

O F S DYRNES
 MAY 1933-R
 R D 2
 QUARRYVILLE PA

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
 AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
 THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
 REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,
 501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-AUGUST, 1932
 Vol. 3 No. 4

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE
Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
 the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
 Act of March 3, 1879.

The Securities of the Faith

"O Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith."

IN PAUL's exhortation to TIMOTHY, just cited, the phrase "that which is committed unto thee" is a translation of two Greek words that taken literally mean "the deposit." Hence PAUL here speaks of the Gospel as a body of divine truth that had been committed to TIMOTHY as a trust and which as such he was under obligation to preserve inviolate and pass on undiminished. MOFFAT translates, "O TIMOTHEUS, keep the securities of the faith intact,"—a translation that has received added point and relevancy in these recent days as men have seen the earthly securities on which they depended lose their value, not infrequently because of the unfaithfulness of those to whom they had committed them.

While it is only in PAUL's latest epistles—commonly called the Pastoral epistles, because addressed to TIMOTHY and TITUS as shepherds of the flock—that the Gospel is spoken of under the figure of a deposit that has been entrusted to men (especially to officers of the Church) yet the thought itself is fundamental to the whole New Testament representation. This appears when it is seen that it is because the Gospel is a "deposit" that the primary function of the Church is to "witness." "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the

uttermost part of the earth." The significance of the word "deposit," as used in this connection, has found almost classic expression in the oft-quoted words of a fifth century expositor, VINCENT of LERINS. "What is a deposit?" he asks; and answers: "It is something that is accredited to thee, not invented by thee; something thou hast received, not that thou hast thought out; a result not of genius but of instruction; not of personal ownership, but of public tradition; a matter brought to thee, not produced by thee, with respect to which thou art bound to be not an author, but a custodian, not an originator, but a bearer, not a leader but a follower."

Perhaps there has never been a time

since PAUL penned his epistles to TIMOTHY when there was greater need of reminding Christians, particularly ministers, that it is both their duty and their wisdom to preserve "safe and undiminished" the deposit committed to their trust. An outstanding characteristic of Modernism (so-called) is its pronounced tendency to sit loosely to the thought of the Gospel as a deposit, as a faith once for all delivered, to be preserved inviolate at all cost. Modernists as a class deny that Christianity has a definite content of its own, given it once and for all by CHRIST and His apostles, that remains essentially the same through every change and chance of time. The following statement is typical: "We know of nothing that has remained or can remain unchanged from the inception of the Christian faith down to the present. The Christianity of yesterday was creative of the Christianity of today, but at the same time the Christianity of today is more and somewhat other than the Christianity of yesterday." The Modernist not only boasts that he does not believe as the fathers believed (including the Apostolic fathers) but he does not expect his children to believe as he believes. Though he calls himself a Christian that does not necessarily mean that the thing he calls Christianity has any close resemblance to the thing PAUL charged TIMOTHY to faithfully preserve and to conscientiously hand on to others.

It is hardly necessary to say that PAUL's passionate exhortation to TIMOTHY was rooted in his conviction that

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments	
Fundamentalism and Premillennialism	2
"Amillennialism?"	3
Francis Turretin	4
C. E. Edwards	
Confessions of a Miser	6
R. C. Tillinghast	
Syncretism	7
C. L. Richards	
Loneliness	7
J. W. Robb	
The Triumph and Fragrance of True and Faithful Preaching	8
T. S. Armentrout	
Notes on Biblical Exposition	10
J. G. Machen	
News of the Church	13

this deposit was possessed of supreme worth. Other knowledge might be important, but not as compared with the knowledge that had been entrusted to him—a conviction that found its ultimate explanation in the fact that it alone gave the right answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" Such a conviction is unintelligible to one who has no consciousness of sin as pollution and guilt and no awareness of the present life as standing in moral and organic relation to the life to come; but it was basic to PAUL and through all the changing centuries it has remained basic to those who have had a historic right to call themselves Christians.

In the interest of guarding the deposit PAUL warns TIMOTHY to avoid knowledge which is falsely so called. The warrant for this is obvious. Truth is a unity. What we profess in one field of knowledge inevitably affects what we profess in other fields. Adopt a false scientific or philosophic theory, and, if we are at all consistent in our thinking, we will no longer be able to hold to the Gospel in its purity. Adopt a scientific theory, for instance, that makes sin but a stage in the evolutionary process and at once we lose interest in the Scriptural answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" Or adopt a philosophic theory that precludes the belief that God has intervened in a miraculous manner for the salvation of mankind, and the Scriptural answer to this question will seem to rest on no solid basis. Ministers and Christian teachers, therefore, cannot be unconcerned about current scientific and philosophic theories. Indirectly if not directly they are blasting and cursing the lives of multitudes.

Let it be noted that it is "knowledge falsely so called" the acceptance of which causes men to err concerning the truth. It is true, of course, that much that is put forth as genuine knowledge actually contradicts the sacred deposit, but that is really evidence that it is counterfeit knowledge, not what it is represented as being. It is one thing to say that Christianity is out of harmony with the teachings of many modern philosophers and scientists and quite another thing to say it is out of harmony with philosophy and science. We admit

the first, but we deny the second. We should ever distinguish between the voice of philosophy and science and the voices of the philosophers and the scientists. The voices of the latter are discordant, because they speak only half-truths. Not until that better day when they speak whole truths will it be possible to identify their voices with the voice of philosophy and science. In the meantime we should not permit ourselves to be unduly exercised over the fact that we are more or less at a loss at times to reconcile the truths of the Gospel with alleged truths derived from other sources. The truths of the Gospel are revealed truths, independently evidenced as true. As such we may not only be sure that they constitute genuine knowledge but that in the end it will appear to all that these truths—both as regards their fact-content and their truth-content—are indispensable arcs in the circle of truth.

According to PAUL it is knowledge falsely so called not real knowledge, the acceptance of which leads men to err concerning the truth as it is in JESUS CHRIST. This is not to deny, however, that too great absorption even in what is rightly called knowledge may lead us to err concerning the faith. Even the good is often the enemy of the best. Men may and often do become so absorbed in their study of science, art, literature, business, economics, politics—and what not—as to become indifferent to things of greater importance. Here too we should strive to keep first things first. Knowledge rightly so called, if sought too exclusively, may blind men to the need of availing themselves of "the securities of the faith" as effectively as knowledge

falsely so called. All other knowledge is valueless as compared with the inherent preciousness of the gospel of the grace of God.

The securities of the faith are the only securities of long standing that have remained at par through every change and chance of time. Though issued some two thousand years ago they have the same value and are paying the same dividends as when first issued. What is more, unlike other securities, they may be obtained by all without money and without price. Strangely enough, however, they are ignored by multitudes who nevertheless are bending every effort to obtain securities of such shifting value as stocks and bonds and real estate. A partial explanation, at least, is to be found in the fact that today as truly as in the days of PAUL the "oppositions of knowledge falsely so called" leads men to suppose that these securities are valueless; but to those who lay hold upon them by faith they pay dividends that prove that they have back of them both the wisdom and the power of God. Guaranteed by JESUS CHRIST Himself who abides the same yesterday, today and forever we may be sure that whatever may prove true of earthly securities the securities of the faith cannot fail. It is the primary duty of the church to commend these securities to men everywhere and that it may do so successfully it is necessary to keep them intact—in other words that it proclaim the Gospel of the grace of God in its purity and integrity. This is what PAUL exhorted TIMOTHY to do and this is what ministers must do today if they are properly to discharge their function as "witnesses."

Editorial Notes and Comments

Fundamentalism and Premillennialism: The China Fundamentalist Approves our Position

IN our issue for November 1931, under the title "Fundamentalism and Premillennialism," we expressed our regret that the "World's Christian Fundamentals Association" insists on belief in the premillennial return of our LORD as a condition of

membership. We did this partly because it excludes from membership many of the leading exponents of orthodoxy but more especially because it tends to make the differences between premillennialists, post-millennialists and amillennialists a divisive issue. While we are far from regarding these differences as unimportant we regard them as such differences as exist among brethren and do not think that they should

be allowed to act as obstacles in the way of all real "fundamentalists" acting as a unit as over against modernism.

Hearty approval of our position was expressed in an editorial in the March issue of *The China Fundamentalist*, published by the Christian Fundamentals League for China. With our editorial in mind it says:

"The November 1931 issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY has a splendid article with which we find ourselves in hearty agreement. For twenty years the present writer has held the premillennial view, and is glad to confess that the study of the Bible during these years as preacher and teacher, and developments in the world situation, has served to confirm us in the premillennial view. But we do not think that belief in premillennialism should be a prerequisite to membership in the 'World's Christian Fundamentals Association.' It is to be regretted that Dr. RILEY and others insist upon it as a prerequisite. Fundamentalism and Premillennialism are not co-extensive terms. For all fundamentalists are not premillennial; neither are all premillennialists fundamental. One of the dangers that threaten Fundamentalism is internal dissension. Let us avoid this. Fundamentalism should be broad enough to include all who believe in the real coming of CHRIST, whether they be pre-, post-, or amillennial."

That other premillennialists (not to mention amillennialists and postmillennialists) share our position in this connection is indicated not only by our correspondence but particularly, for instance, by the success which has attended the organization of the Philadelphia Fundamentalists (see news note in our last issue)—an organization that was established by premillennialists but which does not make belief in premillennialism a prerequisite to membership.

"Amillennialism?"

WE are confident our readers will be interested in what the premillennial editor of *The China Fundamentalist*, in the same issue from which we have quoted, says about the relative merits of amillennialism and postmillennialism. Under the title given above he writes as follows:

"The editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is an ardent advocate of what is termed Amillennialism, the 'A' being privative and meaning that there will be no millennium. We are unable to find the word in the International Dictionary, or in any of the encyclopedias or Bible Dictionaries at hand, and are forced to conclude that either the idea itself or the word used to express it is very recent. This statement is confirmed by the failure to find mention either of the idea or the name in SHEDD's History of Christian Doctrine, which brings the history of doctrine down to 1648. The Amil-

lennial view is sponsored by some of the professors of Princeton Theological Seminary, and we wonder if it did not originate with the late Dr. B. B. WARFIELD. The view is not referred to in Dr. HODGE's Theology, so it must have originated after his day. Neither does STRONG know anything of it in his Theology. Amillennialism has something in common with both pre- and post-millennialism, and is, in fact, a sort of compromise between the two. It is more scriptural and more in accord with world trends than postmillennialism, and so has much to commend it.

