

# 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-APRIL, 1932

Vol. 2

No. 12

\$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 Immortality

**F**AITH in immortality seems to be on the wane. Otherwise it is difficult, if not impossible, to account for the increasing number of suicides. One can scarcely pick up a newspaper today without finding a report of persons—not infrequently persons of national or even international reputations—who have taken their own lives. Doubtless some of these suicides can be explained on the theory of temporary insanity and so on the ground of mental and moral irresponsibility; but as a whole it seems clear that they bear witness to a widespread disbelief in the continuance of life beyond the grave. On the assumption of a waning belief in immortality, there is nothing particularly strange about the growing number of suicides. When men believe that life is but a cry between two eternal silences, it is not surprising that they should judge that suicide offers a reasonable way of escape when the disadvantages of life appear to be hopelessly in excess of its advantages.

If the true explanation of the growing number of suicides is an increasing lack of faith in immortality, it would seem to follow that the only way to lower the number of suicides is a renewed faith in immortality on the part of men in general. We submit that this can be brought about in the twentieth century only as it was brought about in the first century, viz., by convincing men of the reality and the authenticity of that divine revelation in word and deed that is recorded in the Bible.

We would not be understood as

minimizing the value of the rational arguments for immortality, such as the historical and the teleological and the moral. We are far from supposing that Kant's criticisms emptied them of significance. At the best, however, we believe that they establish a strong presumption in favor of belief in immortality. If we are to believe not only in the probability but the certainty of immortality we must have evidence of immortality additional to that supplied by purely rational argumentation. Valid evidence of the kind required is found only in that revelation of life and immortality given us in the gospel. As a matter of fact it was not rational argumentation but historical evidence to the effect that CHRIST had risen from the dead and was the first fruits of them that are asleep that brought about that transformation in men's attitude toward immortality that marked the beginning

of the Christian era. Let mankind lose the conviction that CHRIST has been raised from the dead and that He spoke with authority concerning the life that is to come as well as the life that now is, and there is every reason to suppose that mankind will sink back into that spirit of hopelessness as regards a future life that characterized the ancient pagan world.

The reason why there can be no rational *demonstration* of immortality is often overlooked. It lies in the fact that immortality is an event that occurs, not a necessary truth; and that the appropriate evidence for establishing the occurrence of an event is personal experience or adequate testimony. This means that either we must wait until we die to discover whether we are immortal or some competent person or persons must offer trustworthy testimony as to the reality of life beyond the grave. For instance previous to 1492 many on the basis of rational considerations believed in the probability of the existence of a transatlantic continent but probability passed into certainty when Columbus and his men actually visited this transatlantic continent and bore trustworthy testimony to its existence as a matter of fact. So it is as regards the question whether we are immortal. Either we must wait until death to find out or we must be supplied with some adequate testimony as to the actuality of life beyond the grave.

A pound of testimony is worth more than a ton of rational argumentation when the problem of immortality is

### IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial Comment .....	3
Why I Am a Conservative .....	5
F. N. McMillin	
Whom Say Ye That I Am? .....	6
L. Verduin	
Bithynia's Unknown Evangelists .....	9
A. Hogue	
Notes on Biblical Exposition .....	12
J. G. Machen	
Letters to the Editor .....	14
Books of Religious Significance .....	16
News of the Church .....	17

under consideration. From the nature of the soul as simple and indivisible, from the nature of its endowments, from the seeming incompleteness of its developments on earth, from the apparently disciplinary character of life as now lived, and similar considerations, we may rightly conclude that it is highly probable that we shall live after death. There must be considerations of a different sort, however, if we are to be certain that death does not end all. The following is much to the point: "One traveler beyond that bourne who returns: one voice from the other side of the grave: this would be evidence which, when accredited to the soul, would, once for all, by the proper proof, settle the matter of the occurrence of life after death. Of course, the question how many of those that die will live after death—whether the whole of mankind or a part—would require its own appropriate evidence to determine. But that would be an element of detail: the main point is whether 'death ends all' or whether the soul actually persists in living after the decay of the body."

It is but to repeat from a more religious or theological point of view what has just been said to say that a rational *demonstration* of immortality is impossible because this is a matter that depends on the purpose of God. The soul is not self-existent. It owes its existence to the creative activity of God. What is more it is dependent on God for its continuance in existence. He who made the soul can also unmake it, should such be His pleasure. What God's pleasure is in this matter we can know only as He reveals it to us. This revelation may be given in part in the nature of the soul He has created, in the powers with which He has endowed it, in the longing and desires He has put within it, in the manner in which He deals with it; but if to such suggestions or intimations there is added an explicit word through the prophets which culminates in the testimony of His own Son there will be no room for doubt as to His purpose as regards this matter.

It will be obvious to the reader that we agree with the "Spiritualists" to a certain extent—they are in search of evidence of the sort that would really prove the reality of life beyond the

grave. If the communications with the dead they profess to have received are authentic, it is altogether certain that death does not end all. We do not think there is any good reason to regard their alleged communications with the dead as authentic; but they at least direct our attention to the kind of evidence which, if genuine, would prove the reality of life after death.

We trust it is now abundantly clear to our readers why we hold that it is only by again convincing men of the reality and truthfulness of that divine revelation in word and deed recorded in the Bible that we can function effectively in the way of re-establishing a vital faith in immortality. It is in this divine revelation in word and deed that we have the only valid evidence of the sort that really proves the reality of life after death. Doubtless apart from that revelation of life and immortality made to us in JESUS CHRIST, we may cherish a well-grounded hope of immortality; but it is only in and through this revelation that we can be fully assured of it. Many will demur on the ground that there is no adequate evidence for believing in the reality and trustworthiness of such a divine revelation as we posit. We cannot argue the matter in this connection. Suffice it to say that we believe there is abundant warrant for saying not only that the evidence for the trustworthiness of the Bible as a revelation from God (including the evidence for the resurrection of JESUS as an historic fact) is enormously more cogent than the evidence for immortality to be found in the rational arguments but that it is sufficient to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that in the Bible we have a veritable revelation from God concerning human immortality. In this connection we may add that as a matter of fact few of those who have lost faith in CHRIST as risen—or in the Bible as containing a historical revelation from God—have maintained a vital faith in immortality. The facts being what they are, we may be sure that the question whether mankind will retain a faith in immortality that will be a determining influence in their lives hinges on the question whether they continue to believe in that revelation in word and deed recorded in

the Bible, more particularly whether they continue to believe in life and immortality as revealed in JESUS CHRIST.

It should not be overlooked that the evidence for immortality offered by CHRIST and the Bible is for the immortality of the whole man—that is to say of the body as well as the soul. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is of itself a purely heathen doctrine. What Christianity teaches is an immortality of the whole man. The evidence for immortality offered by CHRIST's resurrection—the most direct we have—is evidence for the immortality not of the soul merely but of the whole man. The resurrection of the body is an essential part of the Christian doctrine of immortality. It is perhaps needless to add that according to the Christian doctrine of immortality the life to come stands in moral and organic relation to the life that now is. The here determines the hereafter. We are moving on toward the judgment seat of God which will be a broad and comprehensive test to decide to what extent we have lived our lives for the glory of God and for the good of our fellows. Only as we live our lives in the light of eternity can we realize their value or the significance of our choices from day to day.

It is not too much to say that Christianity stands or falls with its doctrine of immortality. Eliminate this doctrine and it collapses both as a system of thought and a way of life. The shibboleth of Christianity is not separation from the world but from that which is evil in the world. Yet unquestionably it finds its center of gravity in the world to come, so that it is impossible to vindicate the reasonableness of either its world or its life view apart from that eternity in which alone they find their proper setting. Naturalism may get along without a doctrine of the future life; Christianity cannot. On the assumption that the present economy is but a short span of life between two eternities of death, it is altogether certain that Christianity indicates neither the right way of thinking nor the right way of living. The doctrine of one world at a time has no standing ground whatever in Christian discussion.

# Editorial Notes and Comments

## The Bible as a Rule of Faith and Practice

IN its issue of March 24th *The Presbyterian Advance* devotes both its leading editorial and its leading contribution (by Dr. MOLDENHAWER, pastor of the First Church of New York City) to a discussion of the meaning of the question which must be answered affirmatively by all ministers, elders and deacons of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. before their ordination: "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?"

The editor of *The Advance* and Dr. MOLDENHAWER—both of whom are signers of the Auburn Affirmation—agree that there is widespread misunderstanding as to what is involved in giving an affirmative answer to this question. Few if any will deny the existence of widespread misunderstanding in this connection. It is difficult to think, however, that many straight-thinking as well as informed persons will share their view as to the nature of these misunderstandings.

According to these men there are two major misunderstandings relative to this question. In the first place there are those who mistakenly think that to answer this question affirmatively is to declare that the Bible is free of error, fully trustworthy in all statements, when as a matter of fact such an affirmation "has nothing whatever to do with any theory of inspiration." In the second there are those who mistakenly think that to answer this question in the affirmative is to declare that "the Bible contains 'just one rule' whereas it is a library of writings in which may be found many rules for conduct, some of them contrary to others." According to these writers, if we understand them aright, when we refer to the Bible as "the only infallible rule of faith and practice" we merely mean to affirm (1) that the "supreme standard" for faith and practice is to be found in the Bible and (2) to deny that it is to be found elsewhere, more particularly that it is to be found in tradition as handed down by the Roman Catholic Church.

Both of these writers seem to labor under the delusion that when the Westminster Standards employ the phrase "the rule of faith" they employ it in the sense in which it was employed in the early ages of the church. In Pre-Reformation times the phrase was used almost exclusively to express the fundamental faith of the Church as expressed in a brief creed which brief creed (or creeds) was used as a rule or standard by which the orthodoxy or unorthodoxy of any particular teaching was

judged. In Post-Reformation times, however, in Protestant circles at least, the "rule of faith" is used to designate the authoritative source of Christian knowledge. According to this latter usage (which is that of the Westminster Standards) the "rule of faith" refers to the Bible as the source from which genuinely Christian doctrine is to be drawn. According to the editor of *The Advance* and Dr. MOLDENHAWER, our readers will note, the "rule of faith" as used in our ordination question refers to the substance of Christian doctrine rather than the seat of Christian doctrine. It will be seen, therefore, that their misunderstanding of this phrase as used in the ordination question is due to the fact that through historical ignorance they have tried to interpret it in a sense foreign to the Westminster Standards. In the sense in which they employ the phrase, it refers to the Westminster Confession of Faith to which all ministers, elders and deacons are required to subscribe as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Bible rather than to the Bible itself. Men may differ not only as to whether the Bible is the only source of distinctively Christian knowledge but also as to whether it is a source that supplies us with knowledge that can properly be called infallible. There is no real warrant for denying however, that such was the opinion of those who phrased our ordination questions. What is more the word "infallible" is not susceptible to the minimizing interpretation whereby it is a synonym of "supreme." An "only infallible" rule is not merely the best of a number of rules; it is both an exclusive rule and a rule that is altogether trustworthy. It is a contradiction in terms to say that an infallible rule contains errors.

Both the editor of *The Advance* and Dr. MOLDENHAWER deny that in answering this ordination question in the affirmative we affirm that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are free of error. They would have us believe that all we affirm is that the supreme rule of faith and practice is to be found somewhere in the Scriptures. Such is plainly not the case. We affirm much more than that. We affirm (1) that the Scriptures are the Word of God. That is in fact the main thing we affirm. Having affirmed that, we go on and affirm (2) that the Scriptures (as becomes the Word of God) are also, or, therefore "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The interpretation placed on the question by these writers would require us to say that the Scriptures are the Word of God and so infallible (even in the minimizing sense they attach to the word) only in as far as they contain a rule of faith and practice—as though God Himself were only partly trustworthy! Misinterpretation could

hardly go further. Moreover the representation that the Bible only contains the Word of God and is infallible only in matters of faith and practice is obviously not that of the Westminster Standards as a whole. The Scriptures identified with "all the books of the Old and New Testaments" are referred to as "the Word of God written," as having "God (who is truth itself)" for their "author," as "of infallible truth and divine authority," as so trustworthy that a "Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed" in them. We may or we may not believe that "the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error" but beyond reasonable doubt that is the teaching of the Westminster Standards and that is what we affirm when we intelligently answer this question in the affirmative.

The editor of *The Advance* expressly approves of Dr. MOLDENHAWER's declaration (with this question in mind) that "the man who takes the vow of fidelity to the Bible as supreme authority is not assuming an intolerable burden nor is he playing tricks with his conscience." In our judgment that depends on what he actually thinks about the Bible. If he looks upon the Bible as actually the Word of God and as such completely trustworthy, yes. But if not, no. We confess it has long been a standing wonder to us to understand how those who believe that the Bible contains errors and contradictions can take on themselves the vows required of ministers, elders and deacons.

## "The Price of Union"

THAT the proposed union of the United Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. will have to run the gauntlet of United Presbyterian opposition is indicated by an article by Dr. A. GORDON MACLENNAN, pastor of the Shady-side United Presbyterian Church, in Pittsburgh, Pa.,—an outstanding church of the denomination—in *The Christian Union Herald* of April 2nd.

By way of introduction Dr. MACLENNAN points out that a "price of union" that the United Presbyterians will have to pay will be the loss of all that is unique in their heritage as a church. "As far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned," he writes, "the union will make little or no difference, merely the report at the close of the year following the union, if the union is consummated, that the church has shown an increase of ten per cent in both membership and ministers. The assimilation will have no noticeable effect upon such a large body as the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. The price of union will be paid entirely by the United Presbyterian Church." After speaking of the things that constitute the distinctive glory of the United Presbyterian Church he adds: "To talk of carrying over into the union this heritage is to talk sheer

nonsense. One may as well make up his mind at once to the fact, that all that is unique in the heritage of our church, that which has made her what she is, is part of the price that will be paid for union."

Dr. MACLENNAN, however, does not rest his case on sentimental grounds. The major part of his article has to do with the proposed plan of union. Among the objections to it, he regards three as of supreme importance. In the first place he is opposed to it because of the centralization of control that it would involve. "If for no other reason than this," he writes, "every minister and layman in whose veins flows the blood of Presbyterians who gave their lives for the principles which have been our strength and pride should rise up in vigorous protest against the setting up of a bureaucracy that will rob our churches of their liberty and their historic rights." In the second place, he is opposed to it because of its proposal to abolish open courts and adopt "star-chamber" methods in ecclesiastical procedure. Here he quotes with approval from Dr. MACHEN's recent articles in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, entitled "The Truth About the Presbyterian Church." In the third place, he is opposed to it on the ground that it opens the flood-gates to doctrinal impurity. Dr. MACLENNAN holds that the substitution of the phrase "the system of doctrine" for the doctrines . . . contained in the Confession of Faith, etc." opens the way for men to enter the ministry who deny the doctrines of the church—a contention that, in our judgment, would gain much in cogency if the United Presbyterians would eliminate the Preamble to their Confessional Statement. "At present," he writes, "United Presbyterian ministers are bound to an acceptance of the doctrines taught, which includes each doctrine of the church as though named separately, while the new form binds only to the system of doctrine; this does not mean each of the doctrines necessarily, but only the system. Each man may determine for himself how many of the doctrines he must accept in order to be honestly holding the 'system'."

Special interest attaches to what Dr. MACLENNAN (who was formerly pastor of the Bethany Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia) says about the members of the committee on church union from the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. While he mentions none of them by name, he refers to certain of them in a way as to leave no doubt as to who he has in mind; and adds, "so far as I am able to see there is not one single representative of the great conservative forces of the Presbyterian Church on the committee."

