

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-FEBRUARY, 1932
Vol. 2 No. 10

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

Christianity and the Visible Church

THERE is great diversity of opinion concerning the relation between Christianity and the visible Church and *vice versa*. This diversity of opinion will be found in the main, we believe, to be rooted in and to grow out of different conceptions of Christianity itself. Here as elsewhere, if we mistake not, the primary question is the old yet ever new question, What is Christianity? Be that as it may, the problem of the relation between Christianity and the Church is one of great practical importance. It is not merely true that the different solutions offered have divided and sub-divided those who profess and call themselves Christians into different camps; it is also true that the solutions offered have had and continue to have a more or less determining influence in shaping their conception of their duties and obligations as Christians.

That view of the relation between Christianity and the Church which has prevailed most widely (thus far) has received its fullest and most consistent expression in Roman Catholic circles. According to this view the relation between Christianity and the visible Church is so close and vital that they become practically identical. According to the Roman Catholics, all of God's saving activities in the present dispensation are exercised through the instrumentality of the Church. They teach as fully as any that salvation is ultimately from God and so proclaim a supernatural salvation; but they hold that in distributing this supernaturally wrought salvation to individuals God employs

the Church as His exclusive agent. This means that the Church stands between the individual soul and God and that it is to the Church to which men must immediately look for salvation. This is not to say, of course, that the Roman Catholic supposes that the salvation that the Church dispenses has been obtained independently of CHRIST. He holds as explicitly as any that there is no salvation apart from CHRIST. None the less he holds that CHRIST in dispensing to men the benefits of His saving work operates not directly but through the instrumentality of the Church which He has established for that purpose. This matter is so important that for its fuller exposition we avail ourselves of the words of Dr. W. P. PATTERSON of Edinburgh:

"Observe the extraordinarily important place that is occupied in the Roman Catholic

scheme of salvation by the idea of the Church. It is hardly incorrect to say that in the Roman Catholic conception the central feature of the Christian religion is the supernatural institution which represents CHRIST, which carries on His work, and which acts as the virtual mediator of the blessings of salvation. Instead of making the relation of the believer to the Church depend on his relation to CHRIST, it makes his relation to CHRIST depend on his relation to the Church. It may not be anywhere expressly affirmed that the Church is the central provision of Christianity, but it is certain that the doctrine of the Church dominates and colors the whole interpretation of the Christian dispensation. . . . Its vocation or commission is nothing less than the perpetuation of the work of the Redeemer. It does not of course supersede the work of CHRIST. Its presupposition is that CHRIST, the eternal Son of God, laid the foundation of its work in His incarnation and His atoning death; that from Him come ultimately all power, authority and grace; and that as from Him all spiritual blessing proceeds, so that to Him belongs all the glory. But in the present dispensation the Church, in large measure, has taken over the work of CHRIST. It is, in a real sense, a re-encarnation of CHRIST to the end of the continuation and completion of His redemptive mission. Through His Church CHRIST continues to execute the offices of a Prophet, of a Priest, and of a King. His prophetic office it perpetuates by witnessing to the truth once delivered to the saints and by interpreting and determining doctrine with infallible authority. . . . It represents Him so completely in the priestly function of mediation between God and man that there is no covenanted salvation outside the pale of the visible organization of which He is the unseen Head. It further represents Him as sacrificing priest by the perpetual repetition in the Mass of the oblation He once offered upon the cross. . . . And finally it administers the kingly power of CHRIST on earth. It has an absolute claim to the

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments	3
The Heretical "Auburn Affirmation". Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths	4
The Proposed Doctrinal Basis of Union. John Murray	8
Notes on Biblical Exposition	11
J. G. Machen	
Books of Religious Significance	14
Letters to the Editor	15
Current Views and Voices	16
Ministerial Changes	17
News of the Church	18

obedience of its members in all matters of faith and duty, with the right to punish the disobedient for the breach of its laws, and to coerce the contumacious" (Rule of Faith, pp. 240-242).

It is obvious that while according to the Roman Catholic view both Christianity and the visible Church owe their existence to the once crucified but now reigning CHRIST, and are inconceivable apart from Him, they are related in such a way that the fortunes of the one rises and falls with the fortunes of the other. The Roman Catholic practically identifies the Christianity of any particular period of history with the visible Church of that period inasmuch as he looks upon the extension of the visible Church and the extension of Christianity as virtually the same thing. It is natural, therefore, that his center of interest is in the visible Church and that he should regard its extension as the thing most needed. Surely he is right if the benefits of divine grace are dispensed only through the agency of the visible Church.

The view of the relation between Christianity and the visible Church, which has prevailed most widely in Protestant circles, differs quite radically from the one we have considered. It should not be overlooked, however, that this view (ordinarily called the Evangelical view to distinguish it from the Roman Catholic view on the one hand and the Modernist view on the other) has much in common with the Roman Catholic view. The Evangelical fully agrees with the Roman Catholic that God in His grace has provided a supernatural salvation, that Christianity is through and through a supernatural religion. His opposition to the Roman Catholic view has to do not with the question whether God in His grace has made a great salvation available but with the question of the means by which and the conditions under which the benefits of this great salvation are appropriated by sinful man. To be more specific, the Evangelical denies that CHRIST has established the Church as an intermediary between God and the individual soul and affirms that in His saving operations He deals directly and immediately with each soul. Let it never be forgotten then that the true Evangelical ever

makes the twofold confession (1) that salvation is from God and God alone and (2) that God in saving men deals with them directly and immediately. There is need of emphasizing this because there are many who seem to think they are Evangelicals merely because they confess that there are no intermediaries between the soul and God. He only is an Evangelical who also confesses that salvation is wholly of God. Deep as is the gulf that divides between the Evangelical and the Roman Catholic, it is not as deep as the gulf that divides both from those who teach that men save themselves.

It is obvious that the visible Church occupies a much less important place in the Evangelical scheme of salvation than in that of the Roman Catholic. It distinguishes, as the Roman Catholic does not, between the visible and the invisible Church and regards membership in the latter as the thing of primary importance. Conceivably, according to the Evangelical view, Christianity might not only exist but be influential in the world even if there were no visible Church as here the thing of fundamental importance is the sinner's relation to CHRIST rather than his relation to the Church. This is not to say, however, that the Evangelical attaches small importance to the visible Church. For while he does not hold that CHRIST established the Church as the means by which to communicate His saving grace to men, he does hold that CHRIST Himself established the visible Church and that membership in it is obligatory on all His followers. Moreover he holds that to the visible Church CHRIST "hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints . . . and doth by His own presence and Spirit, according to His promise, make them effectual thereunto." Hence in harmony with his conviction that the thing of fundamental importance is the sinner's relation to CHRIST he holds that all who bow before Him, live in His Word, and respect His ordinances will attach high value to the visible Church. While he does not hold that the visible Church is essential to the very existence of Christianity as a factor in the life of humanity, he does

hold that according to the divine plan its well-being is dependent on the visible Church. Only as the visible Church bears witness to the gospel of the grace of God in its purity and integrity through the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments and the exercise of discipline have we any right to hope that the fortunes of Christianity in this world will go on from strength to strength.

A few words (all that our space permits) as to the relation between the visible Church and the kingdom of God in the present dispensation will perhaps serve to make the matter clearer. The Roman Catholic view virtually identifies the visible Church with the kingdom of God. The Evangelical view, broadly speaking, virtually identifies the kingdom of God not with the visible but with the invisible Church. According to the Evangelical view, therefore, the kingdom of God is much more inclusive than the visible Church. The kingdom of God exists in proportion as God's absolute supremacy is recognized in word and deed. This means that members of the kingdom of God seek in every sphere of life, such as business, politics, science, education, etc., to have the will of God done on earth even as it is done in heaven. It will be seen, therefore, that not only is a true member of the visible Church a member of the kingdom of God but that as a member of the latter he has wider and more inclusive duties than as a member of the former. The late Dr. JAMES ORR has written so wisely relative to the relation between the kingdom of God and the Church that we avail ourselves of his words:

"The kingdom of God is a wider conception than that of the Church. On the other hand, these ideas do not stand so far apart as they are sometimes represented. The Church is, as a society, the visible expression of this kingdom in this world; is indeed the only society which does formally profess (very imperfectly often) to represent it. Yet the Church is not the outward embodiment of this kingdom in all its aspects, but only in its directly religious and ethical, *i. e.* in its purely spiritual aspect. It is not the direct business of the Church, for example, to take to do with art, science, politics, general literature, etc., but to bear witness for God and His truth to men, to

preach and spread the gospel of the kingdom, to maintain God's worship, to administer the sacraments, to provide for the self-education and religious fellowship of believers. Yet the Church has a side turned toward all these other matters, especially to all efforts for the social good and bettering of mankind, and cannot but interest herself in these efforts, and lend what aid to them she can. She has her protest to utter against social injustice and immorality; her witness to bear to the principles of conduct which ought to guide individuals and nations in the various departments of their existence; her help to bring to the solution of the questions which spring up in connection with capital and labor, rich and poor, rulers and subjects; her influence to throw into the scale on behalf of 'whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report.' A wholesome tone in literature, a Christian spirit in art and science, a healthy temper in amusements, wise and beneficent legislation on Christian principles in the councils of the nations, the spirit of long-suffering, peace, forbearance, and generosity, brought into the relations of men with one another in society, Christian ideals in the relations of nations to one another, self-sacrificing labors for the amelioration and elevation of the condition of the masses of the people,—these are matters in which the Church can never but be interested. Else she forgoes her calling and may speedily expect to be removed out of her place" (*The Christian View of God and the World*, p. 358).

We have dwelt at such length on the Roman Catholic and Evangelical views (held by the vast majority of those who profess and call themselves Christians) that we must content ourselves with a mere reference to the "Modernist" view of the relation between Christianity and the Church—a view which while it has received little or no confessional statement is more or less widely held in all the churches. Here as elsewhere the language of "Modernism" is prone to be vague and indefinite; hence it is impossible to state the Modernist view with anything like the clearness and distinctness with which it is possible to state the Roman Catholic and Evangelical views. What is more, here also, the Modernist employs language that can also be properly used by both Roman Catholics and Evangelicals. The Modernist commonly speaks of the "Living Church" but as he rejects the thought of a faith once for all delivered the words have a dif-

ferent meaning when used by him than when used by either Roman Catholics or Evangelicals. Like the Roman Catholic he regards the Church as the seat of authority though in a different sense from the Roman Catholic since he knows nothing of an authoritative Scripture, or an authoritative tradition, to be infallibly interpreted by the Church. Back of the Modernist conception of the Church is the Modernist conception of Christianity itself, according to which the Christianity of today is related to the Christianity of CHRIST somewhat as the oak is related to the acorn from which it sprung. When, then, the real Modernist speaks of the right and duty of the living Church to restate its faith to bring it in harmony with its growing knowledge he has in mind not so much a restatement that will bring it into accord with the full teachings of the Bible as a restatement that will indicate how far the modern Church has gotten beyond the teachings of the Bible. Hence

we need to be on our guard against those who commonly employ the term, "the living Church." They may not be Modernists but the probability is that they are—in some measure at least. We may well approve both when the Modernist rejects the Roman Catholic view of the Church as the distributor of the benefits of divine grace and when he rejects its view of the Church as the infallible interpreter of the Bible: but that does not mean that we may approve when he denies that there are any supernaturally-given benefits of divine grace to be distributed or when he denies that the Bible is the Word of God and as such the infallible rule of faith and practice. To do that would be to throw out the baby with the bath. We do not hesitate to say that in as far as men do the latter they are not Christians at all. An organization composed of such men might call itself a "living Church" but certainly it would not be a Christian Church.

Editorial Notes and Comments

The "Reformation Fellowship"

ABOUT a year ago the REV. JOHN CLOVER MONSMA made a plea for a "Reformation Fellowship," composed of Presbyterian and Reformed laymen (*CHRISTIANITY TODAY*, March, 1931), having as its objective the elimination from our church life of those Modernistic and secularistic activities so prevalent today. We are advised that the response to that plea has been so encouraging that for some months he has been actively engaged in the task of establishing such a fellowship with such a measure of success that an organization meeting is planned in Philadelphia in the month of April.

The advocates of the plan have two leading thoughts in mind. The first is that the laymen of the Church should be roused to activity, and that a general summons to arms should issue to all the faithful men and women in the pews, throughout the land. It is believed that a form of clericalism has developed in the Church that is contrary to Scripture and the Standards. Our fathers stressed the "priesthood of all believers." Believers are "kings and priests unto God." Only in the awakening and banding together of the "laymen" do the proponents of the Fellowship see a chance to throw off the present yoke.

The other leading thought is that the orthodox ministers and members form the real Presbyterian Church, while the modernists are intruders and outlaws. For that reason there should be a reformation, rather than a separation. The Church is historically and juridically theirs. They should pray and labor and fight to deliver their heritage from its destroyers, seeking to restore it by a constructive process of reformation to the true service of CHRIST, their SAVIOUR-KING. And in all this the *general membership* must take an active part.

The immediate goals of the Fellowship will be:

(a) The ascertaining of the numerical strength of the orthodox believers all through the Church, to help raise their morale;

(b) The holding of congresses in various parts of the land where able, orthodox leaders can plead the Reformation cause;

(c) The promotion of the Reformation cause by meetings, addresses, correspondence, and the issuing of bulletins to the members on the progress made;

(d) The placing of orthodox ministers in orthodox charges, and the helping of large numbers of orthodox ministers who are now

(Concluded on page 24)

The Heretical "Auburn Affirmation":

A Menace to the True Peace and Purity of the Presbyterian Church

[A sermon preached in Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on Sunday morning, February 21, by the Minister, The Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths.]

"But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand.

"So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me." (Ezekiel 33:6, 7.)

I.

THE minister of Christ, when he comes forth to preach in the sanctuary, must always feel a sense of immeasurable and solemn responsibility. Before him are the souls of men. On his pulpit is the truth of God. Watching him is the God of Truth. He, weak though he is, must so expound God's word to his people that it will become mighty in their hearts, that souls may turn to the Saviour. The issues of eternity are in his keeping, and woe be unto him if he fails! Yet not to fail he must only be faithful,—faithful to the truth as it is in Jesus, faithful lest he mix with the gold of God's revelation the clay of man's speculation.

Yet as I come to you this morning it is with an even greater sense of responsibility and solemnity. The subject that engages us now is one of more than ordinary moment. It is a duty which I believe God has laid inescapably upon me, to speak out plainly and clearly for the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ and His Word. More, I must needs be not only general today, but particular, that my warnings may be understood, that my words may not be glistening generalities that would leave you more puzzled than when I began. After the flesh, I truly wish that someone else could preach this sermon. I do it in fear and trembling, not out of opposition to men but out of loyalty to Christ and to His Church. I have been reluctant to speak out as I *must* speak out,—until God has made it clear that I can be silent no longer if I am to be His true servant. In so speaking, there is no malice in my heart toward any man.

A few months ago I came before you with the answer to the question, "When may we expect a great revival?" One of the replies to that query was: "When the Church repents of the unbelief in her midst and takes steps to restore the lost purity of her witness to the Gospel." The words "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear

me", are true of Churches as well as of individuals. If we want to keep the heritage handed us from the fathers, if we do not wish to see the Presbyterian Church become a proud but drifting derelict, tossed by every wave of human fashion, we must avoid the sin of crying "peace, peace" when there is no peace. Controversy for its own sake, or for the sake of advantage or place is contemptible; but the kind of controversy that ensues upon the beginning of doctrinal purification will be simply loyalty to God, and because He has commanded such conflict, it will be blessed of Him.

Peace! It is a great word. It is beloved of men and angels. The Saviour is named the "Prince of Peace." But there is sometimes a state named "peace" that is really no peace at all,—that is only an offense to God. The peace of man with sin,—God regards that as such blasphemy and rebellion that man must be cut off from the Divine fellowship and life. Man at peace with sin is man at enmity with God. There is no peace without its corresponding, inescapable enmity. The man who loves beauty will abhor ugliness. The lover of goodness will hate wrong. A man cannot love justice without cherishing in his breast a hatred of tyranny. The children of the light are at enmity with the darkness. Peace is not always desirable,—it may be the worst possible human state. For a man to be at peace with all that is base in his life, spells ruin. Nor can churches escape the working of this universal law. A church at peace with the world, conformable to that world's demands in its life and teaching, is a church in rebellion against God. A church at peace with unbelief, whether that unbelief be found without or within, is at enmity against God. It may desire to maintain peace all round,—to be at peace with God and with that which dishonors Him as well. But that cannot be. Neither churches nor men can serve two masters.

