can do so no longer. In a chapter on "Preterition necessary to the sovereignty of God in election" he says that a sovereignty that has no alternative is no sovereignty at all. "A proposition to revise it so as to declare that God elects but does not pass by sinners, is neither consistency nor Calvinism. If adopted, the Northern Presbyterian Church will have an illogical

and mutilated creed, and will resemble a wounded eagle attempting to fly with but one wing."

And further, "It is said that the doctrine of preterition is not and cannot be preached. It does not require technical terms and syllogistical reasoning in order to preach a doctrine. Who so preaches the doctrine of the trinity, or of regeneration, or of original sin, or of vicarious atonement, or of endless punishment? The doctrine of preterition is preached whenever the herald proclaims to the transgressor of God's law that sin is guilt and not misfortune; that the criminal has no claim upon the pardoning power for pardon; that the Supreme Judge might justly inflict upon him the penalty which his sin deserves; that his soul is helplessly dependent upon the optional unobliged decision of his Maker and Savior; and that it is nothing but God's special grace in regeneration that makes him to differ from others who go down to perdition.—If these truths shall be revised out of the Confession, it is certain that they will be taught less and less, and will finally disappear from the religious experience."—"There never was an age when men more needed to be reminded that they are resisting the common grace of God, and rejecting his universal offer of mercy, and that in so doing they run the great hazard of God's preterition; of being passed by in the bestowment of regenerating grace."

Moreover, in English and foreign languages ever increasing millions are singing this doctrine of preterition. "Pass me not, O God my Father, sinful though my heart may be"; and "Pass me not, O gentle Savior; hear my humble cry." But if we preach and sing preterition why adopt a creed that omits it? Is this new creed supposed to be irenic? But it is a mistake to suppose a creed becomes irenic and satisfactory by omitting doctrines. Paul did not omit them. He told a group of presbyters, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Our Lord Jesus did not bring an irenic gospel when he said, "I came not to send peace but a sword." United Presbyterian fathers of former generations were trained to defend the Westminster Confession against all comers; and no objections have arisen that they did not refute. The wise plan is for these two denominations to unite only on the basis of the Westminster Standards. A neglect of these, together with a neglect of the Bible is an ailment that has affected too much all the great Presbyterian denominations of America. Only about a thousand copies of the Confession are circulated yearly by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. Calvinism is the gospel in its purest form, and it should be proclaimed in all languages on earth. And the earth affords no fellowship that is sweeter, more uplifting, more heavenly, than that of intelligent, loyal Calvinists.

CHAS. E. EDWARDS.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

News of the Church

Presbytery of Washington, D. C. Licenses Non-Affirmer of Virgin Birth

ON December 14 the Presbytery of Washington, D. C., voted to license to the Gospel ministry, Mr. Lucian Harper Kearns, a student of Union Theological Seminary. Six months previously, Mr. Kearns had appeared before the Presbytery, but the conferring of licensure had been deferred until he became clearer as to doctrines upon which he was not entirely in accord with the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Kearns was unable to affirm belief in the Virgin Birth of our Lord, although it is understood he did not expressly deny its possibility. On his reexamination in December, Mr. Kearns' sponsors took the Presbytery by surprise in reporting that the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. had already approved him, and designated him as a missionary to South America. They are said to have argued that since he had been approved by the Board "having on it four former moderators of the General Assembly;" that non-approval by the Presbytery would be unthinkable. Evidently acting under the spell of this noteworthy argument the Presbytery voted to confer licensure.

It is not yet known whether any complaint has been entered against this action. The attitude of the Board of Foreign Missions in this case has already caused a sharp reaction throughout the church wherever the facts have become known.

Board of Christian Education Reduces Salaries

IN view of the financial situation as it affects the Presbyterian constituency, the general secretary of the Board of Christian Education, William Chalmers Covert, and the administrative secretary, Harold McA. Robinson, with the concurrence of general directors of all departments, recently recommended a 10 per cent decrease in the salaries of staff and employees. Salaries of employees receiving \$1200 a year or under will not be subject to the reduction, and the first \$1200 of salaries of employees receiving from \$1200 a year to \$3000 a year will be exempt from the reduction. The full 10 per cent reduction will apply to the entire amount of salaries above \$3000. This proposal was approved by the Administrative Committee December 31, 1931, and will go into effect with the beginning of the next church year, April 1, 1932.

The Proposed "Presbyterian Church of America"

LATE in December and early in January, ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church were apprized of the final result of the labors of the "Joint Committee on Organic Union" of the two churches. A volume of 194 pages, containing much of the proposed basis of union and other information thereon, was mailed to all ministers of the two churches. Those receiving the book were requested to send any comments to the Joint Committee before March 1, 1932. The basis of union as drawn up may possibly be modified by the Committee after that date and before the Assemblies. It is obviously the object of those sponsoring this union to have a common basis adopted by both Assemblies and sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption in 1932. Even if there are no changes in the plan of union, it will have been before the ministers of the churches for study only from January until May 26, when both Assemblies meet—five months. The booklet has not been sent to the ruling elders at all, unless they have personally asked for it, nor has it even been submitted to the Presbyteries of either church for information and study. If changes are made subsequent to March 1, as the foreword clearly implies may be done, it is possible that the basis of union in its final form will not be before the church for study for more than a month before the Assemblies are asked to send it down for a yes-or-no vote of the Presbyteries.

