

F. S. DARNES
MAY 1935-R
R. 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., Inc.
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

OCTOBER, 1934

Vol. 5

No. 5

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE Minutes of the 1934 General Assembly have the excellencies of their immediate predecessors—but also their defects. As regards their format they could hardly be improved upon. It still seems to us, however, that the Stated Clerk, in obedience to the instructions given him by the General Assembly, could have given us a more helpful volume. "To the Stated Clerk," we read in the Preface to the volume, "was committed the responsibility of selecting and arranging the contents . . . as to provide a full, accurate, and usable record of the year's history of the Assembly." In view of these instructions, it might be expected that the Minutes of the General Assembly would provide a record of its proceedings such as would enable the 9,500 ministers (not to mention the 50,000 elders) who did not attend the Assembly to obtain from a reading of its pages something like an adequate knowledge of what happened. It does not seem to us that these Minutes make such knowledge available and hence that it is hardly proper to call them a "Journal of the 146th General Assembly." For instance, while we may learn from the Minutes that the action against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions recommended by the General Council was adopted, there is nothing to indicate that there was any debate over the matter. This is also true of the action taken relative to the proposed union with the United Presbyterians, not to mention other matters. A particularly flagrant instance of inadequate reporting is what is told us concerning the Protests occasioned by the action of the Assembly relative to the Independent Board. On page 236 a Protest against this action, signed by 15 commissioners, with eight reasons therefor, is recorded. Again on page 285 there is record of a Protest, signed by two commissioners, against the action of the Assembly in striking out section 9 of the former Protest with no intimation of the contents of said section. Such a record certainly leaves much to be desired.

One can hardly read these Minutes without realizing the large—altogether too large, it seems to us—place that the General Council plays in the life of the Church. If we deduct the pages devoted to recording the names of the commissioners, the overtures and the Revised Book of Discipline we find that more than one-third and nearly one-half of the Minutes proper are taken up with the report of the General Council. Just why so much good paper and ink should have been used to preserve the articles on "The plan of Union" by DR. STEVENSON, SPEER, DEWITT, MUDGE, KERR, VANCE and COVERT we are somewhat at a loss to know—in view of the action of the United Presbyterian General Assembly.

"THE REFORMED FAITH IN THE MODERN WORLD"

PROFESSOR FLOYD E. HAMILTON, of Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea, to whom we are indebted for two such excellent books as "The Basis of Christian Faith" and "The Basis of Evolutionary Faith" has placed us under his indebtedness still further by making available what is perhaps the best brief discussion (pp. 37) of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformed Faith, to wit—divine sovereignty, human inability, unconditional election, definite atonement, efficacious grace and final perseverance. The following extract indicates PROFESSOR HAMILTON's point of view: "Nothing is more needful at the present time than a rediscovery of the doctrines of free and sovereign grace, which lie at the center of the Calvinistic system. The Church today needs more than anything else a new Reformation, which will sweep away the tawdry schemes of self-salvation, and get back to the Biblical teaching concerning the Almighty grace of God. Not only is Calvinism true; it is the only effective defense against modern paganism. In discarding Calvinism the Church is neglecting the only weapon which can give it the victory in the conflict with the forces of unbelief. There is no rational defense against paganism except Calvinism, and no logical position which can be successfully defended if that be abandoned; for once the Church starts attributing the tiniest portion of our salvation to man, it has started down an inclined plane on which there is no stable equilibrium this side of thorough-going Pelagianism or paganism. . . . It is with the purpose of showing the reasonableness of that position, as well as its scriptural basis, that this pamphlet has been written." Unfortunately for us this pamphlet is published only by the Sovereign Grace Union of London. Copies, however, may be ordered through this office. Single copies, 15c. Ten or more copies, 10c each.

FAIR TRIAL

INDICATIONS of the kind of "fair trial" to be expected by the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions are supplied by an illuminating letter received by President J. OLIVER BUSWELL of Wheaton College (a member of the Board) from the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Chicago. The Clerk, none other than Dr. A. C. ZENOS, professor emeritus in McCormick Theological Seminary, and noted liberal, is the chairman of a committee appointed by the Presbytery of Chicago to deal with Dr. BUSWELL. The letter is as follows:

"August 4, 1934.

"President J. Oliver Buswell,
My Dear Dr. Buswell:
Yours of July 19 informing me of your determination to con-

(A Table of Contents will be found on page 128)

tinue your connection with and support of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions came duly.

Of course, you know that the resolution of the General Assembly, which met at Cleveland last May, calls on the Presbytery for further action, and you will not be surprised to hear again from me on the subject.

The object of my writing is to project a method of procedure which will terminate your connection with the Presbytery of Chicago, as required by the action of the General Assembly.

Let me say parenthetically at this point, that I am doing this with deep regret which I am sure is shared by all the brethren of the Presbytery. If possible within the time limit set by the General Assembly our committee greatly desires a fraternal conference with you before your final decision.

The following are in my judgment some of the most natural methods of reaching the above mentioned end.