"Undoubtedly the premillennial view has the authority of history on its side. It was the prevailing view from the time of the Apostles. Dr. HODGE acknowledges this in his theology: 'The doctrine of a premillennial advent of CHRIST has been extensively held from the days of the Apostles to the present time.' BARNABAS, HERMAS, PAPIAS, IRENAEUS, TERTULLIAN, and CYPRIAN all held and taught the premillennial view. Not till the rise of the allegorizing school of ORIGEN and the conversion of CONSTANTINE, followed by the union of church and state, did the view fall into disfavor. And at the same time the church entered upon the darkest age of her history. With the Reformation and the restoration of the Word of God to its rightful place of authority premillennialism revived. Postmillennialism originated only about two centuries ago, and then avowedly as a 'new hypothesis.' Its effect has been to obscure the blessed hope of the appearing of the glory of our great God and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST, not intentionally of course, but because it is psychologically impossible for people to have much interest in an event that is removed from them by at least a thousand years. For this reason we devoutly wish that all who cannot see their way clear to accept the premillennial view would enter the ranks of the amillennialists."

We have cited the above statement partly because of its inherent interest and partly in order that we may offer a few comments. We say advisedly "a few comments" as the statement raises issues that would require an extended article to discuss at all adequately.

In the first place, we are somewhat surprised to find ourselves spoken of as "an ardent advocate" of Amillennialism. It was our impression that we had "advocated" it only to the extent of maintaining that the term expresses one of the historic views of the second coming that cannot be ignored by any who would take into consideration the main views that have been held in this connection. Without denying that we are disposed to regard it more favorably than any of the other views, our main concern has been to maintain that all who believe in the real coming of CHRIST should stand together as over against encroaching modern-

ism. If we have said much more about the amillennial view than the others, that is because so many seem to think that all believers in a real coming of CHRIST as the great event of the future are either premillennialists or postmillennialists.

In the second place, we are somewhat surprised to find a man like M. A. HOPKINS expressing the notion that the amillennial view is of recent origin. That may be true of the term itself. We do not know its origin. We are confident it did not originate with the late Dr. B. B. WARFIELD—who held the postmillennial view—and while this view was long taught at Princeton by Professor GEERHARDUS VOS we have no reason to think the term originated with him. But, whatever the origin of the term, the idea itself is very old. It is apparently true, strange as it may seem, that neither the term or the idea appears in the theologies of Drs. HODGE and STRONG—both of whom were postmillennialists—but it seems hardly accurate to say there is no mention of the idea in SHEDD's History of Doctrine. Dr. SHEDD apparently does not use the term "postmillennial" either and the impression we get is that his own view was essentially that of the amillennialists. As we have previously pointed out, the view is certainly as old as the Westminster Standards. Its advocates, of course, hold that it is as old as the New Testament.

It is obvious that Dr. SHEDD did not think that "the premillennial view has the authority of history on its side." Witness his conclusion: "The facts, then, established by this account of Millenarianism in the Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Churches, are the following: 1. That Millenarianism was never the ecumenical faith of the church, and never entered as an article into any of the creeds. 2. That Millenarianism has been the opinion of individuals and parties,—some of whom have stood in agreement with the catholic faith, and some in opposition to it" (Vol. 2, p. 398). It seems clear also that it is to misquote Dr. HODGE to say that he acknowledges that the premillennial view was "the prevailing view from the time of the Apostles." The words cited from Dr. HODGE take on a different meaning when read in their context. His statement as a whole follows: "The common doctrine of the Church stated above, is that the conversion of the world, the restoration of the Jews, and the destruction of Antichrist are to precede the second coming of CHRIST, which event will be attended by the general resurrection, the final judgment, the end of the world, and the consummation of the Church. In opposition to this view the doctrine of the premillennial advent of CHRIST has been extensively held from the days of the Apostles to the present time" (Systematic Theology Vol. III. p. 861). It is one thing to say that a view has been extensively held and quite another to say

(Concluded on page 12)

Francis Turretin

(And His Teaching Concerning Predestination)

By Charles E. Edwards
Pittsburgh, Pa.

A FAMOUS successor of Calvin in Geneva was Francis Turretin, whose Latin volumes of theology were used for generations by students in Great Britain and America. Long ago Professor Giger of Princeton College translated these volumes into English; but the manuscript still remains in the Princeton Seminary Library, awaiting an editor and a publisher. These valuable works are practically inaccessible, obtainable only at secondhand, for the last edition at Edinburgh, is dated 1847. Current textbooks quote Turretin, but he would be more appreciated if his pages were in the hands of pastors who value the Word of God. Turretin devotes over a hundred pages to the topic of the Decrees of God, particularly, Predestination, which in English might make seventy thousand words. This topic is developed in eighteen questions, three of which, abbreviated in a free use of Professor Giger's translation may convey some idea of his reasoning.

I

Turretin's sixth Question is, "Should Predestination be publicly taught and preached?" This is an ancient question, asked by brethren in Gaul, since Augustine wrote much about predestination when he refuted Pelagius. In later times some have thought it objectionable, leading to desperation or to carnal security; yet it can be of great profit, when taught seriously, out of the Word of God. Two dangerous rocks are to be avoided, an affectation of ignorance, also an unwarrantable curiosity. Here are reasons:—(1) Christ in the Gospels, Paul, Peter, James and John taught it. Then, are we not to learn? And are we to be more prudent than God, or prescribe rules to Him? (2) It is a doctrine of first importance, and it would be an injury to the Church to ignore it,

for it is the source of our gratitude to God, the root of humility, the strong anchor of confidence in temptations, one of sweet consolation, and a powerful spur to piety and holiness. (3) The enemies of the truth force us by their misrepresentations to refute their errors.

Add these explanations:—Wicked men often abuse this doctrine; but so do they scoff at other doctrines, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection. In dealing with false apostles, Paul was not silent; and we may learn from him when to speak and to be silent. The abuses that lead to license of despair are not due to the doctrine, but the perversity of those who wrest doctrines to their own destruction. The mystery of Predestination is too sublime for us to comprehend *why* it is, but we can firmly hold to the *fact* of it, as taught in Scripture. Two things must be distinguished, "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever," Deut. 29:29. It is ingratitude, to neglect things revealed; it is pride, to search into things concealed. As Augustine says, "We must not therefore deny what is plain, because we cannot comprehend what is hidden."

And Turretin concludes with sensible suggestions. There is great need of *sobriety* and *prudence*, to keep in the bounds of Scripture, not to be wise above what is written, having regard for persons, places and times, to set forth propositions, not all at once, but gradually, and not to emphasize every part of the doctrine equally, but with a sense of proportion. Again, not to descend from causes to effects, but to ascend from effects to causes; not to unroll the book of life with a curiosity that is forbidden, but to consult the book of conscience, to find whether the seal of God is stamped upon our hearts, and whether

fruits of election, faith and repentance may be found in us, which is the safest way of proceeding to the saving knowledge of that doctrine, with the object of increasing our faith, and to labor for edification.

II

Grace Alone

In his "Question XI" concerning the Decrees of God, Turretin asks, "Was Election made from the foresight of faith, or of works? Or, on the contrary, from the mere grace of God?" He acknowledges that the merit of Christ, faith and works, are necessary conditions of salvation, but not the cause of God's decree; He has reasons for that, not revealed to us.

This is the principal hinge of the ancient controversy between Augustine and Pelagius. The same division occurred in the Council of Trent, afterwards between Dominicans and Franciscans, and between Jansenists and Jesuits. But some even among the Jesuits, for instance the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine, have agreed with Augustine, that God's Election is gratuitous. He said, "No reason on our part of the divine predestination can be assigned,"—in order to exclude merit. Luther defended Augustine's doctrine of gratuitous Election, but some Lutheran authorities drifted away from it. While Arminians, according to Turretin, "who call Popery and Pelagianism in by the back door, have struck against the same rock." But the Reformed, "by the unanimous consent of the Church, they maintain Election to be purely gratuitous."

Note his arguments:—(1) Faith and obedience are the fruit and effect of Election. Eph. 1:4, He hath chosen us that we should be holy, therefore not

because we were; and verse 5, having predestinated us unto adoption, therefore unto faith, by which that adoption is secured unto us. Acts 13:48, as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. It is the faith of the elect, Tit. 1:1, because given to the elect alone. Hence Augustine says, "We understand vocation, by which they become the elect, not who are elected because they believed, but are elected that they might believe. For if on that account they were elected, since they believed, they assuredly had elected him first, by believing in him, so that they deserved to be elected." (2) Election was made from good pleasure alone, and not from any works. Rom. 9:11, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,—and verse 16, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." Also, in 11:5, it is called the election of grace. Thus, Mt. 11:25, Christ speaking of the revelation of the mysteries of salvation, depending on Election, attributes it to good pleasure alone, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." So also Paul, 2 Tim. 1:9, "God hath saved us, and called us, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ before the world began." And Rom. 4:16 That "it is of faith that it might be by grace," because faith alone can consist with grace in the matter of Justification. He who speaks of grace alone, excludes all other causes out of God. And Rom. 9:11, 12, cannot be reconciled with the foresight of faith or of works, because it treats of twins, Esau and Jacob, who had done nothing good or bad by which they might be distinguished from each other; and in verses 15, 16, Election is wholly ascribed to the mercy of God alone.