Already voices have been raised in the church protesting against such undue haste; and demanding that the whole basis of union be before the church for suggestion or modification for at least one whole year before the Presbyteries are compelled to take or leave it all as a whole. Those who take this position point out that the Plan of Union introduces several new documents as proposed standards for the united church. They are, a new Book of Discipline (identical with the book sent last fall to the Presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. for information); a new Form of Government; and a new Directory for Worship. In addition the basis of union includes the "Confessional Statement" of the United Presbyterian Church adopted in 1925, (see the article by Prof. Murray in this issue) including the Preamble, with its statement that wherever "it (the Confessional Statement) deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail." The only subordinate standards now possessed by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. that would be retained would be

the Westminster Confession, as variously amended since 1729, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly. But these standards, though retained, are by the preamble to the Confessional Statement, to yield in case of any divergence from the Confessional Statement. In view of these radical facts, those opposing quick action are asking that the church be given time to consider all that may be involved.

The book contains (1) the Doctrinal Basis of Union; (2) the Categorical Question to be asked of Presbyteries in voting upon union; (3) the Formula of Subscription; (4) the Concurrent Declarations of the two Assemblies if and when union is effected; (5) Amendments to the Westminster Confession made by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1903; (6) the "Confessional Statement" of the United Presbyterian Church; (7) the Provisional Form of Government; (8) the Provisional Book of Discipline; (9) the Provisional Directory for Worship. Neither the Westminster Confession of Faith nor the Larger or Shorter Catechisms are included in the contents of the book.

Significant excerpts are as follows:

1. The Doctrinal Basis of Union

The Union shall be effected on the doctrinal basis of the Westminster Confession of Faith, together with the amendments adopted in 1903 by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, together with the Confessional Statement adopted in 1925 by the United Presbyterian Church of North America; and together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; all of which are recognized as being substantially identical in doctrinal teaching, and agreeable to and founded upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, acknowledged as the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

2. The Categorical Question*

Do you approve of the Union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the United Presbyterian Church of North America on the following basis:

(a) On the basis of the terms and provisions of the Plan of Union recommended to the respective General Assemblies of the said Churches, and herewith submitted by the General Assembly.

*This is the question which, as here formulated or in amended form, will, if the "Plan of Union" be approved by the Assemblies of the negotiating Churches, be submitted to the Presbyteries of these Churches for their direct and unqualified affirmative or negative votes.

(b) On the doctrinal basis of the Westminster Confession of Faith, together with the amendments adopted in 1903 by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, together with the Confessional Statement adopted in 1925 by the United Presbyterian Church of North America; and together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; all of which are recognized as being substantially identical in doctrinal teaching, and agreeable to and founded upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, acknowledged as the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

(c) On the basis of the provisional Form of Government, the provisional Book of Discipline, and the provisional Directory for Worship.

3. The Formula of Subscription

1. Do you believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of the living God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

2. Do you believe and acknowledge the system of doctrine professed by this Church as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Confessional Statement, as taught in the Word of God, and do you engage to adhere to and maintain its truths?

3. Do you approve the form of government and system of worship set forth in the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship of this Church, as founded on the Word of God?

4. Do you promise to be diligent in the cultivation of personal piety, endeavoring to adorn your profession by a course of life becoming the gospel and the ministry of Christ?

5. Do you promise to be a faithful student of the Word of God, and to preach the gospel of the Lord Jesus in its simplicity and fullness, beseeching men to be reconciled to God, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, seeking to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus?

6. Do you promise to give a dutiful attendance upon the judicatories of the Church, to submit yourself in the spirit of meekness to the authority of this presbytery and the superior judicatories, and to study the peace, purity and unity of the Church?

7. Are zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire to save sinners and edify the Church your great motive in entering upon the duties and the privileges of the office of the ministry?

8. Do you consent to take charge of this congregation agreeably to your declaration on accepting its call, and do you promise to perform all the duties of a pastor, administering the ordinances and laws of the Church, visiting and exhorting from house

to house, ministering to the sick, caring for the young, seeking to reclaim sinners and build up the disciples of Christ in Christian faith and life, and doing whatever else is incumbent on you as a minister of the gospel?

9. And these things you profess and promise through grace, as you would give in your account with joy at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints, and have an entrance ministered to you abundantly into His everlasting Kingdom?

4. The Concurrent Declarations

1. (a) In the event that the Plan of Union be adopted, the name of the united Church shall be THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA.

(b) Each of the two Churches uniting shall elect, according to provisions of its own Form of Government, a General Assembly to meet in 1934. The two Assemblies thus chosen shall first meet separately and, during such separate session or sessions, each one of the Assemblies shall be governed in its organization and proceedings by its present Form of Government.