First: A simple renunciation on your part of the jurisdiction of the Presbytery and request to have your name dropped from the roll of the Presbytery.

Second: A request from you for a letter of dismissal to another denomination in fraternal relation with Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Third: A request to be heard before Presbytery in defense of your announced determination to remain a member of the Independent Board, with the understanding that if the Presbytery persists in requiring you to withdraw from the Board you will follow one of the two courses above outlined.

Fourth and last: A trial for violation of your ordination vows which among other things include the promise "to be in subjection to your brethren in the Lord." This, permit me to remind you, would involve many tedious and practically useless formalities.

If you can think of any other way of ending your connection with the Presbytery, please let me know. If not I shall, of course, expect to hear from you as to which of those presented above will be the most satisfactory one from your point of view.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) ANDREW C. ZENOS,
PER F. MOORE,
Stated Clerk."

Comment seems almost superfluous, although pages might be written. The calm assurance that the action of the last Assembly requires "your connection with the Presbytery of Chicago" to be terminated, the naive proposal that Dr. BUSWELL will be given a letter to another Church declaring him to be in good and regular standing but that he will not be allowed to remain in good and regular standing if he elects to stay, and the farcical third alternative, while revealing new facets of the machine mind, yet pale into insignificance compared with the "Fourth and last" alternative. The trial, which is supposed to be Dr. BUSWELL'S day in court, when he is to have his opportunity to defend the doctrines of the Word of God that are so dear to him, is, he is bluntly informed by one who should know, to be a process that "would involve many tedious and practically useless formalities." And this in the same letter in which he is candidly told that "The object of my writing is to project a method of procedure which will terminate your connection with the Presbytery of Chicago . . ." To paraphrase Dr. ZENOS: We have to find a way of getting rid of you. Here are four alternatives. Take your choice. The last way, a trial, you can have if you will, but we are telling you in advance that it would involve many tedious and practically useless formalities. You will have to walk the plank anyway, so why bother with them? In other words, you can have a trial if you want to, but I want to warn you that the result of the trial is determined before the evidence is heard. If you can think of any other way of ending your connection with the Presbytery, please let me know. . . .

It is refreshing to read President BUSWELL'S telegraphic acknowledgment of the letter and his reply to its request for a "fraternal conference."

"YOUR LETTER OF AUGUST FOURTH IN WHICH FOR THE FIRST TIME YOU ASK ME FOR A CONFERENCE WITH YOUR COMMITTEE IS JUST RECEIVED IN ASHEVILLE STOP I AM INSTRUCTING MY SECRETARY TO TELEPHONE YOU AND ARRANGE TIME AND PLACE FOR SUCH CONFERENCE STOP I SHALL NOT WITHDRAW FROM THE PRESBYTERIAN DENOMINATION VOLUNTARILY STOP I AM IN SUBJECTION TO MY BRETHREN IN THE LORD AND AM ALSO LOYAL TO MY OTHER SIX ORDINATION VOWS."

Will the rank and file of loyal Presbyterians stand idly by while Protestant and Christian liberties are being destroyed? Today, the liberty of someone else is taken away; tomorrow it is your own. Tyranny never comes all at once.

DR. MACARTNEY AN APOSTATE?

RECENT issues of *The Presbyterian* have contained a lengthy (some 9,000 words) and more or less intemperate and ill-considered attack on Dr. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY by Dr. W. B. PUGH in which he is pictured as an apostate from Presbyterianism and denounced as one who on the basis of "incorrect statements, unsupported assumptions, unwarranted inferences, false interpretations" and such like is instigating a campaign of ecclesiastical rebellion against the government and authority of the Presbyterian Church—the occasion of this attack being an article entitled "Presbyterians, Awake!" which Dr. MACARTNEY wrote about the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board and which *The Presbyterian* published some weeks previous. Dr. PUGH'S article possesses a significance that would not otherwise attach to it by reason of the fact he is reputed to be the author of the "Studies in The Constitution" and of the "Proposed Action" which the General Council submitted to the last Assembly—a fact, if fact it be, that gives the article the standing, in some degree at least, of a reply by the General Council itself to Dr. MACARTNEY'S strictures on its doings. Whether Dr. Macartney will feel impelled to reply to this diatribe remains to be seen. If he chooses to reply we do not anticipate that he will have much difficulty in making clear that Dr. PUGH in attempting to defend the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board as being in accord with the spirit and principles of Presbyterianism took upon himself the task of defending the indefensible.

In estimating Dr. PUGH'S classification of himself with those who "believe sincerely in both the doctrine and polity of the Presbyterian Church," as well as his allegation that the Independent Board has made "false charges" against the authorized Board of Foreign Missions, it should be remembered that he is a member of Princeton Seminary's present Board of Control and that he is on record as holding that Auburn Affirmationists are deserving of the "high regard and confidence of the Presbyterian Church." It is hardly to be supposed, therefore, that any assurance he may give us as to the soundness of the official Board of Foreign Missions will carry much weight with Bible-believing Christians who hold that the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards is one with that taught in the Bible.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL AND THE INDEPENDENT BOARD

IN our last issue we stated, (1) that the General Council acted without constitutional authority when it presumed to interpret the Constitution of the Church for the benefit of the commissioners to the last Assembly, and (2) that it acted contrary to the Constitution of the Church when it

urged said Assembly to take disciplinary action against the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Since that time zealots for the General Council have taken exception to both of these statements.