Again, (3) if this foreseen faith is an act of nature, we elected ourselves, contrary to Paul, 1 Cor. 4:7, ("what hast thou that thou didst not receive?") and Pelagius wins his contest. (4) If Election is from foreseen faith, God would not have elected man, but rather man would have elected God, contrary to what Christ says, John 15:16, which Augustine often quotes, "which Election

the Lord signifies, saying, Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you, nor does faith itself precede. For he did not elect us because we believed, but that we might believe, that we might not be said to have first chosen him." (5) If Election is from foreseen faith, no place will be found for the objections against it which Paul answers. Add another remark by Turretin:—the physician intends the healing of the sick man before he thinks of the remedies, but in the execution he applies the remedies before he heals. "Although therefore, God in executing gives faith before salvation, yet it cannot thence be inferred that God in electing considered faith before salvation."

III

Blessed Assurance

In discussing the Decrees, Turretin's "Question XIII" is, "Can the believer be certain of his Election, with a certainty, not only conjectural and moral, but infallible, and of faith?"

Here he opposes the Council of Trent (especially the Jesuits) which denies that any one can know with the certainty of faith, not admitting anything false, that he has obtained the grace of God. Also the Arminians deny that there is given any sense of Election in this life except a conditional one, always uncertain until death. Turretin states a practical syllogism:—whoever truly believes and repents is elected; now I believe, and therefore I am elected. This is not by a revelation, nor is it free from fluctuations, nor without the use of appointed means.

So the elect can be certain of their salvation:—(1) Because believers know that they are the sons of God, as the spirit witnesses, Rom. 8:15, 16. "We believe and are sure," said the apostles, John 6:69, and I John 2:3 "We do know that we know Him." Said Paul, "I know whom I have believed" 2 Tim. 1:12. Augustine said, "Whoever has it, may see his own faith in his heart, and hold it with the most certain knowledge and the conviction of conscience." As one knows that he lives, from the vital actions which he clearly perceives in himself; so, he who

lives by the spiritual life of the sons of God can know that he lives by the Spirit which works in him. (2) God inscribes the names of the elect in the book of life; inscribes promises in Scripture; and inscribes His grace and law on the book of conscience, "in fleshy tables of the heart" 2 Cor. 3:3, like the white stone with the new name, Rev. 2:17. (3) This is confirmed by the testimony of the Holy Spirit who seals us, Eph. 4:30; and I John 3:24, Hereby we know that he abideth in us by the Spirit which He hath given us. This light, joy, consolation is not fallacious or uncertain. (4) The example of the saints who were certain of their Election and salvation, for instance, Abraham, Rom. 4:18, 19, 21; David, Ps. 16:8 and 23:6; also Paul, Rom. 8:38-9. (5) The effects of faith demand it, such as confidence, Eph. 3:12, full assurance, Heb. 10:22, boasting, Rom. 5:2, unspeakable joy, I Pet. 1:8.

In further explanation, Turretin says that although the certainty of God's grace cannot be gathered from prosperous or adverse or external circumstances, faith can have it from the Word of God and the Spirit's testimony. We are uncertain on our part, but certain on the part of God. Fear and trembling, anxiety as to the means, may leave one tranquil as to the end, based on God's decree. And God restores the joy of salvation, and makes broken bones rejoice, Ps. 51:8, 12. It is not the testimony of human reason, but that of the Word and Spirit on which we depend. The believer from his present state of grace may see the link between the past and future, Election and future glory. Moreover, there is no greater incentive to true piety than a vivid sense of the love of God and his benefits. The state of the believer is two fold, wrestling or victory; in conflict he fears, in triumph he rejoices. David complained of being forsaken, Ps. 22:1, and cut off, 31:22, but is confident in the valley of the shadow of death, Ps. 23:4, and 118:5. See Paul's contrasts, Rom. 7:24, and 8:35. But repentance is indispensable, and the use of means; the desire of sanctification is a necessary condition of this certainty. And the Christian is to seek for this certainty in a growing sanctification every day.

Confessions of a Miser

By R. C. Tillinghast

(The Editors are glad to publish this article because they believe it offers an opportunity by which many may share in a true Christian ministry. Mr. Tillinghast may be addressed at 256 Broadway, New York, N. Y.)

THE realization that I was a miser once sharply disturbed my indolent complacency and the breaking of my selfish habit caused me some pangs like the removing of a tight shoe, but the subsequent experiences have been so stimulating that I am moved to relate some of them.

In my miserly days I was influenced by the tradition that the possession of a private library was something of which to be proud, as indicating the superior culture of the owner, and as being particularly impressive to casual visitors. Of course I knew that more than ninety percent of such books stand unused year after year, having to be insured, stored, and perhaps dusted, and it required but little thought to realize that a book standing on the shelf is immured and that its contents are deteriorating,—those published only a few years ago being largely out of date,—and that in most cases a private library is not a "Lyceum" but a "Mausoleum."

Please do not speak too quickly. You know I am not talking about 'books of reference,'—if used,—nor to one's favorite poet. Also I may safely say that, in this connection, we can disregard all the novels since "Ben Hur" and a mass of other ephemeral trash. However, counting only such as are worth while and of general interest, there are enough idle books within ten miles of where I sit to load—a truck?—Yes, a freight car.—Yes, a five masted schooner!

Please note that a "Miser" is one who accumulates and keeps more of anything than he needs, or who hoards what he does not use. When I realized how closely that definition fitted me and my "shelf of books" my pride was shattered and I sought a way to "bring forth books meet for repentance." Then I thought of the many people who have few books or none; of rural pastors and teachers as well as missionaries, home

and foreign, having very small incomes and with no public library near, lacking even periodicals, right here in our home states as well as abroad; of shut-ins, marines, lumber-jacks;—How the list grows!

A missionary just going to a foreign field for her third term of service said to me earnestly, "We get book-hungry."

Another wrote me from China, "I haven't had money to buy books for three years." (And I complain of hard times although I haven't finished reading my Christmas presents, yet!)

I quote from a letter just at hand from Korea,—*"If we do not read we are done for. We must take in if we are to give out."*

A pastor in the Black Hills, S. D., says,—*"Books, magazines, (I included some trade journals) all are so welcome. We utilize them and they do a great deal of good."*

A native and very earnest worker in a far country was being unsettled by propaganda re Daniel's vision, "666 years," the "last days," etc. Two good books relieved his perplexity.

Having sent an assortment—a real variety,—to a man who is eking out a scanty living in the Australian "Bush," I received an acknowledgment in twelve pages of long hand, informing and interesting.

The chaplain of a penitentiary on one of "the islands of the sea," in acknowledging receipt of what I sent for the prisoners, follows his signature with the letters "S. J." You might be amused by the assortment that I sent, including "Nation's Business" as well as "The Complete Sayings of Jesus." He thanked me in behalf of "the poor fellows"—as he calls them,—to whom he ministers and he gave me his blessing. I'd like to know that Jesuit.

Come on. Join this scheme. You will get a lot of satisfaction out of it. And think of this! *Mirabile dictu!* It does *not involve a committee*. There is no "Secretary"!—?, no office, and no expense. You will save more on storage and insurance than the trifle which you will pay for postage. You can send an ordinary book to the "jumping-off place" for ten to twenty cents.

The whole matter being personal you will benefit more than the other parties. I am coming to believe Acts 20:35.

The thoughtful choice of a book to help the recipient tests and develops both the head and the heart of the donor.

Do you know what will become of your books if you do not pass them on yourself? Let me tell you something. A clerical friend recently died after several years of disability during which he paid \$54.00 per year storage on his books. Two weeks ago his widow received \$25.00 for his library,—about 3,000 books,—less than one cent each,—from a large and reputable dealer. Some of them will go to the paper-mill; others will go on the sidewalk stand, labeled, "Your choice 15c."

There is a present and definite appeal to *Clergymen* as follows:—

"The College" (Reformed), Papa, Hungary, survived the great war with "the buildings are left," but scanty equipment. Its good standing is easily verified. Regent Horthy attended its 400th anniversary last October. They have expressed great gratitude for books, quarterlies, etc., for the library and reading-room. Professor Pongracz now writes me re "the many-sided attacks of the Jesuits on the Reformed Faith" and says, "We must use our own weapons in defence." Dr. Bohatec of Vienna, recently made Honorary Professor, lectured on "Calvin's Importance in the History of Culture," and they want books, pamphlets, etc., on Calvin and Calvinism. New books are not expected and the date is immaterial. I will gladly take all the trouble or they can be mailed to Professor Joseph Pongracz, The College, Papa, Hungary. The postage is 1½ cents for each 2 ounces. No writing other than possibly, a name on the fly leaf is permitted.

Syncretism

By the Rev. C. L. Richards
Poynette, Wisconsin

THE word "Syncretism" has lain asleep in the dictionary for many years, but like Rip Van Winkle, recently roused, springs up desiring to be up with the times and have an important part in the drama of these modern days. It is an old word, coined seventeen or eighteen centuries ago. You might read its record in 200 A.D. when Gnosticism and other pagan ideas tried to centralize and control all the religions of the world and thereby emasculate the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Syncretism is "an effort to reconcile and unite various systems of philosophy or religious opinions on the basis of tenets common to all and against a common opponent," and it would cultivate the "spirit or practice of indifference, of false or undue tolerance."

It was "a movement in the 17th century proposing to bring the Protestant sects into a nearer accord with one another, especially to bring the Lutheran and Reformed churches into a union; advocated by George Calixtus and opposed by Abraham Calovius; later, in the Lutheran Church, the principle of moderation and development, as opposed to strict orthodoxy."

Syncretism woke up again before 1900 and in that year the "National Committee on the Federation of Churches" was formed. In 1903 it was "Closer cooperation or union with sister denominations" introduced by Union Seminary men. In 1904 "Executive Board of the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers." In 1905 they boomed that wonderful Convention in Carnegie Hall, New York, when you could read in large words—"Inter-Church Conference on Federation." By 1908 thirty Denominations were in "The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." Union Seminary ministers in various Presbyteries were prominent in the game. But Syncretism was not yet fully satisfied and Union

men pressed it in 1917-18, and spent much time and money in advocating organic union with all denominations. Because this writer alone refused to sign up and make Madison Presbytery unanimous for that overture large doses of sarcasm came his way. Several Presbyteries responded and the Assembly at Columbus, Ohio, approved. It looked like a complete victory. Three run-down churches in New York City, where Modernism was and is strong, combined and had a Baptist preacher to fill a united platform, pulpit and pews. Then they had a TOWER! But a confusion of tongues followed. Craze for bigness!