It is my conviction that the Presbyterian Church is standing upon the brink of irremediable apostasy. Outwardly, indeed, every attempt is being made to suppress the fact that two entirely diverse religions are living and working within her. Her people have been assured that "the late Modernist-Fundamentalist conflict" is over. My Christian friends, the conflict between faith and unbelief is never over. It is not over in the Presbyterian Church, but what is happening

is, that those who hold to the historic faith of the Church are being quietly and gradually smothered. In the name of "peace in the church" in the name of "an inclusive church," the power of modernism is attempting to secure complete control over the church. The kind of "peace" she now enjoys is only and merely the peace of a church that is dying without a struggle. If the process should continue unchecked, fifteen years more will see historic Presbyterianism regarded as a quaint relic in the then-so-called Presbyterian Church, while the red banners of Modernism replace the bonnie blue flag over the towers of the Zion built, loved and for so many years jealously defended by those who are now of the Church triumphant.

Peace with Unbelief a Sin

If we are at peace with unbelief, then, with doctrines that dishonor God's word and the Christ of that Word, the sooner war is declared against unbelief the better. For if this be so, only a conflict will save the Church, and the man who does not rise to take part in it is disloyal to his God, to the truth he professes, and to the vows he has taken.

Nor let anyone imagine that to come into the open in opposition to unbelief and heresy is to introduce a new method into the Presbyterian Church. Our fathers in the faith gave to our church one of its supreme characteristics: its historic zeal and jealousy for the truth of God. Almost the entire history of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, Ireland, the Low Countries and in North America is the record of how the unbelief that steadily finds entrance into the Church has been opposed and resisted by those who were faithful. The Protestant Reformation itself was one long protest against the idea that outward unity and peace in the Church are more important than purity of doctrine. When matters of faith are at stake, the Presbyterian custom is to speak out, to speak clearly and boldly, not counting the cost. Anyone who tells you that good Presbyterianism means a quiet surrender to the religion of the day simply does not know what he is talking about. So that in making my protest this morning I account myself no schismatic, but as simply a humble follower in the steps of men far greater than myself, and who, if they were here, could speak in mightier accents.

II.

In 1923, the General Assembly, replying to the overture of the Presbytery of Philadelphia regarding the preaching of Dr. Fosdick in the First Presbyterian Church of New York, expressed its sorrow for what had taken place, and reaffirmed deliverances of previous assemblies that five doctrines were "essential doctrines of the Word of God and our standards." I will read you these doctrines in a moment.

Immediately after the Assembly of 1923, opposition to its decisions began to be agitated. These oppositions culminated, in 1924, in the publication of a document entitled "An Affirmation," issued by a Committee of ministers who, while not all living there, issued it from Auburn, New York. Hence it has become known as the "Auburn Affirmation" and its signers as "Affirmationists." Originally signed by only a small group it received finally the signatures of nearly thirteen hundred out of nearly ten thousand ministers of the Church.

This "Affirmation" (so-called) opposed the Assembly's deliverance on two main grounds: (one) that the General Assembly lacks constitutional power to bind the Presbyteries of the Church to any "necessary and essential articles" for admission of men into our ministry without concurrent action by the Presbyteries; (two) that the "five-points" themselves, entirely apart from any constitutional questions involved, are not, singly or all together essential to "the system of doctrine" taught in the Holy Scriptures and contained in our Confessional standards.

Now if the first point only had been raised by the "Affirmationists" the matter would hardly be worth recalling. For they asked a perfectly fair constitutional question, and in it they might be right. It may be that the Assembly *does* lack power to bind the Presbyteries to any "essential or necessary articles." I will not dispute that point now. It is relatively unimportant. The representation has gained wide currency, however, that the "Affirmation" concerned itself with this point only, and that it is merely a plea for correct constitutional practice. That representation is not true. It is the second of the points raised by the Affirmation that makes it of historic significance.

The "Five Points" of 1923

We cannot understand the second point made by the Affirmation unless we have before us the "five points" of the Assembly of 1923. They are:

"One. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.

"Two. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.

"Three. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

"Four. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and of our standards concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that on the third day He rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession.

"Five. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God as the supreme standard of our faith that our Lord Jesus showed His power and love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it."

Now what does the "Affirmation" say about these five points? With regard to the first, which represents the Bible as inerrant, it says, in part, "the doctrine of inerrancy, intended to enhance the authority of the Scriptures, in fact weakens the testimony of the Church . . ." And this is in spite of the fact that the General Assembly of 1893, sitting judicially, solemnly suspended Dr. Charles A. Briggs from the Gospel Ministry for teaching, *inter alia*, that the Scriptures contained error. That Assembly decided that to teach the doctrine of an erring Bible is in conflict with the law of the Church and a violation of ordination vows. The court was plainly right, and its judgment should be respected. Auburn "Affirmationists" flout it. For this reason and for others that will appear I solemnly declare and protest that they have violated the vow they took at their ordination when they gave an affirmative answer to the question: "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?", as the highest court of the Church has defined that vow. Like Dr. Briggs they have violated their ordination vows and should be suspended from the ministry until they repent. I can see no escape from this conclusion.

What is the "system of doctrine" of the confession? This is raised by the "Affirmation's" rejection of the four remaining points of the deliverance, and is not difficult to answer. It is that fabric of related and interdependent truth called "Calvinism," or the "Reformed Faith." It is more than mere evangelicalism, although Calvinism is evangelical. It is a systematized statement of the teaching of Holy Scripture concerning God, His nature, His purposes, His decrees, His methods and His revelation; concerning man as he was in creation, as he is

in sin and as he becomes by grace; concerning redemption by Jesus Christ crucified and risen; concerning the ultimate destiny of man and the ends of his being,—all this and more.

The Affirmation Anti-Christian

It is not claimed that the "five points" of 1923 are any kind of summary of Calvinism. They are not to be confused with the famous "five points of Calvinism"—total inability, unconditional election, limited atonement, efficacious grace, and the perseverance of the saints. But while it is freely agreed that the five points of 1923 do not summarize Calvinism or any system of doctrine, yet my claim is this: if the five points of 1923 are not true, then Calvinism, the system of our Confession, is not true. Even more then: "evangelicalism" is not true; more: then Christianity, in any of its historic forms, is not true. Here is the test: if you take the five points of 1923 from the confession what have you left? The stark answer is, nothing. No system of doctrine at all. One does not need to be a trained theologian to see how inescapable is this dreadful conclusion. Take away the inerrant Bible, a Christ born of a Virgin, the atonement as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God, the resurrection of Christ in the same body in which he suffered, and the supernatural miracles of our Lord,—take them all away, and what have you? It is as though some rough cannon-shot had entered the living, breathing body of Christian truth, tearing out heart, lungs and spine. There may be other organs left in that body—just as there are other doctrines the Affirmation does not deny—but they cannot continue to live or function. The life of the body is gone,—gone because organs essential to its continuance have been shattered and shot away. So with the system of doctrine of the confession,—if the "Affirmation" is true, then historic Christianity, then Calvinism, is shattered and dead.

I am well aware that the "Affirmation" attempts to weaken the force of this inescapable conclusion in two ways: (First)—it declares that some of its signers themselves believe all the five points while agreeing with the others that they are not necessary to our system of doctrine. But is this really any defense at all? How deep can a belief in these five points be on the part of those who can complacently contemplate a Christianity without them? Can a man really "believe" these doctrines in any truly Christian sense if he holds at the same time that they are quite unnecessary to essential Christianity? Further, is it not a commonplace of Church history and law that heresy has to do with *false teaching* as much as with errors in personal *believing*? Regardless of what some few "Affirmationists" may believe about any of the five points, the really important thing is what they *teach*

others to believe concerning them. If an "Affirmationist" stood up at this moment here in this church and claimed that he personally believed in all of the five points I would yet be compelled to point out to him that his heresy consisted in his public teaching,—that he had publicly taught that the five points were not necessary to the system of doctrine of the confession and that that teaching is the baldest heresy.

The "Affirmation" and Scripture

The second method by which the Affirmation tries to cover up the gaping wound its denials leave in the body of Christian truth, is subtle and clever. In opposition to the five points of 1923, it offers five statements of its own—which, while at times similar in language to the five points, are as far apart from them as the poles are from each other. The five points they dub "theories," while upon their own five statements they bestow the sonorous and impressive title of "facts and doctrines." Now we all believe, they say in effect, these facts and doctrines,—but belief in these "theories" (the five points) is a different matter. Then let us see what these "facts and doctrines" are. To point number one, which is the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, they oppose this statement: "we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God." That sounds innocent enough—at first blush. By itself the statement is quite true. Then one remembers that this statement was issued because its framers do not accept the first point. The "inspiration" to which they refer then, is, *inescapably*, one that admits of errors in God's word. Such "inspiration" may mean almost anything or nothing. Here it clearly involves the low view of inspiration that may accompany belief in a Bible that is not factually or doctrinally trustworthy. That is no "fact and doctrine"—it is a *theory* of inspiration—a bad theory—not the theory of our standards, which clearly maintain that the Bible is errorless because it came from God. The "Affirmation" here plainly teaches heresy.

The Virgin Birth

To point number two, which states that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, the Affirmation blandly opposes the belief of its signers "that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh." The Virgin Birth then is a "theory"—of what? Evidently the Affirmationists think it a theory of the incarnation. But the Virgin Birth is no theory, never was, never will be. It belongs in the realm of fact: "true or untrue." Either it happened, or else it did not. The Bible says it did,—the "Affirmation" clearly implies that if one believes that Christ was "God manifest in the flesh" such belief is a good substitute for belief in the Virgin Birth. It happens, however, that historically, Christians have

never felt called upon to choose between belief in the Incarnation and belief in the Virgin Birth. The attempt of the "Affirmation" to call the Incarnation a fact and doctrine of which the Virgin Birth is but one theory is a piece of monstrous absurdity. The only incarnation taught in Scripture includes the Virgin Birth, not as a theory, but as a fact. Here again the "Affirmation" is clearly heretical.

The Substitutionary Atonement

To point three, which asserts that on the cross Christ "satisfied divine justice and reconciled us to God" the "Affirmation" sets off "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself and through Him we have our redemption." Here is the very language of the Scriptures—should this not be enough? No, not when these verses are wrenched out of their context and placed in seeming contradiction to one of the most precious doctrines of the Bible! That Christ died to satisfy Divine justice may be a theory, but if so it is none the less true since it is the revealed "theory" of the Word of God! It is the clear teaching of our confession—the very words, "The Lord Jesus . . . hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father . . ." are found in the Confession's great eighth chapter. We all ought to believe in the majestic declaration of the Scriptures "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,"—how the heart leaps at the words! But any man who would teach his fellows that those words are a substitute for or an alternative to belief in Christ's satisfaction of God's justice, is giving men poison, not food, for their souls. Neither the Bible nor the standards of our Church know anything of a redemption that was not secured by Christ's offering up of Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

The Bodily Resurrection.

To point number four, which declares the bodily resurrection of our Lord, the "Affirmation" says "that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our ever-living Saviour." But what kind of resurrection is implied here? The statement is offered as a substitute for the phrase describing Christ's resurrection as being "in the same body in which he suffered." Inescapably, then, the "Affirmation" means us to understand that this "resurrection" of which it speaks need not have been a *bodily* resurrection. What then? The only other kind of "resurrection" left to believe in is a *non-bodily* "resurrection"—which is nothing more than the simple survival of the soul after death. According to the "Affirmation," then, all that is necessary is to believe that somehow the Cross did not quench or destroy the living personality of Jesus. This is a complete denial of the Resurrection in any historic or

Christian sense. The only Resurrection Christianity knows is a resurrection of our Lord's *body*. According to the "Affirmation" this precious doctrine is only a "theory" that can be discarded without doing violence to the Christian Faith. God help the Presbyterian Church if she is willing to consent to that heresy!

The Miracles of Christ

The fifth point of 1923 is that which speaks of Christ's miracles as "not contrary to nature, but superior to it" that is, as supernatural. The "Affirmation" counters with "in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works . . ." There it is,— "mighty works" instead of miracles, as if His miracles could be explained upon some natural basis! Christianity is supernaturalistic to the core. The "Affirmation" implicitly denies the supernatural by substituting for it a description of Christ's miracles with the miraculous left out. Thus, to this extent at least, it takes its position beside the hosts of naturalism that have tried and are ceaselessly trying to persuade men not to believe in the supernatural record of God's supernatural redemptive acts recorded in the Scriptures. At this point again, truth and candour force me to say: this is heresy.

In Defense of Precious Souls

Such is the doctrinal teaching of the "Affirmation," stripped of its polished veneer, its professed loyalty to our system of doctrine. It had better be called the Great Denial than an "Affirmation"—the Great Denial of all that gives hope and faith and redemption to fallen and struggling mankind. For let no one be deceived: this conflict is not a mere "strife of tongues", it is not a mere dialectic in the interest of one system of human theology as over against another. I speak this morning in the serene beauty of this place so dear to us, in defense of all that placed this stately building here, in defense of the truths that have made it dear. The battle against Modernism is a warfare in defense of human souls. We are fighting for the eternal destiny of boys and girls, young men and women, precious, immortal spirits committed into our care. Upon what they are taught about the trustworthiness of the Bible, the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ, will depend their eternal destiny. Shall we allow their minds to be poisoned with subtle, false doctrines that will lead them to eternal destruction, and do it without a protest? Forbid it Almighty God—forbid it by the tears, the groans, the wounds of our Saviour, by all the burdens He bore upon the cross. Forbid it by the love we should bear to human souls, for whom Christ died,—forbid it as we love the Church, as we are worthy to be called Ministers of Christ! As long as we cherish compassion and tenderness for one

poor soul struggling in sin and yet longing to know the light, O God forbid that we should acquiesce in the preaching of doctrines, belief and trust in which would lead that soul down to the awful abyss.

III.

I hope that throughout this sermon, its letter and spirit will make it abundantly plain that I am not engaging in any "personal attack" upon anyone. Nothing could be farther from my intention. My point is one,—namely that those who accept the doctrinal pronouncement of the Auburn "Affirmation" cannot truthfully be said to accept the Bible as the Word of God or to receive and adopt the system of doctrine of our Confession of Faith, and that, because of this, they ought to demit the Ministry of the Presbyterian Church. I am not blind to the fact that many signers of the "Affirmation" may sincerely claim that they *do* really accept the system of doctrine of the Confession. They may say that this declaration of theirs should settle the matter. But the fact that they are *sincerely* mistaken does not make them any *less* mistaken. It is hard for me to conceive how any intelligent man, theologically trained, can be honest in thinking there is no such contradiction between the Affirmation and the Confession of Faith, but if any man insists that he is sincere in so holding, I will gladly accept his word. But I will still insist that he is wrong and ought to leave the Presbyterian Church without delay. If a minister cannot adopt the doctrines of any Church according to their historic meaning he will be happier without it than within it. He will be free from the stigma of having introduced strife and dissension where there ought to be heart-unity, peace and love. Equivocation and mental reservation lead to uncertainty and strife.

If I must mention names today it is not because I have any desire to slander or to humiliate, God forbid! But you yourselves know that ever since I have been with you in this pulpit, my yea has been yea, and my nay, nay. I have not dealt with innuendo or with equivocation. You have known exactly where I stand with relation to every great issue before the Church. Should I merely speak to you today about the Auburn Affirmation, and denounce it, without naming its signers in our midst, I should do two wrongs: first, I should leave you mystified, your minds filled with generalities. I should warn you of danger without telling you where to expect it. The mission of Christian preaching is not to confuse a people but to inform it, to lead it. The pastor is under a solemn duty to guard the flock committed to his care, and I have tried to discharge that duty. Second, were I not particular in naming those implicated in the Auburn propaganda, I should perpetrate a grave and unpardonable injustice

upon all the ministers of our Presbytery who are *not* signers of the "Affirmation." You would go forth this morning saying, "I wonder who he meant? Perhaps it is so-and-so." And the finger of suspicion might be pointed at men who are entirely innocent of any connection with the "Affirmation." Once I had resolved to speak out on this subject, it did not take me long to see that, no matter how much my act or its motives might be condemned or misconstrued, I should *have* to name the signers in our Presbytery. I did not then think, nor can I now believe, that they can justly be offended, for it is *they* not *I*, who have offered the "Affirmation" to the Church. I am only telling you of something these men have done openly, proudly. How can they object to my naming them if they are not ashamed of their document? Certainly they can have no wish to hide it! It is, therefore, with a solemn sense of responsibility, and without the slightest intention of engaging in personalities that I read you, in alphabetical order, the names of the signers of this document who are now in our Presbytery. They are:

[Here was read a list of the "Affirmationists" in the Presbytery of Philadelphia.]

It may be asked why, if the Auburn Affirmation is an heretical document, formal charges are not now filed against its signers. The answer is simple and direct. While the Affirmation was first published in 1924, and is still being supplied to those who write to Auburn asking for it and while its principles and signers have gained and are gaining a domination in the Church which is a danger and a menace, so that the issue raised by the Affirmation is more alive and urgent today than in the year it was originally signed, section 117 of our Book of Discipline provides that: "Prosecution for an alleged offense shall commence within one year from the time of its alleged commission or from the date when it becomes known to the judicatory which has jurisdiction thereof." There is some doubt as to whether, under this section, "Affirmationists" could escape trial now because of this purely technical time-limit. Why any of them should wish to plead such a defense, and not be willing to have the case settled upon its merits, I do not know. But I have had no wish to begin a judicial case where this plea might be raised, and which might be taken to the General Assembly upon a purely technical issue that would settle nothing when it was all over.