(c) On the day of 1934, the commissioners of the two General Assemblies shall meet together and shall be constituted as one body which shall be known as THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA. Except as to representation, the procedure of this first General Assembly shall be ordered according to the Provisional Form of Government and the Provisional Book of Discipline submitted with this Plan of Union, these to be in effect until the adoption of a permanent Form of Government and a Permanent Book of Discipline by the united Church.

(d) All subsequent General Assemblies shall consist of commissioners chosen in the manner and on the basis of representation specified in the Form of Government in effect in the united Church.

2. Following union of the two Churches, the presbyteries and synods, regardless of boundaries, which are in existence within the organization of the respective bodies at the time of union, shall be recognized as valid judicatories of the Presbyterian Church of America until such time as changes may be effected in the manner herein provided.

3. (a) Should the Plan of Union be adopted, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America shall, each of them, at its meeting in 1933, select eight persons, five ministers and three ruling elders, to serve as members of a special commission of the General Assembly of the united Church. The convener of this special commission shall be the minister among its members who has had

longest service since ordination. When so convened the special commission shall elect its own officers.

(b) The duty of this Commission shall be to prepare, after due deliberation and after consultation with the parties most affected, and to present to the General Assembly of the united Church for approval, a plan of readjustment of boundaries of synods and presbyteries then existing and of such consolidations of these bodies as may be deemed desirable.

(c) The work of this commission is to begin as soon as possible after its members have been selected so that report, at least of progress, may be made to the first General Assembly of the united Church in 1934.

4. All ministers and churches included in the two denominations uniting shall be admitted to the same standing in the united Church which they may hold in their respective connections at the time union is consummated.

5. The official records of the two Churches shall be preserved and held as making up the history of the united Church.

6. So soon as practicable after union the General Assembly shall effect such reconstruction and consolidation of the several Boards and Agencies now belonging to the two Assemblies as will represent with impartiality the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the united Church. Provided, however, that no such action shall be taken with respect to the Women's General Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, unless and until their consent is given.

7. The corporate rights and property now held respectively by the two General Assemblies and by their respective Boards and Agencies shall be consolidated and applied for their several objects as defined and permitted by law.

8. The institutions of learning and the benevolent and charitable institutions, together with the endowment and other property, real and personal, owned by them, which are now under the control of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, or of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, shall remain in charge of and be controlled by the Boards of Trustees, or other managers, respectively, now in charge of such institutions, endowment and property, or by their successors, similarly appointed or elected; provided, that such institutions as are herein described and so related and controlled, shall be at liberty, for the furtherance of the purposes for which they were founded, and subject to the approval of the General Assembly of the united Church, to effect such affiliations and consolidations as are not inconsistent with their respective charters nor forbidden by the civil statutes. All the rights and power of control of such institu-

tions and their property and affairs as are now possessed or exercised by the General Assembly, or other ecclesiastical body of either church, shall be vested in and exercised by the General Assembly or other ecclesiastical judicatory or body of the united Church; provided, that the governing body of any said institutions shall be at liberty to enter such special arrangement or agreement with the ecclesiastical body controlling it as may enable said institution to preserve its integrity and maintain its present policy.

9. It is understood that in the matter of public worship, the "Psalter-Hymnal," the "Hymnal (Revised)," together with the "Book of Common Worship" now in use, are approved for use in the united Church as each congregation may desire. In the event of future books of praise, it is agreed that Psalms in an approved metrical version shall be given an ample place.

10. It is agreed that the provisions in the standards of each Church in the matter of marriage, divorce and remarriage, shall continue in force in each congregation of the two Churches forming the union, unless and until the united Church shall take action for itself in the matter.

The Preamble to the "Confessional Statement" of the United Presbyterian Church

The United Presbyterian Church of North America declares afresh its adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, as setting forth the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures, which are the only infallible and final rule of faith and practice. Along with this it affirms the right and duty of a living Church to restate its faith from time to time so as to display any additional attainments in truth it may have made under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, by constitutional action consummated June 2, 1925, it adopted the following Confessional Statement. This Statement contains the substance of the Westminster symbols, together with certain present-day convictions of the United Presbyterian Church. It takes the place of the Testimony of 1858, and wherever it deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail.

Subscription to the foregoing Subordinate Standards is subject to the principle maintained by our fathers, that the forbearance in love which is required by the law of God is to be exercised toward any brethren who may not be able fully to subscribe to the Standards of the Church, while they do not determinedly oppose them, but follow the things which make for peace and things wherewith one may edify another.