The authority alleged for this action on the part of the General Council is the fact that among the duties assigned the General Council is the following: "To consider between annual meetings of the General Assembly cases of serious embarrassment or emergency concerning the benevolent and missionary work of the Church, and to provide direct methods of relief" (Form of Government, Chap. 26, sec. 2). Obviously the words, just cited, justified any action on the part of the General Council only if as a matter of fact the establishment of the Independent Board had created a "serious embarrassment or emergency" in the missionary work of the Church. DR. W. B. PUGH, reputed to have been the author of "Studies of the Constitution" which was sent to the commissioners to the last Assembly in the name of the General Council, has stated that "no one can deny" that the organization of the Independent Board had created such an embarrassment or emergency—a statement that is contradicted by the fact that DR. CLELAND B. MCAFEE, the representative of the Board of Foreign Missions on the General Council itself, has been reliably reported in the newspapers as having recently said that "the so-called Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has as yet failed to embarrass the official Board" and as "conclusive proof" of this DR. MCAFEE pointed to the fact that the receipts for Foreign Missions for the four months ending August 1, 1934, had totalled \$389,128 as compared with \$363,967 for the same period in 1933. Are we to infer that when DR. PUGH stated that "no one can deny" that the Independent Board had seriously embarrassed the missionary work of the Church he meant to imply that DR. MCAFEE is a nobody? Are we also to infer that the representative of the Board of Foreign Missions was absent from the meeting when the General Council "unanimously decided" that an emergency existed? However, even if it were true, that the establishment of the Independent Board had seriously embarrassed the official Board that fact would not have justified, still less obligated, the General Council to take up itself the task of interpreting the Constitution of the Church for the benefit of the commissioners. It would, no doubt, have imposed upon it the task of devising ways and means of relieving the financial embarrassment or emergency—there is no reason to suppose that any of the money received by the Independent Board would have gone to the official Board if the former had not been organized—but one looks in vain in the Constitution for anything that authorizes the General Council either to interpret the Constitution or to initiate disciplinary action against any who in its judgment may have acted unconstitutionally. To allege, as the General Council has done, that the Constitution "compelled" it to take the action it did is absurd. At the most the constitutional authority alleged is an excuse, not a reason, for the action taken by the General Council.

We have also alleged that the General Council acted contrary to the Constitution when it proposed and in effect initiated disciplinary action against the members of the Independent Board. In support of this contention we cited Sec. 12 of Chap. 26 of the Form of Government, "General Councils shall handle and consider only such administrative business as may be referred to them by the electing judiciaries, as indicated in the succeeding sections, and shall have no power of initiating action except as hereafter provided. No judicial business shall be referred to a General Council," as there is nothing in the "succeeding sections" referred to that gives the General Council any authority to propose or initiate disciplinary action of any sort. It is maintained by DR. PUGH and others that Sec. 12 of Chap. 26 of the Form of Government has no bearing whatever upon the matter before us and that we displayed gross ignorance when we cited it in support of our contention that the General Council has been guilty

of acting contrary to the Constitution of the Church. We are told that this section refers exclusively to General Councils of synods and presbyteries, not at all to the General Council of the General Assembly. As proof of our ignorance we are referred to the 1930 Digest, pp. 488-490, where we have the record of a resolution that was adopted by the 1930 Assembly at the suggestion of the General Council (Minutes, pp. 189-192). The occasion of this resolution was a previous resolution adopted by the 1929 Assembly (at the instigation of the Presbytery of Detroit) bearing upon the rights and duties of the General Council. The resolution adopted by the 1929 Assembly had been drawn on the assumption—a well-grounded assumption we believe, the General Council to the contrary notwithstanding—that Section 12 applied to the General Council of the General Assembly as well as to the General Councils of Synods and Presbyteries. Such limitation of its authority, however, did not meet with the approval of that body. As a result it proposed to the 1930 Assembly that it adopt the following resolution:

"That this General Assembly declare it to be its judgment:

- (1) that Form of Government, Chapter 26, Sections 12 and 16 refer only to General Councils of Synods and Presbyteries; and
- (2) that business of a doctrinal or judicial character shall not be originated or referred to the General Council of the General Assembly, and that all amendments to the Constitution proposed by the General Council shall be submitted to the General Assembly through the appropriate Standing Committee."