"I and many others are wondering," he writes ere he concludes, "just why this union question is before us anyway, and what good reason there is for it. No sound, logical reason for uniting these two great

churches has been presented. Has not the Presbyterian Church problems enough at the present time to vex her righteous soul without plunging her into this agitation? The United Presbyterian Church has been doing a splendid piece of work at home and abroad with a vision glorious, united not only in name but in work and purpose; why bring in a divisive movement to hinder her work, dim her vision and paralyze her great missionary program?"

### The Future of this Paper

THIS issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY completes its second year. Like all similar publications we have been affected by the existing business depression. In our case this has been due not so much to the loss of subscribers because of their inability to pay the subscription price as to the falling off of special contributions. By way of explanation it may be said that the \$1.00 received from our regular subscribers does little more than cover the cost of printing and mailing the paper. This means that the funds needed for office rent, stenographers, promotion and other necessary expenses must be obtained from other sources. Hence the publication of this paper can be continued only as those who approve its aims and purposes place it on their annual budgets of expenditures along with churches, hospitals and other Christian enterprises. This is not an after-thought on our part. As we have repeatedly stated in these columns CHRISTIANITY TODAY was established in the full knowledge of the fact that it would be continuously dependent on those who love the cause for which it stands and who desire to see it promoted in the world. Every effort is made to keep the cost of production at the minimum, but like practically all church papers it cherishes no hope of becoming self-supporting, still less a source of profit.

During the first year of our existence special contributions were fully up to our expectations. There was such a falling off in receipts from such sources during the past year, however, that it was only by cutting down expenditures to the lowest possible level that we were able to complete our second year. Recently we sent out a "begging" letter—if it is permissible to use such a word to describe a letter written in the interest of a Christian enterprise—to a list made up of those whom we had reason to suppose were specially interested in our welfare in the knowledge that if they failed us CHRISTIANITY TODAY would have to be discontinued. Our readers will be glad to learn that receipts received since the sending out of that letter are such as to assure the continuance of the paper for at least another year but as yet not sufficient to warrant the notion that we will be able to do much in the way of promotion work.

Our financial situation, briefly expressed,

is as follows: (1) We have no debts. (2) We have sufficient funds in hand or in sight to assure our publication for another year. (3) We lack funds to use in promoting the interests of the paper in the way of sending out sample copies, soliciting subscriptions and such like. Our financial problem is dealt with more fully in the letter referred to above—a copy of which we will be glad to send to any one desirous of furthering the interests of this paper.

We again solicit the aid and cooperation of our subscribers. Such success as we have had is largely due to what the rank and file of our subscribers have done for us in the way of bringing the paper to the attention of others; and only as this service is continued can we hope for an increased measure of success. In fact, the situation, being what it is, the future of the paper depends more on what the rank and file of our subscribers do for us than upon the special gifts of a relatively few individuals—indispensable as such gifts are.

### The Kearns Case

THE editor of this paper has received a very courteous personal note from Dr. MUDGE in which he disclaims any intention of referring in a slighting or derogatory way to CHRISTIANITY TODAY at the meeting of the Presbytery of San Francisco mentioned in our March issue.

Neither the Board of Foreign Missions, or any one else, however, has questioned the accuracy of what has been reported in this paper concerning what took place at the December meeting of Washington City Presbytery in connection with the licensure of Mr. LUCIAN HARPER KEARNS. The outstanding fact in connection with this action of Presbytery is not so much the fact that he was licensed despite his inability to affirm belief in the Virgin Birth of CHRIST as the fact that his tentative appointment by the Board of Foreign Missions as a missionary to South America was used as an argument by those favoring his licensure. It is not denied as far as we know that the Board of Foreign Missions tentatively approved the appointment of Mr. KEARNS despite his inability to affirm his belief in the Virgin Birth and that it was argued on the floor of Washington City Presbytery that a presbytery ought not to refuse licensure to a man who had been approved by a Board "whose membership included four ex-moderators." It is nothing to the point to say that an illegitimate use was made of the action of the Board of Foreign Missions, inasmuch as the power of licensure is exclusively a power of presbytery. The fact remains that this case makes clear (whatever disposition may be made of the KEARNS case) that the Board of Foreign Missions as at present constituted can not be depended on to send to the missionary field only those who are loyal to the Church's confession.

# Why I Am a Conservative

By the Rev. Frederick N. McMillin, D. D.,  
Minister, First Presbyterian Church on Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio

I AM a conservative because as an ordained Presbyterian minister I want to be intellectually honest. The seat of authority in religion for the Protestant church is the Bible. The Bible records certain facts. It declares that in the beginning God created the Heavens and the earth and gave life to human kind. It declares that man, a free moral agent, disobeyed God and so became a sinner. It reveals the blessed fact that in His great goodness God offered to man a vicarious atonement. In carrying out this plan the only begotten Son of God was incarnated, born of His Virgin Mother. He was crucified for the sins of the world upon Calvary's sacrificial cross. Because He was God as well as man He rose from the dead in His glorious resurrection victory. After forty days He ascended to Heaven and as is distinctly and repeatedly made known in the Word of God He is to come the second time to this world to establish perfect peace, perfect love, perfect righteousness and perfect redemption. I believe these facts. I have pledged myself to proclaim these facts. That minister stultifies himself who professes to believe the Bible and then proceeds to tear it to pieces, doubting this and denying that which the Word of God plainly reveals.

I am a conservative because as a minister of the Gospel of Christ I want to be morally honest. A man has a right to be a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, an Atheist, a Unitarian, or anything else that he wants to be. He has no right to masquerade as a Methodist or a Presbyterian when in reality he is something else. We have declared that we will be loyal to the Historic statements of faith formulated by our respective ecclesiastical bodies. If we are not loyal to them we are not honest. I have never been a thief and I do not propose to obtain money under false pretenses. The overwhelming majority of the members of the Evangelical churches believe the Bible as it is and the statements of the

faith of their churches as they are. They resent, as they have a right to resent, disloyalty in the pulpit. They give their efforts, their time, their prayers and, often at a sacrifice, their possessions that the Word of God in its entirety may be proclaimed. Longing and asking for that Bread of Life of which if any man shall eat he shall never hunger, we have no right to offer to them the stone of a so-called liberalism. No minister has a right to be an ecclesiastical Benedict Arnold. It would be well if every minister would read the tremendous indictment which was published a few years ago in The National Republic the organ of the Republican party, against the so-called modernist ministers in the pulpits of loyal churches. When we hear or read the utterances of some of our so-called liberal ministers we are reminded of the story of the old lady, I think she was a Methodist, who, returning to her home after listening to the sermon of a so-called liberal minister, said to the members of her family, "Well, I think it is better not to know so much than to know so much that isn't so"!

I am a conservative because, being a conservative I am in good company. I am in the company of William E. Gladstone, the author of that great volume "The Impregnable Rock of the Holy Scriptures;" of Lord Balfour, the author of "Theism and Thought;" of Dr. Francis L. Patton, who wrote "Incarnation, Expiation, Resurrection, Ascension, without these there is no Gospel;" of the Apostle Paul, who said "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation;" of a great host of the ablest men of two thousand years, the Prophets, the Apostles, the martyrs, the missionaries, the teachers, the successful pastors, who have believed and given witness to all that is revealed by, and concerning, the Son of God our Saviour.

I am a conservative because I want the church of which I am the pastor to prosper and because whenever and how-

ever I can help I want the Kingdom of Christ in all the earth to prosper. For almost thirty-four years I have been an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church in two city pastorates. For more than twenty-one years I have been the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church on Walnut Hills in the City of Cincinnati. Had I been a so-called modernist or liberal minister I would have gone from my present pastorate long ago. During these twenty-one years I have seen four ministers come and go in a church in this city which boasts itself of its so-called liberalism. This is not a pastorate in such a church, this is a procession. The pitiful weakness of the Universalist and the Unitarian Churches is due to a very large degree to their so-called liberalism. I have often wondered why some of the ministers of our Evangelical churches do not grasp the significance of this fact. If you desire to read the record of the sad influence of a so-called liberalism upon an ecclesiastical institution read the history of Andover Theological Seminary.

I am a conservative because it becomes increasingly evident that a so-called liberalism is a sinister menace to what is best, most precious and most necessary in the lives of men, in the life of our beloved country, in the life of our respective communities and in the life of the church of Christ. Conservatism gave way to liberalism in financial circles and the stock market crashed, bringing sorrow, loss, despair and hopelessness to many. Conservatism gave way to liberalism and there came what is often called the revolt of the youth. A great preacher was not only witty, he was also a sound thinker when he said, "The commandment formerly read 'Children obey your parents in the Lord for this is right,' but now it reads 'Parents obey your children in the prevailing fashion for this is convenient.'" Many young men and young women, as is well known to all, are paying the price of a

so-called liberalism as they have revolted against moral authority, parental authority, the authority of the Word of God and the authority of the state. Rebelling against conservatism in the marriage relationship many, manifesting a so-called liberalism, have increased the appalling record of divorces. Rebelling against a conservative respect for and obedience to the righteous laws of the state a so-called liberalism has resulted in a tragic lawlessness. When men cease to believe the essential and basic teachings of the Word of God, when they lose the restraints of faith, in many other respects to their own hurt and to the hurt of society, they pay the inevitable price of a dangerous liberalism. Because in some of our colleges and universities the strength of con-

servatism has given way to the weakness of a so-called liberalism we behold chaotic religious, intellectual, moral and social conditions. Many parents, beholding the influence of such institutions upon their children, have wished that they had never sent them to college.

I am a conservative because I know that sometime, somewhere I must give account of my stewardship of the Christian faith. The Apostle Paul said, "As we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak, not as pleasing men but God." I have been put in trust with the Gospel. For my own sake, knowing that I must give account, as well as for the sake of those to whom I minister I refuse to betray my trust. May God help us all to be

loyal and faithful so that when our earthly ministry is ended each one of us may be able to say with the great Apostle, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, hence forth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." As we speak the truth, my brethren, let us ever be mindful of another fine saying of the Divine Word, and let us ever speak the truth in love. Honoring and commending, as we do, a great and blessed host of our loyal and conservative fellow-ministers of a blood bought redemption offered to all men in their sins by the Son of God, let us make no attack upon the men who, blind leaders of the blind, are disloyal to any of the profound truths contained in the Word of God. Let us pray for them.

## Whom Say Ye That I Am?

By the Rev. Leonard Verduin,  
Minister, the Christian Reformed Church, Corsica, S. D.

CONCERNING Jesus of Nazareth three very pertinent questions may be asked. They cover the whole range of any man's study of the Christ. They are these: (1) Who *was* He? (2) What did He *do*? (3) What did He *say*? Or, to put the matter as briefly as possible, the three questions are the questions of Christ's *identity*, His *works*, and His *words*.

It must be evident to all observers that the modern church professes to be deeply interested in Christ's *words* and *works*. It is equally clear that she is culpably nonchalant respecting His *identity*. In the mind of the present writer this perversion (for he hopes to show that that word is not ill-chosen) strikes at the very heart of historic, Biblical Christianity.

This perversion has already found broad entrance into the Church. It has produced a clearly defined mentality which in turn has produced a veritable flood of biographies and 'lives of Christ.' Some of these attempts, as Papini's, aim to be serious; others, such

as Dan Poling's, are superficial; still others, such as Bruce Barton's, are frivolous. All of them are mistakes. For a Christianity that takes the matter of Christ's *identity* at all seriously (historic Christianity has always done that) will refrain from writing 'lives of Christ.' For it is very evident that one must either accept the record found in the Gospels, and then a biography, in the usual sense, becomes impossible, or he must reject that record, and then a biography becomes intolerable. It is for this reason that historic Christianity has ever refrained from writing biographies of the Christ.

It is the purpose of this article to attempt to indicate that to ignore the matter of Christ's *identity* is to pervert Christianity. 'Modern' Christianity, better to call it modern Liberalism, does exactly that. We would show further that to place these three considerations on a level is already an error. They are all of them important, in a sense equally important, but they are not on a level; the first question has logical priority over the other two. 'Whom do men say

that I *am*?' was and is the pivotal question.

That the matter of Christ's identity has always enjoyed logical priority is very evident from the record. Any honest study of that record cannot leave a shadow of doubt on the matter. To such a study we now proceed.

The evidence will be marshalled in two divisions. We shall listen to the testimony that was friendly to the Christ, and to the testimony that was hostile to Him. Or, if you will, let us listen to the testimony of Christ's *friends*, and to the testimony of His *enemies*.

### I—The testimony of Christ's friends.

#### a—*that of God Himself.*

God reveals to Isaiah already that the Child that is to be born shall be called 'Immanuel.' And there can be no doubt that the matter of His *identity* speaks clearly in that name. Hence it is because of the fact that He is the Son of Man that the Father has given Him authority (John 5:27).

And, further, we may listen to an audible voice from heaven. God speaks. And surely we may expect only matters of primary concern to be taken up in such a supernatural message; hence both of these messages begin with 'This *is*.' I am referring of course to the voice heard at Christ's baptism and to the words spoken at His transfiguration, 'Thou art my beloved Son' (Mary 1:11) and 'This is my beloved Son' (Mark 9:7). Surely, one might already conclude, to relegate the matter of Christ's identity to the background is misleading, to say the least. True, the matter of Christ's *words* is also referred to in at least one of these messages, 'hear ye Him' follows. But nothing is said about His *words* until His *identity* is clearly established. The modern church may take notice of this sequence. She has much praise for *some* of Christ's words; perhaps she may conclude that her *peans* of praise are a bit premature.