In keeping with its creedal declaration of

truth, the United Presbyterian Church believes that among the evangelical communions of the world there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and therefore, shunning sectarian temper, it cherishes brotherly love toward all branches of the Church Universal and seeks to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Reformed Presbyterians and Proportionate Giving

THE November issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY included a table on "Relative Per-Capita Giving," in which the statement was made that, according to the United Stewardship Council, the Southern Presbyterian Church had the first rank, giving on an average of \$9.01 per member. According to S. J. Paden, of New Concord, Ohio, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, or "Covenanters" have an even higher average. For the past five years yearly contributions have averaged \$48.72 per member. This clearly entitles the "Covenanters" to first place on the basis of known figures. Other interesting facts about this church are: it has an annual synod; eleven presbyteries; ninety-three congregations; one hundred and twenty ministers; forty-one foreign missionaries in four countries; one foreign missionary for each one hundred and sixty-seven communicants; and twenty-two home missionaries working among three nationalities. The great aim and purpose of this Church is to honor Christ in (1) the conversion of men, (2) the evangelism of society and (3) the Christianizing of nations.

It is admitted by all who have seen these facts that the "great" denominations could well afford to initiate the zeal and works of this splendid church.

Overture Concerning Congregational Rights

IN order that the congregations of which the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is composed should have every right and liberty to which they are entitled in either joining or not joining the proposed "Presbyterian Church of America," the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, Minister of Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on January 4, introduced the following overture in the Presbytery of Philadelphia. The measure will be voted on at the meeting of Presbytery on March seventh.

The text of the overture is as follows:

"TO THE VENERABLE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A., REQUIRED TO MEET IN DENVER, COLORADO, THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF MAY, 1932, GREETINGS:

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia, in regu-

lar session this seventh day of March, 1932, respectfully overtures the General Assembly, praying that:

"In accordance with well-recognized reformation and Presbyterian principles, provisions be inserted in the plan of union with the United Presbyterian Church of North America, when and if submitted to the presbyteries, providing for the rights of minorities who may not be able, in good conscience, to enter the proposed union; guaranteeing the right of any congregation, if voting not to enter the proposed union at a meeting duly called, to retain its properties, free from any control by or right of reversion to the said united Church; to the end that the said proposed union, when and if consummated, may be free from the intense bitterness and strife occasioned in other countries by the un-Presbyterian attempted application of coercion and force."

Presbyterians the world over have been shocked and grieved by the bitterness arising from the unsuccessful attempt to force Canadian Presbyterians into the "United Church of Canada," against their will. It is declared by many that to force congregations to join in a union simply because it is approved by the majority, is a reversion to the methods of the sixteenth century. The solution at last found in Canada, and in the recent Scottish union, is the solution recommended in the overture above. While not claiming it to be an ideal solution, its sponsors believe that it is only just and fair to allow any congregation that cannot conscientiously accept the doctrinal basis of the proposed "Church of America" to go its own way and retain its own property. Any attempt to force congregations into the union against their will, or to take their property away from them if they refuse to join would, it is declared, be a blot forever on the name of the united church.

The "Barnhouse Case"

THE case of the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., which has attracted wide attention, has apparently been ended. The Philadelphia morning newspapers of January 8th all contained the information, released by the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania appointed to try Mr. Barnhouse, that he had been found guilty of having violated his ordination vows and of having transgressed the ninth commandment. Upon the publication of the judgment, it was discovered that the Commission had not made it in accordance with the law of the Church in that it did not specify the actual offenses of which Mr. Barnhouse was convicted, or the actual offenses of which he was judged innocent. The main point made by the commission, however, seems to be that it denies the right of any minister to question the doc-

trinal integrity of another minister unless he is willing to bring formal charges of heresy against him. Although the judgment as a whole is generally conceded to be confused and inconsistent, giving no evidence of clear legal reasoning, it is evident that the principle mentioned above was a determining factor in the verdict. It is known that the charges against Mr. Barnhouse had reference to his alleged remarks concerning the doctrinal soundness of other ministers, some of them signers of the modernist Auburn Affirmation. Although the form of the judgment finds Mr. Barnhouse guilty, the verdict seems to turn upon the point that he should not have made the alleged remarks, whether true or untrue, without beginning judicial process against those considered unorthodox—which is an entirely different matter from the issue raised in the formal charges.

Friends of Mr. Barnhouse have claimed to see in the verdict a victory, because they believe that the original intention of those prosecuting him was to drive him from the church, while the penalty directed by the synodical commission was that of simple Admonition—the lightest possible punishment allowed by the law of the Church. However, they regard the judgment as illegal and unjust in that it does not reveal the actual offenses of which Mr. Barnhouse is considered guilty.

Upon the giving of the judgment to the press, the Moderator of the Judicial Commission, the Rev. Wm. B. Pugh, D.D., of Chester, Pa., considered the bright legal luminary of the body, issued a jubilant statement reported by the *Philadelphia Record* as follows:

"The action of the commission is tremendously significant," Dr. William B. Pugh, of Chester, moderator of the commission, declared last night, "because of its unanimity and because it sets a precedent not only for Presbyterians, but all Protestant denominations.

"The Commission is, like Barnhouse, theologically conservative. We feel that no question of doctrine was involved in the trial. What was established, was protection of the minister from backstairs gossip, haphazard railing and irresponsible talk that can do untold harm to his career.