"As denominations grow larger they develop politics, place hunting, salary grabbing, autocratic rule; complicated organization increases beyond proper proportions . . ."

Dr. Coffin, president of Union Seminary suggested the slow method of having two or three denominations unite here and there. The Congregational and Universalist churches united in Illinois, and the pastor of the Congregational church at Madison advised union with the Universalists in Madison. Have two or three German Denominations join and The Episcopalians join the Presbyterians!

We now have before us the plan for ours to join the "United Presbyterian Church of North America." Shall the rebellion which broke out October 15, 1892 and prefers Centralization of Power over all protestant denominations in the United States come soon?

Possibly in tropical America a Boa Constrictor can develop its full length and power in 30 years, but in this more northern country it may take 50 years to crush all denominations into one. The coil of the "serpent more subtil than any beast of the field" would embrace the United Presbyterians with ours next May or June.

Loneliness

By the Rev. J. W. Robb
Lancing, Tenn.

IS God ever lonely? We think that He is—for man. And, likewise, man for God. Why did the Creator place mankind on the earth? What was His purpose? Was it not that His people should come to know Him in His Son, whom to know is life eternal? Was it not that we should worship Him, do His will, enjoy His blessed fellowship, and that He might have delight in His children now and throughout eternity? Everlasting life is not just to live forever, but to grow in knowledge of the Lord, and later to be like Him, to see Him as He is and to reign with Him. We are His; He has made us for Himself. Then our neglect must bereave Him. And our hearts are restless till they rest in Him.

The sense of aloneness is a universal experience with the human family. In

Carlyle's works there is an enlightening sentence stating that a man never comes to the best that is in him unless he has periods of isolation. Henry Drummond said, "There is an experience which becomes more and more familiar to every one who is trying to follow Christ—a feeling to the growing loneliness of this Christian life." The fact that God has chosen us from the foundation of the world, that He has a commission and a far destiny for each person, brings us to this realization.

A drawing apart is a portion of every life, but especially of God's servants. Leaving our homes or a dear friend, at a fearful cost, is not seldom a crucifixion of the soul; and one needs a martyr spirit for courage to carry on. For the Kingdom's sake our Lord left His place in glory and endured such a separation

on the earth, as did the Baptist and Paul. Every age has its rugged souls who have only the fear of God in their hearts and in undertaking some high adventure in God's Name forget themselves into immortality. In all the world there is no finer adventure than this. Upon such exacting decisions the world lives, is lifted and moves forward. Solitude is the motherland of these great souls. One of the benefits is the privilege of communing with God. The Lord, the Angel Gabriel, and God's people regarded John the Baptist as greatest among the sons of men. He lacked our advantages of education and culture, but found time, in the silence of the wilderness, to conform to the command "Be still, and know that I am God." After his conversion, St. Paul spent a decade following

"That rare track made by great ones, lone
and beaten,
Through solitary hours,
Climbing past fear and hate and sin, iron-
eaten,
To godlier powers."

There is no lonesomeness, wherever our lot is cast, so poignant as the awareness of being separated from our Heavenly Father. The consciousness of sin causes this. But are we not tempted, tried and proven that we might be drawn nearer to Him, and treasure through the ages the joy of His presence? Man's grief and solitariness is but his grandeur in disguise, and discontent woos us from earth to heaven. We thus learn to comprehend something of God's holiness, our proneness to disobey, and His longing for our obedience and companionship. All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose.

When we must spend hours of labour without dear ones and their sympathy, we should realize that it is for our good, as we are best disciplined in this manner: that our labors are but for a little while, the rewards will be the greater because of them, and in the future life there will be the blissful and happy abiding with the Father, His holy angels and the spirits of just men made perfect. How sacred and precious to us are the counsels of His presence, angels' visits, the moments we spend

with loved ones! Because of our associations the moments of life are freighted with tremendous issues. Oh, the pathos, the tender pathos of the here and the hereafter! Now we have a foretaste of the endless pleasures which shall ravish our souls when we depart this life; and the privations of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. This is a teaching of the Scriptures, of Christian song, it is a fond hope, and it finds expression in our prayers. This promise is an unailing source of true joy and steadfastness all our days.

"O Christ, He is the Fountain,
The deep sweet Well of Love!
The streams on earth I've tasted
More deep I'll drink above."

Surely our sense of loneliness when apart from others is not wholly unlike that of our God, who has created man in His image and after whose likeness we are made, who imparts to the highest of His creatures many of His attributes—as, a spirit, eternal existence, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth. He desires our prayers not merely that we may make our wants and wishes known, but because He is lonesome without us. The Father loves His own. He has surprises for His heirs. There are unfathomed treasures in His storehouse for all who believe that He is, and who come to Him and diligently seek Him out; and no one has yet sounded the depths of His mercy and gifts. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!

The Triumph and Fragrance of True and Faithful Preaching

A Sermon

By the Rev. T. S. Armentrout
Wilmington, Delaware

"But thanks be unto God who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God, in them that are being saved, and in them that are perishing; to the one a savour of death unto death; to the other a savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as the many corrupting the word of God: but as of sincerity but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ."
(II Cor. 2:14-17)

A MINISTER is often depressed, discouraged and has no rest in his spirit, because his ministrations in the Gospel seem barren and unfruitful. Like his Lord, "all day long he holds out his hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people. The seed he sows falls upon the hard trodden road-bed. Or on stony, or thorny ground. Few if any are con-

verted. But little interest is manifested in his message. Spiritual desolation prevails. Despair grips him as it did Elijah when the fear of wicked Jezebel triumphed over him and he prayed that his life be taken away. The average minister, the faithful minister in the hard and unresponsive fields, if you please, as he looks at the little success that attends his labors, compared with the great things that he wants to do for the souls of men, cries out instinctively, Who is sufficient for these things? One speaker at a Foreign Missions conference in Philadelphia said that the Missionaries in China, as they faced that mighty Continent that unbroken wall of unbelief and stubborn opposition of prejudice and false religion, despaired of winning that Continent of Christ, to Christ by their efforts, and looked for Christ's coming in person to do it. But the speaker said that he took the opposite view, that Christ's coming would

be delayed hundreds and perhaps a thousand years, until the Gospel won that Continent. He had no doubt of its final triumph, nor had the Missionaries. But the contrast between what they were able to accomplish and what is still to be done appalled them. This is the view of the effect as we look out man-ward. When we look up God-ward we are reassured. We have been subdued by God's grace. We are His ambassadors. We have been put in trust with the Gospel. We are led in triumph always and everywhere by God; in Christ we participate in the triumph. The Roman Senate decreed their great general, Marius, a triumph, when he had ended the Numidian war. In that grand procession from the Campus Martius through the streets of the city to the Capitol, Jugurtha the King of the Numidians was led in triumph, in chains. From a thousand altars the sweet-smelling savour of burning incense arose a grateful tribute to the conquering hero. Jugurtha the able and resourceful enemy of Rome, had been captured and delivered into the power of Sylla the young lieutenant of Marius, by the treachery and base betrayal of his ally the king of Mauretania. But we have been won and subdued by the mercy and forgiveness of God in Christ, and are led in triumph by his love. The love of Christ constraineth us. Whatever may be the effect of our preaching upon the hearts and consciences of men, God maketh manifest the savor of the Knowledge of Christ through us in every place, where we minister. The translation of the Greek word, *thriambeuonti*, given in the Authorised Version, "causeth us to triumph," though seemingly suitable and natural in this context, and though it is still defended by able scholars like Schmiedel, and has the authority of Liddell and Scott, yet is shown to be the wrong meaning of the word by Bishop J. B. Lightfoot in his comments upon the same word in his Colossians Ch. II, 15, where "it is" says he, "the defeated powers of evil," but in our passage in II Cor. "the subjugated persons of men, who are led in public, chained to the triumphal car of Christ." "This is the proper meaning and construction of the word as found else-

where." When a man is wholly subdued, body, soul and spirit, heart, mind and strength, to the will of God, God leads him, as it were, in triumph and causes the sweet savour of his knowledge in or through Christ to be manifested in his life and ministrations. He also rejoices in the victory of his triumphing Lord.