Finally go with me to Caesarea Philippi. There we shall hear that flesh and blood do not reveal the truth relative to Christ's *identity*, but the Father which is in heaven (Matthew 16:17). Presumably the *works* and the *words* of Jesus had not meant for Peter what God would have them mean unless the matter of Christ's *identity* were clearly established first of all. And for correct convictions in this matter we today as well as Peter of old do actually need the special witness of the Holy Spirit; 'No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost' (I Corinthians 13:3). Is such witness perhaps lacking in the modern church? Does she perhaps for that reason sidestep this issue? Not I, nor you, but that church itself may answer this question.

b—*that of the angels.*

In their message to Joseph the matter of Christ's *work* is made to hinge upon His *identity* (Matthew 1:21). The same situation obtains when they herald the birth to the shepherds (Luke 2:11). Always it is the phrase 'which is' that arrests our attention. His *identity* was always the burden of their song. We had expected nothing else. But are we then unkind when we urge the modern church to ask herself the question whether she has caught the import of the first Christmas Carol?

c—*that of Christ Himself.*

The matter of His own proper *identity* was always very dear to His heart; no other thing was as jealously guarded by Him. When men say, 'Good Master!' He is not always pleased. Hence the question, 'Why callest thou me good?' (Mark 10:18). No question was ever put with more gravity than the question 'Whom do men say that I am?' So interested is He in obtaining the correct answer that He virtually includes the answer in the question; 'Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?' And must we then believe that it is His will that the modern church should relegate the whole consideration to the limbo of 'theological subtleties'? True, He sometimes enjoined silence on this matter; 'Then charged He His disciples that they should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ' (Matthew 16:20). But the modern church may ask herself the question whether the silence *she* keeps on this matter is the silence He enjoined upon His followers. Or is her silence a *denial*? That surely is not what He sought! His Church is to be a confessing Church!

d—*that of John the Baptist.*

Here we notice that John's testimony was first and last one concerning Christ's *identity*. It may take some of his disciples away from him, (as once it did, John 1:36, 37) so that they follow him no more, but that never deters him from testifying of Christ's *identity*. 'Behold the Lamb of God' (John 1:36), 'And I saw and bear record that this is the Son of God' (John 1:34), these are samples of his testimony. John dares to identify his message with that of the Christ; both of them preach 'Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Some of the *works* of Christ John also does. But when it comes to the matter of *identity* John fairly exhausts himself disclaiming that he is in any sense at all to be identified with the Christ; 'And he confessed, and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ' (John 1:20). And shall the modern church then teach men to slur over the distinction as though it were of merely secondary importance? Is she perhaps fallen behind the lonely man from the desert, than whom the

least in the kingdom of heaven is greater? True, sadly true, John was human; he doubted at times. It appears that the last thing he did was to doubt. And when doubts came upon him it was not the *deeds* nor the *words* of Christ that caused him worry; it was emphatically His *identity*. 'Art thou He that should come or look we for another?' Those are his words. And to the lasting credit of this grim man from the wilds be it said that his last concern was to overcome this doubt regarding Christ's *identity*. Himself in prison he sent two of his disciples to gain the needed information. And is not the modern church sadly remiss when she fails, yes refuses, to set men right on this issue? And that with thousands within as well as millions without the prisons actually dying for want of this soul-soothing information! The modern church may now give an account of herself; not to me, nor to you, but to the Christ whose name she uses.

e—*that of Christ's apostles.*

Here we see Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, making a grand discovery, so great a discovery that he hastens to tell his brother about it. What was so remarkable a find? 'We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ' (John 1:41). Not the *words* (although Andrew must have noted that He spoke as never man did) nor the *works* (although Andrew has already seen some, and was to see greater works than these) but the *identity*, that was the import of his message to his brother. Philip has a very similar experience. It is recorded a few verses down. 'Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, we have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph' (John 1:45). And his first convert, Nathanael, has the same experience. His confession of faith also ran on the theme of Christ's *identity*, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel' (John 1:49). Poor Thomas too had his doubts, he also was human. But when his faith revives it is a confession, and in no uncertain terms, concerning Christ's *identity* that marks his recovery. 'My Lord, and my God!' (John 20:28). Would God the modern church would so

recover! Should any of her children by chance read this prayer may they try to believe that it goeth not forth out of feigned lips. If this prayer is granted then we shall again hear the words of worshipping men, 'Of a truth thou art the Son of God' (Matthew 14:33). *Peter's* confession has already been brought to your attention. It was in Caesarea Philippi that he was permitted to be the recipient of the sweetest benediction that ever fell on mortal ear. It came after a confession of Christ's *identity*. And if the modern church no longer hears that benediction she need not be in the dark as to the reason. Nor need she be in the dark concerning the remedy. Further, in *Paul's* birth cry the same sequence is again very evident; so evident that he who runs may read—provided he does not have his eyes closed. 'Who art thou, Lord?' is his rather paradoxical question. And after that question is taken care of (plainly it is one dealing with Christ's *identity*) then, and not till then, is the matter of further duty taken up. 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' is Paul's *second* question. And if the modern church is remiss (let her decide whether she is) in obeying the commands of this same Christ is it perhaps due to the fact that she has not heard them as commands of *Christ*? In view of this fact in Paul's experience it does not surprise us that Paul's maiden sermon was one on Christ's *identity*, 'And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God' (Acts 9:20). Nor does it surprise us that he continues on that theme, 'but Paul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ' (Acts 9:22). That preaching was successful. The modern church may observe that fact too. And if her preaching remain unsuccessful, if she confounds not a single Jew, she need not ascribe her impotence to lack of knowledge! Now let us turn, last of all, to *John's* testimony. His Gospel is certainly not silent on what Christ *did*, it has much to say about the things He *said*; but it *begins* by telling us *who Christ was*. And when all has been told we are again reminded of the purpose of the whole Gospel, 'that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God'

(John 20:31). There may be more reasons than one why the modern church is not particularly fond of this fourth Gospel!

f—*that of other believers.*

Let us listen to Martha's contribution first. Her confession is also one touching Christ's *identity*. This is the more strange because her Lord asks her opinion on certain *words* of His; 'believest thou this?' (John 11:26). Yet her faith expresses itself in a confession of Christ's *identity*, 'I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world' (John 11:27). And no wonder! *All* faith begins that way. 'Upon this rock (i.e., this confession touching Christ's *identity*) will I build my Church' (Matthew 16:18). The modern church may indeed ask herself whether in common honesty a church that ignores and stifles this confession is still entitled to so glorious a name. And she may likewise consider whether or no the gates of hell shall prevail against such a church. Of the *gentile converts* we see a woman whose first reaction is plainly one to *identity* claims. 'Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet' so she begins (John 4:19). That is still very imperfect as far as content is concerned. Had she but known who it was that said to her 'Give me to drink' she would have asked at once and He would have given her living water (John 4:10). Ten verses down she has made remarkable progress; a soul is about to be born in Zion. 'Is not this the Christ?' she asks her townfolk (John 4:29). And no wonder she progresses; Christ had said to her, 'I am he' (John 4:26). And then the whole town takes up that confession concerning the *identity* of the stranger, 'Now we believe and know that this is the Christ the Savior of the world' (John 4:42). A group confession of His *identity*! May we now ask the modern church when she has last heard such group confessions and where? And that church may further note that the testimony that God has made Jesus both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36) has a way of pricking men in their hearts so that they cry out, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' (Acts 2:37). And *finally* travel with us within hearing distance of the Ethiopian

chariot on the way from Jerusalem to Gaza. You are privileged to witness a conversion. And you who read this deem that a privilege worthwhile I know. You may hear a confession, a beautiful confession of faith from this servant of Candace. And you may witness the administration of the sacrament of baptism by an orthodox preacher. And you cannot help but notice that the whole matter turns about a confession of Christ's *identity*. 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God' (Acts 8:37). And I beg you, if you honestly can, to bow your head reverently and repeat that confession of Christ's *identity*. That confession makes you a candidate for Christian baptism. That confession entitles you to the name of 'Christian.' You, in principle at least, have been enabled to answer the purpose of your existence, 'that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (Philippians 2:11). You have the faith that overcometh the world, 'who is he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?' (I John 5:5). Will the modern church kindly investigate whether she is actually overcoming the world? She claims that as her particular mission. If she is not very successful need we ask the reason why? That church owes an answer—not to me, nor to you, but to the Christ whose name she appropriates!

## II—The testimony of Christ's enemies.

a—*that of the Jews.*

It is very plain that the opposition which Jesus met from the side of the Jews was always motivated by a consideration of Christ's *identity*. Even when some *word* or some *work* of Christ puts them on their ire it is not because of the *word* or the *work* 'per se' but because of the claim as to His *identity* that lay in it, either expressed or implied, that they are displeased. It is always the question, 'Whom makest thou thyself?' (John 8:53) that inspires their anger. A few may venture the statement, 'This is the Christ' (John 7:41) but altogether they agree that 'if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue' (John 9:22). And they persist in this

(Continued on page 10)

# Bithynia's Unknown Evangelists

By Professor Addison Hogue,  
Washington, D. C.

IN various countries since the close of the World War the nations have vied with one another in paying tribute to the Unknown Soldier; to a soldier who faced death in the line of duty, and laid down his life for a cause he thought righteous.

"The Unknown Soldier!" What sacred and tender thoughts cluster around these words. Many an old father and many an aged mother have wondered whether he was their boy. Many a girl whose lover never came back has woven her romance around that hallowed grave.

But still, there is a tomb, and its place is known.

Another soldier—or, more likely, other soldiers—equally unknown, encountered perils just as great and perhaps far greater in a warfare nobler than the one just spoken of. Their weapons were not carnal but spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. They went to heal, not to wound; not to take prisoners, but to release those in bondage to sin and Satan; to give deliverance to captives and opening of the eyes to those that were blind.

These unknown soldiers won a great victory against overwhelming odds. They invaded a country from which Paul and Silas had been warned away by the Holy Spirit, who now, however, worked with these unknown missionaries. They had to contend with the forces of heathenism entrenched behind the power of the Roman empire.

They had to tell the Bithynians of a King and a kingdom not of this world.

They had to announce principles of conduct utterly repugnant to their hearers—so repugnant that it was almost like trying to make water run uphill.

Then, think of what they preached. Utter and absolute nonsense it would seem to those heathen—a message of which St. Paul has this to say:

For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom failed to

gain a knowledge (ouk egno) of God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of what was preached [the proclamation] to save them that believe. 1 Cor. 1:21.

"The foolishness of what was preached"!—and this in the Bible? Yes; but just look at it. A few Jews, members of an unpopular and often a despised race, themselves no doubt unknown, poor, and without any worldly influence or backing to encourage them—these men had the audacity to tell the Bithynians that the gods they worshipped were no gods, and that to be saved they must accept as God a Jew whom Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, caused to be crucified as a malefactor between two robbers, after this Jew's own people had rejected him and handed him over to the governor; and then to add, that on the third day he rose from the dead. Could anything more foolish be imagined than this, aside from the hostility it would naturally arouse by opposing the gods of their hearers?

Did they have any success? Yes, and I will produce two reputable witnesses.

The first one is the apostle Peter. Bithynia is mentioned only twice in the New Testament: once in Acts 16:7 where we see the remarkable statement that though Paul and Silas tried to carry the gospel into Bithynia, "the Spirit of Jesus"—an expression found nowhere else in the Bible—did not allow them to do so; the reason seeming to be that God had a far larger sphere of work for Paul and Silas by sending them over to Europe. But He did not neglect Bithynia; for St. Peter, writing probably within ten years of that time begins his first letter as follows:

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are scattered abroad and sojourning in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia—(elect) according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the

blood of Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace be multiplied.

That is the first witness. He tells very little; but even that little is important.

The other witness testified some thirty or thirty-five years later, and tells us far more about the success of the unknown missionaries; and *his* testimony is particularly important, because it comes from an enemy, the Roman governor of Bithynia about the year one hundred of our era.

In Roman history there were two distinguished men by the name of Pliny, uncle and nephew, known as Pliny the Elder, and Pliny the Younger. The elder Pliny was a perfectly ravenous reader and untiring student. He lost his life at the overwhelming of Herculaneum and Pompeii by the great eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79—nine years after the destruction of Jerusalem following its capture by Titus.

Pliny the Younger was a lawyer in Rome and a man of great literary ability. The emperor Trajan appointed him governor of Bithynia. There are left quite a number of letters that passed between them. [We also have some 800 letters of Cicero's, and some of Nero's teacher, the philosopher Seneca, a brother of the Gallio of whom we read in Acts (18:17) that he "cared for none of these things," when the Jews beat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, before Gallio's judgment seat.]

But not all of these letters *combined* are as important as a letter that Pliny wrote to his emperor, Trajan, in regard to the great spread of Christianity in Bithynia. This is by far the most important letter that has come down to us from antiquity, and I will give it to you in as careful a translation as I could make.

## Pliny's Letter to Trajan

It is my custom, Master, to appeal to *you* in all matters as to which I am in

doubt; for who is better able to direct me when hesitating, or to instruct me in my ignorance?

I have never been present at the legal trials of the Christians. Hence I do not know what the punishment usually is, or how far the investigation ordinarily extends. And I am greatly in doubt on the following points:—Shall any distinction be made on account of age? or shall those of tender years, no matter how young, be dealt with exactly as those who are stronger? Does repentance deserve pardon? or shall the fact of having *ceased* to be a Christian avail nothing to a person who has undoubtedly *been* one? Is the mere name "Christian" to be punished even if no crimes have been committed? or must there be the name *plus* the crimes?

Meanwhile, in the case of those who were constantly being reported to me as being Christians the following has been my mode of procedure: I asked whether they were Christians. If they confessed that they were, I asked again, and a third time, after threatening them. If they persevered in their statement I ordered them to be led to execution; for I did not doubt that, no matter what it was that they were confessing to, pertinacity and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished.

There have been others afflicted with the same folly, and I had them marked to be sent to Rome, because they were Roman citizens.

Presently—and this is perfectly natural—as it became more widely known that it was accounted a crime to be a Christian, more cases had to be dealt with. There was placed before me an anonymous paper containing names of many persons. Some denied that they were Christians or ever *had* been. In these cases I recited the words they were to repeat after me; and then, if they invoked the gods and worshipped your image (which I had ordered to be brought for this purpose), and if they also worshipped the statues of the divinities by a libation of wine and by offering incense, and especially if they reviled Christ, I judged that their cases should be dismissed. Notice that I say "especially if they reviled Christ"; for it is said that none who are really and

truly (re vera) Christians can possibly be forced to do this.

Others, named by an informer, admitted that they were Christians, and presently took it back; "they had been, indeed, but had ceased to be"—some, many years previously; one individual even *twenty* years before. All of these worshipped your image and the statues of the gods and reviled Christ. They assured me, however, that the sum total of their fault or error—call it which you will—was this: they had been accused on a certain day to meet together before it was light and among themselves to recite a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves by an oath, *not* to the commission of any crime, but *not* to commit any thefts, any robberies, any adulteries; not to violate their pledged word, and not to disown any deposit entrusted to them when called upon to return it; and after all these matters had been attended to, it had been their custom to depart, and again to meet for the purpose of partaking of a meal in common, but an innocent one. Even this, however, so they said, they had ceased to do after my edict, in which, following your instructions, I had forbidden such gatherings. That is why I thought it all the more necessary to learn what truth there was in it; so I put to the torture two maid servants whom they call deaconesses (ministrals); but I found nothing except a depraved and immoderate superstition. So I postponed their trial, and have had recourse to you for advice, for the matter has seemed to me to be one in which your advice is needed, particularly because of the number of those endangered. For many of every age, of every station in life, of both sexes too, are exposed to danger, and will be. Nor is it merely cities, but villages also and countrysides that the contagion of this superstition has pervaded; and it seems that it must be stopped and corrected.

This much anyhow is a fact: the almost deserted temples have now begun to be frequented and the usual sacred rites, after long intermission, are again being repeated, and food for the sacrificial victims is once more being offered for sale, though up to this time a purchaser could rarely be found for it.

From all of which you can easily see

what a crowd of people can be brought to mend their ways, provided room can be found for their repentance.

### Trajan's Reply to Pliny

You have followed the proper course of action in dealing with the cases of those who had been reported to you as being Christians; for it is impossible to lay down any universal law that must never be departed from.

The Christians are not to be sought for. If they are reported to you and are convicted, they must be punished, with this proviso, however, that if anyone says he is *not* a Christian and proves it by the very fact of worshipping our gods, he must obtain pardon on account of his repentance, no matter how suspected he may have been in the past.

Anonymous communications are not to find a place in *any* accusation; for this sets a most pernicious precedent, and is totally unworthy of the spirit of our age.