"While this protection always has existed as a matter of church law in Presbyterianism, no case of slander had been carried before a church tribunal to gain the afforded protection. Ministers bore false witness philosophically because of the tedious, embarrassing and expensive nature of a trial of a fellow clergyman.

"The finding of the commission serves notice on all that if a minister is dissatisfied with the preaching or conduct of another, he must act in the constitutional manner and have the complaint probed, rather than cause the other's reputation and career to be ruined through his unproven slander."

Persons familiar with the law of the Church received Dr. Pugh's prediction that the judgment of a commission of one synod of one denomination would "set a precedent not only for Presbyterians, but all Protestant denominations" with considerable amusement, feeling that Dr. Pugh's estimation of the importance of his commission was "slightly exaggerated." Nor was his contention that legal process is the only recourse of a minister who believes another to

be unorthodox, regarded as good law. As one minister declared, "it is not good law simply because there does not happen to be any such requirement in the constitution of the Presbyterian Church."

Mr. James E. Bennet, of New York, who, with Mr. J. Roy Dickie, of Pittsburgh, acted as counsel for Mr. Barnhouse, issued the following statement after the judgment had been made public:

"I have carefully studied the decision on the Synod Commission in the Barnhouse case, in which Dr. Pugh was moderator.

"The decision is incomplete. It does not decide anything definitely and is, therefore, unfair to the accused for the following reasons:—

"Mr. Barnhouse was charged with seventeen (17) items called specifications, which were grouped under two heads as breach of the 9th Commandment and violation of ordination vows. These seventeen charges have been read in the presence of the Philadelphia Presbytery; before two separate Commissions of Presbytery; before at least one Synod Commission and certainly the substance was before other Synod Commissions in 1930 and 1931 and have been given wide publicity, usually in a garbled form greatly to the detriment of Mr. Barnhouse.

"The trial was to determine the truth or falsity of these seventeen items. Any properly conducted trial and decision would determine this, but in the present decision to our amazement these questions are neither discussed nor referred to.

"Four items of the charges were abandoned on the trial by the prosecution without explanation or apology. Apparently they had served as charges for publicity purposes, but as they could not be proven (and as a matter of fact never were true) they were dropped. Surely the Church and Mr. Barnhouse are entitled to an explanation and apology for these four false charges. This amazing decision, however, does not mention these four charges at all but clearly leaves the impression that Mr. Barnhouse is guilty of everything as charged.

"Another item had no proof because the witness called by the prosecution denied the truth of the item charged. The decision is silent on this also.

"The Book of Discipline, the law book of the Presbyterian Church, says, Paragraph 24, chapter IV, 'After careful deliberation the judicatory shall proceed to vote on each specification and on each charge separately, and judgment shall be entered accordingly.' This Synod Commission ignored this law and as far as we know it did not vote on each specification. If it did and then withheld the separate decisions, it is clearly guilty of committing one of the greatest acts of injustice ever perpetrated in any church or secular court. Any decision which does not clearly decide the items charged is, in fact, no decision at all but a crime in itself far greater than any of those charged against Mr. Barnhouse.

"The net result of this so-called trial and decision is this. If anybody ever heard a rumor that Mr. Barnhouse was charged with anything, however preposterous and damaging it might be, that person, under the blanket authority of this so-called decision has a perfect right to believe that rumor to be true. It was in the power of this Synod Commission and its clear duty to make a definite decision on the items charged and help to clear up a terribly unjust situation, but it has chosen rather to make confusion worse confused. Mr. Barnhouse, in the commission's mind is guilty of everything charged, even if no evidence was offered as it was not in five of the items. Instead of discussing the specifications and evidence the commission gives a long, one sided history of the case which contains some definite inaccuracies and cites quotations from church decisions which seem to imply that Mr. Barnhouse is guilty of disturbing the peace and purity of the Church by his doctrinal teachings, but nothing of the kind entered into the trial at any time.

"This plainly incompetent and unjust decision is evidence that the Presbyterian church is on trial for its justice and fairness in the attempted maintenance of the purity of its doctrines and administration of its discipline.

"Whatever it may have meant by its decision, one thing is certain, this Synod Commission has unjustly placed a stigma upon Mr. Barnhouse as long as he lives, which will be used against him by his enemies and the enemies of the church.

"The trial was conducted with great secrecy, and at the opening the Moderator made the following statement:

"The Commission feels that in fairness to all parties, in fairness to the church at large, in fairness to itself, that it desires all business in connection with this Judicial Commission to be kept absolutely secret. * * * We do not want to be arbitrary in the matter but we have in mind certain evils which inevitably arise from publicity. We do not want this case if it be tried to be tried elsewhere than before the Commission. * * * It is understood that those who remain in this room, after this announcement, will observe strictly the desires of the Commission in that respect."