The faithful preaching and loving service of a heart so subdued and under the power of God is an unfailing fragrance and success in the sight of God, whether men are saved or perish, whether they will hear or forbear, whether men believe the things spoken or believe them not, whether they receive Christ and are saved from their sins, or reject Him and die in their sins. The very proclamation of the Gospel, the bringing of the kingdom of God nigh unto sinners, the upholding of Christ crucified before a perishing world, manifests the glory of God, and is a savor well-pleasing to him. It proves the deadness, the insensibility of the human heart that it remains unsubdued by such a display of divine mercy and love as is exhibited in his unspeakable gift. That it is hardened against the victorious Son of God and refuses to have Him reign over it, proves that it is "a vessel of wrath fitted to destruction;" that it progresses from death, spiritual hardness and impenitence here, to eternal and irremediable death. The same glorious Gospel, the same pure, loyal and bold preaching of God's word results in opposite effects. It issues in life to some in eternal death to others. If it be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." The sunlight is reflected from hard surfaces, yet it reveals their hardness. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be re-proved." This is the meaning of the prophet Hosea, "The ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in

them; but the transgressors shall fall therein." And Prov. 10:29 "The ways of the Lord is strength to the upright; but destruction to the workers of iniquity," a passage with which, the Prince of Orange closed his celebrated proclamation to the people of the Netherlands, the 31st of August 1568, opening the momentous struggle against the blood-thirsty duke of Alva and the Spanish tyranny, in which the word of God was made a savour of death unto death to many, but a savour of life unto life to multitudes, and is still a sweet savour unto God. The gospel sets before men the alternatives of life and death. From these there is no escape. "Who is sufficient for the calling of the Gospel ministry," asks Dr. James Denney, "when such are the alternatives involved in it? Who is sufficient, in love, in wisdom, in humility, in awful earnestness, for the duties of a calling the issues of which are life or death for ever?" Paul answers, our sufficiency is of God. For we are not as the many, who corrupt the word of God. Who corrupt it either by taking from or by adding to it. By annulling it by opinions or traditions of men. By rejecting or ignoring its authority. By compromising its inescapable facts and its supernatural origin and miraculous abutments. By taking refuge in an agnostic attitude of "neither affirming nor denying" the plainly recorded truths of the Gospel history. By soft-peddalling or silently acquiescing when the honor of Christ or the veracity of God is insidiously attacked. When the outstanding doctrines of the Gospel are held up to ridicule. When public preaching consists in sneering at dogmas and venerable creeds, and fundamental doctrines of grace and salvation are scorned. "And the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge." The Greek word here used by the Apostle, *kapaleuo* was used of those who retailed wares for profit, especially the wine merchants who adulterated their wine and sold the solution at great profit, hence by metaphor it meant to adulterate or to corrupt in an ignoble and mean way. It is used by Plato in the sense "To higgler or chaffer in philosophy." It is exactly suited to express the work of the "bootleggers" in the church

who mix the poison of their opinions and unbelief with the pure Word of God, and industriously peddle it out to a credulous and unsuspecting public. Bolsheviks who unlawfully attack the foundations of the Faith, and poison the souls of men in the very citadel of religion. Who defy all church authority

"despise dominion and speak evil of dignities" consider sacred symbols and solemn vows as "scraps of paper." A fitting name for these corrupters and rationalists *Kapaelons* might be coined because they weaken and corrupt and debase the pure Word of God, and thereby overthrow the faith of many.

With their tongues they use deceit, and the poison of asps is under their lips.

But the true minister who is like the Apostle led in triumph by God, does not corrupt the Word of God, but as of sincerity, as of God, that is as though God were speaking by him, in the sight of God, speaks in Christ.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XX. THE PERIL OF INCONSISTENCY

"But if in seeking to be justified in Christ we were found, ourselves also, sinners, is Christ a minister of sin? God forbid! For if the things which I tore down, these things again I build up, I show myself to be a transgressor. For I through the law died to the law that I might live to God" (Gal. 2:17-19a, in a literal translation).

The General Sense

IN the last two articles in this series we have been considering the speech which Paul made to Peter at Antioch. "You and I," said Paul to Peter, "were Jews by nature; we had all the advantages which the law could give. Yet we relinquished our confidence in all those advantages, so far as the attainment of salvation was concerned, by seeking our salvation in exactly the same way as that in which it is to be sought by despised Gentile 'sinners'—namely, by the free grace of Christ received by faith alone."

At that point, an objection might arise from the Jewish point of view; and the objection is taken up incidentally and by implication at the beginning of the passage which we study this month.

It is rather a difficult passage. But difficult though it is in certain details, the general thought of it does seem to be fairly clear. That general thought may perhaps be paraphrased as follows: "We Jews, when we became Christians, gave up seeking justification through the

law; we became just as much 'sinners' (in the old Jewish sense of the word, which divided humanity into the two classes of (1) Jews and (2) sinners), as the Gentiles. But it was Christ who led us to take that step. If so, if Christ led us to become 'sinners,' how shall we avoid the conclusion that Christ was one who led us into sin? Only by recognising that that Jewish distinction between 'sinners' and Jews is invalid. We must not set it up again. If we do set it up again, then we do charge Christ with being a helper in sin. Christ led us to become 'sinners' in that Jewish sense of the word. If that sense is right, then, since Christ led us to become 'sinners,' He led us into sin."

A Difficult Connection

So much for the general thought. We must now consider briefly one or two details.

The first difficulty concerns the connection of the sentence, "For if I build up the things which I tore down I show myself up as a transgressor." That sentence is introduced by "for"; it gives thus a reason for something that precedes. But the words immediately preceding are "God forbid" (literally, "May it not be"). Our first impulse would be, then, to regard the "for" clause as giving a reason for the "God forbid." The sense of the "God forbid," when it is taken together with the question which it answers in the negative, is: "No,

Christ is not a helper in sin." If, then, the "for" clause gives a reason for that negative assertion, we get the following: "Christ is not a helper in sin; for if I build up the things which I tore down I show myself to be a transgressor." But that hardly seems to make sense. It is very difficult to see how the sentence introduced by "for," so understood, gives any reason for, or has any logical connection with, the preceding clause.

The connection could, indeed, be established if we could introduce the word "only" into the clause introduced by "for." Then we should have the thought: "Christ is not a helper in sin; for only if I build up what I tore down do I show myself to be a transgressor and thus show Christ to have led me into transgression by leading me to tear it down, whereas, on the other hand if I stand by the step which I have taken I do not confess that it was wrong for me to take it and so do not confess that Christ led me into sin when He led me to take it."

This interpretation yields a perfectly good thought. But the trouble with it is that in order to adopt it we have to insert the all-important word "only," the word upon which the whole interpretation hangs.

How Vacillation Dishonors Christ

It seems better therefore, to say that the sentence introduced by "for" does not give a reason for the "God forbid"—

does not give a reason for Paul's negative reply to the question, "Is Christ a helper in sin?"—but rather explains how Paul came to raise that blasphemous question. No doubt it would have been more coldly logical to postpone the negative answer to the question—to postpone, that is, the "God forbid"—until the question itself has been thoroughly explained. But the Apostle Paul, though always logical, is not coldly or pedantically logical; and so here, when he raises the blasphemous question, "Is Christ a minister of sin?", he prefers first to brush that blasphemous question aside with his indignant "God forbid," before he explains how that question ever could arise. We get, then, the following sense for the passage: "If in giving up the law as a means of salvation we became 'sinners,' is Christ a helper in sin? You will agree with me, Peter, in rejecting any conclusion so blasphemous and absurd; you will agree with me in brushing that conclusion aside with an emphatic 'God forbid.' But let us look at that matter a little more closely. That blasphemous conclusion does follow by an inevitable logic, Peter, from your vacillating conduct. If, by your example in refusing table-companionship to Gentile Christians, you build up that view of the law as a means of salvation which when you trusted in Christ you tore down, you confess that you did wrong in tearing it down; and, since Christ led you to tear it down, you confess that *He* did wrong, you confess that He was your helper in an act of sin."

Tearing Down and Building Up

So much for the question regarding the connection of the sentence introduced by "for" with what precedes. Another question has been asked about this passage. What is meant by the "transgression" which is referred to in verse 18? Two opposite views have been held.

According to one view, the "transgression" is the initial act of Paul and Peter and other Jewish Christians in turning their backs upon any thought of the law as a means of salvation. According to the other view, the "transgression" is not the tearing down, but,

paradoxically enough, the building up.

Let us consider the second of these views first. According to this second view, Paul is expressing the paradoxical thought that in this particular case, unlike what usually prevails, it is a transgression to build a thing up. That paradoxical thought becomes clear, say the advocates of this interpretation, when verse 18 is taken in close connection with the words "through the law" in verse 19. "In this particular case," Paul would be saying, "I would become a transgressor of the law in building up the law as a means of salvation, because it was through the law that I died to the law; since the law commanded me to tear the law down as a means of salvation, I would become a transgressor of the law—paradoxical though it may seem—in going back upon that initial act by building the law up again."

This interpretation has the advantage that it exhibits a good and close connection between verse 18 and verse 19; according to it, the "for" at the beginning of verse 19 is made to introduce a reason for what immediately precedes. What is perhaps even more important, it relieves us of our previous difficulty regarding the "for" sentence in verse 18; it makes it possible for us to take that "for" sentence, after all, as a reason for the immediately preceding "God forbid," and relieves us from the necessity, which we had previously felt ourselves to be under, of making the "for" of verse 18 jump back of the "God forbid" to the question with which the "God forbid" is an answer. Thus, if we can adopt this identification of the "transgression" with the building up, even what we have already said about verses 17 and 18 will have to be abandoned, and the whole passage will be understood as follows: "If we became 'sinners' when we gave up the law as a means of salvation, is Christ, who led us to take that step, a helper in sin? No, He is not a helper in sin; for in this particular case, unlike ordinary cases, it was not a sin to tear the thing down; the law itself commanded us to tear it down, so that Christ, in leading us to tear it down, did not lead us to be transgressors of the law; on the contrary, we became transgressors of the law if, going back upon

what Christ led us to do, we build the law up."

The Right View About the "Transgression"

Despite the advantages of this interpretation, despite the close logical connection which, unlike the other interpretation, it shows between every clause and the immediately preceding clause, it must probably be rejected. The trouble is that verse 18—"For if the things which I tore down these things again I build up, I show myself to be a transgressor"—is worded as though it were a general and obvious proposition, and most emphatically not as though it were meant to express a paradoxical exception to that general proposition. If Paul had meant that in this particular case that general proposition does not hold, but on the contrary it is the building up and not the tearing down that is the "transgression," why did he not make clear in some way—in verse 18 itself—that he is talking about the particular case and not about the general proposition? As a matter of fact, verse 18 is put in the most studiedly general form, and no ordinary reader would take it in any other way than simply as expressing the obvious thought that if just after tearing a thing down I proceed to build it up again, I confess thereby that I did wrong in tearing it down; I confess that my tearing it down was a transgression.

We, therefore, despite the temptation offered by the view just discussed, are inclined to stick to our previous interpretation of the connection between verse 17 and verse 18. The "for" in verse 18 does, we still hold, go back of the "God forbid;" it does not give a reason for this negative answer to the question, "Is Christ a minister of sin?," but it explains how that question came to be raised.