The Minister's Duty to Warn Against Error

There are those who will say that I have no right to preach this sermon, that I ought to prefer charges; that if I cannot prefer charges I ought to remain silent (as if eight years of time made the doctrines of the Affirmation less pernicious!). Those who

take this position show at one glance their utter ignorance of the basic principles of the Presbyterian Church as expressed in its history and standards; and their superficial and inadequate understanding of the nature and duties of the minister of Christ. It is an obligation of Christ's minister to bear testimony against error not only jointly with others as a member of a Church court, *but as a minister*: it is an essential portion of the character and nature of his office. He may not abrogate this obligation without ceasing, in any full sense, to be a minister of Christ. I protest against the idea that a minister must cease from his plain duty simply because Church courts may fail in *their* duty!

If the Church Becomes Apostate

And I further protest, before the great Searcher of all hearts, that if in the Presbyterian Church it becomes a crime and an offense for a minister of Christ to warn precious souls against false teaching and teachers within or without the Church, which duty is laid upon him by Holy Scripture, that then the Presbyterian Church will have become an apostate Church. Nothing is more clear in God's Word than the sacred duty of the Christian minister to bear witness to truth as opposed to error. For what other purpose does he exist? And what person with any maturity of mind could conceive that the bringing of judicial charges, filed privately, heard behind closed doors by secret courts, with rumor and innuendo as the only source of public information, will be any warning to precious souls against false teachings and teachers? There is no law *now* in the Presbyterian Church upholding the ridiculous contention that the only way to protest against error is to bring formal charges. But if the day ever comes when such a law exists, or when the highest court of the Church decides that in order to remain a Presbyterian minister one must surrender this essential ingredient of his ministry, then let the Presbyterian Church remember the words of the fifth paragraph of the twenty fifth section of her Confession of Faith; for they will be graven upon her tombstone for a warning to posterity: "The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan."

I value my ministry and the succession in which I have received it. I love the Presbyterian Church. I am a Presbyterian not by convenience, but by conviction. But if the Presbyterian Church seeks to force upon us an emasculated ministry, prohibited from that warning against error and errorists which is a solemn and inescapable duty, then I would rather leave the Presbyterian Church, rather exercise a full ministry without her walls than remain within her.

I would depart in sadness, but would do it because I "ought to obey God rather than men."

No Liberty to Defend the Gospel?

Further, I am amazed at the position taken by some: that in the Presbyterian Church there is liberty for men to attack the doctrines of the Bible and our standards. (As the Auburn "Affirmation" does)—to belittle the very Person of Christ as He is described in Scripture, but *no liberty* to defend the standards of the Church, the doctrines of the Scriptures and the person of our Lord by calling public attention to attackers and their attacks. *They* are to be given liberty to attack the Church by boring from within; *we* are to be denied the right in the name of the law of the Church, to defend that Church's law, doctrines and Head. *They* may attack *Christ*. *We* may not attack *them*! What could be more absurd?

Please allow me earnestly to repeat that the preaching of this sermon is no easy matter. It has followed literally months of heart-searching and seeking of Divine guidance. Once that guidance came there could be but one question left,—namely the *time* that should be chosen for speaking out. What our age needs is a profounder emphasis upon God as the source and ground of truth than it has ever known before. Because He is our God, and because truth is of the essence of His nature and acts, His minister may not dare to despise it, or handle it or alter it as though it were his own. Recently I listened to the pithy observation that "a man who is willing to sacrifice truth for the sake of expediency is a 'yes-man', and in their hearts all honest men despise him." How true! True today as when Paul withstood Peter to his face because he was to be blamed, true as when Athanasius said with the proudest humility the world has ever known, "The world against me? Then I am against the world!" True today as when the erstwhile Brother Martin, the sledgehammer of God, nailed his ninety-five theses on the church door at Wittenberg,—at one blow knocking down age-long prison walls of superstition over whose ruins the refreshing breezes of the Spirit of God could blow untrammelled and free. We have received a noble inheritance preserved to us by the courage and constancy of the fathers. Shall we give it up without a struggle?

An Appeal to Modernists for a Peaceful Separation

The characteristic plea of Modernism is, "Let us give up all that conflicts with truth!" It is a noble cry, and despite its ghastly errors, Modernism would, in the estimation of the world, gain in moral stature if it would seriously practice it. Conscientious Modernists know that the system of doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is not Modern-

ism, but its very antithesis. In their hearts they know that no honest man can be at permanent peace with himself, even if his modernism be sincere, when he has gained the right to be a teacher by giving formal assent to doctrines that he does not and cannot believe. Further, every intelligent Modernist (alas! there are many) knows that two contradictory religions,—alien in foundation, structure and objects of labor—*ought* not to be struggling with each other within the confines of a single church. Modernists and Evangelicals should be able to go their separate ways,—each to bind up the wounds and bruises of the world in his own manner—not to add to that world's hurt and confusion by a disgraceful compromising that enthrones temporary and *only temporary* tranquillity above a clear, ringing proclamation of the truth, whatever that truth may be. Even if Modernism were right and historic Christianity wrong, when will Modernists not see that, in attempting to hold to forms they can no longer believe, in attempting to crowd those who *do* believe the old faith out of the churches to which they belong by conviction, or to silence them into a doctrinal indifferentism, they are themselves sinning against the truth? There are probably relatively few here who have been

affected by Modernism, but feeling that what I say may be read by a considerable number of Modernists, I dare to make this appeal to their candour, their honesty, their sense of fairness: If you really love truth above buildings, endowments, historic seats of learning and the prestige of ancient names, then withdraw from us,—leave us at peace. Go your own way,—build up your own churches, or else join the communion of some body which has taught from the beginning what you teach. If you are right, the God of truth will bless you. Never will there be peace in the church until she is truly *one*,—one in agreeing upon her essential message and purpose. The peace which we formerly enjoyed is not of our breaking, but of yours. If it continues to be broken, the responsibility will be yours. You have intruded into our pulpits, our agencies, our seats of learning and instruction. It is *your* presence in the church that makes peace impossible,—more, disgraceful and dishonorable to you and to us unless we *all* are willing to confess that we value expediency above truth. Let us part in peace. Take with you the new light and truth you think you have, and leave to us the Church of our fathers,—those fathers whose memory we bless and whose faith we share.

The Proposed Doctrinal Basis of Union

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

IN the January issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY we tried to estimate from the theological point of view the creedal quality of the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church of North America. In this issue it is our purpose to deal with the confessional standing of the United Presbyterian Church as it is affected by the adoption of this Confessional Statement, and the confessional standing of the proposed Presbyterian Church of America if the union between the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church is consummated, as that standing would be affected by the incorporation of the Confessional Statement in its creedal constitution.

A Shorter Creed

At the outset we should observe that, although the Confessional Statement adopted in 1925 by the United Presby-

terian Church does not profess to be a substitute for the Westminster Standards; yet the well known practical tendency of the adoption of a shorter creed which professes to contain the substance of the historic Westminster Symbols is to oust the latter from their true and honoured position. The current of the present time is towards the depreciation of well-defined and full doctrinal statement, and it is a fundamental colossal mistake to encourage and confirm that tendency by the acceptance and endorsement of a diluted confession. It is to encourage and confirm what is one of the most malignant moral and spiritual diseases of our time. We may not know enough to venture a judgment with respect to the effect it has had in this direction in these six or seven years in the United Presbyterian Church; we feel safe, however, in predicting that it would have such an effect

in the proposed united Church. Consequently, even irrespective of the explicit doctrinal divergences of this Statement from Scriptural and Reformed teaching, we believe that opposition to it is justified and demanded on the part of those who desire vigorously and consistently to maintain and defend the testimony of the historic Reformed Church.

Substance of the Westminster Symbols

But not only so. This Confessional Statement according to its preamble claims to embody the substance of the Westminster creeds. Some conservatives may be disposed to argue that this is an achievement in modern confessional formulation. Is it not wholesome in these times of doctrinal delinquency to have a reaffirmation in an up-to-date creed of what is the substance of Reformed doctrine? So far from this being so, the attempt to define the substance of the Westminster Symbols constitutes a thorough-going menace to and virtual breakdown of a truly Reformed Confession. This attitude can be validated by two considerations.

First of all, so far as confessional formulation is concerned, the very principle of substance definition is to be repudiated. "It is perfectly obvious," as Dr. Charles Hodge contended, "that there is no authoritative standard by which to determine what the substance of a doctrine is."* Neither is there any authoritative standard by which to determine the substance of the Westminster Standards. The term in this precise connection is far too vague and uncertain, and so the Confessional Statement presumes to do what ought never to be attempted.

But secondly for the sake of argument let us suppose the phrase is allowed. Then the man wholly loyal to the Westminster Symbols is shut up to one of two alternatives. Either the Confessional Statement puts into the phrase a meaning to which he will on no conditions submit for it is an interpretation compatible with the contradiction and omission of certain integral elements of the system of doctrine

contained in these Symbols, or the Confessional Statement in making the assertion that it contains the substance of the Westminster Symbols states what is a plain misstatement of fact. On the former alternative the sincerely and intelligently Reformed person is excluded from subscription because of the vicious interpretation put upon the term "substance." On the latter alternative, when the word "substance" is made to mean something acceptable, no thoughtful Reformed office-bearer can subscribe to the Statement because it contains what is not true; it does not contain the substance of the Westminster Standards. No person or Church can afford to be implicated in a plain misstatement of fact.

Deviations Which Are to Prevail

But still further the Confessional Statement affirms in its preamble that "wherever it deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations are to prevail." These deviations were pointed out in a previous article, and it is to be remembered that they are not trivial. They cut deeply into the system of doctrine taught in our historic creeds; they really disrupt what is most precious in that system. And these deviations are to prevail! That is to say the man who faithfully and honestly signs the subscription formula commits himself definitely and unequivocally to deviations which constitute the repudiation of the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Standards. The evidence is, then, not only presumptive but conclusive that no man who in good faith signs the formula of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as at present maintaining can sign the Confessional Statement and that no Church that is loyal to the great heritage of Presbyterianism in America can incorporate this Statement in its constitution. Let the union be effected on the basis proposed and the consequence for Presbyterianism in America is only too apparent.

Forbearance in Love

But however serious these foregoing considerations are and however conclusive against union, we have not yet men-

tioned what raises perhaps the most serious issue of all. Suppose that the forty-five articles of the creed we are discussing were unimpeachable. Let us even suppose that for soundness and clearness they were unsurpassed, models for fulness of statement and richness of expression, opposition just as determined as ever to the Confessional Statement and to the proposed basis of union would be completely justified. This may appear anomalous, perhaps even preposterous, but nevertheless strictly true. The explanation rests in the second paragraph of the preamble. It reads: "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 discussing this we confine ourselves to the bearing it would have on the testimony of the proposed Presbyterian Church of America. The section in the proposed new formula of subscription to which this paragraph in the preamble has direct reference reads thus: "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?" Section 2.

According to previous arguments we cannot allow that this is a coherent and intelligible question, because certain integral elements of the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Standards are contradicted by the teaching of the Confessional Statement. So then if we take both together, we cannot believe that there is a system of doctrine. It is a system with self-contradiction which consequently is no system.

But suppose that for the sake of argument we allow this to pass. The formula does profess to commit the subscriber very definitely to the system of doctrine contained in these Standards as taught

* The Church and Its Policy, p. 325.

in the Word of God. And in the first section the Scriptures are said to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Solemnly and definitely, then, it commits him to this system of doctrine as taught in the Word of God. And just as solemnly and definitely it does no more than this. What it does not do should be marked as well as what it actually does. The Declaratory Statement adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1903 says explicitly that the "ordination vow of ministers, ruling elders and deacons, as set forth in the form of Government requires the reception and adoption of the Confession of Faith only as containing the System of Doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and this also incorporated in the basis of union is confirmatory of the fact that it is only as containing the system of doctrine that the symbols are Standards of the Church.

But now the paragraph quoted above from the preamble implies that the subscriber in his ordination vow need not fully subscribe to the Standards of the Church. The meaning, then, is that in one solemn act of subscription he is definitely committed to a certain system of doctrine, but according to a principle just as emphatically expressed he is not required fully to subscribe to that system of doctrine. That is to say he is not required fully to subscribe to that to which he does subscribe. Is this not absurd? But it is worse than absurdity; it is downright perversity.

By common consent the Christian ministry is the highest and most consecrated vocation upon earth. And ordination is surely one of the most solemn acts, if not the most solemn act, in connection with that vocation. The issue we are pressing now is that according to the simple logic of the situation created by the above facts the candidate for the most sacred vocation in the most solemn act he may be called upon to perform need not fully believe that to which he pledges his word and his signature. He may enter the gospel ministry with a lie in his right hand. The preacher of truth may practise dishonesty.

But it is not simply that *he* may practise dishonesty; the protection and good faith of the Church is pledged to his dishonesty. Forbearance in love is to be exercised to him. And then the responsibility for this forbearance in love is foisted upon the law of God. The law of God requires it! The Church protects and endorses a moral tragedy, and claims authority for so doing from the law of God.

But this is not all. Subscription to the formula applies to the system of doctrine professed by the Church, and this system of doctrine is said to be taught in the Word of God. If now the candidate for ordination may disbelieve part of that system of doctrine, he not only disbelieves what belongs to the system of doctrine contained in the Subordinate Standards, but he may disbelieve what the Church affirms to be taught in the Word of God. On what conceivable ground can such a position be justified? And how can it be compatible with that to which the candidate has subscribed in the first section of the formula which reads: "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?" The logic is simply that he may disbelieve what is expressly stated to be taught in the Word of God which he himself has already professed to be "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." This principle then leads not only to the undermining of the authority of the Subordinate Standards; it really undermines the supreme and final authority, the Word of God itself.

The adoption of this principle by the Church will mean that it ceases to be a confessional Church. It gives liberty for the disbelief in the Church by ministers and officebearers of every element of the system of doctrine professed. It may be beyond reason to suppose that every element could be disbelieved by any one man, but one may disbelieve one element or more, another may disbelieve another, and so throughout the Church every element may be disbelieved and even opposed so long as not "determinedly opposed."

This latter expression is distressing. How much mischief by way of propaganda and attack could be done to the very foundations of the Church under the plea that it had not yet attained the character of "determined opposition" is too dreadful to contemplate. But it is interesting in that it goes to confirm our argument. It surely means that "forbearance in love" could justifiably cease when unbelief and opposition reached that stage. That is, an ordained person may disbelieve and in some ways oppose doctrines which if "determinedly opposed" would involve him in a just charge and a sentence of discipline.

So then however rigid a construction may be put upon the system of doctrine to which a candidate according to the formula professes to subscribe, it is completely nullified by the reservation expressed in the preamble. Subscription that is intended to mean everything comes virtually to mean nothing. Every really honest man would need to wash his hands clean of such a piece of ecclesiastical jugglery. It is a moral atrocity in which he cannot take the risk of being in any way involved. The garment of simple straightforward honesty is too precious to have it besmeared with such obliquity.

These various discussions surely establish with unmistakable conclusiveness that this proposed union if consummated by the incorporation of the Confessional Statement in its constitution means that in the said Church testimony to the Reformed system in faith and conduct will have ceased, and that testimony to the final and infallible authority of Scripture will have been subtly but effectively prejudiced. The Presbyterian Church of America will have come into being by the renunciation of the great Presbyterian and Reformed tradition. The greatest Presbyterian Church of North America will by one momentous decision have ceased to be. And who is to raise her testimony and unfurl her banner? "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee that it may be displayed because of the truth." Let us pray that this union may not occur.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

XIV. Paul's Commission and its Importance to Us

"But from those who were reputed to be something—of whatever sort they were, it makes no difference to me; God does not accept the countenance of a man; for to me those who were of repute added nothing, but, on the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision just as Peter with that of the circumcision (for He who had worked for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision had worked also for me unto the Gentiles), and when they recognized the grace that had been given me, James and Cephas and John, those who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision—only, that we should remember the poor, which very thing also I was zealous to do" (Gal. 2:6-10, in a literal translation).

Another Broken Sentence

IN the immediately preceding verses, which were treated in last month's issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Paul has spoken of the Judaizers and of his refusal to yield to them regarding the test case of Titus. Those verses constitute in some sort a digression; and the apostle now returns with verse 6 to the point at which he has broken off. He has told us in verse 2 that he laid his Gospel before the leaders of the Jerusalem Church. Now he tells us what they said to him in reply. With the words "from those who were reputed to be something," contrasting as these words do the leaders of the Church with the words "from those who were reputed to be something," contrasting as these words do the leaders of the Church with the Judaizers of whom he has just spoken, the Apostle takes up the interrupted thread of his narrative.