It is the resolution, just cited, that is advanced as evidence that Sec. 12 of Chap. 26 of the Form of Government does not apply to the General Council of the General Assembly. This evidence proves nothing of the sort. It is a mere Assembly deliverance and even a tyro knows, or at least ought to know, that an Assembly deliverance does not have the binding force of a constitutional enactment. Obviously the Assembly of 1930 had no authority to declare that Sec. 12 of Chap. 26 of the Form of Government does not apply to the General Council of the Assembly. What the Assembly of 1930 should have done, if it wanted to create a situation wherein this section would not apply to the General Council of the Assembly, was to send down an overture to the presbyteries to discover whether they were willing to amend the Constitution in such a way that this section would apply only to the General Councils of Synods and Presbyteries. It is equally pertinent to note that even if the resolution adopted by the 1930 Assembly (at the suggestion of the General Council itself) be looked upon as an authoritative declaration that said section applies only to General Councils of Synods and Presbyteries it would still be true that the General Council exceeded its powers when it proposed and in effect initiated disciplinary action against the members of the Independent Board. And that because the resolution itself explicitly states that "business of a doctrinal or judicial character shall not be originated by or referred to the General Council of the General Assembly." Surely it is as clear as day that the General Council did originate business of a judicial character in the action it took relative to the members of the Independent Board. Surely if the 1930 resolution has any authoritative bearing on the case at hand (we do not think it has) its second section is just as binding as its first. It might have been expected that the General Council would at least respect its own privately-prepared resolution, whatever degree of respect it has for the Constitution of the Church itself.

We repeat that "all real Presbyterians, regardless of what they think of the Independent Board, ought to be united in condemning the part that the General Council played in securing its condemnation by the last Assembly." The Church is confronted with the spectacle of a group of law-breakers initiating disciplinary action against another group for an alleged infraction of its laws.

Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith

The Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D.

[An address delivered in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia, May 8th, 1934, on the occasion of the fifth Commencement of Westminster Theological Seminary. The text follows that of the prepared manuscript as the exigencies of the occasion necessitated some abridgment in the process of its delivery.]

IT WAS zeal for the Reformed Faith that brought Westminster Seminary into existence. It is for the preservation of the Reformed Faith and its transmission undiminished to those who shall come after us that Westminster Seminary exists. It is these facts that have determined my choice of subject tonight. It has seemed to me not merely fitting but imperative that on this anniversary occasion I take as my subject, "Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith."

Lest any suppose that in speaking on this subject I am making an official pronouncement as to the aim and purpose of Westminster Seminary I should perhaps say at the outset that no one of my colleagues on its Board of Trustees or any member of its Faculty has any knowledge of what I propose to say. I hope that they will approve, as I hope you will, but be that as it may, they are hereby absolved from all responsibility for what I may say.

When Westminster Theological Seminary was established it was freely predicted that its first year would be its last. That prophecy has not been justified by the event. Disappointing as it may be to many, Westminster still exists. What is more, to an extent that is true of but few seminaries, no matter what their age or the size of their endowments, its line has gone out through all the earth and its words to the end of the world.

Here is something that calls for explanation. Why is it that Westminster Seminary though probably the youngest Theological school in America, certainly the youngest of the Presbyterian type, is one of the most widely recognized? The answer is not difficult. It is because it was established to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary as that Institution existed prior to its reorganization by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A. in 1929. That is why, unlike most educational institutions, it had no period of infancy and youth. In its case, there was not first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. Minerva-like it was born fully grown and fully armed.

This means that Westminster Seminary is a new Seminary in name only, that in reality it is one of the oldest Theological Institutions in America. What happened in effect—we are thinking now only of things spiritual and intellectual—is that the giant tree that had been maturing for upward of one hundred years in Princeton was transferred to Philadelphia. Naturally this action somewhat retarded its growth but fortunately the transplanting was done so well that its roots immediately began to draw

nourishment from its new environment and, please God, it will not be long until it will have fully regained its former vigor.

In further explanation of my reference to its Faculty as well as of my reference to its background, attention may be directed to the fact that all the members of its Faculty to date have been Princeton trained and that five of the nine professors who have occupied its chairs have actually taught at Princeton—one of them, the late Robert Dick Wilson (of blessed memory) for nearly thirty years and two others, J. Gresham Machen and Oswald T. Allis for about twenty years. What is more, I am sure that there is no body of men living today better qualified and more desirous to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of old Princeton than the existing Faculty of Westminster Seminary. They have all drunk from the waters and fed upon the fruits that grow along the banks of that ancient stream and have no higher academic ambition than to show themselves workmen worthy of being accounted true successors of that long line of scholars that made Princeton for upward of one hundred years famous as a center of sound Theological learning—the Alexanders, the Hodges, William Henry Green, Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield and Robert Dick Wilson, not to mention others of equal or near equal distinction.