What, then, on this view of verse 18, is the meaning of the "for" at the beginning of verse 19? We have rejected the close connection between this verse and the immediately preceding verse. What shall we put in place of that connection? For what does the "for" at the beginning of verse 19 introduce a reason? We answer that it introduces a reason for

the general thought of verses 17 and 18. "Away," says Paul, "with all this inconsistency which confesses that we did wrong in giving up the law as a means of salvation and which thereby confesses that Christ did wrong in leading us to do it. I for my part will have nothing to do with such inconsistency; I broke with the law (as a means of salvation) not temporarily but for ever; I *died* to it, that I might live to God."

If there is any proposition in what precedes which we must single out as being that for which the "for" of verse 19 introduces a reason, it must be, we suppose, the "God forbid" of verse 17. "Christ is not a minister of sin," says Paul; "for, in opposition to all vacillating policy which would make Him a minister of sin, I for my part stand firmly by the decision which He led me to make; I for my part *died* to the law, as He led me to do, in order that I might live to God."

At first sight, this might seem to be an artificial and unnatural treatment of the passage. The passage falls into four divisions, of which the last two are causal clauses introduced by "for": (1) "Is Christ a minister of sin?"; (2) "God forbid!"; (3) "For if I build up what I tore down I show myself to be a transgressor"; (4) "For I through the law died to the law." According to our interpretation, (3) refers not to (2) but to (1), and (4) refers not to (3) but to (2). At first sight, this business of making causal clauses give the reason, in each case, not for what immediately precedes but for something further back would seem to be unwarranted. The answer to the objection will be found if a man will just read the passage over again and take it as a whole. When he does that, he will see, we think, that the interpretation proposed does bring out the sense of what Paul was intending to say.

The Sin of Vacillation

At any rate, the difficulties of the passage do not obscure its profound meaning for the modern Church. Whatever interpretation be adopted as to details, the passage does set forth the danger—the terrible sin—of inconsistency.

If we merely go back upon what *we* have done, well and good. We are but weak and fallible men, and often we make mistakes. But if we go back upon what *Christ* led us to do, if we go back upon some decision of principle which we made for Christ's sake, then we are falling into a very dreadful sin.

How common that sin is in the modern Church; how common it is, in particular, in our Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.! A man decides to take a stand for the gospel of Christ against that "other gospel" of doctrinal indifferentism which now dominates our Church. Then comes flattery from the ecclesiastical authorities; then comes Satan's voice about "peace and work" and about avoidance of contention, and about propagation versus defence and about making our message positive and not negative and about not alienating the support of moderate and peace-loving men in the Church and about teaching the truth and letting Church politics go. At first, the man resists the Tempter's voice. But as these shibboleths of unbelief continue to make their impact upon his soul, his evangelical ardor begins to wane. He begins to fear the ecclesiastical machinery; he begins to consider consequences rather than principle; he begins to withdraw and separate himself from those who bear the reproach of Christ.

Such vacillation is one of the greatest enemies of the evangelical cause today. One wobbly evangelical often does more harm to the cause of the gospel, and leads more of Christ's little ones astray, than do a dozen Modernists. God send us men of a different type, no matter how few they may be! God send us foursquare men, who give the cause their all! God send us men who will say, as over against the "other gospel" now dominant in the Presbyterian Church: "I for my part will never go back upon a decision which Christ led me to take; I will never dishonor Him by confessing that what I did for His sake was sin; I have broken once and for all with that other gospel, which now dominates the Church, and I will never make common cause for one moment, in presbytery, General Assembly or theological seminary, with those who proclaim it."

Editorial Notes and Comments (Concluded)

that it has been the prevailing view, especially when it is added that it has been held in opposition to "the common view." It is also an overstatement to imply that the Reformers held to the premillennial view. As a matter of fact the Reformers as a class were amillennialists. "The Reformers in general," to quote Dr. HEAGLE, "did not believe in any millennium; considering the church to be the proper kingdom of God on earth, and the whole matter of the thousand years to be one of those 'Jewish opinions' which have often appeared in history." How little the Reformation was a premillennial movement is indicated by the fact that Dr. SHEDD writes: "In the period of the Reformation, millenarianism made its appearance in connection with the fanatical and heterodox tendencies that sprang up along with the great religious awakening. Hence, the symbols when they notice the doctrine at all do so in terms of condemnation" (Vol. II. p. 396). If the amillennial view originated since Dr. HONOR's Theology was written, as Dr. HOPKINS apparently thinks, and if "postmillennialism originated only about two centuries ago," as he expressly states, it would seem clear that the premillennial view must have been the prevailing view throughout the history of the Church. But apart from the question whether it is the true Christian view, it is hardly open to doubt that the vast majority of those who have called themselves Christians have not been premillennialists.

It may or may not be true that postmillennialism has "obscured the blessed hope of the appearing of the glory of our great God and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST," but, be that as it may, it seems to us that Dr. HOPKINS is skating on thin ice when he declares that "it is psychologically impossible for people to have much interest in an event that is removed from them by at least a thousand years"—in view of the fact that two thousand years have come and gone since the words were spoken: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven." If it was psychologically possible in the days of the Apostles, why not now?

But while we think that some of Dr. HOPKINS' statements are of doubtful validity, we are in hearty agreement with what we regard as the core of his contention, viz. that "Fundamentalism should be broad enough to include all who believe in the real second coming of CHRIST, whether they be premillennial or postmillennial or amillennial." Our agreements, we believe, have to do with what is fundamental, our differences with what is non-fundamental.

News of the Church

Synod of California Decides Against Mr. Jamison

ACCORDING to a United Press dispatch, "The action of the Los Angeles Presbytery in withholding a pastorate near the University of California at Los Angeles from Rev. Milo F. Jamison was approved by the judicial commission in a report which was adopted by the Synod. No reflection is cast upon the good name of Rev. Jamison, however, it was added.

"Liberal members of the Los Angeles Presbytery had caused the pastorate to be withheld from Rev. Jamison because they felt that he, a fundamentalist, should not occupy the university pulpit."

It is regarded as likely that the case will be carried to the Assembly. It will be watched with interest.

World Humanist Move Organized

CREATION of an international association to centralize activities of the humanist movement in religion was announced from Minneapolis, Minn. late in July, by John H. Deitrich, pastor of the First Unitarian Society.

Headquarters of the organization, the Humanist Extension Bureau, will open in Minneapolis with control vested in an Advisory Committee, which will have general supervision. Its members include:

Harry Elmer Barnes, New York author and educator; A. Eustace Haydon, professor of comparative religions, University of Chicago; Curtis W. Reese, dean of Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago; L. M. Birkhead, Minister of the Liberal Center, Kansas City; Roy Wood Sellars, professor of philosophy, University of Michigan; Prof. Eldred C. Vanderlaan, University of California; George R. Martin, vice president of the Great Northern Railroad, and M. N. Levine, pathologist, University of Minnesota, both of Minneapolis.

"The bureau should not be construed as an effort to establish a new religion or cult," said Howard G. Kraus, director. "Rather it is a means of extending to the present church structure the cooperation of humanist groups. We hope to stress the readjustment of religion to modern civilization and science."

Mr. Kraus said a large percentage of active humanists now are contained in the liberal element of the Unitarian Church, but that "there are many thousands the world over who are humanists without ever having heard the term, including many of the so-called reformed rabbis in Judaism."

"There are leaders in most denominations and creeds who practice the principles of

humanism, some by name and others without actual reference," he said. "After all, the essence of humanism is the encouragement to its followers to think for themselves."

The following Unitarian ministers also were announced as members of the advisory group:

Henry J. Adlard, of Duluth; George I. Ashley, of Hollywood; Burdette E. Backus, of Los Angeles; Warren P. Blodgett, of Pittsburgh; Ernest Caldecott, of Schenectady; Eugene M. Cosgrove, of Hinsdale, Ill.; Dale De Witt, of Hollis, N. Y.; Charles J. Dutton, of Des Moines; William R. Holloway, of Madison; Gordon Kent, of Sioux City; John G. MacKinnon, of Wichita; Harold P. Marley, of Ann Arbor; R. Lester Mondale, of Evanston; Homer L. Sheffer, of Oklahoma City; Eugene W. Sutherland, of Louisville; Clarence M. Vickland, of Stockton, Calif.; Frank S. C. Wicks, of Indianapolis; Kenneth C. Walker, of Boston, and Robert Weston, of Trenton, N. J.

Dr. Machen in Liverpool

PROFESSOR J. Gresham Machen visited Liverpool, England last month and addressed three meetings at St. Silas Church, Toxteth, for the Liverpool and Merseyside Fundamentals Fellowship. The Rev. H. Siviter, vicar, presided at the afternoon meeting. Professor Machen said there was much talk today about religious education. The current idea was that a fixed body of truth was not to be put into a child's mind. This was thoroughly unscientific. The aim should be to impart a fixed body of Divine truth not mercy to "train the religious faculty." "We are in very great need not only of a new Reformation but of a new Renaissance. We are facing today far more than an attack upon this doctrine or that; we are facing an attack upon the possibility of truth itself. That is what non-doctrinal Modernism means—not an attack upon this truth or that but an attack upon truth. Men have become interested in religion because they have ceased to believe in God."

Alderman J. G. Paris presided over the evening meeting. Professor Machen founded an interesting address on the hymn, "There is a green hill far away," which, he said, set forth in a theologically accurate and wonderfully comprehensive way the great Christian teaching about the Cross of Christ—truth which particularly needed emphasis today because it was particularly denied. Never was there a time when the truth was being so attacked—by Secularists without and Modernists within the Church—as today.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

A FACETIOUS comment upon what was known as the whirlwind campaign of a leading Canadian politician was that it was one part whirl and three parts wind. The Moderator of the General Assembly of 1931, Rev. W. G. Brown, conducted a whirlwind campaign but it is not subject to the same criticism as launched against the politician. It was a steady campaign of speaking every day and sometimes several times a day, for many months. The Moderator in every address laid a foundation of strong doctrine, set forth the opportunity and the responsibility of the Church, disclosed in particular the open doors for service in the great Canadian west, among the foreigners in Canada, in the mining and agricultural areas in other sections of the land, and in the Orient,—and all this with a passion that has greatly moved his hearers everywhere. One result is that in response to his appeal over \$70,000, in addition to contributions to the Budget, was forwarded to the Church Treasurer.