### Whom Say Ye That I Am?— Continued

resolution. Did not Christ's first rejection at Nazareth follow the question, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' (Luke 4:22). And did not their objection to Christ's 'Thy sins are forgiven thee' (Mark 2:7) spring from the same consideration? And Christ's last visit to Nazareth brings on the same reaction, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' (Mark 6:3). At one occasion they threaten to stone Him (John 10:31) and that not (they make an unequivocal answer to Jesus' question touching this point) for any good work but for blasphemy, 'because thou being a man maketh thyself God' (John 10:33). The question of Christ's *identity*, that is the issue consistently and continually. And the most unkindest cut of all was the indictment, none the less heinous because put in question form, 'Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?' (John 8:48). A very close second to this blasphemy is the modern version, 'Say we not well that thou art merely the fairest flower that ever graced the beautiful stalk of humanity?' Will the modern church please consider whether

the Church can become blasphemous! No wonder the Jews' official charge against the Christ is one pertaining to his *identity* claim. Their attempts to convict Him on His *words* ended in a confessed failure (Mark 14:58 and Matthew 26:61). Listen to the impious words of the High-priest, 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God! (Mark 14:61). Who is this, that is their question. And it is of huge importance to note that Jesus, hitherto strangely but serenely silent, at that remark suddenly speaks, speaks with all the gravity of which His great soul was capable. The matter that lay closest to His heart had been touched by the foulest of hands. He cannot now be silent! Can you? The modern church can! For shame! See them in their devilish mockery as it reaches its most infernal depth. My heart sickens to hear them as they wound Him with their 'Hail, King of the Jews!' (Mark 15:18). And if that were not enough listen to their 'If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross' (Matthew 27:40). Even the impenitent thief must add his barb to the deadly arrow striking deep into His very heart, 'If thou be the Christ save thyself, and us!' (Luke 23:39). Let the modern church ponder once more whether He can possibly regard with favor any nonchalance respecting His claims as to His *identity*. And let her ponder also whether there is not such a thing as crucifying the Son of God afresh!

b—*that of the centurion and his soldiers.*

The only positive reaction we witness here was not 'Truly this man has done many excellent works!'; nor was it 'Truly this man has taught many marvelous things!'; nay rather, 'Truly this man was the Son of God!' And can a Church fall behind these uncultured, most likely unsaved pagans? Let the modern church answer this question; not to me, nor to you, but to the very Christ!

c—*that of the devil.*

We note that all his temptation speeches turn about the *identity* theme. They begin with 'If thou be the Son of

God' (Matthew 4:3, 6). And well might he give that matter due consideration! Especially after that voice from heaven! And small wonder that the 'ape of God' as Luther called him will once more, and then finally, attack this opponent in His *identity*; shall not the Antichrist claim once more that he is the Christ? (Matthew 24:5, 23, 24). And may we not ask whether the modern church will then see any cause for alarm? After she has ignored the whole issue for so long a time? Must one be termed a fanatic when he suggests that the Antichrist will find a congenial home within the ranks of that church?

d—*that of the demons.*

Here it is very evident that the demons feared not at all in the first place Christ's *words* (although they did fear Christ's words); nor did they fear in the first place Christ's *works* (although they did fear Christ's works). Their primary concern, the notion that inspired their terror, was the *identity* of the 'strong man.' Therefore came the devils out saying, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of God' 'for they knew that He was the Christ.' Therefore one demon calls out, 'What have I to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of the Most High? I know thee whom thou art, the Holy One of God!' I shall not quote the other half dozen passages of like import; rather would I ask the modern church whether things have come to such a pass that the truth must be sought in the mouth of the powers of darkness rather than in the confession of the bride of Christ? That can not, may not, shall not be! Shall the Church become guilty of making God a liar in not believing the record He gave of His Son (I John 5:10)? If so let the modern church consider that at one time the *identity* of this Christ will be unmistakably clear to all concerned; when He shall have on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' (Revelation 19:16). The modern church may well ask herself whether she is preparing her sons to take their places at that day with those who implore the mountains to cover them; or whether she is preparing them for the blessed pronouncement 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant.' All depends in the

first place upon what answer she has taught them to give to the question of questions, 'Whom say ye that I am?'

We have come to the end of our evidence. The writer does by no means claim to have said anything new; all this is part and parcel of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. It seems to him self-evident that in the light of this array of evidence, both pro and con, no one may, in ordinary honesty, lay claim to the fairest of all names and at the same time avoid the Biblical confession in re Christ's *identity*. He who has substituted another confession for it has not committed greater sin. And it seems as evident as the nose on a man's face that all our modern talk about 'following Jesus' means exactly nothing at all unless we mean by it 'following Jesus.' And even a little child can understand the Barthian truism that the importance of a predicate depends upon its subject! We may heal the sick (take over Christ's *works*) or we may repeat, in or out of its connection, the Sermon on the Mount (take over His *words*) but unless we also, and first of all, take over the proper conception of His *identity* all our labors are vain! One might as sensibly preach Socrates and him poisoned as to preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified—unless one tells the truth about the *identity* of the Christ he aspires to proclaim. For if we leave the question put in Caesarea Philippi unanswered (which is no worse than to give a positively wrong answer to it), if we fail to give Peter's testimony respecting the *identity* of our Christ, we have made Christianity impossible. For then we can no longer worship Him and our Christianity is extinct; or we continue to worship him and so make ourselves guilty of hideous idolatry. For to worship a mere creature were idolatry whether we keep on spelling certain names with capitals or no. Dr. Fosdick is beautifully consistent when he speaks of the 'peril of worshipping Jesus'; were his 'theology' such that the word 'sin' could still have a place in his vocabulary he might have preached on 'The *sin* of worshipping Jesus' For to worship the creature instead of the Creator is the very essence of sin. *That* shall be the bosom sin of the Antichrist. And it were

(Concluded on page 15)

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

## XVI. THE RIGHT HAND OF FELLOWSHIP

*"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).*

### One Gospel Given to Both

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we showed that when Paul says in Gal. 2:6, "For to me those who were of repute added nothing," he is not excluding such an action as the issuance of the so-called "Apostolic Decree" with its four prohibitions as recorded in Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25. That discussion involved the whole difficult question of the relation between Acts and Galatians, and of the identification, with one or another of the visits recorded in Acts, of the visit to Jerusalem which Paul records in Gal. 2:1-10.

This month we turn to somewhat easier matters and can make more rapid progress.

"But on the contrary," Paul continues (after the momentous words discussed last month), "when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision just as Peter with that of the circumcision . . ."

It is very important here to observe the tense of the verb "had been entrusted." What the leaders of the Jerusalem Church recognized was not that Paul was then being entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, not that he was worthy to be entrusted with it by their instrumentality, but that he had *already* been entrusted with it, in complete independence of them, by God.

By speaking of "the gospel of the uncircumcision" and (by implication) of "the gospel of the circumcision," Paul does not mean to say that there were two different gospels, one to be preached to Gentiles and the other to be preached to Jews. Such an interpretation is excluded by the "right hand of fellowship" which, according to verse 9, the Jerusalem pillars gave to Paul and Barnabas; it is also expressly excluded by I Cor. 15:11, where Paul says, "Whether it were I or they, so we preached and so ye believed." What Paul means, and what the Jerusalem leaders recognized, is that it was the same gospel that was everywhere proclaimed, but that to Paul had been entrusted the special duty of preaching that gospel to Gentiles, and to them the special duty of preaching it to Jews.

How did they "see" that Paul had been entrusted with the gospel? It is natural to think in this connection of the glorious results of Paul's preaching of the gospel out in the Gentile world; and the Book of Acts tells us that Paul and Barnabas recounted in Jerusalem "how great things God had done with them" (Acts 15:4) and "how great signs and wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles" (Acts 15:12). No doubt that was one kind of evidence that convinced the Jerusalem leaders that Paul had really been entrusted with the gospel. But there is no reason why we should not also include among the evidence that convinced them the imme-

diately received when Paul told them what his gospel was.

### One God Working for Both

At any rate, we are told in the next verse that at least one reason why they were convinced that Paul had been entrusted with the gospel was that God had worked for him as He had worked for Peter. "For He who had worked for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision had worked also for me unto the Gentiles." It is not very important to ask whether the working of God here referred to was the working in the hearts and lives of the hearers, giving effect to the gospel that Paul preached, or the working of God in Paul himself, making him powerful in the preaching of the gospel. Probably both kinds of working are included. At any rate, the Jerusalem leaders saw that it was the same gospel that had been preached by Peter and by Paul, because the same God had worked for both.

"And when they had recognized the grace that had been given me . . ." The Jerusalem leaders saw that the divine favor rested upon Paul. No doubt they saw it partly through the marvellous effects of his preaching in the Gentile world. But here, at least, even if we should not do so in verse 7, we ought probably to think also, and perhaps primarily, of the immediate impression which the Jerusalem leaders received from Paul. They were convinced, by their immediate contact with him there in Jerusalem, that the divine favor had been bestowed upon him to make him what they so plainly saw him to be.

"James and Cephas and John, those who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." James the brother of the Lord is here put first, although he was not one of the Twelve Apostles, because

he was the head of the Jerusalem Church and so seems to have presided over its meetings. These men are here called "pillars" by a natural figure of speech which has come, through the influence of this passage, into our common parlance, in which we speak of "pillars of the Church."

### The Meaning of "Fellowship"

The pillars of the Jerusalem Church gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. The word "fellowship" is derived from a word meaning "common"; a man has "fellowship" with another, in accordance with the usage of this word, when he has something in "common" with him. But it is perfectly clear from the context what it was that the Jerusalem leaders had in common with Paul, and what they recognized that they had in common with him when they extended to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. They had the gospel in common with him. By extending to him the right hand of fellowship, they indicated that they and he were both engaged in preaching the same gospel of the same Lord.

The word "fellowship" is a fine, rich word; it is the same word as that which appears in the "Apostolic Benediction" at the end of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, where Paul writes of the "communion" of the Holy Ghost. There is no reason whatever for weakening its meaning in our passage in Galatians.

Much mischief has been wrought in the interpretation of the Bible by making the interpretation of what is clear fit a doubtful interpretation of what is obscure. So in the Epistle to the Galatians some men have read a great deal between the lines. They have interpreted the puzzling phrases, "those who were reputed to be something," "those who were reputed to be pillars," to mean that Paul was in permanently strained relations with the original apostles; and then, on the basis of that very doubtful view, they have proceeded to explain "the right hand of fellowship" to mean merely that the Jerusalem leaders on the one hand and Paul on the other made a cold agreement to disagree, a cold agreement to keep apart from each other in order that quarreling might be avoided.

As a matter of fact, what is abundantly clear about this passage—a passage in some respects obscure—is that the Jerusalem leaders and Paul did *not* make a cold agreement to disagree, but that they gave each other the right hand of fellowship and said thereby that they were all engaged in preaching the same gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ and that neither group of them could do without the other.

### The So-Called "Division of Labor"

The pillars of the Jerusalem Church, Paul says, "gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision." In the Greek, there is no verb at all in this purpose clause; it reads merely, "that we to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision." Some verb no doubt has to be inserted in English; but the Greek is more general, and yet more forcible. "We to the Jews, you to the Gentiles"—such was the way in which the Jerusalem leaders summed up the guidance of God in sending out laborers into His harvest in those days.

Grievous errors have often arisen in the modern understanding of this "division of labor." It has been represented as though its purpose were largely negative—to prevent Paul from trespassing upon the field of the original apostles, and to prevent the original apostles from trespassing upon the field of Paul. So the question has been asked by some modern scholars whether the meaning of the division was geographical or ethnological—that is, whether Paul was to preach in Gentile *countries* and the original apostles in the Jewish *country*, Palestine; or whether Paul was to preach to Gentiles, wherever they might be found, even in Palestine, and the original apostles were to preach to Jews wherever they might be found, even in Gentile countries. The suggestion has even been made that Paul understood the division in one way and the original apostles in the other, Paul understanding it geographically and the original apostles ethnologically, so that when Peter came to Antioch he was doing right according to *his* understanding of the arrangement (since there were some Jews at Antioch) but wrong according

to Paul's understanding (since Antioch is not in Palestine).

But the very raising of such questions shows a complete misunderstanding of the right hand of fellowship which the Jerusalem leaders gave to Paul. As a matter of fact, the so-called "division of labor" between Paul and the original apostles was not, strictly speaking, a division of labor at all; its purpose was not negative; it was not meant at all as a limitation of the field of one party or of the other; it did not mean that Paul was not to preach to Jews or that Peter was not to preach to Gentiles; it did not mean that Paul was not to preach in Palestine or that Peter was not to preach outside of Palestine. But it meant that so far, according to the plain meaning of God, Paul had been sent predominantly to the Gentiles and the original apostles to the Jews; and that, therefore, unless both Paul and the original apostles continued their work, the cause would suffer. "Neither of us," said the Jerusalem leaders, "can do without the other, you and we are both preaching the same gospel; but we are needed to preach it to the Jews and you and Barnabas are needed to preach it to the Gentiles. It is all Christ's work; and in the future prosecution of the work, among both Jews and Gentiles, both by your instrumentality and by ours, we all have fellowship."

### "Remember the Poor"

There was one express exception to the division of labor (if we may call it such) between the Jerusalem leaders and Paul. "We to the Gentiles," says Paul, "they to the circumcision—only, that we should remember the poor." By "the poor" is meant, of course, the poor of the Jerusalem Church. "God has sent you to the Gentiles," said the Jerusalem leaders; "but do not be so exclusively an apostle to the Gentiles as to forget our poor people here in Jerusalem."

It is very important to observe that this exception, introduced by the word "only," is not an exception to the assertion in verse 6, "To me those who were of repute added nothing." If it were an exception to that assertion, then the omission of all mention of the Apostolic

Decree would, despite what we said last month, become very strange. If the inculcation of care for the Jerusalem Church was an exception to the general assertion, "They added nothing to me," then surely the inculcation of the four prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree would also seem to be an exception, and Paul would probably have been obliged to mention that exception as much as the other. In other words, if Paul meant to say, "They added nothing to me except that I should remember the Jerusalem poor," then the words, "they added nothing," would probably not be interpreted (as we interpreted them last month) merely as denying an addition to Paul's gospel, but would have to be taken in a much broader sense, as denying any communications addressed by the Jerusalem leaders to Paul; and in that case it would seem strange that Paul does not mention the Apostolic Decree as an exception along with the inculcation of relief for the Jerusalem poor.

As a matter of fact, however, it is quite impossible to take the words, "only, that I should remember the poor" (verse 10), with the words, "they added nothing." Those words lie four verses back (in verse 6); and it is of course as plain as day that what verse 10 is actually to be taken as presenting an exception to is the division of labor which has been mentioned in the immediately preceding verse. "You to the Gentiles, we to the Jews," said the Jerusalem leaders to Paul. "That is the general division of labor which so far seems to have been established by the guidance of God. But there is one matter at least where we hope you will not take the division too strictly even now—to say nothing of any guidance of God which may be given to both of us in the future. There is one matter concerning the Jews in which we need the help of you, the Apostle to the Gentiles, even now. We hope you will not forget our poor of the Jerusalem Church."

Paul took very seriously indeed that call for help. He says here in Galatians, "which very thing also I was zealous to do"; and in I and II Corinthians and Romans it becomes evident that the collection for the Jerusalem poor was very much on his heart.

## 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.]

### Why Mar Beautiful Hymns?

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Newspapers recently reported that in a Church Conference, proposals have been made to excise from Christian hymns certain references to the atoning blood of our Lord, on the ground that these references were not pleasing to young people.

Now it is reported that Bishop Heber's grand old missionary hymn "From Greenland's Icy Mountains," is to be altered to please certain missionaries who consider it "snobbish."

But is this charge of "snobbishness" true? Is the desire for change well-founded?