I am not ignorant of the fact that there are those who contend that Princeton Seminary, in the present as in the past, is loyal to the aims and ideals of its Founders. The *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, published by the Trustees of the Institution, in its issue of November, 1929, stated:

"The reorganization of the Seminary undertaken and completed by the General Assembly was concerned only with the reorganization of the administration of the Seminary. It had nothing to do with its theological position, except to strengthen the safeguards whereby it should be held to the teaching of the Reformed Theology in accordance with the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

As evidence of the correctness of this representation, the same issue of the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* cited the fact that the new Board of Control at its first meeting made the following corporate declaration:

"In the one hundred and seventeen years of its history, Princeton Seminary has stood with firm steadfastness for the propagation at home and abroad, and for the scholarly defense of Evangelical Christianity as formulated in the standards of the Presbyterian church. In taking up the duties assigned to it by the General

Assembly, . . . the Board . . . feels that it has a solemn mandate from the Assembly to continue unchanged the historic policy of the Seminary and to do nothing whatever to alter the distinctive traditional position which the Seminary has maintained throughout its entire history."

If the statement and the declaration I have just cited stood alone, they would be fitted to provoke a question as to what sort of mental aberration the Founders of Westminster Seminary were suffering when they judged it necessary to establish an institution to carry on and perpetuate the historic policies and traditions of Princeton Seminary. This statement and this declaration, however, do not stand alone even in the issue of the *Seminary Bulletin* from which I have quoted. In this same issue may be found a letter from the Board of Control to the Alumni, signed by both its President and the President of the Seminary, in which it is not only asserted that its thirty-three members—two of whom are signers of the Auburn Affirmation, according to which belief in the full truthfulness of the Bible, the Substitutionary Atonement, the miracles of our Lord, His Virgin Birth and bodily Resurrection, need not be believed even by ministers of the Presbyterian Church—"have the high regard and confidence of the Presbyterian Church," but in which a lengthy paragraph is devoted to an attempt to show that the presence of these two Auburn Affirmationists on the Board, with the approval of its other members, has no significance for the doctrinal position of the Seminary. The conclusion is inescapable that the doctrinal position of Princeton Seminary, as long as it is under the control of its present Board, will be one that has the assent if not the approval of Auburn Affirmationists. If that does not involve a departure from its historic doctrinal position, it is difficult to say what would.

It is impossible, it seems to me, to justify the establishment of Westminster Seminary if it be true, as was alleged, in the issue of the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, from which I have quoted, that the Assembly in reorganizing Princeton Seminary "not only preserved the old safeguards of conservative doctrinal teaching devised when the Seminary was organized, but enlarged and strengthened them." It seems necessary therefore for me to say something in this connection about the controversy that preceded the reorganization of Princeton Seminary and that resulted in the establishment of Westminster Seminary. That controversy, in my opinion, had its origin in that naturalism of thought and life that began with the so-called "Enlightenment" of the Eighteenth Century. Previous to that time, all life and world views, whether within or without the Christian Church, had been supernaturalistic to the core. To quote Herman Bavinck: "The religious supernaturalistic world-view has universally prevailed among all people and all ages down to the present day, and only in the last hundred and fifty years has given way in some circles to the empirico-scientific" (the Philosophy of Revelation, p. 1). The outstanding characteristic of the life and world-view which then made its appearance is its

thorough-going naturalism, the resolute manner in which it turns its back on all supernaturalism and supposes itself able to find in this world all that thought and life is warranted in asking. It is this naturalism in which modernism has its roots and of which it is a more or less consistent manifestation in all its forms of expression.

I do not mean necessarily to imply that there are any thorough-going modernists in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., but whether there are any thorough-going ones there are a great many half-way ones. This is evidenced by the fact, among others, that in 1924 nearly 1300 ministers signed the so-called Auburn Affirmation which attacked the pronouncement of the previous Assembly in a way that detracted from its supernaturalism in regard to its doctrines of the Bible, of the Virgin Birth of Christ, of His labors of love, of His work of Redemption and of His Resurrection. The promulgation of this document was in effect a declaration of war by the advocates of this reduced supernaturalism against the advocates of the full supernaturalism of the Assembly's pronouncement. In the war that immediately began, the majority of the Board of Directors and of the Faculty of Princeton Seminary with a small minority of its Board of Trustees took their stand in favor of the full supernaturalism of the Assembly's pronouncement, but a minority of both its Board of Directors and of its Faculty, including the President of the Seminary, and a large majority of its Board of Trustees without expressly approving the reduced supernaturalism of the Auburn Affirmation—except in one instance—took a position that met with the approval of its advocates. When the latter became convinced that it was impossible to secure a majority in the Seminary's Board of Directors they appealed to the General Assembly, meeting at Baltimore in 1926 and thus precipitated a conflict in the Church at large that was not concluded until the Assembly of 1929.

The lines of this "Battle of Princeton" were drawn by President Stevenson when speaking before the Baltimore Assembly he said: "We are the agency of the Old School and the New School, and my ambition as President of the Seminary is to have it represent the whole Presbyterian Church and not any particular faction of it"—a statement that he further explicated a few months later, in a written statement, by saying that "Princeton is, according to its title, *the* Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and therefore should be inclusive not merely of the Old School, but of the New School descendants." This declaration for an "inclusive" Seminary won for the minority of the Faculty and Directors and the majority of the Trustees the support of the Auburn Affirmationists and their sympathizers, with the result that the effort to reorganize Princeton Seminary was successful.