Relief from the extraordinary strain to which he has subjected himself was found in a measure by his being sent, at the request of the General Board of Missions, to participate in the Diamond Jubilee celebration of the Presbyterian mission in north Formosa, and this without drawing upon the funds of the Church. Friends contributed the necessary amount to meet the expense of sending the Moderator and Mrs. Brown on this happy errand.

The Mission is one of the great enterprises of modern Christian endeavor and its founder will stand out in history as one of the great heroes of missionary effort for courage, endurance, and sagacity.

On the evening of September 19th, 1871, George Leslie Mackay was ordained and set apart for foreign mission work in what was then known as Gould St. Church, Toronto. One month later he was on his way into the unknown for he had nothing more explicit in mind than that he should find a sphere of labor in China. The evening of April 10th, 1872, found him in full possession of a house in Tamsui, North Formosa, and so assured of God's guidance as to his destination as to warrant this entry in his diary:

"Here I am in this house, having been led all the way from the homestead in Zorra by Jesus, as direct as though my boxes were labeled, 'Tamsui, Formosa, China.' Oh, the glorious privilege to lay the foundation of Christ's Church in unbroken heathenism! God help me to do this with the open Bible! Again I swear

allegiance to Thee, O King Jesus, my Captain. So help me God!"

Thus began a missionary career which for faith, courage, consecration to the work of preaching the Gospel, energy, enterprise, endurance, and signal success has given our Church occasion for thanksgiving to God, and just pride in the memory of a noble son.

A very important service rendered through the medium of the Board of Missions, at its recent meeting, was the relief for the areas in the west that suffered so severely, not for one year but several years in succession, from drought. This relief effort was carried out in a very comprehensive, orderly fashion and in happiest cooperation with the Federal and Provincial Governments. The Secretary of the Board was able to announce that all requests for food, clothing, and money had been met, the last being devoted to compensate ministers and missionaries for loss of income. In this way stipends of ministers affected by the distress are provided for until the end of next harvest. In this work the women had a very large share and the railways and cartage companies co-operated by carrying goods free.

The Board of Sabbath Schools and Young People's Societies met at the same time and reviewed the work of the past year as well as laying plans for the year to come. This society supports two workers in the foreign field, one in Manchuria, and one in Poland. Great enthusiasm marked the announcement of the editorial committee that it had achieved the re-establishment of Presbyterian Publications under the editorial and business management of Rev. N. A. MacEachern, and that the enterprise was now on a paying basis. The Church therefore once more became independent in the matter of Sunday School publications.

In the person of Dr. E. Margaret Strang the Church has a unique representative and worker in the home field. Last year she was appointed by the General Board of Missions for work on the frontier and she is now engaged among the settlers in a section of the wide Peace River area. She is a graduate in Arts and in Medicine and left a lucrative practice to undertake this work. She occupies a log house built by the community and furnished by the Presbyterian ladies of Edmonton and both for her distinctive missionary work and medical service she is a most welcome member of the community.

"I have a great field," she writes, "and wish I could multiply myself by forty more or less that I might accomplish all the work that is to be done. Medical calls are frequent enough to keep me moving rather fast at times. The weather lately has been very cold which makes travel by horseback not very comfortable and sometimes a bit risky . . . I conducted my first funeral service

last week, a four-day old baby. There isn't an ordained minister within many miles nor a graveyard of any description, so we buried that much-wanted and sorely-grieved-for baby on a lonely knoll overlooking the White Mud River."

Shanghai University Resuming Work

THE tense war situation in Shanghai made it necessary to postpone the opening of Shanghai University for the spring term. The presence of the Japanese military and air forces next to the campus made it seem unwise to attempt to open classes, or to bring any considerable number of students to the campus, until the situation cleared up. The University depends upon the contributions from friends and the tuition received from students, to a large extent, to carry on the work, so it faced a serious financial crisis. It was necessary to take drastic steps to keep the institution from going heavily in debt. It was necessary to suspend the regular budget for the balance of the fiscal year and adopt an emergency budget on a minimum basis.

Although the guns were booming, the Downtown School of Commerce was opened on March 4th. The campaign for the building fund was completed, and more than \$51,000 was raised. There were more than 300 applicants, in spite of the unsettled conditions in Shanghai, and 212 students were enrolled and are now attending classes in the evening. The most urgent need of the school at present is for library facilities. It is now attempting to build up a library of commerce and industry. The Economic Society of China has pledged to contribute \$10,000, and the Foreign Trade Association of China is cooperating in this project. The China Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce has affiliated its library with the library of the school. A number of leading citizens and firms of the community have presented publications to the library.

On account of the war, the work of the Yangtzepoo Social Center was suspended for a time, because many of the factories were closed and the workers in that district were away. Director D. Y. Tsien and his staff started the work again March 15th, and all the activities have been resumed. There are about 350 students enrolled in the labor school.

Death of Dr. F. C. Morehouse

FREDERIC COOK MOREHOUSE, editor of *The Living Church* since 1899, died at his home in Milwaukee on the evening of June 25th. On the previous day, the forty-first anniversary of their wedding, his wife, Lillias E. Morehouse, had succumbed after a lingering illness of more than a year.

Mr. Morehouse was the dean of Religious Editors in America, and his periodical *The Living Church* is regarded by many as the best made-up and edited religious journal in the country.

A man of brilliant intellectual and spiritual power, Mr. Morehouse had been known for many years as the acknowledged leader of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the American Episcopal Church. He was a member of every General Convention of the Church since 1910.

Even by those who opposed his views he was universally recognized as one of the best-informed laymen in the Episcopal Church. On the floor of General Convention and in the columns of *The Living Church* he waged many a vigorous battle for the recognition of the Catholic character of the Church that he loved and served faithfully. Sometimes he won and sometimes he lost, but he was never known to lose his temper in the heat of conflict, or to take unfair advantage of his opponents, with the result that he was held in universal esteem by his fellow-Churchmen.

Mr. Morehouse was for many years a member of the National Council. He had also served on various committees and commissions, perhaps the most notable being the Evaluation Commission, which made a thorough study of the national administration of the Church in 1925, and the Commission on Evangelism, which inaugurated the "Bishops' Crusade" a few years later.

In 1927 Mr. Morehouse was a representative of the Episcopal Church at the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne, Switzerland. At this conference he took a firm stand for the frank recognition of the differences among various Christian groups, as well as the points of agreement, and opposed hasty schemes of reunion based upon the ignoring of conflicts in fundamental doctrines. This stand won him the opposition of a considerable group in the conference, but it ultimately prevailed, with the result that such conservative groups as the Eastern Orthodox Churches, which had threatened to withdraw, were enabled to continue in the conference.

In the summer of 1928 Mr. Morehouse underwent a serious operation, from which he never fully recovered. In November of that year he was able to attend the General Convention held in Washington, and received a tremendous ovation from the members when he rose to speak, but he was unable to take his usual vigorous part in convention debates. Although he was elected to represent the diocese of Milwaukee at the next triennial convention, held in Denver in 1931, he was unable to attend, though he was keenly disappointed at missing General Convention for the first time in twenty-one years.

The death of Mr. Morehouse removes one of the most picturesque and vigorous figures in any American Church.

Death of Lord Brentford

THE Evangelical and Protestant element in the Church of England has sustained a severe loss in the recent death of one of its outstanding leaders, Lord Brentford, perhaps better known under the name of Sir William Joynson Hicks. He had practiced law in London since 1888. In politics he was a Conservative. He was Home Secretary in the Conservative government of 1924. Speaking editorially of his life, *The English Churchman* says, in part:

"His value to the Church of England consisted not merely in the fact that he was a layman of position and influence who had won his way to the front rank of British statesmen and who took also a leading part in the affairs of the National Church. Nor did it consist in the possession of any extraordinary intellectual gifts—his chief assets in this direction were common-sense and mother wit. It lay rather in the twofold characteristic which 'The Times,' with a true instinct, recognised when it headed its obituary notice of Lord Brentford with the two words 'Consistency and Courage.' It was the possession of these two virtues that gave value to his career and, especially, to his work as an upholder of that Reformation Settlement. The two qualities are not always found in double harness. For lack of consistency the courage of many a prominent member of the human race has been rendered barren. Sacred and profane history alike abound in examples of the failure. But where the two qualities have flourished side by side, they have always had their reward in the tribute of public esteem and in the strengthening of the cause on behalf of which they have been exerted.

"It was so in the case of Lord Brentford. Led to see the real value of the Reformation and to understand its fundamental principles, he became a willing and watchful defender of the Reformed Church of England and a fearless exponent of its Protestant position. It needed courage to stand up against the official influence of a Bench of Bishops who for many years have thrown the weight of their privileges into the sacerdotal scale, and who, by ordaining and promoting the enemies of Protestantism, have flooded the Church of England with teachers of error and superstition. Lord Brentford's courage stood the test and carried him into and through the memorable battle of the Prayer Book controversy. The wonderful and deeply significant rejection of the Deposited Books by the House of Commons was in no small measure the result of his strong and courageous stand. During the progress of the conflict, many opportunities of weak and unworthy compromise presented themselves, but consistency came to the support of courage, with the result that the Church of England has still the priceless possession of her reformed and Truth-upholding Book of Common Prayer. A review

of the circumstances of the conflict must surely lead every Protestant Churchman to thank God for the consistency and courage of those who stood in the breach and won the hard-fought fight. . . .

"In our present conflict, we must pray that leaders who will similarly take the Word as their one guide may be raised up and strengthened for the task before them. It is a task of tremendous difficulty but of splendid opportunity; a task in which, because of its fidelity to the Scriptures of Truth, those who engage in it may do so in the confident assurance that God will never fail those whose most trusted weapon is the Sword of the Spirit—the Word of God."