Does not this hymn say substantially what Christ and His Apostles declared, that men who worship false gods and are without Christ are "in darkness," in "error's chain," "blind"; and that the crucified and risen Son of God alone can save them; that the Gospel is the "wisdom of God," and can make men "wise unto salvation"?

If there is a fault, it is not in the hymn; it is in the Gospel and the Scriptures.

But who are the "missionaries" who object, and desire a change? If the truth were known, they are comparatively few in number, and do not come into close contact with the people in mission fields. They hold that heathen religions, having some truth, are a sufficient rule of life. That mission work should be a "sharing," a syncretism—taking some ideas from heathenism, and giving some things of Christianity. That the heathen are not "lost," as Paul thought they were, "dead in trespasses and sin," &c., &c. Here is the real ground of objection to these noble hymns: it is the objection of Modernist's unbelief to the Gospel of Christ.

We rejoice to believe that the great majority of missionaries in foreign lands are true to the Gospel, and would strongly oppose the changes proposed in the Church's hymnology. And true converts would take the same position, and oppose softening down the humbling statements of the Gospel to please human pride and self-sufficiency.

In the name of the many faithful missionaries and native converts who stand for the Truth, we protest against the unfounded charge of "snobbishness," which does great injustice to an honored servant of God, and this attempt to alter the hymns of the Church to suit a minority who are out of sympathy with the Gospel.

HENRY M. WOODS.

Ventnor, N. J.

### The Kearns Case

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Have you room somewhere in your fine Christian paper for a humble, loyal servant of the Church to be heard?

In your mid-January, 1932, number, I read of, seems to me, a terrible thing,—the acts of Presbytery of Washington, D. C. and of our Board of Foreign Missions.

Is it possible that our Board of Foreign Missions will, knowingly, appoint a man to go to any foreign field to preach and teach the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, who can not affirm his belief in the integrity of the same, on *any* point, much less when it relates to the *very center and heart* of the whole Bible message?

Then because four ex-moderators are said to be on the Board the Presbytery thinks it "unthinkable" not to license him!

Have the four ex-moderators more weight with that Presbytery than the Bible and the Westminster Standards to which millions of Calvinists have pledged their allegiance and along with them the *members* of the Board of Missions and the Board as a *unit* and the Presbytery of Washington, D. C. also?

Does the Church believe as this Presbytery and our Foreign Board have acted? No! Has the world a right to think and to say we do? Yes! most emphatically. When atheists gleefully commend such steps, have they a just reason? They have!

Our Scriptures say "He that believeth not—disbelieveth—refuses to believe, shall be damned—condemned—rejected."

The entire gospel message says the unbeliever is rejected from God's service. Yet our Foreign Board thinks it can use them that "refuse to believe." No wonder the Church is losing and failing and no wonder that the respect due to sacred things of God is almost unknown among the large denominations. No wonder the spiritual power of these churches is so nearly gone. God and His Word are left out of their plans. No wonder so many of our candidates elected to represent us in high places of our nation are defaulters. No wonder our international pacts and pledges are only scraps of paper. The organized forces—at the head—of the Presbyterian Church of Jesus Christ, U. S. A., seem to have no more respect or regard for the Word of God and its Confession of Faith than a pagan nation or a degenerate Christian nation has for its international agreements.

In fact, it is taking the lead and these evil forces are saying, surely we can follow

where the Presbyterian and Methodist churches and others are leading.

Choosing men who "believe not" the Word of God to teach and preach it is not the way to lead an ungodly people to God. The unbeliever can not carry a message of faith and salvation to disbelievers—when he himself doubts it.

With this fine young man and thirteen hundred "Auburn Affirmationists" leading or steering the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., we are headed for the whale's belly. If these modern Jonahs were as sincere and as honest as "Old Foggy" Jonah they would confess their sins and ask to be thrown overboard, that *all* may not perish. The "Old Ship of Zion" can't carry all this rebellious cargo and make the harbor. It will sink or go to pieces.

How many are willing to continue to support such a leadership?

W. V. M.

### God's Continuing Work of Grace

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Paul, writing to the Philippians and to other Christians through them, says: "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. 1:6. The Revised Version has the same idea and almost the identical words.

Paul does not tell them that he is confident that they will persevere and continue in the faith; rather that God's work in them will continue to perfection, till the day of Jesus Christ.

The old Calvinistic doctrine of the perseverance of the saints has a Scriptural Basis, but back of their perseverance is God's continuing, persevering work in them. We ought always to feel our dependence on Him rather than on ourselves.

The work in them is begun in them in regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the invisible third person of the Trinity. It is carried on in them till the coming again of Jesus Christ, when soul and body are united to make a perfect, complete man.

There is a breaking point for every saint. Jesus said to His disciples concerning the tribulation of the last days: "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Matt. 24:22.

Many of the saints fall from righteousness, even if they do not fall from grace. Peter denied his Lord with profanity at the time of the crucifixion. Perhaps he returned to youthful habits. Yet God's work in him continued and he kept meeting with the other apostles. He continued his leadership of the apostles, and did the first work among the Gentiles. Through Mark he may have begun the New Testament. Beyond doubt he wrote the two epistles which bear his name.

The companionship of the apostles at-

tracted Thomas and he kept meeting with them after the crucifixion of Christ. Although Thomas did not at first see the necessity of the atonement and the resurrection, God continued His work in his heart. At the second appearance of Christ to the eleven he was there and acknowledged Christ as Lord and God.

Within recent years we have the career of Rev. B. Fay Mills as an illustration of the truth of this verse. In the early part of his public career he was a successful evangelist. Then doubts began to arise in his mind and he went into the far country of Unitarianism. A short time before his death he returned to his former evangelistic faith in Christ and expressed belief in the doctrines he had for a while discarded.

At this point the question arises, of what use is this teaching any way? It might interest the skillful theological dialectician. It may arouse the interest of some as an example of mental and spiritual gymnastics, but it seems to have no real value for everyday Christians. But Paul, the writer of this verse was an intensely practical man. He started several churches and helped other struggling churches that were just beginning. He combined deep theology and practical efficiency. They were not incompatible; in fact one helped the other.

This teaching enables a man to get a firm footing on the Rock of Ages in the midst of the swirling currents of modern life and reach out a helping hand to others. For a man to think that his own perseverance in belief and in righteousness does not depend on himself, on his own frail strength, but on some one mightier than he, gives him confidence, courage and steadiness.

The process of sanctification in the believer is the expression of God's continuing grace.

WILLIAM F. BISSELL.

Saxton's River, Vermont.

### A Good Confession

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Perhaps no more sweeping proposal to change the doctrinal foundations of the Church has ever been presented to the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. than the one to add the United Presbyterian Confessional Statement to the Westminster Standards. Even the Brief Statement of Reformed Doctrine, so widely published, is not a part of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. It is a question whether the General Assembly of this denomination is sufficiently prepared to discuss so momentous a change. Weeks ago, among other documents, the U. P. Confessional Statement was sent to ministers, but not to elders, who make half the membership of the General Assembly. Moreover, a number, perhaps a considerable number of elders have never read the Westminster Confession. This may seem less incredible if we recall

that some forty years ago one of the most famous Presbyterian pastors of New York City declared that he had never read it. Perhaps it does not require a theological training to perceive that in any Presbyterian denomination it is a perilous situation when there is an extensive and profound ignorance of the Westminster Standards and their merits, doctrinal and historical.

In the opening pages of his "Calvinism Pure and Mixed," Dr. Shedd urged that reaffirmation of the Westminster Standards, not their revision was the real need, together with catechetical instruction. He said: "What is there in the Presbyterian Church of today that necessitates any different statement of the doctrine of decrees, of atonement, of regeneration, or of punishment, from that accepted by the Presbyterian Church of 1837, or 1789? Are the statements upon these points any more liable to misconception or misrepresentation by non-Calvinists now than they were fifty or a hundred years ago? What is there in the condition of the Presbyterian Church of today that makes the old Confession of the past two hundred years inadequate as a doctrinal Standard? All the past successes and victories of Presbyterianism have been accomplished under it. Success in the past is guaranty for success in the future. The Westminster Confession, exactly as it now reads, has been the creed of as free and enlarged intellects as ever lived on earth. The substance of it was the strong and fertile root of the two freest movements in modern history: that of the Protestant Reformation and that of Republican Government."

In the splendid series of volumes containing the works of Dr. B. B. Warfield, "The Westminster Assembly and its Work" is excellent. He speaks (p. 56) of the Confession's peculiar comprehensiveness, and that its statements of the generic doctrine of the Reformed Churches have a directness, a definiteness, a crisp precision, and an unambiguous clarity which are attained by few Confessional documents of any age or creed. And, (p. 58) it is "the ripest fruit of Reformed creed-making." Also, (p. 61) "it is professed by perhaps a more numerous body than any other Protestant creed."

CHAS. E. EDWARDS.

### Whom Say Ye That I Am?— Concluded

a serious charge that the modern church is preparing the way for this typical sin of the Antichrist; she may answer whether she has deserved such a charge. And she may answer, not to you, nor to me, but before the Christ of the Gospels. She *may* answer now; otherwise she *must* answer at the day of His coming!

## Books of Religious Significance

*REFORMED DOGMATICS* by Louis Berkhof, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Calvin Seminary. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Two Volumes. pp. 797 including Bibliography and Index. \$10.00.

IT is hardly too much to say that this is the most important work in systematic theology, from an American source, that has appeared in recent years. It seemed a pity to the writer that Dr. B. B. Warfield passed away without having left us a systematic theology, much as we value the collection of his selected writings that are now being issued by the Oxford University Press. Our regret over Dr. Warfield's failure to give us a systematic statement of his theological conclusions has been greatly lessened, however, by the appearance of these able and comprehensive volumes from the pen of Professor Berkhof. While Professor Berkhof is not a stranger to the writings of Dr. Warfield (to mention only modern theologians) it is the influence of the writings of the great Dutch theologians, Kuyper, Bavinck and Vos, that is most noticeable throughout these volumes. This is not to imply that Professor Berkhof has given us but a compilation of the conclusions of these great masters of reformed theology. Despite his modesty in laying claim to no special originality as a theologian, it is obvious that all had passed through the alembic of his own keen and constructive mind before he placed pen to paper. While these volumes are the outgrowth of the author's class-room and the schematic arrangement is intended primarily to meet the needs of theological students, yet they are admirably fitted to meet the needs of men in the active ministry. Greek and Hebrew type has been avoided. The result is a work that also meets the needs of those who have had no special theological training. The price is not large when it is considered that it would require a small library of ordinary books to cover the subjects treated in these volumes.

These volumes are correctly named. This is not a work in apologetics. Its conclusions are assumed. It also assumes rather than presents the conclusions of exegetical and historical theology. What it seeks to do is to set forth in a systematic way the doctrines of Christianity, as these are understood in Calvinistic circles. The views of divergent views are not overlooked, but their consideration is always incidental to the exposition of theology as understood in Reformed circles. Like all truly Reformed theologians Professor Berkhof is distinctly a Biblical not a speculative theologian. He draws his material from revelation, particularly from that supernatural revelation

which is recorded in Holy Scripture. His central aim is first to reflect in his own consciousness and then to present in systematic form the whole of that knowledge of God and divine things made known to us through special revelation as embodied in the Bible.

Professor Berkhof presents his material under six main heads: (1) The doctrine of God and the World; (2) The doctrine of man in relation to God; (3) The doctrine of the person and work of Christ; (4) The doctrine of the application of the work of redemption; (5) The doctrine of the Church and the means of grace; and (6) The doctrine of last things.

It would mean much for Christianity if works like this were more generally read. Dogmatic theology is discredited in many quarters in the interest of a practical piety without doctrinal content; and the result is Christians who waver in their testimony and who are distressingly inefficient. Let it not be forgotten that the only consistent despisers of dogmatic theology are those who deny the reality of supernatural revelation in word and deed as recorded in the Bible. If the Bible is true, dogmatic theology stands in no need of defense. Its necessity is a matter of course. This is what Francis Landey Patten had in mind when, with his intellectual powers at their height, he said: "Sooner or later I am sure the eyes of men will be opened and they will see—would to God they might see it now—the great battle of the twentieth century is in its final issue a struggle between a Dogmatic Christianity on the one hand and an out-and-out naturalistic philosophy on the other."

S. G. C.

*THE WORD AND THE WORLD* by Emil Brunner, Professor of Theology at the University of Zurich. Charles Scribner's Sons. pp. 127. \$1.75.

THIS is the second book in English dress by Dr. Brunner. "The Theology of Crisis" consisted of a series of lectures delivered in this country in exposition of Barthianism and was reviewed at some length in our issue of May, 1930. The book before us consists of five brief lectures delivered on invitation of the University of London in March, 1931. Dr. Brunner while differing from Karl Barth on some points is everywhere recognized as one of the ablest exponents of the theological movement that has achieved such headway, especially in Europe, under the name of the Dialectical Theology or Barthianism. That it is not without influence in Great Britain and America was indicated in our issue of November, 1931, in connection with our review of "The Significance of Karl Barth" by John

McConnachie, a Scotch minister, and "Karl Barth: Prophet of a New Christianity?" by William Pauck, professor of the Congregational theological seminary of Chicago. Dr. Brunner is a man of commanding ability whose writings cannot be ignored by any desirous of understanding the genius of the movement he essays to interpret and commend.

Dr. Brunner professes a two-fold object in these lectures: (1) to render the old truth of the Bible once more intelligible to thinking men of today and (2) to remove misunderstandings which confront the Dialectical Theology, not on the Continent merely, but in Great Britain and America.

This book by Dr. Brunner had not appeared when in our issue of November last we expressed the opinion that Barthianism is fatally defective at at least three points—in its one-sided emphasis on the transcendence of God, in its supposition that Christian faith is not built on historic facts, and in its contention that while the Word of God is in the Bible yet the Word of God is in no real sense to be identified with the words of the Bible. It happens that in this book Dr. Brunner deals with all these points.

He vigorously defends Barthianism against the charge of placing an exclusive emphasis on the transcendence of God, affirming that "much nonsense has been talked about the 'Barthian Theology' having perception only for the transcendence of God, not for His immanence." He also defends Barthianism against the charge of minimizing the significance of the historical element, of that which occurred in time in the person and work of Jesus Christ. At the beginning of his lecture on "The Word of Christ and History" he says: "It is not superfluous to utter today in theology the commonplace that Christian faith is faith in Jesus Christ—that belief which the Fourth Gospel formulates in its own fashion: the Word of God has become flesh in Jesus Christ. This assertion is exclusively Christian. . . . The entire New Testament in all its parts, where it speaks of Jesus the Christ, means by this name an event which is not only gradually but fundamentally above all other events, and one which essentially can happen but once."