We observed last month that verses 4 and 5, in the opinion of many exposi-

tors, constitute an "anacoluthon"—that is, Paul begins a sentence which he breaks off without completing it in any grammatical way. There, however, the anacoluthon is of such an unusual kind, if it really does exist, that many scholars have sought to avoid it by joining the verses to the preceding sentence.

In our passage, on the other hand, there is an anacoluthon which is altogether natural and easy. Paul was intending, when he began the sentence, to say, "From those who were reputed to be something I received nothing": but after the words, "from those who were reputed to be something," several explanatory clauses intervene; the sentence is broken off; and Paul expresses in a different form the thought which he had in his mind. Instead of saying, as he had at first intended to say, "From those who were reputed to be something I received nothing," he expresses exactly the same thought by saying, "Those who were reputed to be something added nothing to me."

The Main Point

The only question is whether the word which we have translated provisionally by the conjunction "for" in the last clause of verse 6 really means "for" or is merely resumptive of the broken thread of the sentence.

If it means "for," it gives a reason for the words, "of whatever sort they were it makes no difference to me," or for the words, "God does not receive the countenance of a man." Paul would thus mean to say: "Whatever advantages the Jerusalem leaders possess, it makes no difference to me; for to me at least (whatever others may have received from them) they added nothing, since my gospel had already been given me by Christ." Or else, he would mean: "God does not accept the countenance of a man; for this general principle is illus-

trated in the present case by the fact that I, who had so little advantages compared with those of the Jerusalem leaders, needed to receive nothing from them."

If either of these two interpretations be right, the whole weighty series of clauses beginning with the word "for" in the last clause of verse 6 and extending to the end of verse 10 is introduced in support of a parenthetical assertion. But what is thus introduced in support of the parenthetical assertion is also the main point of the whole passage, so that in content, though not in form, Paul has completed what he started out to say, and any further grammatical completion of the sentence would have been pedantic and unnecessary.

However, the word which we have provisionally translated "for" is also sometimes used in Greek merely to resume the broken thread of a sentence, as we in English use the words, "I say," or the like. If this be the use of the word here, then the passage is to be translated: "But from those who were reputed to be something—of whatever sort they were, it makes no difference to me; God does not accept the countenance of a man—to me, I say, those who were of repute added nothing"

Fortunately it does not make much difference which meaning is to be attributed to the word; it does not make much difference whether it introduces a reason for what stands in the parenthesis or resumes the thread of the sentence after the parenthesis is completed. In either case, the sentence is grammatically incomplete, but in either case Paul fully completes the expression of the thought that he had in mind when he began.

Former Privileges and Present Authority

So much for the general grammatical structure of the sentence. When we come

now to the details, we can pass over without further comment the phrases, "those who were reputed to be something" and "those who were reputed to be pillars." Those phrases were sufficiently dealt with in the December issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. They do not, as we there observed, indicate indignation against the original apostles, but only indignation against the Judaizers who had falsely appealed to the original apostles against Paul.

At the beginning of the parenthesis in verse 6, there is serious question about the meaning of one word. The word which we have translated by the suffix "-ever" in the phrase "of whatever sort they were"—thus regarding it merely as imparting a somewhat more indefinite tone to the "of what sort"—may also mean "formerly" or "once upon a time." If the meaning "formerly" or "once upon a time" is to be attributed to the word here, then the clause means: "Of what sort they *formerly* were makes no difference to me;" and we have a clear allusion to the advantages which James and the original apostles possessed during the earthly ministry of Jesus, when the apostles were intimate disciples of Jesus, and when James, though not a disciple, was bound to the Lord by close human ties. No doubt the Judaizers had emphasized those former advantages of the Jerusalem leaders. "Paul," they had no doubt said, "is an upstart and a newcomer, whereas Peter and the others have long been bound to Jesus in the closest possible way." In opposition to that argument, Paul would be saying (if the word in question does mean "formerly" here): "Of what sort the Jerusalem pillars were formerly—during the earthly ministry of Jesus—makes no difference to me."

Certainly that interpretation of the word yields an excellent sense, and it may be correct. But it is quite possible also that the other interpretation is right, and that the word merely makes the "of what sort" a little more indefinite.

Even, however, if this latter interpretation be adopted, even if the word be taken to mean "-ever" and not "formerly," there is still probably an allusion, though in this case not so definite an allusion, to the advantages

which the original apostles and James the brother of the Lord enjoyed during the earthly ministry of Jesus. Even if Paul says merely: "Of whatever sort James and Peter and John were, it makes no difference to me," still he is alluding to advantages which those three men enjoyed in the opinion of the Judaizers, and prominent among such advantages was no doubt the former close association of those men with Jesus when He was on earth.

Man's Person and God's Grace

In the next clause, Paul indicates the underlying reason why it made no difference to him how great the Jerusalem apostles were. The reason was that God had already given him all the authority that he could in any case have received from them; God does not, in the disposal of His favor, regard the outward advantages of this man or that; His grace runs counter to all human expectations; and so He had given to Paul, the enemy, a commission which made him independent even of what James or Peter or John could give.

The expression, "to accept the countenance of," which occurs in this clause, is formed in imitation of a phrase of the Hebrew Bible meaning "to lift up the countenance of." In the New Testament, it is used in a distinctly unfavorable way, meaning "to look upon the outward advantages of," "to show partiality because of the high position of the one with whom one is dealing." "No such partiality," says Paul, "is to be attributed to God; high worldly position means nothing to Him; He puts down the mighty from their seats and exalts them of low degree; and so He bestowed His favor upon me, the persecutor, as much as upon those whom all in the Church regarded highly as the original friends of Jesus."

Paul does not mean that the long association of the original apostles with Jesus was a matter of no importance; on the contrary, he regarded it no doubt as a blessed privilege. But what he does mean is that the Judaizers were wrong in thinking that such privileges of the original apostles set limits to the divine grace. "God's ways are not man's ways," Paul means to say. "To human eyes it might have seemed as though the

original apostles alone could be true apostles of Jesus Christ. They had been with Jesus when He was on earth; they were looked up to—and rightly—in the Church. But God's grace broke through all such human calculations. The Lord Jesus appeared to me after apparently the series of the appearances had been closed; I, the persecutor and the enemy, was made to be an apostle equal to the apostles whom all in the Church revered."

A Possible Misunderstanding

We observe here again, as we have observed before, that Paul's appeal to the pillars of the Jerusalem Church was capable of being misunderstood. When a man appeals to another for endorsement, the natural inference might seem to be that he is appealing to a higher instance, to the source from which he regards his authority as being derived. Was not Paul confessing, then, by his appeal to the original apostles, that his authority was derived from them; was he not saying to the Judaizers, in effect: "You say that I am not an apostle; well, I *am* an apostle because the pillars of the Jerusalem Church sent me out; they constitute surely the highest authority, and if *they* commissioned me, my commission is valid indeed?"

Such an understanding of the appeal to the Jerusalem leaders, plausible though it might seem at first sight, is exactly what Paul is most concerned to deny. His concern to deny it will explain a number of the peculiarities of Gal. 2:1-10, and will refute many of the false inferences that have been drawn from those peculiarities.

It will explain, for example, as we have already observed, the use of the peculiar expressions, "those who were of repute," "those who were reputed to be something," "those who were reputed to be pillars," as referring to James and Peter and John. By these expressions Paul does not mean to say that these men were not really "*something*," were not *really* "pillars," but were only reputed to be such. On the contrary, he shows in the plainest possible way, by his references to them elsewhere (and indeed, for that matter, in this very passage), that he recognized them as true witnesses of the risen Christ and as men

who had a high commission in the Church. What he does mean is that it was not their real importance, but only the importance attributed to them by the Judaizers, that caused him to appeal to them in this particular connection. If he had appealed to their real importance, that would have meant that he had received his authority from them; it would have been equivalent to saying: "Accept me as an apostle because James and Cephas and John were so great as to be able to transmit authority to me."

For exactly the same reason, Paul says, in the passage with which we are now dealing: "Of whatever sort they were, it makes no difference to me." Taken out of the context, these words might seem to betoken an unbrotherly indifference, on the part of Paul, to those who had been apostles before him; but in the context they indicate nothing of the kind.

Paul and the Original Apostles

From many points of view, it did make a very great difference to Paul what the original apostles were; it made a great difference to him, for example, that they were true witnesses of the risen Christ, and in I Cor. 15:3-8 he tells us that he appealed to their witness in his basic teaching in the churches. But from the particular point of view which is determinative in this particular passage in Galatians, it made no difference. Here it was not a question of factual detail about the life of Jesus on earth, nor of additional testimony to the resurrection which would impress those who had not yet been won to Christ. In such matters Paul undoubtedly received much from the original apostles, who had lived so long with Jesus on earth. But here it is a question of Paul's apostolic authority—not whence he received this piece of information or that regarding Jesus, but whence he received his commission as an apostle. With regard to that question, he did not need to appeal to the original apostles or to any man; he did not need to say: "I am an apostle because James and Cephas and John were so great as to be worthy channels through which my apostleship could be transmitted to me." In fact,

that is just what he is anxious *not* to say.

What he is anxious here to say is that the greatness of these men had nothing whatever to do with the matter in hand; his apostleship did not come to him through any man, but directly from Christ; and so no man's greatness—not even the greatness of the original apostles of Jesus—had anything whatever to do with its invalidation. He appeals, therefore, to the original apostles not because of their real greatness—which he did not at all deny—but because of the greatness that was attributed to them by the Judaizers. The Judaizers had appealed to them in a falsely exclusive way, as though they were the only ones who had a right to speak. "Well," says Paul, "let the Judaizers be refuted out of the mouths of the men to whom they themselves have appealed. James and Cephas and John did not give me a commission at the Jerusalem conference. On the contrary, they recognized the fact that I had already been commissioned in completed independence of them; they did not say: 'You are worthy, Paul, and therefore we send you out henceforth to preach;' but they said: 'God has already bestowed His grace upon you; you are already preaching the same gospel as that which we preach, and you have received that gospel in the same way, directly from the Lord Jesus Christ; go forward in your sphere as we go forward in ours, that Christ may be preached unto every creature.'"

Why Paul Contended

Was Paul engaging in an unworthy contention when he insisted so strenuously upon his complete independence; was he animated by unworthy jealousy when he guarded so carefully, in our passage, against any thought that it was the real greatness of the original apostles to which he was obliged to appeal as though his commission came in slightest measure from them?

The answer is, most emphatically, "No." Paul was not contending for himself when he contended for his apostolic independence; he was contending for Christ's little ones of all ages, and for the countless multitudes who have received the gospel through his

written and spoken words. He was contending—in ultimate import—for the right of the eighth chapter of Romans, and all the other glorious chapters of the Pauline Epistles, to stand in Holy Scripture; he was contending for the wonderful symmetry and completeness of God's Word. Unless the Epistles of Paul be truly apostolic, they should be excluded from the Bible; and if they were excluded, what a sadly mutilated Bible we should have!

No, Paul was not contending for himself when he contended for his apostolic independence, but he was contending for the One who gave him his apostleship, and for the Church whom that One purchased by His precious blood.

The claim of Paul to apostolic independence, so zealously guarded in the Epistle to the Galatians, does, it is true, place before us a sharp alternative. If the claim was justified, then Paul is to be received today, as always, with the love and gratitude of the Church; but if the claim was not justified, then he deserves much of the opprobrium which has been heaped upon him by an unbelieving world.

Attempts are sometimes made to evade the issue. Attempts are sometimes made to find good in Paul and yet reject his apostolic claims.

We need not wonder that those attempts are made. Similar attempts are made in the case of a greater One, in the case of the Lord Jesus Himself. Jesus came forward with stupendous claims. Men reject those claims today, and yet seek to retain Jesus as the moral ideal of the race. They will not take Him as their Lord and their God; yet they are pleased to admire Him as the leader of mankind into a higher life.

But all such attempts to avoid the issue are vain. In reality, Jesus is everything or nothing. He is either God come in the flesh, as He claimed to be, or else He is unworthy of the admiration of men. Is it really sufficient to give Him the polite admiration that the Church is graciously bestowing upon Him today? "Let the dead bury their dead," He said to a half-hearted disciple when He was on earth. His claims are equally stupendous today. Reject His claims, and you make Him unworthy

even of that measure of devotion which He is receiving from modern men.

A somewhat similar alternative faces us when we consider Paul. He too advanced stupendous claims. His claims were, indeed, infinitely less than the claims of Jesus; he certainly never presented himself as God; he never presented himself as a supernatural person. But though he did not present himself as a supernatural person, he did present himself as one who had a supernatural commission.

Men have tried to evade the issue presented by such a claim. They have tried to push the claim into the background in the account which they give of the life of Paul. They have made excuses for the apostolic consciousness of Paul as they have made excuses for the Messianic consciousness of Jesus; they have tried to show that it was psychologically necessary in that age, that it was the temporary form in which Paul expressed an abiding experience. They have tried to admire Paul the man, after they have ceased to believe that he was, in the sense in which he meant the word, an apostle of Jesus Christ.

But all such efforts are vain. These "Liberal" historians, with their polite excuses for Paul, are farther perhaps from the truth about him than are the radicals who, attending to his stupendous claims, abhor him and all his works. Paul refuses to be placed in the mould in which men try to place him today. Unless his commission was supernatural in the high sense in which he represented it as being, unless it was totally different in kind from the commission of ordinary Christians or the greatest of the saints of the historic Church or the greatest of religious geniuses, then he was a mere visionary and enthusiast, and all his defence against his detractors in Galatia and elsewhere was but the work of an overwrought and irascible man. But if the Lord Jesus really appeared to him on the road to Damascus and made him, not by any human agency but in very presence, an apostle instead of an enemy, then his defence of his apostleship was defence not of himself but of his Lord, and then, too, his Epistles are part of God's holy Word, not one whit inferior in authority to the words which Jesus spoke when He was on earth.

policy of doctrinal inclusiveness that has been followed by the Northern Church. On page 59 we read: "The New School Union of 1869-70; the Revision Question of 1889; the Cumberland Union of 1904; the Auburn Affirmation of 1923; the latitude taken by New York Presbytery in ordaining ministers; the failure of the 1927 Assembly to judicially rebuke this attitude; the ideal of 'an inclusive church' avowed by Northern leaders, are to Columbia Seminary like so many stones in a vast pyramid of difficulty in the way of organic union."

An interesting and what may prove to be a very significant fact in connection with efforts to reunite the churches is recorded on page 66: "The perpetuation of the Southern Church is guarded by a legal seal. The Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States provides that full organic union and consolidation with any other ecclesiastical body can only be effected by the approval of two General Assemblies and the consent of three fourths of the Presbyteries; and that this paragraph can only be amended by the same vote."

Dr. Robinson is not unknown to the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY having contributed the articles, "The Gospel of Jesus" (July, 1930) and "Is the Church Forgetting God?" (May and June, 1931).

S. G. C.

THE BASIS OF EVOLUTIONARY FAITH: A CRITIQUE OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION, by Floyd E. Hamilton, Th.M. James Clarke & Company, London. pp. 222. Six shillings. (May be obtained through CHRISTIANITY TODAY for \$1.50.)

Books of Religious Significance

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AND THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, by Wm. Childs Robinson, A.M., Th.D., D.D. Dennis Lindsey Printing Co., Decatur, Georgia. pp. 233 \$1.75.

THIS volume by the Professor of Church History and Polity of Columbia Theological Seminary should command a wider interest than its title might indicate. While it is primarily a history of Columbia Theological Seminary, having been presented at the celebration of its Centennial and bearing the endorsement of the Board of Directors of that institution, it deals with questions of thought and life that have agitated the whole Southern Presbyterian Church during the last one hundred years. What is more, it deals with matters that have an important bearing on present-day problems, particularly with the question of organic union between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian churches. Special interest attaches to what is said about the question of slavery, the reasons for the division of the Presbyterian Church between the North and the South, the differences in the field of Church polity between Thornwell and

Hodge, the evolution controversy in connection with Prof. Woodrow, and the theology of Thornwell in as far as it is distinguished from the old Princeton theology. No student of Church history or of Church polity or of theology can afford to ignore this volume.

Dr. Robinson points out that there are two great obstacles in the way of a reunion of the Northern and Southern Presbyterian churches. The first of these is difference of attitude of the two churches relative to the spirituality of the Church. While the Northern Church since the days of the Civil War has permitted political questions to influence its actions and on occasion has even made political pronouncements, the Southern Church insists that political matters are outside the province of the Church. On page 61 Dr. Robinson points out that in the Baltimore Assembly in 1926 spokesmen for all three groups within the Northern Church (the Conservative, Liberal and Mediating) condemned the doctrine of the non-participation by the church in political or secular matters as that doctrine is embraced in the Southern Church.