"In personal conversation with the Moderator he told me that when the decision was rendered it would be served upon Mr. Barnhouse and that we were not to make any statement for the public, except that if the decision was adverse and we took an appeal, we might publish the appeal itself. Any other action on our part would be frowned on by the General Assembly and the ban of secrecy was to continue until the case was finally disposed of in the last court.

"Mr. Barnhouse was served with a copy of the decision about seven o'clock in the evening of January 7th, as he was leaving to preach in Collingswood, N. J. When he returned home about ten o'clock he learned that Mr. Pugh had given the complete copies of the judgment to all of the Philadelphia newspapers and also had given them a statement from himself concerning the importance of the case.

"The newspapers uniformly carried a head line.

"Dr. Barnhouse held guilty of slander by Church Tribunal

and among other things said 'seventeen Philadelphia ministers complain that Barnhouse had made remarks against them.'

"I feel that this action in making the decision public in this way was a complete breach of faith with the defendant, and the manner of its publication as the unanimous decision of finding Mr. Barnhouse guilty of slander has placed on him a stigma which he can never live down. The word 'slander' was not mentioned in the decision nor in the trial, and a completely unfair account has been given which has prejudiced the minds of the public against Mr. Barnhouse.

"The question now is, can a minister in the Presbyterian church who zealously, honestly, fearlessly and powerfully preaches and teaches the truths of the Gospel, whatever persecution or opposition may arise on that account, be accorded a fair and impartial trial and judgment in courts of that church. In my opinion this decision strikes a hard blow at the very foundation of Presbyterianism.

"This also confirms the oft expressed opinion that it is difficult if not impossible to obtain judgment in a secret court, a star chamber proceeding, as this one was. This case should have been tried in the open with a decision openly arrived at."

The Synodical Judicial Commission received the case for hearing and decision last June, after a reference of the case, declared by many to have been illegal, had been made to the Synod by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. At the time of the "reference" the case was in the hands of a local judicial commission which was proceeding to hear and decide it. The prosecutor, however, declined to prosecute before this commission, which was the occasion of the "reference." Complaints already filed with the stated clerk of the General Assembly will raise the question at Denver as to whether the "reference" was illegal.

Beatification of Czar Nicholas II of Russia

THE *Ecclesia*, published in Geneva, reports that an influential group of Russian emigrants have again petitioned the synod of the orthodox Russian bishops at Szemski-Karlovi (Jugo-Slavia) to pronounce the beatification of the "Emperor-Martyr," Nicholas II of Russia.

The Pope's Invitation to Protestants

POPE PIUS XI, in the closing days of 1931 issued an encyclical letter, in commemoration of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus, which council condemned the Nestorian heresy regarding the person of Christ. The Pope took this occasion to appeal to non-Romanists to return to his fold. He says that he has firm confidence that should his words be diligently meditated, they will not only bring comfort to Roman Catholics of the entire world but also will be a motive to the "separated brethren" to consider that the Roman Church always has been the faithful depository and custodian of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and that also in the first ages of Christianity all the other churches and religious communities of the East and of the West had recourse to it as the infallible teacher of truth.

The Encyclical then treats very fully, supported by historical and dogmatic arguments, the following points of doctrine which find, it says, in the orthodox reaction against the Nestorian heresy and in the developments of the Ephesian Council, the happiest and fullest confirmation, namely:

That in Jesus Christ the two natures, divine and human, are united in only one Divine Person (hypostatic union); that the Virgin Mary is the true Mother of God; and that to the Roman Pontiff belongs by divine right a supreme and infallible authority over the whole Church in matters of faith and morals.

In the first place, the Encyclical develops the third point, which treats of the supreme and infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff.

After referring to the rise of the Nestorian heresy, which fifteen centuries ago endeavored, as already the preceding heresies had done, to divide the concord and unity of the Universal Church, he tries to show by the citation of copious historical documents how in that most grave extremity the entire Christian Hierarchy recognized the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome.

Indeed, Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, that great master and defender of the orthodox faith, even from the first appearance of the Nestorian heresy had recourse, according to traditions cited by Pope Pius, to Pope Celestine in order to have from him a sure word and unquestionable ruling before condemning the error.

And the heresiarch Nestorius, himself Bishop of Constantinople, is claimed to have implicitly recognized the supreme and infallible judgment of the Roman See, since he also writes more than once to the Pope to justify himself and to obtain his approbation.

First, the Patriarch of the Oriental Church, St. Cyril, shows that by himself he is unable to decide so great a dogmatic question; second, the Bishop of the second Rome, Nestorius, appeals to the pontifical

authority; Pope Celestine without delay convokes a synod in Rome to examine the question diligently and by an unappealable judgment defines and condemns it.

At this point the Encyclical mentions an objection which is wont to be made in this respect by not a few ancient and modern writers, which is that although Pope Celestine had already defined the truth and condemned the heresy, yet the Council of Ephesus in discussing the question "ex integro" and pronouncing upon it showed itself to have an authority superior to that of the Pope.

Against this grave objection the Pope argued that the Pontifical Legates sent to Ephesus to preside at the Council received from Pope Celestine a precise order not to put the question in discussion again but to consider it as already judged and defined by the Bishop of Rome.