The third charge, however (that having to do with the Bible), he not only admits but iterates and reiterates. He distinguishes sharply between the Word of God contained in the Bible and the Bible itself; and thus separates himself from those he calls the orthodox or fundamentalists. The following passage is typical and also indicates that he has much more sympathy for the fundamentalists than for the modernists: "The Son of God who came in the likeness of man in the form of a servant, also gave His Word in the form of a servant. That is why in the Bible we find so many errors and inaccuracies, so much that is no better than what man has said and

done in other places and in other times; the Bible is full of that frailty and fallibility which is characteristic of all that is human. But this earthen vessel was designed by God to become the receptacle of peculiar contents, the bearer of a history and a message which no other books contains. He who confuses the message with the material in which the message is written, is foolish. But he who, because of this earthen material, despises the message is much more foolish. The former, the orthodox, after all is concerned about the message, and for its sake he thinks the material to be holy, which is (so to speak) a piece of childish folly; but the other throws away the *pearls* because they are covered with dust" (p. 96). While we agree that the Bible cannot rightly claim exemption from historico-critical treatment we are far from supposing, as Brunner seems to do,

that its value as divine revelation is independent of the results of such criticisms. Here Dr. Vos is the better teacher: "Whether we like it or not, criticism can touch the essence of our religion, because religion has become incarnate, and for our sakes had to become incarnate and make itself vulnerable in historic forms. As the Son of God while on earth had to expose Himself to the unbelief and scorn of men, so the Word of the Gospel could not be what it is for us unless it were subject to the same humiliation." But while we think Dr. Brunner's view of the Bible fatally defective, we are grateful for his exaltation of revelation above reason as the one way whereby we can learn of God and His saving grace.

Dr. Brunner shares Karl Barth's estimate of apologetics. As a result it seems to us that even those important truths that Barth-

ianism emphasizes hang in the air, as it were, to be accepted by us, if accepted at all, as an act of sheer faith, not as by those who can give a reason for the faith that is in them.

There is much that is commendable about Barthianism, especially its attitude toward Modernism. The Barthians at least have their eyes open to the fact that Modernism is not Christianity but something diametrically opposed to Christianity. "Modern thinking," writes Brunner, "expresses a new interpretation of human existence and one which is as irreconcilably opposed to that found in the Bible and in Christian teaching as were the Baals against which the prophet Elijah fought to the God of Israel. For Christianity, the conflict with modern thinking is a fight for very existence."

S. G. C.

## News of the Church

### The Overtures

AT the present time it appears that none of the overtures sent down by the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to the Presbyteries has much more than a remote possibility of adoption. The vote by presbyteries is as follows:

	Yes	No	No Action
A .....	44	26	—
B .....	16	55	1
C .....	45	23	1
D .....	36	29	4
E .....	46	21	1

### Presbytery of Philadelphia Concurs in Overtures

THE Presbytery of Philadelphia, in its regular meeting held on April 4, voted overwhelmingly to concur in the overture of the Presbytery of Philadelphia-North, asking the General Assembly to take steps to abolish the General Council of the Assembly. The Presbytery also concurred in the Overture of the Presbytery of Cayuga relating to the proposed Union with the United Presbyterian Church requesting deliberation and caution, and with the overture of the Presbytery of Clarion asking the Assembly to protest against certain forms of cigarette advertising.

### New Plan for Vacancy and Supply

THE Presbytery of Birmingham, in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., has adopted a new plan for handling the difficult question of vacancy and supply. Believing that much trouble is bred by a tendency of

some churches to lose sight of "the ties that bind" in the Presbyterian system and to become unconsciously congregational in practice, the Presbytery has devised a plan that, it is hoped, will correct this tendency. Believing also that a double standard has grown up as between the requirements of the Presbytery in the matter of a candidate's qualifications for ordination, and the congregation's conception of ministerial qualifications, a "supplement" has been added to the act establishing the Bureau which emphasizes the fundamental qualifications of the minister as defined in the Confession of Faith and the Book of Church Order. The plan, which is entirely voluntary is as follows:

#### BUREAU OF VACANCY AND SUPPLY OF THE PRESBYTERY OF BIRMINGHAM

I. *Structure:* To the end that our churches may enjoy a more intimate and helpful relation to the Presbytery and to the church at large, and that they may develop a keener sense of corporate consciousness, we recommend that the Presbytery of Birmingham establish a Bureau of Vacancy and Supply after the following manner:

1. The Bureau shall consist of three members. The first group shall be elected for one, two, and three years. The regular election shall be by Presbytery at its stated Spring meeting.
2. The relationship of the Bureau to the several churches and ministers shall be merely advisory. Its function shall be in close cooperation with the Bureau of Vacancy and Supply of the General Assembly.
3. Immediately after a church has become vacant the Bureau shall nominate to the

Presbytery a Moderator for the Session of the church. The business of the Moderator elected by the Presbytery shall be to keep in close touch with the activities of the church and to preside over such meetings of the Session as expediency may dictate. The relationship which he shall sustain to the church will be that of representative of the Presbytery as Counsellor.

4. Immediately after a church has become vacant, the Bureau shall arrange with the officers of the church to send a minister to preach a sermon and to declare the pulpit vacant; to speak to the congregation of the relationships which maintain between ministers and churches, and between church and Presbytery; to advise with the officers of the church relative to a pastor, and to offer the full resources of the Bureau in securing a pastor. The supplement entitled, "PRESBYTERY'S COUNSEL TO CHURCHES" shall be read to the congregation, or used as a guide by the one charged with the service outlined above.
5. The minister who preaches the sermon and declares the pulpit vacant shall make a written report to the Bureau relative to his contacts with the vacant church, giving in detail such findings as are designed to be most helpful to the Bureau in its efforts to render intelligent and constructive service. The Moderator of the Session shall keep in close touch with the Bureau, making such suggestions as may be mutually helpful in the discharge of duties common to the church and the Bureau.
6. The Bureau shall be open to requests from churches, from officers of churches,

and from ministers: for a change of pastor, or change of pastorate. It shall be open to requests for the establishment of the pastoral relation between ministers without pastorates and vacant churches, etc.

7. Recognizing the wisdom of the principle of reciprocity between Presbytery and Synods, the Bureau of this Presbytery shall be in correspondence with other such Bureaus relative to pastors and pastorates.

II. *Counsel of Presbytery to Churches:* The Presbytery of Birmingham, considering how important it is that the steps which you will take in selecting a minister for this congregation should be guided by every thoughtful reflection, deem it fitting to address to you some words of counsel.

You are now called as a Congregation to exercise the privileges which belong to you under the Presbyterian system. You are to call a minister not only to the Congregation but to the Presbytery. It is impossible to over-estimate the seriousness of this duty.

Your Presbytery would remind you that the Book of Church Order provides certain qualifications for one to be ordained to the ministry; these qualifications are exacting; they should not be displaced by qualifications less worthy of the minister's high calling.

In making choice of your minister you should bear in mind that the issues of such call are vital to yourselves and to this Presbytery. The welfare of the congregation, the promotion of the cause and kingdom of Christ in this place, and the attainment of the many and great benefits which arise from a successful ministry, depend on your exercising your choice wisely and well.

Considering, therefore, how solemn the duty is to which you are now called, and how serious its consequences will be, let it be your earnest desire and effort to discharge it with thoughtful care. Let it be your aim, and your only aim, in the decisions which you form, to do what you sincerely consider will be most for the good of the Church of Christ.

As becomes a congregation, knit together by the common bond of allegiance to Christ, let all your relations be established in love, maintaining towards each other, however different your opinions may be, a spirit of forbearance and peace. Pray also, to the Heavenly Father, earnestly beseeching Him to guide you by His Spirit; so that the several steps which are taken for the election of a minister to your congregation and to this Presbytery, may issue in a choice which shall be for His glory and for the good of the church.

### Ban on Reporters to Continue

FOR many years the Presbytery of Philadelphia has enjoyed the distinction of being (so far as is known) the only Pres-

bytery of the Church whose meetings are at all times closed to reporters from the daily press, whose information is supposed to come only from the Clerk, after the session. At its last meeting, April 3, a resolution was offered by Dr. Wm. P. Fulton, retiring moderator of Presbytery, repealing the standing rule that contains this regulation. He considered the rule un-Presbyterian and unwise. The reporters always received information from other sources than the Stated Clerk, and he felt that if they were to report the Presbytery at all, they ought to be there to see and hear for themselves. Against the motion, it was argued that the reporters did not understand the spirit of a Presbytery, and would emphasize only the sensational. To this it was replied that the only way in which the press *could* learn to understand the Presbytery was by watching it operate, not by hanging around outside the doors. Further, if certain members felt that the words spoken in Presbytery, and actions taken, were of such a nature that it would be scandalous to print them, then the remedy lay, not in keeping out the reporters, but in amending the conduct of the members of Presbytery. After the debate was concluded, the motion was put, and lost, the vote being 32 in favor and 36 against. It is freely predicted, however, that the rule is not likely to remain much longer.

### Winona Lake School of Theology

THE School of Theology conducted at Winona Lake, each summer, is attracting an increasingly large number of ministers and younger men and women of the teaching profession. Many from these groups have found in Winona Lake School of Theology the type of work they sought. Last summer's session of the School resulted in an attendance increased 26% over that of the 1930 Session. Students came from twenty states in the Union, and Japan, and about an equal number of denominations were represented.

A program has been announced for 1932 which is believed to be superior to any program yet offered. The management of the School continues as heretofore, with Mr. C. E. Sawtelle, President; Dr. W. E. Biedewolf, Director; Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean. The Faculty for 1932 are all outstanding instructors from the great theological schools of America. They are, as follows: Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean, Dr. John E. Kuizenga, Dr. Gaius J. Slosser, Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Dr. Oswald T. Allis, and Dr. R. H. Martin. All of these instructors are widely known, are authorities in their respective departments, both as teachers and authors. Courses will be given in English New Testament, Greek New Testament, Religious Education, Christian Doctrine, Old Testament Problems, and Methods of Christian Citizenship.

The dates for the School are July 6th to

August 12th. There will be two Semesters of fifteen days each; the dates for the First Semester being July 6th to 23rd, and for the Second Semester July 25th to August 12th. Work may be pursued in one or both Semesters.

Courses taken are applicable for the regular theological degrees. Expenses are very reasonable.

A twelve-page Prospectus may be had for the asking from the Dean, Dr. J. A. Huffman, at his permanent address, 302 Horton Boulevard, Marion, Indiana.

### New York Summer School of Theology

A MEETING of significance was recently held in New York and out of it has grown a plan for a three weeks' summer theological course for ministers and students.

It was felt by the group of seventy-five laymen who met, that there should be established a strong intensive course of study under the leadership of men who are scholarly and sound in the faith.

This new movement will be called The New York Summer School of Theology. It will open its first season Monday, June 27. The school will be held in the great building of Calvary Baptist Church, 123 W. 57th Street, Manhattan.

On the faculty will be such stalwarts as Dr. A. T. Robertson, of Louisville, Dr. Allan A. MacRae, of Philadelphia, Dr. R. B. Kuiper, of Grand Rapids, Canon Dyson Hague, of Canada, Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr. President of Wheaton College, and other scholars of strength and ability.

A unique feature of the plan will be the presentation of evangelism along with the study of theology. An evangelist each week will teach evangelistic methods and in public evening services conduct meetings of an evangelistic nature. Dr. Harry Ironside, Pastor of the Moody Church, Chicago, will be present one week as the Pastor Evangelist. This man preaches to 4000 people in his Sunday evening service and is having steady accessions to membership.

The dates will be June 27 to July 15 with sessions Monday to Friday each week. The teaching hours are so arranged that a student can take every course if he wishes.

The cost is to be kept very low. The entire cost of tuition is three dollars—the registration fee. Low rate rooms can be arranged in hotels and residence clubs near by.

New York is an ideal place to have a summer school as it offers splendid advantages—beaches within five cent fare, long ten cent bus rides, Goldman's Band within fifteen minute walk and hosts of other summer attractions.

The emphases of the school are to be threefold—First, scholarship, Second, orthodoxy, Third, practical spirituality.

Will H. Houghton, Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, 123 W. 57th Street, New York, N. Y., is chairman and will be glad to mail a folder to all who are interested.

### Overture Concerning Formula of Subscription

THE Presbytery of the Hudson, of the United Presbyterian Church, in a recent session in the First United Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, N. J., has overtured the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church called to meet in Butler, Pa. on May 25th, 1932, asking that:

"In view of the widespread tendency in our times to question the eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ our divine Lord and Saviour, and His essential equality with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit; that there be included in the 'formula of subscription' for all candidates for licensure and ordination in the United Presbyterian Church of North America,—or any union of churches to which the United Presbyterian Church of North America shall be a party,—the following questions; and that no person shall be licensed or ordained, or received by transfer as a minister from any other church,—who is unable to give a clear and unequivocal and hearty affirmation of his sincere belief in these revealed truths, which are deemed to be an essential part of the divine revelation concerning the plan of redemption:

1. Do you believe in the Triune God,—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,—as revealed in the Holy Scriptures?
2. Do you believe in and rest upon the Lord Jesus Christ; that He, being the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, came into the world by being born of the Virgin Mary, through the power of the Holy Spirit, without a human father; that He lived a life of perfect holiness and obedience; that He voluntarily gave His life on the Cross, as a sacrifice for the sin of the world; that He died and was buried, and rose from the grave on the third day and ascended to the right hand of God; that He is the only Mediator between God and man; that He will come again to judge the world in righteousness; and that by the Holy Spirit He ever lives in the hearts of His disciples as their divine Saviour and Sanctifier, their Guide and ever-present Friend?"

### Lane-McCormick Merger

THE petition presented to the courts of Ohio for the privilege of merging the work of Lane Theological Seminary with The Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, has been granted. This petition has been pending subject to the consent of the residuary legatees, two of whom had

refused to join with the seminary up to a recent date.

All these having been satisfied and quit claim deeds to all rights and claims to the property of Lane Seminary having been obtained by the institution, the Courts granted the petition for the right to effect the merger.

Lane Seminary has had a faculty of four full time professors, Dr. John Vant Stephens, Dr. Frank Granstaff, President R. Ames Montgomery, and Professor John Adam Garber. Dr. Paul E. Davies of the Chicago seminary has been special lecturer in New Testament literature and Dr. George W. Osmun, instructor in Hebrew.

President Montgomery and Professor Garber will continue their work in the Chicago institution which they have already begun in the field of Missions and Biography and in the field of Religious Education and Sociology. Dr. Stephens, who has been professor of History at Lane for twenty-two years and Dr. Granstaff, professor of Homiletics, will retire with pensions provided by Lane.

The decision of the Court in this case is regarded as of great importance, not only as affecting the program of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., for the consolidation of educational institutions, but for other organizations contemplating similar action.

The Lane Seminary property will be held for the use of the merged institutions. The present policy of the Trustees of Lane contemplate a regular summer session at Lane for the instruction of ministers and lay church workers.

### Ordination of Professor Stonehouse

DR. Ned Bernard Stonehouse, Assistant Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, was ordained by the Presbytery of Philadelphia in the Tioga Presbyterian Church on the evening of Sunday, April 3rd. The Moderator of Presbytery, Dr. William P. Fulton, presided. The Scripture lesson was read by the Rev. Professor Allan A. MacRae, Assistant Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Seminary. Prayer was offered by Dr. George M. Oakley, of the Faculty of Beaver College. The sermon was delivered by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Professor of New Testament in Westminster Seminary. The ordination prayer was offered by Dr. Robert R. Littell, Pastor of the Tioga Presbyterian Church, and the charge to the newly ordained minister was given by Dr. Oswald T. Allis, Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Seminary. A large congregation was present. Music was rendered by the Westminster Seminary Quartette and by the choir of the Tioga Church.

Dr. Machen's sermon dealt with the im-

portance of teaching in the modern Church. Underlying teaching, he said, is scholarship; for, contrary to a certain perverse type of modern pedagogic practice, the chief thing which a teacher needs to know is not the mere methodology of teaching but the subject which he is endeavoring to teach. Teaching and scholarship, therefore, go hand in hand. Christian scholarship, the preacher pointed out, is important (1) for evangelism, (2) for the defense of the Faith (and a Christianity which is propagated without being defended is pretty sure not to be real Christianity at all), (3) for the upbuilding of the Church. Under this third head, the preacher pointed out the importance of our great heritage of the Reformed Faith. The new Confessional Statement of 1925, which is being proposed by the Committee on Organic Union for adoption by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., bears the same relation to the Westminster Confession of Faith as that which is borne by a mushroom springing up overnight to a mighty oak. And the mushroom is not quite of the edible variety!