The second of these great obstacles is the

IN 1927 Professor Hamilton gave us his book, *The Basis of Christian Faith: A Modern Defense of the Christian Religion* (George H. Doran Co. N. Y. \$2.25)—the book which still contains the best comprehensive apology for the faith "once delivered to the saints," fitted to meet the needs of college students and other non-professional men and women who have doubts as to the validity of the Christian religion, of which we have knowledge.

In this book Professor Hamilton has given us a critique of a faith which as it is ordinarily presented is a rival of the Christian faith. Professor Hamilton is aware, of course, that there are advocates of "Christian Evolution" but, as he points out, these include practically no evolutionists of standing. "The kind of evolution that is being taught in most schools and colleges, with perhaps a few notable exceptions," he rightly says, "is not only anti-Biblical and anti-Christian, but antitheistic." Moreover, as he also points out, most of those who maintain that there is no conflict between evolution and Christianity really mean that there is no conflict between evolution and that kind of Christianity that "eliminates the first chapters of Genesis, does away with the

fall of man and rules out miracles and a divine Saviour." But, actually, a Christianity that knows nothing of a divine Saviour from the guilt and power of sin is just no Christianity at all. It will be seen, therefore, that even if we hold that there is a form of the evolution theory that is compatible with Christian faith, it would still be necessary to defend historic Christianity (which rests upon its own independent basis) against such forms of the evolution theory as are not compatible with such Christianity. If, however, the evolutionary faith is itself untenable in the light of the fullest knowledge, it is obvious that the most effective way of combating anti-Christian evolutionary views is to disprove evolution as an adequate explanation of things. It is this that Professor Hamilton attempts. It seems to us that his attempt is a noteworthy one.

Professor Hamilton begins with a chapter on "The Present Status of Evolutionary Faith" in which he points out that while practically all scientists have abandoned Darwinism as an explanation of the causes of evolution (without having discovered any explanation to take its place) they continue to assert their faith in the fact of evolution. "Nothing now known to science," he writes, "could have produced evolution, and there is nothing left to examine. Yet strange to say, instead of abandoning evolution or re-examining the alleged evidence for evolution, scientists fall back on *faith!* They say they still *believe* in the fact of evolution, though they do not know what could have produced it!" Professor Hamilton holds that such a situation calls for a re-examination of the evidence for evolution. Inasmuch as this is not being done by the scientists, he believes that it is within the province of the layman in science to attempt it, rightly claiming that laymen who have had a training in logic and the laws of evidence are just as competent—often more competent—to criticise the theories and reasonings of the scientists than are the scientists themselves. He follows this with an interesting chapter entitled, "Evolution and Scientific Repute," in which he indicates some of the reasons why scientists are not themselves re-examining the alleged evidence for evolution and why they practically all accept evolution as a proved fact.

The bulk of the book is taken up with an examination of the evidence, new and old, bearing on the truth of the evolutionary faith. After making clear the precise difference between the evolutionists and non-evolutionists as to the origin of species—whether the Genesis account teaches that God formed the individual species, or simply the genera or the families is held to be an open question and one that may be left to scientific investigation to discover—Professor Hamilton deals first of all with the new evidence on the subject that has been ac-

cumulating during the last twenty-five years. Here he deals particularly with the discoveries in the fields of cytology (the science which treats of cells) and genetics and maintains that discoveries in these fields have not only disproved Darwinism but made clear that there is no known cause or causes capable of producing evolution. In the next place he deals with the various lines of evidence that have long been held to establish the evolution theory, inasmuch as it is upon these that the scientists fall back when they admit that we can be certain of the *fact* but not of the *factors* of evolution. In this connection he points out the inadequacy of the evidence from Classification, Comparative Anatomy, Embryology, Vestigial Organs, Blood Tests, Geographical Distribution, and Palaeontology. He shows that some of these lines of evidence have been weakened if not destroyed by recent advances in knowledge. The chapter on Palaeontology is specially valuable inasmuch as it is in the field of Geology that the strongest apparent evidence for the evolutionary faith is to be found.

This book has an added interest from the fact that its author himself held the evolutionary faith until what seemed to him the overwhelming weight of the evidence forced him to change his position. Throughout he makes clear that his opposition to evolution is not opposition to science.

This is the best critique of evolution, fitted to meet the needs of those possessed of an ordinary college education or its equivalent, of which we have any knowledge. We trust that the demand for it will be so large as to call for an American edition. In the meantime we are glad to say that through special arrangement with its author copies may be obtained through the office of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. No financial profit accrues to us through this service. We have sought to indicate its contents but nothing short of reading the book itself will enable one to perceive the cogency of its argumentation or the clearness with which it indicates how over-hasty they have been who have given up their faith in Christ and the Bible at the behest of anti-Christian evolutionary teaching.

S. G. C.

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.]

From India

[Editor's note: We are glad to publish this challenging letter from Dr. Bowman, the Editor of *The United Church Review*, the organ of the United Church of Northern India, and from Dr. Ewing, who wrote the article referred to in the letter. The reference in our columns to the committee sent out to investigate foreign missions was entirely for the news value of the information. The doctrinal complexion of the committee was given as a generally known fact,—not as editorial opinion. We had no hand in the selection of the committee, and gladly disclaim any responsibility for its findings. We did not intend to infer that the *United Church Review* or the *Indian Witness* were indifferent to sound doctrine, but showed simply that these journals seemed to have overlooked the modernist preponderance on the commission. So far from contesting the truth of this statement, the letter given below certainly establishes it, for its point is that the Editors of these papers were debating other qualifications of the members of the commission, without reference to their doctrinal standing. Of the doctrinal position of members the committee, Drs. Bowman and Ewing say they knew nothing—which furnishes added ground for saying

truthfully that they "have overlooked the fact that the preponderance of weight on this committee is distinctly modernist." We are glad to bear testimony to the desire of these brethren to make it clear that they are not indifferent to modernism, and hope that no one drew such an unintended inference from the news-item in question.]

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Our joint thanks are due you for the October issue of your magazine in which you make reference to certain editorial or semi-editorial comments regarding the personnel of the Laymen's Commission at present engaged in evaluating the facts relative to Christian Missions in India—comments which appeared in recent numbers of the *Indian Witness* and the *United Church Review*.

After some consideration, we have decided that the single sentence which you have written by way of comment on the matter merits a note of protest. You say, "Both papers seem to have overlooked the fact that the preponderance of weight on this committee is distinctly Modernist, and can hardly be expected to have much sympathy" with the presentation of the Gospel to non-Christian peoples in any case. We assume that you know whereof you speak,

though we were ourselves unaware of the theological position of a majority of the Commission. If what you say is true, it is certainly to be deplored.

But we would call your attention to the fact that the theological predilections of the members of the Commission was not in question. The point at issue between our two Indian Church papers—whether clergymen ("evangelistic pastors") or laymen ("university professors") *per se* should have found the larger place on this Commission. And the point made by Mr. Ewing was that "the Commission is a Laymen's, not a Clergymen's Commission; that a man may be a college professor and at the same time keenly interested in the direct presentation of the Gospel . . ." We submit that that statement remains true.

We should deplore it if your readers, among whom we number many personal friends, were to read into what you have called our "overlook"-ing the Modernistic complexion of the Commission, a spirit of indifference to that fact (granted that it be known as true). We are in point of fact very far from being indifferent about it. But it comes a bit odd, does it not, that a magazine of the Church in America should take to task similar organs of the Church in India for ignoring the theological position of men *you* have chosen to send out to investigate *us*? If you of the Church in America do not like the theological leanings of your own investigators, why did you choose them? And if you reply, "We had no voice in the matter," then why do you not choose another Commission of your own liking and send it out to *investigate us*? Certainly the Commission which approached us last year cannot complain that on the whole we were unwilling to be *investigated* as much as the Church in America wishes.

We are not writing this letter with the desire solely of vindicating ourselves. That can await the judgment of the Lord we serve; and we remember that there is a verse which runs, "He that believeth shall not make haste." But we are desirous of challenging the attention of the conservative forces in America through your columns. Is it a matter of "dollars and cents" or of "brain and brawn," or just why is it that the conservative element in the Church in America did not think of *investigating us*? Are you lacking in interest in scientific inquiry into the facts pertaining to Foreign Missions? Or are you convinced without *investigation* that we are doing the right thing—or perchance, just the reverse? Or do you believe that the facts involved are of such a character as to remain hidden from scientific tests? *And*—do you propose to accept this evaluation when presented by the Commission which is now at work? If not, what means have you for passing judgment on that evaluation?

Please do not interpret our silence on this

matter, then, as due to our "overlook"-ing it. We have, indeed, thought about it a great deal and are concerned not a little, though unaware in many cases of the theological position of your investigators. But we have hitherto refrained from dealing with it edi-

torially because we have considered it your problem and not ours.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BOWMAN,
RHEA M. EWING.

Saharanpur, U. P., India.

Current Views and Voices

Where Is the Boldness of the Apostles?

Editorial in *Grace and Truth*

IT IS a marvelous thing to reflect upon the boldness which characterized the early church.

When Peter and John had healed the lame man at the temple gate, a great throng, numbering thousands of persons, ran together to see this miracle. Peter seized the opportunity and boldly proclaimed the Gospel to them. His preaching aroused the ire of the chief priests and the Sadducees, who arrested them and put them in prison. The next day they were called to stand before the Sanhedrin to give account of themselves. Bear in mind that it was this identical company which only two months before had condemned the Lord Jesus to death, and who had incited the people to clamor for His blood in the streets, before the palace of Pilate. Now in the presence of this company, when they are asked, "By what power or by what name have ye done this?" Peter speaks with Spirit-given boldness, saying,

Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Whom ye crucified, Whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole.

This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.

Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved (Acts 4:10-12).

Peter knew the hatred for the Lord Jesus which filled the hearts of these men; and he knew that so to speak might seal his own death warrant; and yet he spoke with marvelous boldness.

Then when the Sanhedrin had threatened them and commanded them to speak no more in this Name, he returned an answer which is breath-taking in its boldness.

Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard (Acts 4:19-20).

And when they had been further threatened and released, they told the disciples all that had happened unto them. Hearing this that humble company of believers prayed, and the prayer of their hearts was,

Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak Thy Word (Acts 4:29).

What was the secret of such amazing boldness, first in the life of Peter, who in craven fear only a few days before had denied his Lord, and in the company of the disciples? It was the same in both cases.

Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said . . . (Acts 4:8).

And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the Word of God with boldness (Acts 4:31).

Here and there today, in individual cases, we have outstanding examples of similar boldness in speaking the Word of God; but in general it is sadly lacking among God's children. We need more of it. And we will have more of it when, like Peter, and like the early disciples, the children of God will yield themselves to Him and permit His Spirit Who dwells in their hearts to fill them.

Material for the Morgue

Editorial in "*The Churchman*"

EDITORS of religious journals are frequently asked: "Why can't we have a religious paper that leaves out controversy?" We can have such papers and we have them in many denominations. They are the dullest and altogether most useless periodicals in existence. The outstanding religious journals today are without exception journals which deal with controversial issues. They have become the best journals largely because of this fact. In a day when mental ferment is a characteristic of all departments of life, when religious issues are widely discussed in the secular press, he is indeed a short-sighted person who would ask the religious press to avoid those issues, carried into every home by secular papers inadequately equipped to discuss them intelligently. In one of his weekly messages, reprinted in the news columns of this issue, Dr. Reiland writes: "When religious conviction shuts the door on thinking and settles down in satisfaction and solitude it enters into a decline and begins to lead an unhealthy existence. . . . The great blessing of our time, though many may resent it, is the vigor of criticism." A religious journal which fails to recognize these facts is fit material for the morgue.

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Calls

Chester Carroll Carnahan, Tulsa, Okla. to be Stated Supply, Fredonia, Kans.; Thomas L. Eberman, Salem, O. to Federated Church, Solon, O.; Fred E. Robb, Middletown, Ia. to Creston, Ia.; James M. Robison, Wink, Tex. to Oakland, Miss.

Calls Accepted

Philip H. Austin, N. Warren, Pa. to Athens, Pa.; C. E. Burdine, Wapello, Ia. to West Liberty, Ia.; David John Donnan, Helena, Mont. to Santa Monica, Cal.; H. Ralph Geil, Brownsville, Ore. to Calvary Church, Portland, Ore.; Robert B. Hamilton, Seaman, O. to Hartwell, O.; Donald J. Henry, Myton, Utah, to Bandon, Port Orford-Langlois, Ore.; Frank D. P. Hickman, Oriskany Falls, N. Y. to Berwyn, Pa.; George R. Hull, Ellendale, N. D. to Hunter, N. D.; Leon M. F. Jordan, Wishek, N. D. to Stirum, N. D.; Daniel James Kerr, Minneapolis, Minn. to East Grand Forks, Minn.; D. Ira Lambert, Nevada, Mo. to Rich Hill, Mo.; Grant Mason, Remington, Ind. to Petersburg, Ill.; H. W. Miller, Westminster Church, Harrisburg, Pa. to Strasburg, Pa.; John H. Patterson, Auburn, Neb. to Federated Church, Bayard, Neb.; Samuel E. Prytherch, Welsh Church, Slatington, Pa. to Welsh Church, Granville, N. Y.; Tibor Toth, Magyar Church, Beaver Falls, Pa. to Magyar Reformed Church, Slyna, O.; Robert H. Wood, Spring City and Kingston, Tenn. to Pekin, Ill.; Harry E. Bicksler, Lingle, Wyo. to Templed Hills, O.; Roy C. Chapin, Milan, Mich. to Mackinaw City, Mich.; R. B. Colton, Supply, Fort Branch, Ind.; Robert F. Galbreath, Bellevue, Pa. to Presidency Westminster College; A. L. Howland, Manning, Ia. to Foxboro, Wis.; Simeon Jewkes to Lake Side Church, Rochester, N. Y.; Harold McMillan to Dauphin, Pa.; H. E. Neff, to be Supply, Cynthiana, Ind.; F. F. Ogle, to be Supply, Bloomfield, Ind.; B. F. Pickering, Lake Park, Ia. to Blue Grass, Ia.; Howard Rodgers, Glenfield, Pa. to Greenfield Avenue Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.; C. Dewey Smitley, Marsteller, Pa. to Fairchance, Pa.; J. W. Turner, D.D., Alexandria, Nebr. to Wakefield, Nebr.; Henry J. Walsh, Oakfield, N. Y. to Grace Church, Rochester, N. Y.

Resignations

G. W. Atkinson, Harbor Springs, Mich.; E. E. Bacon, Seville, O.; I. M. F. Jordan, Wishek, N. D.; Wm. R. McElroy, White Hall, Md.; Wm. F. McKee, D.D., First Church, Monongahela City, Pa.; Samuel Semple, D.D., First Church, Titusville, Pa.; A. Mason Brown, First Church, Providence, R. I.; Hugh A. Craswell, First Church, Greeley, Colo.; O. J. Davies, Bethel Church, near Wymore, Nebr.; Christian B. Eby, Toughkenamon and Unionville Churches, Pa.; W. L. Gilmore, Court Avenue Church, Memphis, Tenn.; Jason T. Harbert, Park Hill Church, Pueblo, Colo.; Otto R. Jaack, Lake Nokomis Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; Robert M. Ramsay, Doe Run, Pa.; H. Marshall Thurlow, D.D., First Church, Clifton Heights, Pa.; Louis Tinning, Hollenbeck Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

Installations

Richard T. Billingsley, Ocean City, Md., Nov. 12; Gilbert I. Boyd, Corry, Pa.; Lloyd R. Bream, Rocky Grove Ave. Church, Franklin, Pa.; John R. Campbell, Brownville and Dexter, N. Y.;

David J. Donan, Santa Monica, Cal.; G. J. Lowrey Fendrich, Jr., Wilshire Church, Los Angeles, Cal.; R. J. Fredericks, Calvary Church, Newcastle, Pa.; John Heslip, Stated Supply Eastminster Church, Erie, Pa.; R. Frank Jones, Westminster Church, Ontario, Cal., Oct. 29; Edward L. Junkin, First Church, Lewisburg, Pa., Nov. 12; Gustavus G. Kundaal, Neelsville Church, Germantown, Md., June 23; Joseph Lundsay, Emmanuel Church, Erie, Pa.; Paul Fritchard, Grace Church, Los Angeles, Cal.; Joseph H. Miller, Rogers, Ark.; Edward R. Rein, Wallingford, Pa., Dec. 1; Stanley H. Roberts, Third Church, Los Angeles, Cal.; A. E. Weisz, Bull Creek and Curtinville, Pa., Nov. 18; C. D. Wickard, as Assistant to pastor, First Church, Warren, Pa. and Stated Supply, Sugar Grove, Pa.; J. W. Wright, East Side Church, Wichita Falls, Tex.; A. A. Acton, First Church, Belvidere, N. J.; Harold R. Austin, Fair Haven, N. Y., Dec. 21; Charles T. Baillie, First Church, South Bend, Ind., Jan. 14; F. J. Bryson, Second Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., Dec. 16; C. Ransom Comfort, Jr., First Church, Hackettstown, N. J.; Henry W. Coray, W. Pittston, Pa., Jan. 18; Frederick B. Crane, Gettysburg, Pa., Jan. 19; A. E. Dickerson, First Church, Coalinga, Cal., Feb. 14; Winslow S. Drummond, Calvary Church, Highland Park, Pa., Jan. 29; Louis H. Evans, Third Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., Dec. 16; G. D. Fisher, Bethel Church, West Union, Ia., Dec. 18; Arfon E. Jones, Welsh Church, Los Angeles, Cal., Feb. 7; Robert McInturf, West Union, O.; A. A. Mitchell, First Church, Turlock, Cal., Feb. 5; Crayton K. Powell, 8th Avenue Church, Denver, Colo.; Victor A. Rule, Edgewood Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., Feb. 5; William R. Rutledge, People's Church, Denver, Colo.; Albert F. Von Tobel, Rockledge, Fla., Jan. 13; Bertram B. Weatherall, Palm Springs, Cal., Feb. 14; George W. Westburg, Memorial Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Jan. 18.