Having arrived in Ephesus after the Council had begun, they asked to see the preceding acts and to confirm them in the name of the Pope. They pronounced, by the mouth of the priest Philip, Pontifical Legate, words in which is expressed solemnly the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and brought forward the judgment already proclaimed by Pope Celestine, asking for the approbation of all the Fathers. The Pope declares that all the Fathers consented to and applauded the words of the Pope, whom they called the "Custodian of the Faith."

Coming to the condemnation of Nestorius, the Council Fathers declare themselves "obliged" by the sacred canon and by the definition already given by the Bishop of Rome. There is, then, not a new condemnation, but rather the execution of that already pronounced by Pope Celestine.

Having attempted to show in this manner that even at the time of the Nestorian heresy recognition of the supreme and infallible authority of the Pope was common in the Church, the Encyclical develops two other points regarding the doctrine defended and confirmed in the Council of Ephesus, and in the first place the union of two natures in one only Divine Person (hypostatic union).

The proof and illustration of the dogma is taken from the sacred revelation contained in the Scripture and in tradition. In it two Persons in Christ are not spoken of, but one only Person, as the same only Savior is called both Man and God, Man who is born, is nourished, suffers and dies; God Who works the greatest miracles by His own power.

This truth affords an occasion to the Pontiff to return to the subject of the unity of the True Church, which is the mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

And with this the Pope repeats his invitation to all the dissident children who, by ancient and modern schisms and heresies, have "lacerated this Mystical Union," to return to the one Fold and the sole Pastor, —himself.

Finally, the Encyclical develops the last point, which regards the maternity of Mary. This point is none other than a corollary of the dogma previously referred to. If, indeed, Jesus Christ is God, she has borne Him, and must be called "Theotokos," that is, Mother of God. And if she is the Mother of God, she must be full of every grace and adorned with every privilege. Therefore we ought to venerate, love and imitate her.

The Pope addresses to Protestants also a paternal exhortation to follow the example of Roman Catholics by invoking the protection of the Virgin as mediatrix and intercessor with the Divine Savior.

At this point the pontifical document addresses words of affection to the Mother of the Redeemer, and a final, feeling exhortation of the Pontiff to the separated brethren of the Eastern Church. "They who also venerate Mary as we do; they, who for so many centuries maintained themselves in unity with the Apostolic See and who, in the Council of Ephesus, saluted the Pope as the 'Custodian of the Faith,' are warmly invited to return to the ancient common Father, who, in the person of Celestine fifteen centuries ago, united with them in an admirable harmony of mind and heart, proclaimed the highest privilege of the Virgin, the Divine Maternity."

The Pope expressed a wish for the day in which they will return to the "centre of unity" and prostrate themselves with him before the mosaics in the Liberian basilica celebrating the triumph of Mary in the Ephesian Council.

Lastly, the Pope, wishing to leave a record of the present centenary celebrations, establishes for his whole Church the Office and Mass of the "Maternity of Mary."

No one has yet noted any rush upon the part of non-Romanists to accept the Pope's invitation.

League of Evangelical Students

THE League of Evangelical Students has announced the Seventh Annual National Convention to be held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, February 12th, 13th, and 14th.

A splendid and strong program of speakers is being prepared, but because of its tentative character, full announcements cannot yet be made.

Such speakers as Dr. Charles E. Scott, and the Rev. William B. Hunt—both missionaries; and Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, and Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle are expected at the convention.

Prayer and testimony will receive primary stress, one whole session being devoted to intercession and reports concerning the Lord's leadings in the various League Chapters. Missions will continue to hold a large place—the whole Sunday afternoon session being devoted to a consideration of foreign missions.

The Conference comes as the climax to a

year of testing and trial, yet one of unprecedented spiritual blessing and growth. Friends are asked to pray for mighty things to be done in the Spirit through the League, and its-coming gathering at Pittsburgh.

"The group thrills me. They are awake to situations and are anxious to meet the conditions at college." So writes Miss Margaret Hunt of her visit to an Eastern women's college.

Miss Hunt and Miss Margaret Haines are Regional Secretaries of the League of Evangelical Students and have been doing a great deal of visitation chiefly to women's colleges in the East. Considerable interest has been stirred among some of the groups they met, and prospects for several thriving League Chapters have been found. As these young women continue their work of witnessing, friends of the League are asked to pray for them and their task of making Christ and His Word known to the students whom they meet.

While these secretaries were engaged in their labors, the General Secretary visited the first New England Regional Conference of the League. It was a specially blessed and splendid Conference. Gordon College Chapter was the host. Eleven schools were represented at one session. As a result of the conference and previous visitation, the General Secretary was able to reach eight New England schools, and to aid in the formation of two new Chapters, one at Boston University, and another at Eastern Nazarene College. Union College of Schenectady, N. Y. has applied for membership, and since its application, the chapters at National Bible Institute, New York, and at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., have been revived, and hopes are held for a rich season of witnessing on the part of these units. Affiliated groups have also been established at Princeton University and Yale University.