Dr. Allis, in his charge to the newly ordained minister, laid stress upon the pastoral relation in which a teacher stands to the students in his classes—pastors and teachers seem to designate one class of persons in Eph. 4:11—and also upon the immense responsibility of the teacher for influencing the lives of successive student generations. The teacher, said Dr. Allis, should, like the Old Testament prophet, be a man of God; and he should be an interpreter of the Word of God.

Dr. Stonehouse was born at Grand Rapids, Michigan on March 19, 1902. He attended Calvin College in that city, receiving the A.B. degree in 1924. He then attended Princeton Theological Seminary for three years, receiving the Th.B. and Th.M. degrees in 1927, and being awarded also the Alumni Fellowship in New Testament Literature and the Archibald Robertson Scholarship. During the years 1927-1929, he pursued his New Testament studies in Europe, at the Free University of Amsterdam in Holland and at the University of Tübingen in Germany. In June, 1929, he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Theology *cum laude* by the Free University of Amsterdam.

His thesis for his doctor's degree has been published in book form under the title, *The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church* (Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre; distributed in America by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids). It is a very learned and important contribution to the study of the New Testament Canon and of early Church history.

The question with which it deals is one of vital importance for the Church of all ages and particularly for the Church of today. What is it that makes the twenty-seven books in our New Testament different

from other books known to the early Church; and how is it that just these books and no others came to be included in the Canon of Holy Scripture? Was it simply that these books were felt to be more valuable to the Church than other books, or was it because they were possessed of a divine authority with which our Saviour invested the apostles whom He chose?

This question becomes particularly pressing in connection with the Book of Revelation. There are those who say, with Harnack, that this book was at first accepted not because it was apostolic but because it was prophetic, and that it was only toward the end of the second century (when the appeal to prophecy came to be abused by the Montanists) that the apostolic origin of the book was appealed to as the root of its authority.

Dr. Stonehouse examines this hypothesis by means of an exceedingly learned and comprehensive examination of the relevant patristic literature, and comes to the conclusion that the real basis of the acceptance of the Apocalypse by the Church was, in the early period as well as in the later period, the conviction that the book was written by one of the apostles, who had derived a unique authority from their Lord. In the course of the investigation, the author discusses many intricate and difficult questions concerning the life of the Church in the first three centuries; but even difficult questions seem to become clear when they are treated in such an illuminating way. No careful reader of the book can possibly doubt but that a man of genuine scholarship has here entered into the New Testament field.

### League of Evangelical Students

"WE were happy to have the Conference with us, and I might say that the witnessing that two of the delegates had in one home has resulted in the head of that household accepting Christ as his Saviour. More good was done than we know anything about." So wrote the Pastor of the entertaining church of the Seventh Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students recently held in Pittsburgh. And student reactions both during and after the Conference express a like delight in the interest stirred and the blessings received at the gathering.

The program of the Conference was carried out almost exactly as announced. The charming preparations had been perfectly executed by the entertaining Chapter of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and the co-operating churches and individuals. One hundred and three *student* delegates representing twenty-seven different institutions of learning were present. This attendance contrasted with the twelve delegates representing six schools, in attendance at the Constitutional Conference in Pitts-

burgh, in the month of April, 1925! Schools from Tennessee, Texas, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—that far removed from Pittsburgh—sent delegates. It was a truly national Convention.

With delight delegates heard of gains in the movement during the past year, but with burdened hearts they heard the immensity of tasks still awaiting them. Apart from the enthusiastic devotional spirit manifest throughout the Conference, and the distinct missionary and evangelistic stress, the final burden of the Conference was to make the testimony of the League so thorough-going as to enable them to readily and joyfully give a reason for the hope that was in them as Christian students. That joy crowned the success attending the great witness of this movement could be gathered from the Chapter reports given on the Friday evening of the Conference. So soul-stirring were these reports that the spontaneous singing of the "Doxology" was the only fitting climax to their reception.

Friends of the League may read more of this Conference by sending to the *Evangelical Student*, Box 455, Wheaton, Illinois for a sample copy of the Convention Number.

### Open Letter to Southern Modernist

AS many readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY are aware, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., has, in recent years, been agitated by the modernist teachings of a Dr. Hay Watson Smith, of Little Rock, Arkansas. Much attention has been aroused by the recent appearance of an "open letter" to Dr. Smith, written by The Rev. R. W. Jopling, of Lancaster, South Carolina, well known for his loyalty to the historic faith. Space will not permit publication of the entire letter, but, in abridged form it appears as follows:

DEAR BROTHER:

Several months ago I received from you a page from the Arkansas Gazette of October 25, 1931, which contained a statement of your position with regard to our church. I have not had time to give attention to it until recently . . .

From the time I first met you in Union Seminary, in Virginia, years ago, you seemed to me strangely prejudiced against orthodox views. You read with avidity the writings of the critics, the forerunners of the Modernists, but seemed to have no taste for orthodox writers. I well remember you telling me one day that you did not believe the Lord Jesus Christ could secure licensure or ordination in Orange, your home Presbytery, and that you knew the Apostle Paul could not.

In your paper, above mentioned, when you state what you call the traditional, which I prefer to call the historical attitude toward our creed, you greatly exaggerate the facts. We are not required to believe

and perpetuate "all the details of doctrinal statement." At ordination we are asked if we sincerely receive and adopt our Standards as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." We are also asked questions in regard to the fundamentals of the system, but the details are not pressed or often mentioned. Of course, if a man who applies has a well established reputation as a sort of heretic, as you had, it is natural and proper that he should be questioned more closely.

You give your view of the church, "As a living organism, changing from generation to generation, and capable, by reason of its faith and inner vitality of discarding outgrown views and of assimilating new truth, while at the same time preserving spiritual continuity with its historic past." That raises a number of questions: 1. Our creed is a summary of our faith. If therefore our creed is to be discarded as "outgrown views," how can we preserve our faith? 2. How can we discard our creed, the systematic statement of our faith, as outgrown views, without at the same time severing spiritual continuity with our historic past? When we discard our creed, do we not, ipso facto, discard our historic past? 3. Our creed is a human document. It lays no claim to infallibility. Its language is often archaic; in places errors of statement may have crept in; some doctrines may be pressed too far; other doctrines may not have received the attention they deserved; but by and large, we believe our creed to be securely built upon and buttressed in the Holy Scriptures, that it is far and away the best creed of which we have knowledge, and better by miles than the church could formulate today. Believing this, if we are to discard our creed as outgrown views, what are we to do with the Scriptures, on which the creed is based? Are we to discard them too, "as outgrown views?"

Right here, My Brother, is the fundamental difference between us. It is basically a difference of view, not of our creed, but the Holy Scriptures themselves.

Just how far afield you have gone from the orthodox view of the Scriptures into the by-ways of Modernism, I do not know. I wish you had told us frankly. You fellowship with Modernists, and a man is known by the company he keeps, and I do know that once a man has departed from the orthodox view of the Scriptures as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, there is no theological terminus, in which he can stabilize himself this side of Unitarianism, and according to the acknowledgment of some of its leaders, Unitarianism would long ago have perished from the earth, had it not been for a small but constant stream of high blown heretics trickling in from the orthodox churches.

There are Modernists and Modernists. Some have gone the length of their logic into unrelieved naturalism. They deny that the Scriptures are in any sense a super-

natural revelation from God to man, and declare that they are simply what man, in the unaided exercise of his natural faculties, has discovered, or thought he had discovered about God. They strip from the Scriptures every vestige of authority. According to them, evolution accounts for every thing, including the earth, all life, ourselves, the Bible and the Lord Jesus Christ to boot. To all intents and purposes, they take away our Bible and offer us themselves as our infallible teachers.

Modernists in general, of course have not yet gone that far. Something of their early orthodox training and faith still clings to them. But they are in unstable equilibrium, and either they, or their children, natural or spiritual, running true to form, will go the limit. They have in large measure departed from the orthodox view of the Scriptures and become disciples of modern thought. With us, when modern thought runs counter to the Holy Scriptures, so much the worse for modern thought; with them, when the Scriptures run counter to modern thought, so much the worse for the Scriptures. They think more of evolution than of Revelation, more of modern thinkers than of Christ and His Apostles. They deny or doubt or question all worthwhile views of inspiration, some or all miracles, the Virgin birth of our Saviour, His vicarious atonement, the resurrection of His body, our own bodily resurrection, etc., etc. So that Modernists in general so weaken the truth and authority of the Scriptures, as to render them of little or no practical value, so eviscerate our religion, as to leave it a cold and lifeless skeleton.

On the other hand, we believe the Bible to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, God's full and final revelation for all men of all lands and all ages; that it is, "The word of God that liveth and abideth forever, . . . the faith which has been once for all delivered unto the saints," that it is like God himself eternal and immutable. In its teachings we are to believe, by its precepts we are to live and by its rule we are to be judged in the last Great Day.

Until man can invent or discover a greater God than Father, Son and Spirit, revealed to us in the Scriptures, a more lovable and mightier Saviour than Jesus Christ, a more blessed Spirit than He Who renews our hearts and as our Comforter abides with us forever, a higher dynamic than sacrificial love, a more worthwhile enterprise to engage the attention of man than co-worker with Jesus Christ in saving a lost world, and a grander destiny for man than "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" and heaven forever, we will believe in the Scriptures; and the Christian religion and the Scriptures that reveal the Christian religion to us, still will stand, though earth and hell come against them! . . .

If you believe about the Scriptures as the Modernists do, as outlined above, you do

not belong to us, and ought quietly and voluntarily to go out from us; if you believe the Bible as we do, as the Word of God the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and if you receive and adopt our Standards as containing that system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, then you belong to us, and ought to be permitted to remain with us without further molestation, no matter if you do entertain a few curious diverse crotchets. But, you ought to quit making a fetish out of your crotchets, quit flaunting a red flag (your precious differences of opinion) in the face of good men whose patience has already been sorely tried; and you ought to find some way to divest yourself of that superiority complex, that air of conscious superiority which has clothed you as a garment in the past. Believe it or not, this is brotherly and Christian advice.

In the old orthodox faith we have experienced a change of heart that makes us a new creation; we have found a new humility that gives us a juster estimate of ourselves; a new reverence for things holy and divine; a new love for God and for man; a peace the world can neither give nor take away; a courage to meet the trials and vicissitudes of life without faltering; a witness borne with our spirits that we are the children of God, and a fellowship with the Christ that is as heaven in our hearts.

You can hardly expect us to forsake the Scriptures which bring us these blessings, as outgrown views, and adopt instead the doubts and denials, the unsupported and unstable affirmations of the Modernists. The Christian Century is a Modernist journal. Its editor is a Modernist of the Modernists. You doubtless know that some months ago, in a leading editorial, he frankly acknowledged that Modernism was "bankrupt."

In a word: We believe in the Bible, we worship God; Modernists believe in Modern Thought, Modernists worship themselves—though they seem not to know it.

When we have a real God who loves us, a real Saviour Who died to redeem us, a real Holy Spirit Who regenerates us and abides with us; a real heaven to win and a real hell to shun, real sin to be forgiven and real righteousness to be attained; a world of mankind lying in sin and a gospel the power of God placed in our hands to save them; even then it is a man's job with the power of God thrown in to help us, to win them against the pull of the world, the flesh and the devil, from sin unto God. But when we are uncertain of our God, when we have no Saviour, but only a human leader, no certainty of a heaven to gain, practical certainty of no hell to shun; when we have no sin to be forgiven for which man is responsible, but only some of the dregs of a former state of existence which evolution has not yet but will in time eliminate, it is a practical impossibility to win men to such

a religion—and such a religion is not worth having after one gets it.

When you come specifically to state the grounds of the difference between you and the rank and file of our ministry, you say:

1. That it is due to IGNORANCE on our part. In that you are running true to Modernistic form. It is a habit with them to claim for themselves superior intelligence, all scholarship, up-to-dateness, wisdom and knowledge, and to look down upon those who oppose them with ill concealed contempt as being of lower intelligence, behind the times, devoid of scholarship, obscurantists and ignorami. It seems to not a few of us that Modernists are drunk from the idea of their own superior intelligence, suffering from delusions of grandeur. . . .

Concerning those within our own Church, of whom you formerly wrote, who sympathize with your views and write you privately encouraging you to stand firm in your position, I confess I have no knowledge. Whoever they are, they have not the courage to come out in the open and avow their views, and I have and desire no avenue of underground communication with them. I should think you could draw small comfort from the support of such men.

2. That it is futile to *try to enforce uniformity of thought*. This is another form of the chronic claim of Modernists, that they are big, broadminded, up-to-date men whose heels are constantly dogged by a pack of narrow-minded, two-by-four men who would rob them of their sacred right of freedom of thought and of speech. There is no truth in this claim. We are not trying to enforce uniformity of thought; we trench upon no man's right of freedom of thought or speech. We are jealous of our own rights, and we accord the same rights to others that we claim for ourselves. We are trying to preserve the faith once for all delivered unto the saints, and we would be ashamed of ourselves if we were not. In doing so we rob no man of any right. . . . The Presbyterian Church requires no man to join her or to remain a member or to hold office in her fold; she accords to every man the right to leave her at will; the right to seek by all lawful means the repeal or amendment of any or all her laws; but she does require of all her members obedience to all her laws, and she requires all her officials to take a solemn vow to receive and adopt her constitution. That is her inalienable right, and in exercising that right she is infringing no right of any man.

Right here I wish to mention a few things concerning the ways of Modernists that forever discredit them and damn Modernism in my eyes. Modernists, with rare exceptions, knowing that they have departed from the orthodox faith, have all along continued to live in manses and to preach in churches which have been paid for by the money of orthodox Christians, and to receive and live on salaries paid by orthodox Christians; meanwhile they bore from

within, using orthodox phraseology with a veiled heterodox meaning, and strive gradually by half-concealed hints here and there, to undermine and destroy the orthodox faith and lead the people blindfolded into Modernism. With deliberate purpose, it seems, they keep their real views hid until they feel safe with their congregations, so that they can hold on to the manse and the church and the salary! That, to my mind is un-Christian, deceitful and cowardly. When Modernists are such cowards, how can they expect brave men to follow them. When Modernists themselves are so lacking in faith in Modernism, how can they expect others to believe in it? What a spectacle for men and angels! Modernists claiming to be God's spokesmen, the recipients and purveyors of a new and better revelation, the last word in the gospel of Jesus Christ, guilty of such palpable deceit, such arrant cowardice!

When Modernists have the courage of their convictions; when they have the honesty and the manhood to renounce the orthodox faith, to cut loose from orthodox manses, churches and salaries, and avow their faith in Modernism and live or die by it, they will be respected by all men, even by those who disagree with them, and they may win followers. . . . In England, in 1662, rather than submit to the Act of Uniformity in which they did not believe, in one day 2000 godly ministers suffered themselves to be ejected from their living. When Modernists have this sort of faith and courage, they may get somewhere. Until they do, when they make a convert, it is but a repetition of the case of the Pharisees, whose convert, when made, is two-fold more the child of hell than before. . . .