Changed Addresses

James M. Douglas, Lincoln, Neb.; John W. Kennedy, D.D., 4101 N. 29th St., Tacoma, Wash.; Daniel H. Rohrbach, 940 Grandview Ave., Westfield, N. J.; F. G. Behner, Charleroi, Pa.; B. W. Davis, Delia, Kans.; James M. Douglas, 1411 Washington St., Lincoln, Nebr.; A. H. Gammons, Orange Cove, Cal.; Earl C. McConnell, La Jara, Colo.; H. H. Rayburn, Derby, Kans.; Owen J. Roberts, D.D., Waddington, N. Y.; E. V. Ruskin, 610 E. Kaskaskia St., Paola, Kans.

Deaths

Edwin H. Adriance, Kalispell, Mont.; William Boyd, D.D., Lansdowne, Pa., Nov. 2; A. V. Bryan, Monroeton, Pa., Sept. 20; Wm. H. Fishburn, D.D., Los Angeles, Cal., Nov. 15; William S. Holt, Portland, Ore., Nov. 24; George F. LeClere, Eagle Rock, Cal., Oct. 13; J. P. MacPhie, D.D., Pasadena, Cal., Nov. 24; William McKibbin, Cincinnati, O.; W. S. Peter, Monticello, Ind., Nov. 15; John T. Reagan, Knoxville, Tenn., Oct. 27; George C. Butterfield, Ph.D., Los Angeles, Cal., Jan. 28; J. B. Cameron, Independence, Ia., Dec. 30; Carlos C. Cardova, Albuquerque, N. M., Jan. 21; John R. Gass, D. D., Albuquerque, N. M., Jan. 13; Phidelah A. Rice, Colorado, Jan.; William H. Wilcox, Chester, N. Y., Dec. 12.

Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

Calls Accepted

Robert L. Bell, D.D., to Tuskegee, Ala.; Charles M. Boyd, D.D., First Church, Tuscaloosa, Ala. to Westminster Church, Charlotte, N. C.; Claude A. Calcote, Jacksonville, Ala. to Ayeleigh Church, Newberry, S. C.;

W. J. Coleman, Livingston, Ala. to Midland, Tex.; T. M. Kingsley, to Inman, S. C.; Wm. H. McCorkle, to First Church, Knoxville, Tenn.; W. R. Smith, Jr., Banner Elk, N. C. to Beckley, W. Va.; J. G. Walker, Supt. Extension work of Presbytery, to Limestone, S. C.; J. Blanton Belk, D. D., Huntingdon, W. Va. to Second Church, Memphis, Tenn.; M. R. Gibson, Concord, N. C. to Amity Church, Newell, N. C.; Norman Johnson, Blacksburg, Va. to Rocky Mount, N. C.; C. D. Whiteley, First Church, Logan, W. Va. to Albemarle, N. C.

Resignations

Firley Baum, Philadelphia Church, Forrest Park, Ga.; A. E. Curry, D.D., Second Church, Memphis, Tenn.; E. C. Grimshaw, D.D., Fort Valley, Ga.; T. W. Sloan, First Church, Greenville, S. C.; W. P. Chalmers, Chatahoochee, Fla.; J. C. Leckemby, Panama City, Fla.

Ordinations

W. A. Peake, Louisville, Tenn. Presbytery; C. M. Voghs, as evangelist New River, Rush Run, W. Va.

Installations

C. C. Anderson, Mulberry Street Church, Montgomery, Ala., Nov. 24; S. S. Daughtry, Westminster Church, Atlanta, Ga., Nov. 8; B. D. Kennedy, D.D., Del Rio, Tex., Oct. 25; Frank Kincaid, Fountain Inn and New Harmony, S. C., Nov. 8; O. E. Landen, La Feria, Tex., Nov. 1; John V. McCall, D.D., Sanderson, Tex., Oct. 25; T. M. Stevenson, Craigsville, Va., Dec. 20; John D. Thomas, Milton and Bagdad, Fla., Oct. 25; Parks W. Wilson, Harrisonburg, Va., Dec. 13; Edward A. Mohns, Jr., Hayneville and Lowndesboro, Ala., Dec. 15; G. Hunter Norwood, D.D., De Funiak Springs, Fla.; F. C. Symonds, First Church, Lynchburg, Va.

Changed Addresses

S. N. Cramer, Fort Payne, Ala.; E. C. Grimshaw, D.D., Quitman, Ga.; H. Kerr Taylor, Greenville, S. C.

Deaths

J. F. Pharr, Denmark, Tenn.; J. W. Skinner, D.D., Kingsville, Tex., Oct. 24.

Presbyterian Church in Canada

Calls

Harvey Carmichael, Montreal, Que., to Whitby, Ont.; C. E. Fisher, Olds, Alta., to Westmount Church, Edmonton, Alta.; Alex. Nimmo, Morewood, Ont., to Great Village, N. S.; T. DeCourcy Rayner, Wallacestown, Ont. to St. Andrew's, Lachine, Que.; J. Beecher Snider, to Dundalk and Ventry, Ont.

Calls Accepted

O. J. Roberts, D.D., St. Luke's Church, Finch, Ont. to be Stated Supply, Waddington, N.Y.

Resignations

Leslie MacLean, Glebe Church, Toronto, Ont.; Geo. S. Ritchie, Burns, Mosa, Ont.; Robert Simpson, Woodville, Ont.; G. G. Squires, D.D., Chatham and Newcastle, N. E.; Thomas Tait, First Church, Edmonton, Alta.

Ordination

J. F. Minor Simpson, Chauvin, Alberta, Dec. 8.

Inductions

A. T. Barr, St. Paul's Church, Peterborough, Ont., Dec. 30; H. Brash Bonsall, as Stated Supply, Kitsilano, Vancouver, B. C.; Robert Boyle, Port Dover, Ont.; M. G. Court, Knollwood Park, London, Ont., Oct. 28; Alexander Kay Davison, Knox and St. Paul's, Moose Jaw, Sask., Oct. 6; E. L. Garvin, Selkirk, Man.;

A. D. Hamilton, Hanover, Ont., Sept. 13;
 R. J. Hay, St. Andrew's Church, Petrolia, Ont., Sept. 18;
 Hugh Jack, Knox Church, Red Deer, Alta., Oct. 23;
 Wallace Johnston, Allenford, Ont., Nov. 24;
 D. Pary Jones, Knox Church, Harrison, Ont., Dec. 1;
 John Lennox, D.D., Huntsville, Ont., Oct. 5;
 T. G. Marshall, St. Andrew's Church, Hespeler, Ont., Dec. 17;
 Thomas McAfee, St. Andrew's Church, Arnprior, Ont.;
 Walter McCleary, Fort Frances, Ont.;
 W. B. MacOdrum, Mount Brydges, Ont., Nov. 19;
 John McTurk, Cooke's, Chilliwack, B. C.;
 William B. Mitchell, Bridgen and Bear Creek, Ont., Oct. 15;
 Thomas A. Rodger, Knox Church, Calgary, Alta., Sept. 18;
 Frederick Smith, Fairmount-Taylor Church, Montreal, Que., Dec. 1;
 Robert G. Stewart, Merriton, Ont.;
 D. J. Townley, as Stated Supply, Merigomish, N. S.;
 Kenneth C. MacLennan, Port Elgin, Ont., Dec. 15;
 John V. Mills, St. Paul's Church, Wlarton, Ont., Dec. 8.

Deaths

A. H. Scott, D.D., Perth, Ont., Nov.
 Alexander Shepherd, Shelburne, Ont., Jan. 7.

Reformed Church in America

Calls

J. J. Althius, to Bethany Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 G. M. Van Pernis, Fulton, Ill. to People's Park Church, Paterson, N. J. (declined)

Calls Accepted

Bernie Mulder, Pella, Ia. to Bethel Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 A. DeRuyter, Ridgewood, N. J. to Second Church, Lodi, N. J.

Resignations

Nickolas Bruinix, Beverly Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Installations

Carl W. Fleth, Far Rockaway, N. Y., Feb. 16;
 E. Clay Frye, Church of the Covenant, Paterson, N. J.;
 Arthur H. Voerman, Albany, N. Y. to Greenwich, N. Y.

Changed Addresses

Martin Flipse, Box 48, Artesia, Cal.;
 A. V. S. Wallace, D.D., Little Britain, N. Y.

Deaths

Lester M. Conrow, Brooklyn, N. Y., Jan. 11.

Reformed Church, U. S.

Calls Accepted

G. H. Gebhardt, Wadsworth, O. to First Church, Phila., Pa.;
 Addison H. Groff, Quarryville, Pa. to Boonsboro-Mt. Moriah, Md.;
 Frank W. Leske, to Easton, Pa.;
 James B. Musser, Hublersburg, Pa.;
 A. C. Renoll, Ph.D., Fredonia, Pa. to Hartville, O.;
 F. A. Rittershaus, Streeter, N. D. to Artas, S. D.;
 L. D. Benner, Detroit, Mich. to St. Luke's Church, Phila., Pa.

Resignations

Joseph S. Peters, St. James Church, Allentown, Pa.

Changed Addresses

L. D. Benner, 921 N. 26th St., Phila., Pa.;
 C. Edward Holyoke, 736 33rd St., Des Moines, Ia.;
 Edward L. Mohr, Orangeville, Ill.

Installations

Henry Abraham Blum, Waldo, O., Nov. 15;
 B. Herbster, Zion Church, Norwood, O., Nov. 29;

R. W. Hucke, First Church, Marion, O.;
 O. B. Moor, Salem Church, Cincinnati, O., Nov.

Christian Reformed Church

Calls

H. Blystra, Sully, Ia. to Graafschap, Mich.

Calls Accepted

J. C. Schaap, Lucas, Mich. to Oostburg, Wis.

Installations

John Schuurmann, Lincoln Center, Iowa.
 H. Bel, La. Grove Avenue Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., Feb. 14.

Cumberland Presbyterian Church

Calls Accepted

A. J. Hargett, to Otto, Ark.;
 J. E. Martin, to Antioch, Ark.;
 Russel Tatum, Antioch, Ark. to Foster's Chapel, Ark.

United Presbyterian Church

Calls Accepted

Harry H. McClellan, Presbytery of Soudan, Egypt, to Bovina Cent., N. Y.
 John L. McGeoch, Vandegrift, Pa. to Unity, Pa.

Resignations

T. H. Melville, Albia, Ia.
 Robert A. Campbell, Glen Echo Church, Columbus, O.;
 J. W. Giffin, First Church, Cleveland, O.;
 J. I. Phillips, Wayne Avenue Church, Dayton, O.

Installations

W. M. Hay, West Side, Monmouth, Ill., Jan. 14;
 J. M. Gillespie, as Supply, Saxman, Kans.

Changed Addresses

C. F. Hoffman, La Crosse, Kans.;
 Homer H. Wallace, D.D., 38 Beech Road, Glen Rock, N. J.;
 J. G. C. Webster, Ray, Ind.

Deaths

James S. Hill, Winona Lake, Ind., Jan. 23.

News of the Church

The Presbyterian League of Faith

A NEW printing of the Constitution and list of members of the Presbyterian League of Faith has just been issued. According to this list, 1082 ministers of the Church have applied for membership and been received. It is expected that many more who have not yet signed, but who are in thorough sympathy with the purposes of the League, will apply for membership in the next few months. The new printing contains an amendment to the Constitution adopted at the last meeting of the League. Article III, on Memberships, now reads as follows: "Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. if they are in full accord with the objects of the Association, shall be eligible to membership. Written application for membership in the League may be regarded as sufficient evidence of such accord. Applicants for membership may be received by vote of the Executive Committee." Ministers wishing to join the league may address the Rev. A. D. Gantz, Secretary, 730 East 225th St., New York City.

The Overtures

LATEST returns from the offices of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. show that the overtures have received Presbyterian concurrence and non-concurrence as shown below. It is the general opinion that none of the overtures will secure sufficient votes to carry it.

	Yes	No
A.....	35	18
B.....	15	37
C.....	37	14
D.....	31	18
E.....	39	11

Overture from Presbytery of Hudson

THE Presbytery of Hudson, N. Y., has overtured the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. asking that all connection be severed between the Church and the "Federal Council of Churches."

Bishop Manning at Peace with Dr. Guthrie

IN March, 1924, by reason of disapproval of certain ritualistic dances and other symbolic services being held in St. Mark's Church-in-the-Bouwerie, East Tenth street at Second avenue, New York City, of which the Rev. Wm. Norman Guthrie is rector, Bishop W. T. Manning of the Episcopal diocese of New York announced the discontinuance of his visitations to that church. During the intervening eight years the rector of St. Mark's has maintained his unusual program of services in spite of the Bishop's disapproval, and neither Bishop Manning nor his Suffragans have made the annual visitations to St. Mark's to which a parish in good standing in that church is entitled. It has now happened that as a matter of economy the rector of St. Mark's, the Rev. Dr. William Norman Guthrie, has been obliged to discontinue the special services to which the Bishop has objected, a situation which has permitted the resumption of the pastoral relationship between the two chiefly concerned.

When Bishop Manning understood that these services had been discontinued, he wrote to Dr. Guthrie suggesting that the Episcopal visitations be resumed. The suggestion was accepted with alacrity, and Bishop Manning plans to visit St. Mark's Church on March 13th.

The Student Volunteer Convention: An Interpretation

By Frank R. Neff, Jr., '33

Program Secretary of the Maryville College Student Volunteer Group
Special Correspondent for Christianity Today

(This account, although expressing the viewpoints of at least half of the Maryville College delegation to the Buffalo convention and of the administration of the Student Volunteer Group at Maryville, is solely the work of the writer, a student-delegate to the convention, who made full use of his own convention notes in the composition of his article and who assumes full responsibility for all the statements made.)

FOR the eleventh time since the formation of the student volunteer organization in 1888, members of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions of the United States and Canada met in a quadrennial convention. This convention was held in Buffalo, New York, from December 30, 1931, till January 3, 1932, and was attended by 2200 delegates representing over 600 American and Canadian institutions of higher learning, in addition to many foreign countries. "The Living Christ in the World of Today" had been chosen as the convention theme. Around this theme was to be built the intended general presentation and specific considerations of the whole missionary program of Christianity in all its aspects, the general presentation to be by world-recognized leaders from the convention platform, and the specific considerations by the delegates themselves in twenty-five round table groups of limited size.

In this report, however, we are not interested so much in explaining what took place—the newspapers have given ample space to such material—as in attempting to catch the significance of the various subjects announced, of the discussions of those subjects, of the relative importance attached to each subject—in short, to interpret the convention and that from the standpoint of evangelical, potential missionaries.

Speaking in general terms, we would say that the Buffalo convention revealed a poor sense of relative values on the part of the Student Volunteer Movement and that this fact may be seen in three things.

First, in its undue emphasis upon the present world situation. Anyone reading the newspaper reports of the convention could not have failed to observe that the dominant note struck was that of present political, social, and economic conditions. World peace was the subject most discussed. The part that the League of Nations should play in the Manchurian crisis, the right and wrong of the British-Indian situation, the question of disarmament, the inefficiencies of capitalism, were anything but secondary matters.

Now we are by no means of the opinion that these subjects were irrelevant. We

believe that these are matters with which our missionaries should be conversant. And we share the convention's opinion that the League of Nations should deal aggressively with the Manchurian situation; we share the convention's uncertainties as to whether a missionary to India should be pro-British, pro-Indian, or neutral; we also would disarm the nations of the world in an effort to minimize war; we also would reform the present policies of capitalism (not abandon capitalism for socialism, however, as many of the convention leaders seemed to urge).