In the light of what has been related it is vain and futile to allege that the issue at stake in the Princeton controversy was administrative, not doctrinal. As a matter of fact it was doctrinal to the core and the administrative issue was introduced solely in the interest of the doctrinal issue. I question whether anyone seriously believed, as

the Assembly's Committee affirmed, that "the root and source of serious difficulties at Princeton and the greatest obstacle to the removal of these difficulties was its plan of government by two Boards." As a matter of fact, Princeton Seminary as an educational institution did not have "two Boards of Control," in the sense implied, for while Princeton Seminary had two Boards of Control, they controlled *different things*, the Directors being in control of things educational and the Trustees of things financial. But whatever may be thought of the old plan of governing Princeton, from a purely administrative point of view, it cannot be denied that it worked successfully. For it was under that so-called divided control that it waxed great. If Princeton Seminary had been on the wane there might have been some seeming warrant for blaming its plan of government. As a matter of fact, however, when the effort to reorganize it was launched it was at the height of its influence as a center of sound Theological learning. Beyond reasonable question the reorganization of Princeton Seminary under a single Board of Control, was sought not because the Seminary was unsuccessful but because it was successful—successful, however, in furthering the supernaturalism of the Bible and the Westminster standards rather than that measure of supernaturalism for which the Modernist-Indifferentist party in the church was willing to stand. The one controlling reason, in fact, for advocating a single Board of Control was that it offered the only feasible method of ousting the old Board of Directors and of putting in their place a Board that would favor an inclusive Seminary.

The issue at stake in the Princeton controversy involved the question whether a Seminary of the Princeton type would be tolerated by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Princeton Seminary, previous to 1929, did not claim to represent the whole church doctrinally, any more than Auburn or Union Seminaries. All it claimed was the right to maintain its distinctive doctrinal position within the larger unity of the church. Its historic attitude had been one of strict adherence to its distinctive doctrinal position *within the Seminary itself* combined with a tolerance *within the Church at large* of any and all views consistent with belief in the Bible as the Word of God and acceptance of the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster standards. President Stevenson once defined the historic doctrinal position of Princeton Seminary as "simply one of unquestioned loyalty to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church." While this definition contained nothing but truth it did not contain the whole truth. It quite ignored the fact that Princeton's doctrinal position, both before and after the Reunion of 1870, had been that of the Old School—a position to which it was committed morally by the intention of its founders and legally by the trust funds which it held subject to the condition that certain specified doctrines (to which reference will be made later) be taught as "understood and explained by the Old School General Assembly." This representation would have been more excusable on President Stevenson's part had it not been for the fact that his colleague, Professor Caspar

Wistar Hodge—whose knowledge of the doctrinal history of Princeton Seminary is unsurpassed—had made perfectly clear that "the Faculty of Princeton Seminary always has been whole heartedly attached to the pure Gospel of God's sovereign grace or the principles of pure and consistent evangelical religion as held by the Old School type of Calvinism, and that after the Reunion of 1870 Princeton Seminary continued to maintain the same doctrinal principles" (Report of the Special Committee to Visit Princeton Theological Seminary to the General Assembly, May, 1927, pp. 75-80).

The friends and supporters of Princeton Seminary were long of the opinion that the right to maintain their distinctive doctrinal position within the larger unity of the Church had been guaranteed to them by the terms of the Reunion of 1870. It was that Reunion that Dr. Patton had more particularly in mind when in "Fundamental Christianity," he wrote: "Two unions of the Presbyterian Church have made the recognition of a certain area of tolerated difference of opinion a moral obligation" (p. 140). Had the Princeton Fathers of 1870 not been of that opinion, we may be sure the Reunion of the Old and New Schools would not have taken place, as one of the chief obstacles in the way of that Reunion was the fact that while all the Old School Seminaries were under the control of the Assembly, the New School Seminaries like Auburn and Union enjoyed a relative autonomy or independence. Naturally the friends and supporters of Princeton Seminary, whose influence was more or less dominant in Old School circles, were much concerned over what might be the effect of having the institution placed under the control of an Assembly having a large element of New School members. The result was the so-called "Compact of 1870" in which the Assembly's method of control over Princeton Seminary was modified in important respects. While this "Compact" was not regarded as a legal contract, enforceable in the courts, yet it was generally recognized that it created a situation in which it would be a breach of faith on the part of the Assembly if it should take any action that, directly or indirectly, nullified the right of Princeton Seminary to maintain its distinctive doctrinal position within the larger unity of the Church. The friends and supporters of Princeton also thought that this right was guaranteed to them by Article VIII, Section 4, of the Plan of the Seminary which read: "The intentions and directions of testators and donors, in regard to moneys or other property left or given to the Seminary shall, at all times, be sacredly regarded"—an article that in the nature of the case they interpreted in the light of the fact that a large part of the funds given the Seminary during the disruption period had been given under the condition that "if at any future time the leading doctrines of the Confession of Faith and catechisms of the Presbyterian Church such as the doctrine of universal and total depravity, the doctrine of election, the doctrine of the atonement, the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to all His people for their justification, the doctrine of human

inability, the doctrine of the necessity of the influences of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration, conversion and sanctification of sinners, *as these doctrines are now understood and explained by the aforesaid Old School General Assembly*, shall cease to be taught in said Seminary" these funds should no longer be retained by the Seminary. With these two guarantees—one moral and the other both legal and moral—it is not surprising that whatever fears the Princeton Fathers of that period cherished as to the wisdom of the Reunion itself, they felt perfectly confident that they would be permitted to maintain their distinctive doctrinal position within the larger unity of the Church.