4. That last and chiefly you ask, "Would this heresy hunting business receive the sanction" of the Lord Jesus Christ? You also mention "new wine and old bottles." I take these up in order:

a. Would Jesus approve heresy hunting? . . . Jesus stood with adamant firmness for the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures. He also promised His Apostles the gift of the Holy Spirit Who should lead them into all truth. But the Modernists deny or doubt or question the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and wrest and twist and torture them, until they are robbed of their natural meaning and authority, so that Jesus and His Apostles could not recognize them. Further Jesus sent a message from heaven to the churches in Asia, warning them against false teachers. His Apostles Paul, Peter, James, John and Jude, spent their lives fighting false doctrine and anathematizing false teachers, and left us overwhelming proof of their undying opposition to all heresies and all heretics. So, if you ask me if the Lord Jesus Christ would sanction this heresy hunting business, I answer unhesitatingly and emphatically that I believe with all my heart HE WOULD!

b. Now a word about the new wine and

"THE HERETICAL AUBURN AFFIRMATION," the sermon that is awakening the Presbyterian Church, has been reprinted by public demand in a form convenient to carry and mail. It is so light that it may be enclosed in an ordinary envelope with a one-page letter and yet cost only two cents to mail. Pastors and office-bearers are urged to send for copies for distribution among their associates and friends. Get a supply and enclose them in your letters. It is not printed for profit, and the low prices are only made possible by the help of those who want to get the truth in the hands of the people. Circulation of this sermon on a large scale will be of incalculable benefit to the Church. All prices are postpaid. They are

5c each  
50c per dozen  
\$3.50 per hundred  
\$30.00 per thousand

Address: Tract Dept., 501 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.

(We will be glad to receive contributions from those who wish to have a share in this work of faith.)

the old bottles. First of all, What new wine have you got? For several years you have been sending out letters and pamphlets to our ministers. I have read them all, but I have not been able to find even a trace of wine. Have you got a better God than our Father of the Scriptures? Have you a better Saviour than our Lord Jesus Christ? Have you a better Comforter than the Holy Spirit? Have you a better way of salvation than through the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ? Have you a better Gospel than that based on and motivated by sacrificial love? Have you a nobler enterprise to engage the powers of man than the salvation of a lost world? Have you a grander destiny for man than transformation into the image of God's own Son, Jesus Christ? Well, if you have, you have dismally failed to produce them.

The only thing that I can discover that you have that is different from what we have, is the theory of evolution and what grows out of it, and that does not taste like wine to me. The Modernists, it would seem, with your approval, are busy trying to jack up the Christian religion from its sure foundation on Divine Revelation and roll it away and set it up on a foundation of the shifting sands of the theory of evolution. Meanwhile they are working like beavers, cutting and slashing here, tearing out and adding to there, and so remodeling the whole as to make it fit its new foundation. When it is all done, it is just about as much like the Gospel of Jesus Christ as a jack rabbit is like a lion!

As you doubtless know, the editor of the Christian Century, an outstanding Modernist (as mentioned above), a few years ago, boldly advocated that Modernists discard the name "Christian" altogether. I honor him for it. When the substance has been

discarded, the honorable thing to do is to discard the name, too. However, he got no encouragement that I ever saw. The name "Christian" is too valuable an asset, and Modernists are shrewd politicians. Full well they know that Modernism will die still born, unless the people can be fooled into believing that it is Christian.

Just how much of what I have written above about Modernism and Modernists applies to you, I do not know. I should be glad to find that none of it does. I have written frankly, without apology and in a kindly spirit.

Fraternally Yours,

R. W. JOPLING.

Lancaster, S. C., March 25, 1932.

### The "Federal Council" on Mixed Marriages

THE problem of "mixed marriages," especially of the marriages of Protestants and Roman Catholics, is treated as a question of serious importance by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in a study just made public. The report was made by its Committee on Marriage and the Home, as a result of several months' study, and was approved at the March meeting of the Administrative Committee of the Council.

The report was originally drafted prior to the decree from the Vatican on the same subject on February 5. The Vatican decree requires that the children of marriages between Roman Catholics and "non-Catholics" must be reared in the Catholic faith under pain of annulment of the marriage, refusal of participation in church activities, denial of a church funeral and, in extreme cases, public excommunication.

The Federal Council of Churches refrains from making any attack upon the Roman Catholic Church, but takes issue with its position on mixed marriages, on the ground that it is intolerable. The Council's conclusions, which are put forth, not as regulations, but as suggestions to church members for their consideration, deal both with inter-marriage of members of different Protestant groups and also of Protestants and Roman Catholics. These conclusions are embodied in a series of four recommendations, as follows:

"1. Where the persons contemplating marriage are members of different communions nearly related in doctrine or polity, they may well be advised by their respective pastors to settle the question before marriage by agreeing to attend together one or other of their churches, or even a third church, and to bring up their children in it.

"2. Where only one of the persons is a member of a church of the Protestant group and the religious differences are profound, such persons should be advised to consider the situation with great seriousness, in all

its aspects, and to reach an agreement before marriage.

"3. Where intolerable conditions are imposed by either church in which membership is held, persons contemplating a mixed marriage should be advised not to enter it. The Committee on Marriage and the Home protests earnestly against the requirement by any church that the children of mixed marriages should be pledged to that church.

"4. When conferences in the churches interested in the questions arising from mixed marriages can be arranged, such conferences should be welcomed with a view to safe-guarding the sanctity of marriage and the spiritual welfare of the home."

These conclusions are based upon a review of "the historical background," which narrates the practice with regard to marriage between members of different Christian communions at different periods, and also an analysis of "the present situation." In examining the present situation, the Committee on Marriage and the Home takes the ground that religion is such a "basic interest in human life" that "differences in religion, if these are fundamental, may strain a marriage to the point of breaking." Strong emphasis is also laid upon the avoidance of any "ecclesiastical interference" which would force upon either partner to a marriage any rigid ecclesiastical requirement which is contrary to his own religious convictions. On this subject the report says:

"It is evident that the problem of mixed marriages is not simple, and that it is not susceptible of easy solution. Religion is a basic interest in human life, and differences in religion, if these are fundamental, may strain a marriage to the point of breaking, especially where they are aggravated by ecclesiastical interference. No religious body which confesses itself Christian can tolerate the imposition upon one of its own members of the requirements of another religious body by which the religious scruples of that member are aroused, or action repugnant to reason and conscience is forced upon him by an authority which he does not acknowledge. For example, if one of the partners to a mixed marriage submits to the dictation of such an authority and promises that his children will be brought up in a faith which he does not share, reason and conscience are offended, the seeds of future discord are sowed at the very outset of married life, and the prospect of true marriage, with conjunction of mind and soul, becomes remote. Or, if either partner enters upon the union as a propagandist, determined through the intimacies of marriage to subvert the religious faith of the other, disaster is imminent.

"Statistics bearing upon the matter are not adequate, but there is reason to suppose that marriages of this sort are highly unstable; furthermore, that in very many cases they lead either to the departure of both partners from the practices of religion or at

least to the abandonment of any attempt on their part to provide for the religious education of their children.

"It is possible for mixed marriages to be successful. Where the differences of religious faith are not fundamental, and where each of the married persons respects the viewpoint of the other, such differences may conceivably augment mutual love and forbearance. Even when the differences are fundamental, they are not necessarily insuperable, always provided that there is still mutual love and forbearance, that no attempt is made on the part of either to subvert the faith of the other, and that they determine to bring up their children in such articles of the Christian faith as they hold in common. This, however, requires independence, strength of character and rare wisdom and patience, and unless these prerequisites are present, the strains of adjustments will be found to be too severe for any good and happy solution of their common problem. So great is the importance of religious unity in the home that some pastors advise at the time of the wedding that the two agree upon one church or the other, or upon a third church."

The Chairman of the Federal Council's Committee on Marriage and the Home, by which the report was prepared, is Dr. Howard Chandler Robbins, formerly Dean of the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, now Professor of Pastoral Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York. Included in the membership of the Committee are prominent clergymen of various Protestant communions and, in addition, several well known laymen and women. The lay members include: Honorable George W. Wickersham, formerly Attorney General of the United States; Mrs. Robert E. Speer, President of the National Board of the Y. W. C. A.; Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.; Professor Ernest R. Groves, of the University of North Carolina; and Professor Alva W. Taylor, of the School of Religion of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

### Reduced Estimates of Age of the Earth

**T**HAT Science sometimes moves in circles was emphasized late in March, when a return to the idea that the universe was created all at once, as set forth in the Bible, was suggested by Prof. Ernst J. Opik, of the Tartu University Observatory, Estonia.

Prof. Opik, striking at the theory of stellar evolution in his speech at the dedication of the astrophotographic building of the Harvard College observatory, startled his hearers by suggesting that the age of the universe had been grossly overestimated. He said observed facts indicated the present universe could hardly have existed longer

than 3,000,000,000 years, an estimate that represents an enormous reduction in the conception of the age of the universe held by many scientists.

Many scientists have inclined in recent years to the opinion that the age of the universe should be measured in hundreds of billions of years.

Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard College Observatory, who presided at the conference, said at the close of Prof. Opik's address, that he, too, had been entertaining "some disturbing thoughts about stellar evolution." Dr. Shapley conceded there was strong support for the theory of instantaneous creation and an age of only a few million years.

Prof. Opik, who spoke on "Meteorites and the Age of the Universe," pointed out that a survey of meteorites and a measurement of their ages by the most newly developed methods, had led Prof. Paneth, of Konigsberg, to estimate their ages at not more than a billion years. The method of measuring their age hinges upon the clock-like action of radio-active minerals which "tick" away helium atoms through the centuries and finally change into lead. Some of these meteors are believed to have come from outside the solar system.

After calling attention to Prof. Paneth's theory that large bodies in the universe were perhaps a thousand times older than small bodies, Prof. Opik said there was no proof of this conclusion.

He said the present theory of star evolution would indicate that large twin stars should be closer together than small twin stars. This is based on the idea that as they grow cooler and shrink in size, their gravitational pull would decrease with their decrease in mass.

As a matter of fact, Prof. Opik pointed out, just the reverse is true. The large twin stars are farther apart than the small ones.

Then he turned to the sensational discovery that has recently set the astronomical world agog, the fact that the spiral nebulae are apparently receding from our galactic system at incredible speed—as though the universe were exploding. Their distance at present would indicate that they could not have been traveling more than a few billion years, he said.

From these facts he inferred that not much more than 3,000,000,000 years have elapsed since the spiral nebulae, the stars and stardust were born out of the original parent system.

Perhaps future generations of scientists will scale the age of the universe down still more!

### The Scottish Church in Amsterdam

**T**HE old Scottish Church in the Bagijneshof, the old court off the Spui in Amsterdam, situated in the centre of the town,

it is proposed to open daily from 12 to 2 o'clock. A short service on behalf of peace will be held from 1 till 1.15 o'clock. The services will be held by Amsterdam preachers of various denominations. This old church was the religious centre of the famous Scottish brigade, the regiment of Scottish volunteers who served in Holland against Spain during the Dutch war of independence. At a later period, members of the Pilgrim Fathers during their residence in Holland, worshipped within its walls.

### Form of Protest Against Affirmation

**F**OLLOWING the publication of "The Heretical Auburn Affirmation" in the February number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, the desire was expressed in a number of different quarters for some form by which congregations, sessions, or meetings of Christian people might make a protest against the "Affirmation." As a result the following form has been prepared, and is published for the information of all who may be interested:

#### A Resolution

WE, the members of the Congregation of ..... (or Session of....., etc.) assembled in a meeting properly and regularly called, desire to affirm anew our adherence to and love for the great truths of the Word of God as they have been historically received in the Presbyterian Church. We deplore the inroads of Modernism in our beloved Church, and express our wish that those who hold views which in their nature are destructive of the Christian faith of men and women, boys and girls, will of their own free will leave the Presbyterian Church. It is our conviction that we will never have a true peace in the Church until those who deny great essentials of the Christian Gospel go their way into some other Church whose vows they may take and keep honestly, and where they will not be a disturbing factor.

**FURTHER**, we associate ourselves with the deliverances of the General Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923, in declaring the following doctrines to be essential, and we protest against the attempt of the "Auburn Affirmation" to term them mere "theories" which are not necessary to our system of doctrine:

"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

**IF YOUR ADDRESS LABEL  
Says "April 1932", or any month  
previous, your renewal is due. Will  
you not please help those who are  
carrying on this work of faith, and send  
your dollar if it is due? If it is not  
due, please ignore the enclosed re-  
newal notice.**

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 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 on the right hand of His Father, making intercession.

"Five. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and 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."

And further we pray to the great King and Head of the Church that He will send down upon us a mighty revival of the Grace of God, to the salvation of many souls. It is our firm belief that God will not send this revival unless and until the Church puts away her sins of unbelief, coldness and lack of love for the souls of men for whom Christ died.

Date:

Attest:

.....  
*Clerk of Meeting.*

### Further Scottish Unions Contemplated

**A**N interesting epoch in Scottish history is recalled by the recent negotiation for union between the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Secession Church and the Free Church. Looking at the National Covenant, now a musty document framed in the National Library in Edinburgh and fraught with memories of the bitter conflict for Presbyterianism for Scotland, one would hardly expect to find it having a direct bearing on church life today. Up to the present day members of the "Secession Kirk" have taken no part in the election of members to Parliament or with the doings of the Church of Scotland. In a private interview Professor Morton, a member of this Church, which broke away from the Church of Scotland in 1735, made

the interesting statement that the Covenanting question had been satisfactorily settled and that the National Covenant would no longer appear as a barrier preventing union with other Presbyterian Churches. "Although a good understanding has been reached," continued Professor Morton, "There is still a good deal of ground to be covered as the problem of the 'vote' has not yet been decided." Viewed from the angle of the Church of Scotland the proposed union is very important. If three committees with such decided divergencies of opinion in matters of both Church and State have come to a common understanding there is reason to believe that at some future date the gulf between the two united Churches may be bridged and the Church of Scotland be the name of all Scottish Presbyterian Churches.

### Westminster Seminary Rallies

**A**N informal supper for the presentation and discussion of the cause of Westminster Theological Seminary was given by the session of the Collingswood Presbyterian Church, Collingswood, New Jersey, on the evening of March 28th. About thirty-five ministers and elders of West Jersey Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were present. The Rev. Harold S. Laird, pastor of the Collingswood Church and secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, presided. Informal addresses were made by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Professor of New Testament in the Seminary, and by the Rev. Edwin H. Rian. After these addresses, there was an informal discussion, in which an exceedingly cordial attitude was manifested. Particular interest was evinced in that method of support for the Seminary which is found in the placing of the institution upon the annual budget of congregations. This is done in a very generous way by the Collingswood Church, as it is being done in many other congregations throughout the country. The trend of the Collingswood meeting was clearly favorable to an extension of the plan in churches of West Jersey Presbytery.

Other rallies are to be held in the near future. On April 29, in the Memorial Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, the Westminster cause will be presented by Dr. Machen and Mr. Rian. The Rev. Dr. Russell Paynter, formerly of Philadelphia, is the pastor of this great church. On May 2, a rally will be held in the Church of the Covenant in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Rev. Dr. Frank R. Elder is the pastor of this outstanding congregation. On May 6, a gathering will be held in the Broadway Presbyterian Church, New York, of which The Rev. Dr. W. D. Buchanan, known everywhere for his firm stand for the faith, is minister.

Other rallies are planned for different parts of the country in the near future.