Christian School Convention

THE annual convention of the National Union of Christian Schools will be held in Holland, Michigan, during the 17th and 18th of August. As has been the case in former years, the Convention will begin in the evening and will be continued during the next day, closing with an evening session.

The speaker of the opening evening session will be Dr. Clarence Bouma. The topic of his address is, "The Test of our Christian School Faith."

During the day session two addresses will be given. The first is entitled "The Antithesis in Education." This subject will be treated by Dr. C. Van Til of Westminster Theological Seminary.

"Maintaining Our Christian Schools on a Distinctive Basis" is the title of the second address to be given during the day.

The closing evening address will be given by Dr. H. Meeter. His subject being, "Calvinism As a Vital Force."

Methodist Conference Refuses to Alter Doctrinal Basis

THE recent General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North) at its recent meeting in Atlantic City solidly resisted the determined effort of a considerable group within its body to modify the Church's doctrinal basis. For a decade and a half that Church has opened its mind to a criticism of its basis of faith. The General Conference just past received the shock of that whole discussion. They definitely faced the question of changing the Church's basis, and answered it. The vote was 392 to 402. The proponents of change had a slight majority, but they needed a two-thirds majority. The slight majority actually recorded, however, was only gained, it is claimed by conservative Methodists, by the use of misleading arguments. The General Conference was told over and over that

no actual change in the Church's basis of faith was desired. The only thing wanted was the power of making such a change. As an actual fact, a memorial was at that time before the Committee on Temporal Economy seeking to abolish the doctrinal basis of Methodism altogether. But in spite of this apparent beclouding of the issue, and the inherent power of the appeal to a body to assert its own freedom, the effort failed. The General Conference refused to do anything that even might look like a disturbing of the Church's doctrinal basis; and, if the preachers showed a slight majority favorable to the beclouded motion for change, the laity showed an almost equal majority against it. The amendment could only have been carried by a two-thirds majority of both orders, so it doubly failed, not gaining such a majority of either order.

It is claimed by conservative Methodist leaders that this vote is evidence that the General Conference sent forth to the world the declaration that Methodism is a part of the historic Christianity of the centuries, and will remain so; its doctrinal basis inviolate.

Evangelicals Win Legal Victory in South Africa

THE famous "Capetown Church Dispute" in South Africa has resulted in a legal victory for evangelicals who opposed the "Anglo-Catholic" majority in the South African Church. The case turned upon the technical point whether the present Archbishop of Capetown is the legal successor of the Lord Bishop of Capetown created by Letters Patent of the British Crown in 1847. The latter person was appointed as trustee of Trinity Church, Capetown. Since that time the Church in South Africa separated from the Church of England, and now elects its own bishops. The present Archbishop, Dr. Phelps, claimed to be the legal trustee. The congregation, however, which had remained evangelical, had refused to recognize the sacerdotalist Phelps as trustee. They also claimed to be still part of the Church of England, hence no part of the Church of the Province, and not subject to the Bishop's authority.

In deciding the case, the South African Supreme Court has held that Dr. Phelps is *not* trustee. The Court said, in its judgment, in part:

"Now there are certain principles which should guide the Court in the choice of a trustee. In the first place, it is clear that the persons beneficially interested in a trust are the persons whose interests are mainly to be considered in making such an appointment. Consequently the trustee must be a person who will administer the trust for their benefit and in sympathy with their requirements.

"In the present case, the trust to be administered is a trust for ecclesiastical purposes in connection with the Church of England in this Colony. The building upon the trust property is a church and the congregation of the church are the persons for whose benefit the church was built and was intended to be used. They are

members of the Church of England accepting, as far as possible, the whole of the faith and doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. The interests and wishes of the congregation are therefore entitled to great weight in this matter.

"The congregation has consistently refused to join the Church of the Province of South Africa, and has declined to recognise it as the equivalent of the Church of England in South Africa. They claim to be part of the Church of England in South Africa. Whether or not that claim can be substantiated in its fullest sense is a matter I need not decide.

"This congregation follows the evangelical school of thought, and regards certain rites and ceremonies countenance and practised in the Church of the Province of South Africa as illegal practices.

"It, therefore, regards the Church of the Province of South Africa as not only legally disconnected from the Church of England, but also as severed from it in matters of faith and doctrine.

"The Church of the Province of South Africa, on the other hand, does not regard the views of this congregation with sympathy; in fact, it is opposed to their views and has refused to acknowledge the existence of a congregation of the Church of England in South Africa which was not part of the Church of the Province of South Africa.

"In the past, frequent difficulties have arisen between this congregation and former archbishops of Cape Town. For example, previous archbishops have endeavoured to compel the ministers of Trinity Church to acknowledge the canons of the Church of the Province of South Africa before granting them a licence to officiate at Trinity Church, and one of them refused to ordain candidates for the ministry unless they joined the Church of the Province of South Africa.

"Again, the Archbishops of Cape Town have claimed the right to nominate the incumbent of Trinity Church, and this has led to differences between them and the congregation. The present Archbishop claims that right.

"It seems to me, therefore, that, although Archbishop Phelps is the person most nearly corresponding to the successor in title of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, it would not be right for me to appoint him trustee.

"He is the head of the Church of the Province of South Africa, which does not regard the views of the congregation of this church with sympathy, and such an appointment could only have the effect of giving the Church of the Province of South Africa, through Archbishop Phelps, control over his congregation, and effectually preventing them from making use of Trinity Church in accordance with the views which they held. . . ."

This is regarded as a great blow to those who, departing from the old Protestant standards, have sought to force evangelicals to go along with them.

The Pope Condemns Votive Candles

THE Pope recently gave a shock to the whole Roman Catholic Church by the following edict issued through the Vicar-General of Rome, Cardinal Marchetti Selvaggiani:

"The custom prevailing in many Churches of placing at the disposal of the public wax tapers known as votive candles, to be lighted before statues and sacred pictures in exchange for money offerings by the faithful, is open to serious objections. It might easily become what appears to be a superstitious usage, besides giving the impression that it is permitted for the sake of the money which it brings in.

"Moreover, the practice detracts from the decorum and cleanliness of sacred buildings, bespatters the floor, impregnates the hangings with smoke, and consumes the air,

WE WILL APPRECIATE

The courtesy if our subscribers will kindly look at their expiration labels and send in renewals if they are due, or past due. To send out notices and return envelopes is an expense which our readers will understand our wish to avoid, in the interest of every possible economy. We solicit the prayers of Christian people for the continuance of the ministry of this paper.

"The practice must, therefore, cease. The candle stands are to be removed, even when they are of intrinsic or of artistic value. No tapers or candles may be sold in churches, oratories, sacristies, porches, or in adjacent buildings."

The "Record" (British) says, in comment: "It will be interesting to observe how Anglo-Catholics react to this ordinance. They have been impervious to charges of superstition from Protestant quarters, but to find the Pope himself using the same language is 'the most unkindest cut of all.' To crown all, he adds that 'a single Communion devoutly received will bring down more heavenly blessings and favors than thousands of candles burned for days on end.' Already one ardent Anglo-Catholic writer in the daily press has taken the line that candles are an old custom and that the Pope's ban applies only to 'the Diocese of Rome.' Fancy! Defying the Pope about candles!"

Roger Babson Declares Need for Revival

ROGER BABSON, president of the Babson Statistical Organization, recently addressing representatives of a score of denominations assembled at East Northfield, Massachusetts, said: "For churches to close this summer is like hospitals closing during an epidemic. I say this because an epidemic of fear, such as is raging today, is as dangerous as an epidemic of 'flu' such as raged in 1918. The need of the hour is not more money, more real estate, or more stocks and bonds, but more self-control, more unselfishness, more faith and more courage. Self-control, unselfishness, faith and courage are spiritual qualities which cannot be secured from bankers or stores, but only from vital religion. In behalf of the discouraged business men, the unemployed wage-workers and the millions of others in trouble today, I beg of ministers to minister to the wants of these people at this critical hour. An economic recovery is only awaiting a spiritual revival."

Electric Power in the Jordan Valley

ABOUT ten years ago a Jew named Pinhas Rutenberg obtained a concession from the British authorities in Palestine for an Electric Corporation. This company is now supplying light and power to Palestine and Transjordan from a hydro-electric plant in the Jordan Valley, just south of the Sea of Galilee, where the little Yarmuk River has been dammed, producing a lovely lake, through which most of the waters of Jordan must flow, on their way to the Dead Sea. Only one of four turbines is now in use, but it is expected that the increased consumption of power will soon draw on the reserve. Long lines of electric transmission towers now stalk across the historic plains of Esdraelon and Sharon. Jaffa, Tiberias and other towns are served, but not Jerusalem, which has a power plant of its own. An interesting irrigation prospect is opened by the development. The Jordan, whose bed lies so far below the surrounding terrain that its waters are not available for irrigation, will now be able to lift itself and irrigate the surrounding desert. It is said that when Doctor Weizman, the Zionist, was questioned some years ago, by an eminent geographer as to the possibility of maintaining a large population in so arid a land, he answered that Jewish genius would so enormously increase the fertility of the Promised Land that it would support more inhabitants than ever. Mr. Rutenberg's company seems to be fulfilling his prophecy.

Sunday "Cinemas" in England

THE Sunday Cinemas Bill last month before the British Parliament was overthrown in Committee. To the surprise of almost everyone, the Government thereupon introduced a measure of its own in the House. This is regarded as without doubt one of the most extraordinary developments in the history of Parliamentary procedure. The former Bill was defeated because it was left to a free vote of the House, that is to say, every member voted according to the light that was in him, without regard to party ties. Now it has been decided that this free voting must stop, and that members of the Government must cease to have regard to the dictates of their conscience and must obey, instead, the behests of the party whips. It is said by many to be a shameless abuse of the rights of political leadership and a gross invasion of the freedom of conscience. The Bill itself has been described as a measure to "legalise illegality." It was vigorously fought in Committee but finally passed, and found its way to the Statute Book the day Parliament adjourned. In the House of Lords the Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, supported the bill.