The League is entering the schools, not waiting for the schools to come to it! The prayers and support of believers are asked for this challenging, yet most delicate and difficult student witness and work.

For information concerning any part of the work or for the coming National Convention in Pittsburgh, February 12th, 13th, and 14th, address William J. Jones, General Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students, Box 455, Wheaton, Illinois.

Young People's Bible Conference at New Haven, Conn.

THOSE interested in the work of the Lord Jesus Christ and the salvation of souls, will be glad to learn there are still 7000 in New England who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of Modernism.

The three-day Young People's Conference held in the Benedict Memorial Presbyterian Church, New Haven, Conn., in December,

Will Canadian Subscribers in sending their remittances please make them large enough so that for each subscription will be sent the equivalent of a dollar in United States funds? Much as we would like to do so, we cannot afford to lose what is sometimes as much as twenty cents per dollar at the prevailing rates of exchange.

We are also compelled to ask that all foreign subscribers will follow the same practice in remitting.

was a spiritual feast and blessing to everyone who attended. The Lord Jesus Christ as a Crucified, Risen, Coming Saviour was exalted; the Bible was spoken of and expounded As It Is In Truth The Word Of God; and the Power of the Holy Spirit was manifested. New England may have "gone Unitarian" for the most part, but the Lord has not left Himself without a witness there.

Over a hundred young people from many parts of New England attended the conference, beside others some of whom came from New York, Philadelphia and as far West as Illinois. There are many praising God with all their hearts for this testimony, clear cut and ringing true, which was given just off the Yale University Campus. Several of the delegates and speakers made personal contacts with the students.

Friday evening, Rev. Charles W. Woodbridge, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Flushing, Long Island, brought the opening message of the conference, on the Second Birth, "Ye Must Be Born Again." It was a message that gripped hearts. In clear, positive language he explained the meaning of being born again, and when he finished no one present could say that he did not understand what was meant.

Saturday morning was devoted to an intensive study of God's Word, both Old and New Testaments with time allotted at the close for questions on points the speakers brought up. The Rev. William J. Jones, General Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students delivered the opening lecture on "Old Testament Bible." He set forth clearly the claims of the Scripture to being the inspired Word of God. He showed the plan of redemption running throughout its pages, the scarlet highway of salvation through the shedding of blood in the Levitical sacrifices and offerings and extending through history to the coming of the Christ Who was to be "The Lamb Of God Who taketh away the sin of the world." Dr. Allison, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport, Conn., brought a fine message in the afternoon for young men only, and Mrs. L. Craig Long for women only.

A time of real Christian fellowship was enjoyed at the banquet in the church just prior to the evening service. Rev. Harold

Laird, minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Collingswood, N. J., was the evening speaker. The message had the testimony and seal of the Holy Spirit and drove home to hearts the meaning of the apostle Paul's mighty witness for his Lord, "For Me to live is Christ." The prayer groups held throughout the conferences were a constant source of spiritual uplift, and as one speaker well expressed it, "This conference was saturated with prayer." A number of young people came out definitely in reconsecration and dedication of their lives in service for Christ. One was heard to remark, "The prayer groups alone were worth coming for."

Dr. J. Gresham Machen, chairman of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, spoke both Sunday morning and evening. In his usual clear and forceful way, Dr. Machen pointed out in the morning service that whenever the church has experienced revival and sinners have been brought under conviction, there controversy has abounded concerning the mighty doctrines of the Person of our Lord. In the evening, speaking over the radio, and reaching many parts of New England, Dr. Machen made a stirring appeal for young ministers who would prove faithful stewards of the mysteries of God, and who would be fearless in their proclamation of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ regardless of the opinions or antagonism of men.

The last meeting of the Conference was for prayer and testimony. The Rev. L. Craig Long made a powerful appeal to those present to give themselves unreservedly for service in the work of Jesus Christ. It was a meeting not soon forgotten when at the close every person was on his knees and prayers offered up in every part of the room for spiritual power in days of apostasy and infidelity. It is the hope of many that God may send more conferences like this one to New England where young people are brought face to face with the living Christ as their Saviour, as their Lord and as their coming King.

Moody Bible Institute Founder's Week Speakers

THE Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, in announcing its forthcoming Founder's Week Conference for the first week of February, presents a notable array of speakers: Dr. P. W. Philpott, pulpit orator; Dr. Charles G. Trumbull, editor, *The Sunday School Times*; Dr. Robert G. Lee, eminent clergyman of Tennessee; Rev. Charles J. Rolis, of Auckland, New Zealand; Prof. Samuel M. Zwemer, of Princeton Seminary; Dr. Chas. E. Scott, of China, Rev. W. H. Hanna, of China, Rev. Paul W. Harrison, of Arabia, Mrs. Arthur F. Tylee, Brazil, honored missionaries with thrilling messages. Dr. James M. Gray, president of the Institute, will be heard both as presiding officer and Bible expositor.