Wise as the Princeton Fathers of that day were, however, they did not foresee what would happen when a generation that "knew not Joseph" should appear. At that time though Modernism was in process of incubation it had not yet burst its shell, as far as appearance *within* the Presbyterian Church was concerned. Twenty years later, we may be sure the Princeton Fathers would have demanded stronger safeguards before they would have agreed to Reunion with the New School branch of Presbyterianism, especially as it was among the descendants of the New School that the de-supernaturalizing tendencies of modernism found their most ready acceptance, as far as Presbyterians were concerned. For it was in 1891, that Dr. Francis Landey Patton speaking at the death of Dr. Caspar Hodge, after mentioning the fact that Dr. Hodge's closing years had been saddened by the blindness of the church and its leaders to the dangers of the "New Theology" that had already begun to flaunt its face within the Presbyterian Church, uttered the prophetic words:

"I cannot think of him today without feeling that by his death he has been spared a great sorrow. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that American Christianity is about to pass through a severe ordeal. It may be a ten-year conflict. It may be a thirty years' war; but it is a conflict in which all Christian Churches are concerned. The war will come, the Presbyterian Church must take part in it, and Princeton, unless her glory is departed, must lead the van in the great fight for fundamental Christianity. It is not amendment; it is not revision; it is not restatement; it is a revolution that we shall have to face. The issue will be joined by and by on the essential truth of a miraculous and God-given revelation, and then we must be ready to fight, and, if need be, to die, in defense of the blood-bought truths of the common salvation."

Unfortunately, however, when Princeton Seminary under the control of its old Board of Directors was still leading the van in this great fight for fundamental Christianity, the General Assembly of 1929, dominated by a combination of Modernists and Indifferentists, approved the plan of reorganization that had been proposed to the previous Assembly and thereby not only ousted the old Board of Directors but placed the Seminary under a Board of Control that favored an "inclusive" Seminary—so inclusive in fact as to include those reduced supernaturalists known as Auburn Affirmationists. Inasmuch as Princeton

Seminary was the one outstanding Seminary in the Church that had stood four square and without equivocation for the Bible as the Word of God, and as such infallible, and for the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster standards as the one and only system taught in God's word, this meant that its historic viewpoint no longer had anything like adequate representation in the educational life of the Church, and that a new Seminary was needed if the policies and traditions of old Princeton were to be carried on and perpetuated. Hence the founding of Westminster Seminary.

In pointing out what led to the establishment of Westminster Seminary, I have been pointing out at the same time why Westminster Seminary did not seek ecclesiastical approval. It was ecclesiastical control that had led to the undoing of Princeton Seminary. Surely an Institution that sought to carry on and perpetuate the aims and ideals of an Institution that had been suppressed by ecclesiastical authority could not be expected to seek such approval—even if there had been reason to suppose that such approval would be given. It is not impossible that Westminster Seminary, provided it be content to be and remain a small and insignificant institution would be tolerated by the Presbyterian Church as it now is; but I am sure that it could not be as influential as it is, still less as it hopes to be, without finding itself "cabinéd, cribbed, confined and bound," if not rendered absolutely helpless, if it were to allow itself to be brought under Assembly control.

I have sought to make clear the nature of the Princeton controversy and so the occasion and purpose of the establishment of Westminster Seminary. I have done so not only that I might justify its establishment but that I might indicate why it appeals for support not merely to maintain its existence but to "lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes," despite the fact that there are apparently already too many Seminaries in the Church. If Westminster Seminary were merely "another" Seminary of the type of which there were perhaps too many before Westminster was started, I for one would not be interested in its welfare. Westminster Seminary, however, is not merely "another" Seminary. It is a Seminary with a task to perform that is not being adequately performed by other Theological Schools—a task moreover that, in the judgment of its Trustees and Faculty, is of such importance that it must not be left undone if Christianity is to renew its strength and thus maintain the validity of its claim to dominate the culture and civilization of the world. The occasion of the establishment of Westminster Seminary belongs, of course, to the past but the purpose that led to its establishment is still, and please God will continue to be, its dominant purpose until He whose right it is to rule and reign shall appear. That task is the exposition, defense and propagation of the Reformed Faith in its purity and integrity. As it was zeal for the Reformed Faith that brought Westminster Seminary into existence, so it is zeal for the Reformed Faith that urges it to the performance of what it conceives to be its God-given task.