Nevertheless, we would ask: "What is the relation of these matters to the task of carrying to the ends of the earth a spiritual gospel of the personal salvation of individuals?" The subjects named deal with men not as individuals but only as constituent parts of nations. Our interest as Christian missionaries is centered in individual personalities, in individual souls; and the Student Volunteer Movement reverses the true order of values when it considers the political, social, and economic welfare and temporal status of nations at the expense of the spiritual welfare and eternal destiny of individual men.

Second, in its presentation of missionary work as one merely of social betterment. The gospel mentioned the most frequently in the convention meetings was the social gospel. The problems to be dealt with by means of this social gospel were those of living conditions and standards, social customs, education, and so forth. Perhaps this fact was but due to the Kansas City quadrennial of 1914, the report of which records that "only a Gospel and a Christian Spirit which show themselves able to deal successfully with the sad and tragic social facts of our North American Communities can break the power of caste in India and lift the other indescribably great social burdens which so heavily oppress the inhabitants of Asia and Africa"—a sentiment which causes men to be considered as groups rather than as individuals.

We believe that "the sad and tragic social facts" are matters of great concern to Christian missionaries. We believe thoroughly in the social gospel, but *only in so far as it is a part of that larger gospel which deals with the human soul.* Our criticism of the Student Volunteer convention is that in its eagerness to include in its program all of the sideline phases of Christian missions it had apparently forgotten that all-important nucleus around which the entire structure was originally built. We again assert that this policy shows a reversal of the true order of values as to the temporal status of groups and the eternal destiny of individuals.

Third, in its apparent lack of a sound theological background. The poor sense of values shown in the over-emphasis upon the present world situation and upon the social aspects of the missionary project was undoubtedly due, in our opinion, to a similar failing in the realm of theology. God was represented as "a more than human power." He is certainly all of that, but he is more than that; he is an infinite Personality. Jesus Christ was represented as having been "the supreme achievement of humanity," "the supreme revelation and assertion of divinity." Both of these representations are correct, of course, in so far as they go; but what do such meaningless abstractions mean to the Latin American Indian, for example? We can fancy the latter responding to such a message by crying out in despair, "Lord, I guess all that complicated, abstract, supreme-achievement-revelation-assertion-humanity-divinity stuff is true, but what I want to know is how to unload myself of this terrible burden of sin!" But what place could sin have in a convention theology with such representations of the Father and Son? Is it any wonder, therefore, that the word "redemption" was used merely to mean the "reconstruction" of the political, social, and economic conditions of the world, that the word "salvation" was used to denote this higher world order rather than a new spiritual state of man, and that the matter of human justification before God was completely ignored?

The viewpoint here presented may be criticised by some as being too theoretical, and it is readily admitted that it is theoretical. We are mindful of the fact that the Pharisees, teachers of the Fatherhood of God, lived as though their father were the devil. But it is important to note that Christ did not cast aside this theoretical doctrinal basis in his preaching of practical righteousness. Rather He affirmed the Fatherhood of God with emphasis, building his structure of practical righteousness upon it. And we insist that the Student Volunteer Movement cannot expect to build an enduring, practical, missionary project on anything other than sound theological theory. The whole reason for Christian missions is to be found in Biblical teachings, and to discard those teachings is to admit the defeat of the Student Volunteer Movement itself.

It should not be assumed, on the ground of the above critical analysis, that there was nothing of value in the Buffalo quadrennial. Quite to the contrary, there was much of value. The inspiration naturally created by a gathering of 2200 was everywhere felt. The broadening process common in an international, intercollegiate gathering was in full operation. The deeply spiritual, soul-stirring messages given by certain of the speakers kindled anew in our hearts the fire of evangelistic zeal and the desire to be of service to suffering mankind.

But the convention failed to show the proper relationships between the various phases of the Christian missionary enterprise. With its poor sense of relative values it could not fling out a challenge sufficient to move students to *adequate* and *truly efficient* service.

At this point, however, we would register a protest against the weakness on the part of some college groups, revealed in their secession from the general Movement. At the time when Christ was being made the reproach of men, his own deserted him. And now (although the consistency of this analogy may be questioned) when the Student Volunteer Movement seems to have declined in its missionary leadership and spiritual potency, and certainly has declined in numerical strength, many have seen fit to desert it and accordingly they have "given up the ship." But not so Maryville. We love the Student Volunteer Movement, and we believe in it, although we are saddened by its departures from its one true purpose. We recognize its great potentialities, and we would continue with it as faithful witnesses of Christ and of the eternal verities of his gospel to the Movement and through the Movement to the world.

What is needed by the Movement, and by its various constituents, is a new vision of the Lord, high, lifted up, and holy. What is needed is the confession of unclean lips and the purging of their sin of expressed unbelief. Then, and then only, shall we, as true Student Volunteers, be enabled to hear the call of God to service, and to answer with a full realization of all that is involved, "Here am I; send me."

F. S. Harmon Succeeds John R. Mott in Y.M.C.A.

MR. FRANCIS S. HARMON is the new General Secretary of the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A.

The very recent reorganization of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations is an event of interest for all the Churches as this largest of lay organizations of North America enters a new period of service to the boys and young men of the world.

In August the Y. M. C. A. National Council of the United States had requested the International Committee to resume financial and administrative responsibility for its foreign or missionary program of cooperation with more than thirty brother movements in as many lands, the purpose being to reinforce the democratic strength of the National Council with the leadership and support of such a lay body as the International Committee could enlist among other laymen having national and international affiliations and experience. The Executive Board of Canada concurring, the transfer took place January 19, at a meeting in the Union League Club, New York City.

Dr. John R. Mott, unable to assume the large accession of executive duties which the change brought to the General Secretaryship of the International Committee, asked to be relieved of the office and to nominate his successor. He presented Francis S. Harmon, Mississippi newspaper man and lawyer, whose election unanimously followed. Coincident was the selection of Wilfred W. Fry of Philadelphia as chairman of the International Committee to succeed James M. Speers of New York, who has served in that capacity for the last ten years. Mr. Fry is president of N. W. Ayer and Son, Incorporated, advertising agency, and for many years active in Y. M. C. A. affairs. He is a prominent Baptist layman.

Mr. Harmon, who takes up the post vacated by Dr. Mott, is already in New York and begins his duties immediately. He is thirty-seven years old and has been active in the Association's affairs since his high-school days.

Mr. Harmon completed in 1931 two years' service as President of the Y. M. C. A. National Council (U. S.), being the youngest man ever elected to that post. He accepted the position vacated by Dr. Mott in response to pledges of support from all sections of North America. It is noted that he is only the third General Secretary, the first being Richard C. Morse, who began his service in 1869 and continued until 1915, when Dr. Mott assumed that office.

Dr. Mott has been elected to membership on the International Committee, and continues as president of the World's Alliance of Y. M. C. A. His responsibilities continue as chairman of the International Missionary Council.

Westminster Seminary Rallies

WESTMINSTER Seminary Rallies are being held in various strategic centers for the purpose of discussing "The Condition of the Presbyterian Church" and "Westminster's Place in the Church." Rallies have been held in the Presbyterian Church of Wayne, Pa., of which the Rev. Charles Schall, D.D., is pastor, and in the Arlington Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, where the Rev. T. Roland Philips is pastor. The attendance and response were highly pleasing.

Proposed rallies are planned for Collingswood, N. J., Philadelphia, New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Detroit, Minneapolis, Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota. Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., Chairman of the Faculty of Westminster Seminary, has been the principal speaker at rallies held so far. It is hoped that the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., will address one of these gatherings.

The reaction of the people to Westminster Seminary is one of the hopeful signs that the onslaught of Modernism in the Presbyterian Church may be checked.

Presbytery Protests Lesson Materials

AT A meeting on January 19, West Jersey Presbytery adopted the following:

"Resolved, That in view of the unorthodox teachings found in the Westminster Graded Material, a sample being found in Teachers and Leaders of Intermediates for October, November and December, 1931, the Presbytery of West Jersey express its disapproval of such teachings and its conviction that such false teachings not only destroy the usefulness of the Board's lesson material, but also hampers the presbytery in its desire to commend the general work of the Board to the financial support of our churches. And further—

"That a copy of this resolution be sent by the stated clerk to the Board of Christian Education."

Westminster Theological Seminary

THE annual day of prayer in Westminster Seminary, when all classes are suspended and students and Faculty join in intercession before the Throne, was held this year on Thursday, February 18th. The leader for the day was the Rev. Albert Sidney Johnson, D.D., of the First Presbyterian Church of Charlotte, North Carolina. Dr. Johnson is one of the well-known evangelical leaders of the country and he was warmly welcomed at Westminster. The thoughts of the Faculty and student body are always turned, on this day, toward the colleges from which they have graduated. Prayer was made on behalf of these institutions and of their students.

The Seminary has announced that its third annual Commencement exercises will be held in Witherspoon Hall, Walnut and Juniper Streets, Philadelphia, on Tuesday, May 10th, at eight o'clock. The Commencement address will be delivered by the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, president of Calvin College. It is not too early for the alumni and friends of the Seminary to make their plans to be present at this time. The other exercises and functions of the Commencement season will be announced in due course. The Alumni Association is planning its annual banquet, which was initiated a year ago.

The required course in Missions at the Seminary is held during the second term, which commenced January 25th. The lectures in this course are being given this year by the Rev. Robert H. Glover, M.D., F.R.G.S., Home Director for North America of the China Inland Mission, and by the Rev. Charles Ernest Scott, D.D., of the Presbyterian Mission, Shantung, China, who is at present home on furlough from his Chinese field. The enrollment in this course packs to capacity the classroom in which the lectures are held.

On February 4th the Rev. John Weidenaar, pastor of the Christian Reformed Church of Worthington, Minnesota, delivered a lecture

before the faculty and students. His subject was, "Paul's Apology." It was the speaker's purpose to bring out that the gospel is reliable in the sphere of truth, in the sphere of history and in the sphere of experience. He explained further that one can distinguish but not separate these three. It is useless for the Christian to seek to escape into the field of emotion unless he has been more than conqueror in the field of truth and history. Our love is based upon knowledge and fact. It is useless too to seek to escape into the field of fact without the interpretation of the truth about that fact by God. The particular has no meaning apart from the universal; "my idea of God" is true only if it corresponds with God's idea about God. And only then can my joy be full; only then can I have genuine experience.

Commenting upon the address, Dr. Cornelius Van Til, Professor of Apologetics, said, "The message is certainly a timely one. Modernism, based as it is upon a vague pantheistic philosophy, seeks to separate truth and fact. For Modernism truth consists in certain abstract principles such as truth, goodness and beauty. Personality, even the personality of Jesus is no more than an exemplification of these truths. And if this is all that the historical fact of Jesus means it is but consistent to maintain that man's consciousness is the standard by which the Bible must be judged. On this basis too Christian experience can be no more than a cold-blooded contemplation of impersonal ideals. Modernism is seeking to substitute falsehood for the truth, imagination for facts and the void for love."

Dr. Kyle to Lecture at Columbia Seminary

COLUMBIA Seminary at Decatur, Ga., has announced that Professor M. G. Kyle, now of Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, has been elected by its faculty and board to deliver the Smyth Lectures during the current scholastic year.

Dr. Kyle has chosen as his subject, "In the Footsteps of Bible Characters," with the following as the themes for the individual lectures:

- I. "Footsteps of Moses and Joshua."
- II. "Footsteps of Prophets and Apostles."
- III. "Footsteps of Our Lord, Galilean Ministry."
- IV. "Footsteps of Our Lord, Judean Ministry."
- V. "Footsteps of the Great Missionary Apostle, Asia Minor and Greece."
- VI. "Footsteps of the Great Apostolic Missionary, Rome."

Dr. Kyle has had the date placed somewhat late in the year (February 29 through March 5) in order to bring over special slides and pictures from Jerusalem for this occasion.

An interesting feature in connection with this announcement is the relation which Dr. Kyle will have this year to three Southern Presbyterian Seminaries. His major work for many years was with Xenia Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church. With the merger of that seminary he formed a connection with Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, and the fact that Columbia and Richmond coincidentally have each invited him for their special lectureships this year indicates the high regard in which he is held, and the warm welcome held out to him by the Southern Presbyterian Church. The last "Columbia Bulletin" also announced that Dr. W. T. Thompson, of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., would deliver the Smyth Lectures in 1932-33, on a phase of "The Psychology of Religion."

Scottish Moderators Designated

IT is the custom of the Scottish churches to designate the moderator of an approaching Assembly through committees appointed for that purpose. Accordingly, announcement has been made of the designation of the Rev. Prof. H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., D.Litt., to be moderator of the 1932 Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Mackintosh comes from the former United Free Church, and is professor in New College, Edinburgh.

The Rev. Peter Clarkson, minister of Coulter Free Church, Lanarkshire, has been nominated as moderator of the 1932 General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. Originally of the Original Secession Church, he joined the Free Church, following the disruption consequent to the formation of the United Free Church, in 1905.

The Rev. Dr. David Marshall Forrester, minister of Broughton, has been nominated moderator-elect of the United Free Church of Scotland (continuing) Assembly. He was ordained in 1886, in the then United Presbyterian Church. When that church joined in the movement that created the United Free Church he followed it, but when the United Free Church was recently reunited with the Church of Scotland, he could not approve.

Death of Bishop Gore

THE death of Bishop Gore, which occurred on January 17th, from pneumonia, has deprived the Church of England of one of its noted scholars.

Charles Gore was born on January 22, 1853. He was educated at Harrow, under Dr. Montague Butler, where he won a Balliol scholarship in 1870, and graduated in 1875. In that same year he was elected to a fellowship at Trinity College, Oxford. When Pusey Home was started in 1883, Dr. Liddon and the other trustees appointed Gore as librarian. The famous symposium entitled *Lux Mundi* appeared in 1890, and public at-

ention, fastened upon Gore's *Inspiration* essay as the most notable and even startling of the contributions. *Lux Mundi* and some of its writers came rapidly to the front. Gore was made Bampton lecturer in 1891, and the issue of the lectures, which were on the Incarnation, was a further triumph.

In 1894, Lord Salisbury appointed him to a canonry of Westminster Abbey. His expository lectures drew immense congregations and his systematic teaching week by week revealed to the London public his gifts as a teacher.

In November, 1901, Gore was appointed to the see of Worcester in succession to Dr. Perowne. The diocese of Worcester, as then constituted, was unwieldy; it included the fair villages of Warwickshire and the dark places of Birmingham. Dr. Gore's efforts to create and endow the diocese of Birmingham read like a romance, for he put down practically his entire fortune to secure the object of his hopes. It was natural that he should choose to take charge of the new Birmingham diocese on its formation in 1905.

In 1911, Bishop Gore was induced to accept translation from Birmingham to Oxford. There his zeal to redress what he considered to be the wrongs of tenant farmers led him to denounce the squires of his agricultural diocese. When the Bishop brought forward a scheme for the division of the diocese, although the scheme was excellent in itself and in principle already had been approved, the laity turned it down. Bishop Gore felt this most keenly, and came to believe that he could serve the Church more usefully as a writer and a preacher than as a Bishop. He resigned his see in 1919. He resumed again work of the kind that had occupied him before his appointment to Worcester. He applied himself to the writing of books and preached with his accustomed vigor to a vast number of congregations. He was active in his interest in the work of the Church abroad, and recently journeyed to India in order to study its religious problems at first hand.

Forms of Prayer Arouse Controversy

THE Church of England, on the first Sunday of the new year, observed a special call of the King to have a day of intercession in view of current national difficulties. The forms of prayer approved by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have aroused an aftermath of ridicule and protest. Among the petitions authorized were:

(1) In the policy of our Government for the restoration of credit and prosperity, Thy will be done.

(2) By the restoration of commerce in the confidence of restored credit and of mutual good will, Give us our daily bread.

(3) Because we have indulged in national arrogance, finding satisfaction in our power

over others rather than in our ability to serve them, Forgive us our trespasses.

(4) If any have injured us by crooked dealing, by scamped work or by exploitation, We forgive them that trespass against us.

(5) If other countries, while pursuing their own interests, have unduly hindered ours, We forgive, etc.

(6) At times of fear concerning what others may do to us, and of desire to strike lest we ourselves be struck. Deliver us from evil.

After the discussion had reached an almost acrimonious stage in the public press, the Archbishop of York himself came forward and revealed himself as the author of the prayers.

Anglican and "Orthodox" Negotiations

IN recent negotiations between representatives of the Church of England and the "Orthodox" (Greek) churches, a statement was agreed upon which seemed to imply that the Anglican representatives were willing to accept "Tradition" as equal in authority with Scripture. Because of the storm of public protest, the Bishop of Gloucester, who was chairman of the Archbishops' Joint Commission to confer with the "Eastern" Bishops, has issued a statement, which is, in part, as follows:

... In speaking of Scripture and Tradition the whole Commission agreed upon the following statement:—

Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church.

That statement the Anglican members of the Commission could not have agreed to unless they had previously guarded themselves from anything inconsistent with the teaching of their Church by a statement which preceded it.

Further, the representatives of the Anglican Church would say:—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." As St. Athanasius says: "The sacred and inspired Scriptures are sufficient to declare the truth." And elsewhere: "These are the fountains of salvation that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these books alone is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness. Let no man add to them nor take aught from them." And as St. Augustine says: "In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture all things are found which cover Faith and Morals which cover Hope and Love."

The Anglican representatives, although fully recognizing the part which tradition has played in handing down the Scriptures and the Creed and customs of the Christian Church, were careful in no way to depart from the fundamental Anglican and, as they believe, Catholic position that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." Their agreement with the representatives of the Orthodox Church must be read in the light of the fundamental Anglican conviction. . . .

Commenting, the *English Churchman and St. James's Chronicle* said:

The Bishop has evidently realized the seriousness of the position accepted by the "representatives" of the Anglican Communion when they agreed to the extraordinary statement that "Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church." The Bishop claims, as will be seen by reference to his letter, that

the preceding statement made on behalf of the Anglican Communion and setting forth the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, must be read in connection with the agreed declaration quoted above, and that, without this explanation, "the report as published (in 'The Times') might lead to rather unfortunate misconceptions." We felt when perusing the Report itself that the two statements were contradictory and we wondered how any representative of the Church of England having affirmed the first could possibly give his assent to the second. The letter of the Bishop of Gloucester leaves us still wondering. If the Bishop really believes that the first statement presents "the fundamental Anglican and Catholic position," we cannot see how such a sufficient Rule of Faith as Holy Scripture is there declared to be can possibly require "completion" in "the Holy Tradition." In signing their agreement to the second proposition, the Anglican "representatives," in the judgment of any ordinary mind, greatly weakened, if they did not annul, the force of their preceding declaration. The common ecclesiastical practice of using ambiguous and apparently contradictory language and attributing the inevitable criticism to misconception or misunderstanding has nothing to commend it.

Progress of Chinese League of Churches

SINCE the original organization of the League of Churches as a protest against modernism in China, a number of other organized bodies, groups, and individuals have definitely united with it. It received urgent invitations to have representatives attend the Shansi Provincial Council of China Inland Mission churches. That body by hearty vote united with the League, thus following the lead of the Honan Council, as reported when the League was organized. The Kiangsi C. I. M. churches have all voted as units to join the League. The C. I. M. missionaries of Anhwei voted to unite. The prompt action of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Anhwei Provincial Council in joining the League has been followed by hearty cooperation. While one of the Vice Presidents, the Rev. Wm. Christie, had to reluctantly leave China, he is placed in a responsible position as Treasurer of their Board in New York.

The China Baptist Direct Mission, also by official vote confirmed the attitude of their men, who were among the original founders. The North China Convention of the Chinese Baptist Churches at their last meeting at Tsiningchow by unanimous vote recommended the League to their local churches. The Mennonites by official vote confirmed the course of their men in uniting as individuals. Peter Bredvei, of the Norwegian Lutheran, and Hermann Swenson, of the Scandinavian Alliance, are new men who have thrown themselves heartily into the League, backed by official votes from their organizations. From many quarters come similar reports.

Since the organization much valuable literature has been issued by the Publicity Committee, officers of the League, and groups of leaders. "The Challenge to Faith" signed by ninety-one of the leaders, was published by the Bible Union of China, by the China Fundamentalist, and journals in many lands, meeting a hearty response. A Lutheran member of the Executive Committee placed full data on the League with

church leaders in Germany. Encouragement and cooperation have come from journals and leaders in Britain, Canada, Australia, The United States, Germany, India, and other lands.

When the issue in the China Sunday School Union was precipitated by the requirements of the International Sunday School Association, the Executive issued resolutions, upholding the loyal Sunday School men who refused to countenance the modernist policy.

With such indications of the Spirit's leading, it was decided to hold two meetings of the Executive Committee, one at Tenghsien, which is in reach of the Northern section of the League and one later at Kuling.

The Executive Committee has issued a letter to its friends, in which it says, "The first meeting has now been held, and we enjoyed the thrill of spiritual unity. No questions were raised as to our points of difference, and no divisions were raised as to the essentials. Whenever there was a break in the continuity of business, the Spirit would be felt surging over us.

"That the Lord is with us was apparent from the fact that with no efforts on our part, a thousand dollars had come in, and the treasurer stressed the point that with all the expenses incident to our work thus far, nobody had called on him for a cent. It was decided, therefore, on the one hand, not to go in debt, and on the other to adopt as our objective in prayer the sum of ten thousand dollars, as what we need within a year from date of this meeting. (This sum is silver, which at present rates of exchange would be equal to about \$2000 or £500.—). As to whence this sum is to come, we have no conception, but we act in faith. With it the next great step in the League can be accomplished. By far the larger part of our membership have thus far had no opportunity for real, vital cooperation. We are separated, many of us, by thousands of miles, and our preachers, many of them live on salaries of twenty or thirty dollars, silver, per month. To make the League effective we plan, firstly, to utilize the mails, working through the church papers, through bulletins of our own League, and by letters. And, secondly, the next meeting of the League, which is due in 1932, should be made accessible to a large and widely representative element of the membership. To this end it should be held in some more central city, but easily accessible to the section, where the League originated: chosen speakers should be provided: and selected representatives from even the most distant places should be enabled to attend. The Executive, therefore, plan tentatively for this meeting to be held in May at either Kaifengfu, Honan, or Sūchowfu, Kiangsu. Objective is to make this a "get-together" meeting, and we go forward in faith.

"It had been hoped that the way would be open for full-time workers in the interests of the League. The Spirit did not allow it

yet, but the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of China, Rev. Chia Yü Ming, D.D., and Rev. P. J. Boehr, of the Mennonite Church, were requested to give two months each year to work for the League, holding revival meetings and deepening the spiritual life, and they were led, as we believe, by the Spirit of God, to accept this call."

In the original organization of the League many saw a *Chinese League of Christian Churches*. But certain of the Chinese promoters had a wider foresight, and with purposeful intent threw out the word "Chinese." When, therefore, requests came from abroad for membership in the League, the Executive were in position to announce that membership in the League is open to all men everywhere, who accept the Doctrinal Statement and Form of Government on which the League was organized.

In order to cooperation and progress, the Executive Committee has asked friends of the League in other lands form Advisory Committees. For America, the Executive have requested the following to act in this capacity: Rev. Wm. Christie, Rev. James M. Gray, D.D., Chas. G. Trumbull, D.D., Rev. George Gordon, Lois Gordon, W. Runyon, Rev. Roswell Smith, Rev. Paul Rader, Mr. Sidney T. Smith, Rev. W. B. Riley, D.D., Pres. Oliver Buswell, D.D., Rev. Wm. Jones, Rev. Henry M. Woods, D.D., Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., Editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*.

With regard to the interests of the League in Britain, one of the founders, Rev. A. B. Lewis, is now there, and the League has requested him to consult friends looking to this objective. For Germany, a member of the Executive Committee now in that land, Rev. Theod. Scholz, has been asked to take such steps as may in his judgment seem advisable. Mr. Arie Kok of the Netherlands Legation, one of the Vice-Presidents of the League, has been requested to make connections with a few outstanding leaders in Holland.

Generally speaking, the key note of this movement was struck in the opening exercises of the Executive Committee by Rev. Chia Yü Ming, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of China. Success depends, not on organization, not on human efforts, nor financial strength, but on the power of the Spirit of God, he declared.

In this spirit the Executive acted, and looks for a world wide response in prayer.

The Executive committee of the League of Christian Churches is composed of the following: Chairman, Rev. Hugh W. White, D.D., Yencheng, Kiangsu, China.

Treasurer and English State Clerk, Rev. Albert B. Dodd, D.D., Tenghsien, Shantung, China.

Editor of League Periodical, Rev. Wang Heng Hsin, Süchowfu, Kiangsu, China.

Chinese Stated Clerk, Rev. Han Feng Kang, Newchwang, Manchuria.

Roman Church Alters Views on Marriage

MARRIAGE between Roman Catholics and those of other faiths hereafter will be considered illegal by the Roman Church unless the children actually are educated in its fold. The new ruling was issued on February 5th by the "Congregation of the Sacred Office." The ruling, tightening mixed marriage restrictions, was issued because of a belief that parties to such marriages often have disregarded promises that the children should be reared as Romanists.

The congregation decided that henceforth those who obtain the dispensation of the church for mixed marriage must take those promises seriously, and that the church no longer will accept the plea that the laws of the countries where such persons reside prevent proper Romanist education of the children. If necessary, the congregation decided, such persons must refrain from going to countries where they would be unable to keep their pledges to the church.

In case of any failure to educate the children as Roman Catholics, the church will regard such marriages as illegal.

The congregation's ruling, in the form of a decree, was approved by Pope Pius.

The decree applies to marriages between "Catholics and non-Catholics, baptized and unbaptized."

It was announced that if the parents in a mixed marriage fail to educate their children as Catholics the dispensation granted for the marriage becomes "null and invalid."

Such action would make the marriage illegal so far as the church is concerned and was regarded as amounting to annulment of the marriage.

This decree is a sensational departure from the position of the Roman Church which was that a marriage performed by it derived its permanence from its sacramental character. Henceforth that church teaches that marriage may, after twenty years, perhaps, or longer, be regarded as void from the beginning, although it had received the blessing of the Roman Church, because of something which occurred *after* the consummation of the marriage. This is revolutionary. In trying to maintain its position against divorce the Church of Rome is regarded by many as having sanctioned something much worse—a relationship between a man and a woman, blessed by the church, which may later be dissolved *as of the beginning* by that church, placing the stigma of sin upon the parties and of illegitimacy upon the children, simply because the parties did not obey the church. Men or women could not, under such circumstances, know whether they were living in sin or in grace, in "free love" or marriage, until after their children were educated. Truly Rome changes.

The Evangelical Fellowship of Korea

BECAUSE of the rise of Modernism in the mission fields, several organizations have, in past years, been instituted to uphold the gospel there. The latest of these has been formed in Korea, and Christian people generally will be glad to read its constitution which is as follows:

Believing that in these days of widespread apostasy and compromise there is laid upon all those who accept the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ in its purity and fullness, a responsibility to "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints," we do hereby organize the **EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF KOREA** for the following purposes:—

I. PURPOSES.

1. To maintain a witness

a. to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the fully inspired Word of God and as the only authoritative rule of faith and practice.

b. to the all-sufficient Gospel of Christ as the only way of salvation, emphasizing in this the Deity of our Lord, His Substitutionary Atonement, His bodily Resurrection and His Personal and visible Return to earth.

2. To withstand and in so far as possible to render ineffective every effort towards the rationalization of the Korean Churches and Missions by intelligent, vigorous and combined action, and so to oppose all efforts to establish church union on a basis other than that of the evangelical faith.

3. To promote the preaching and teaching of the great themes of the Gospel and to seek to awaken all Christians to the seriousness of the issues involved in the present day conflict between Christianity and rationalism.

II. ACTIVITIES.

In order to carry out these purposes we will engage in the following activities:—

1. *Bible Study*. We shall seek to encourage Bible study on the part of the individual members of the Fellowship and to foster Bible conferences on a definite evangelical basis.

2. *Prayer*. The members will engage in prayer for God's blessing and guidance upon this Fellowship and for all its undertakings.

3. *Publicity*. Efforts shall be made.

a. to give publicity to events which tend toward the spread of rationalism in Korea.

b. to combat the publication and dissemination of unsound literature and to work for the creation and circulation of a literature of a constructive evangelical type.

c. to prepare articles for papers and magazines on the Gospel and its relations to

the issues of the day and to present these themes through personal contact and in our teaching.

4. *Conferences.* The Fellowship will hold meetings for conference and mutual encouragement as opportunities may be found.

III. DOCTRINAL STATEMENT.

We fully accept the historic evangelical creeds of our respective churches but in order to make our position perfectly clear we subscribe the following doctrinal statement:—

1. We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, inerrant in the original writings, and as authoritative in all matters of faith and practice.

2. We believe in the triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, equal in power and glory, three Persons and one God.

3. We believe in the full Deity and true humanity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Who being truly God, took unto himself a human nature, was born of the Virgin Mary, worked miracles, kept perfectly the law of God in our behalf, died on the cross as our Substitute to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, rose from the grave on the third day leaving an empty tomb, Who, having ascended unto the Father, ever liveth to make intercession for believers, and will come again in a personal and visible manner.

4. We believe that salvation is not to be obtained by human character or by man's effort but by grace through trust in the merit of our Saviour Jesus Christ alone, and that all who so believe are justified by faith.

5. We believe that those who truly trust in Christ as their personal Saviour are regenerated by the Holy Spirit and must show forth their salvation by a life of conscious obedience to the will of God, as revealed in the Scriptures.

6. We believe in the resurrection of the body for all men, "some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

7. We believe that all those who consciously reject the offer of salvation through Christ Jesus are under condemnation of eternal punishment, and this fact constitutes an urgent call to preach the Gospel to all men.

We accept this doctrinal statement without mental reservations and pledge ourselves to bear testimony to its truthfulness and to oppose all efforts to subvert or hold as unessential any of these Christian truths.

IV. MEMBERSHIP.

1. All who accept the doctrinal basis and are in sympathy with the purposes and activities of this Fellowship shall be eligible for membership.

A few copies of "The Basis of Evolutionary Faith," by Professor Floyd E. Hamilton, which is reviewed in this issue, are on hand in the editorial offices of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. They may be secured at \$1.50 each, postpaid.

2. Upon the proposal of two members with the approval of the Executive Committee those nominated shall be admitted as members.

Jesuits Expelled from Spain

THE Jesuit Order in Spain was formally dissolved by decree of the Spanish government on January 23. The decree dissolving the Jesuits and taking over their property estimated to be worth \$30,000,000 had been signed several days earlier by President Niceto Alcalá Zamora, but the order was not formally promulgated because of the unrest prevailing in Spain. The decree provided that the Society of Jesus and dependent organizations within Spain are to be dissolved. Priests and members of the organizations were given ten days in which to cease living together in communities. An inventory of the movable assets of the organization and a complete inventory of the immovable property were to be sent to the Minister of Justice within ten days. Roman Catholics in the various districts of Spain are required to make inventories of the Jesuit churches and the objects used in religious ceremonies, and to report to the government, which forbids their use in the future. Provincial and local superiors of the Jesuit communities are held personally responsible for the enforcement of the articles disbanding the communities and for any resistance against the decree.

The Spanish republic seems determined to rid itself of the priestly yoke that has dominated the government and people for centuries.

A Day of Penitence

THE following resolution has recently been adopted by the League of Christian Churches, in China, and deserves the consideration of all Christian people.

WHEREAS:

1. The world is involved in an abnormal state of wickedness and distress.

2. Statements have been issued, representing large and representative elements of the Christian world, to the effect that this all proceeds from a spirit of rebellion against God and that immediate repentance is urgent. One such statement is signed by

patriots of eight countries, viz., The United States, Britain, Germany, (Christian) Russia, Hungary, Norway, China, Holland. Another comes from a large group of senior business men of Alberta, Canada. Still another is issued by a group of business men in Philadelphia.

3. Petitions have gone to our rulers from Presbyterians of Scotland, from Manchester, England, from Canada, from the United States, asking that a special day be appointed for penitence and prayer.

4. A suggestion has been received that Friday of Easter week, 1932, be designated as a day of penitence.

Now therefore, be it resolved that the League of Christian Churches heartily approves this suggestion. We recognize that it was on this day the human race committed its awful sin of killing the Son of God. The day is fixed beyond question, being determined according to the moon and the vernal equinox. Every Passover of Old Testament times looked forward to it, and the Lord himself declared that nobody could touch him until his day arrived. It is appropriate that Christians, on behalf of the human race, should on that day confess our sin before Almighty God, and pray, especially three requests, (1) For wisdom to understand the origin and the strength of this Satanic movement. (2) For grace to us as individuals and collectively to know and to discharge our several responsibilities toward God and our fellow men. (3) For the spirit to look forward hopefully, joyfully to the coming of the blessed Lord Jesus Christ.

Editorial Comment—Concluded

being forced into insignificant charges or caused to stand idle to obtain places of influence and power;

(e) The stirring to action of the presbyteries, so that orthodox commissioners will be delegated to General Assembly;

(f) The maintenance of a general Information Bureau for churches and individuals;

(g) The establishment of a spiritual radiation center for ministers and people everywhere.

The ultimate goal of the Fellowship will be a gradual, thorough reformation of the entire Church in all its departments—educational, governmental, missionary, etc. The Reformation Fellowship will endeavor, with the blessing and help of God, to become instrumental in leading God's people away from their timid and halting defense tactics and having them assume even more as the years go by the aspect of "an army with banners."

The Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY welcome all efforts to purify the Church, and wish every success and blessing to the "Reformation Fellowship."