Westminster Seminary is bound to the Reformed Faith,

both by the charter granted it by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and by the Constitution adopted by its Board of Trustees, in the form in which it has found expression in the Westminster Confession of Faith. It is specifically stated moreover that it is bound to the Westminster Confession of Faith in the form which it possessed in 1929. Hence even if the Presbyterian Church should alter or amend its Confession of Faith, that would have no effect on the doctrinal standard of Westminster Seminary. That does not mean that in the judgment of Westminster Seminary the existing doctrinal standards of the Presby-

terian Church in the U. S. A. are incapable of improvement, or that there are not confessions of Faith other than the Westminster that set forth the Reformed Faith. What it means is that, in the judgment of Westminster Seminary, the Westminster Confession of Faith is the clearest, the most adequate and most carefully guarded statement of the Reformed Faith that has as yet been penned by the hand of man and that until that statement has been improved it will remain the doctrinal standard of the Institution.

(To be concluded in our next issue)

The Genius of Supernaturalism in Religion

By the Rev. William H. Topping

THE genius of supernaturalism in any field, science, philosophy, medicine, religion, may be said to be a mind or aptitude for the supernatural. Its essential principle is a world-view which regards God as immanent and active in His world. In the Christian religion this presence and control of the Deity manifest themselves in the form of prophet, miracle and incarnate word, three elements that distinguish revelation from the physical sciences. This mind or genius for the supernatural may be said to be a native endowment of soul disposing the individual more readily to the supernatural phenomena of conversion, rather than a product of education or the refinements of the arts.

Some individuals appear to have a mind much more open to the concept of the supernatural than others, and with whom the approach is made quite naturally and easily. Others again experience great difficulty in grasping the idea of the supernatural, while multitudes of people seem quite unable to receive it at all. How are these facts to be explained, for facts they are, as every worker familiar with dealing with the unsaved, knows.

The ancient Hebrews thought in terms of the supernatural. Their history as the chosen people of the Lord is replete with theophanies, miracles, personal manifestations of the Deity, and revelations of the divine will to the prophets. Hence their history as recorded in the Scriptures is one of the supernatural leadership and interposition of the Deity in every phase of their national life. This element of the supernatural persists in the New Testament. Christ Himself, and every phase of His life and teachings were altogether supernatural, and could not be understood apart from it. This same genius of the miraculous is to be found in the church letters, and naturally so for the reason that they are but the development and interpretation of the supernatural acts and facts of the life and passion of Jesus Christ.

The amazing thing to be noted in connection with this mind for the supernatural is that the "natural man," or the mind of the flesh unenlightened by the Spirit of God, can not see or understand it. "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are

foolishness to him: neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned," or revealed to one by the Spirit of God. This is true of many of the finest minds in the intellectual world, notably scientists, philosophers, artists, physicians and surgeons. Whether the nature of their professional studies and pursuits contributes a naturalistic mental atmosphere or sceptical attitude toward the supernatural we are not prepared to say, but the fact remains that the natural mind challenges the miraculous and supernatural in every field, and finds no place for God in the world of nature, science or religion.

The modernists in religion are simply men of the natural, fleshly mind, who, influenced by one motive or another, have strayed into the field of religion. Religion is one thing, however, and Christianity is quite another. The religions of the world are very largely if not altogether naturalistic in their world-view. Humanism, ethical culture, Unitarianism and a thousand others are merely religions of the flesh and of the mind, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. Christianity on the other hand is essentially supernatural in character and form, having its tap-root in the life and passion of the Son of God, and the dynamic ministry of His Spirit.

There are all degrees of modernistic unbelief from the extreme types exemplified by some of our leading metropolitan Modernists, who have little or nothing left of the supernatural of Christianity in their faith or preachments, to less radical types who recognize something more than human or moral in the Scriptures and the person of Christ. Many of these men of the natural mind in religion are men of culture, gentility and scholarly attainments; are gifted with charming personalities, and attain eminence in the social, intellectual and literary worlds. But the fact remains, and we say it kindly, that they seem to be utterly bereft of a sense of the supernatural.

They are "good fellows," with an abundance of the milk of human kindness; interested in social betterment and political reform; use the symbols and speak the language of Christianity, but "deny the power thereof." They can not be said to have the mind of Christ because they do not speak the language of Christ or of His Word. In their

preachments they concern themselves solely with the task of making this world a better place in which to live by slicking over its plague spots of human sin, and essaying to clean up its festering corruption by means of an application of smelling salts and a feather duster. *No power under heaven can change the hearts of men but the spirit of God with the Word of God and the Blood of Jesus Christ as His instruments of rebirth and cleansing.* Obviously, a social gospel has neither need nor place for the blood or cross of Christ. We search in vain for them in their preachments.

The Modernists in religion constitute their reason the criterion of truth. They oppose and deny what they can not see or understand with their natural, fleshly minds. Miracles never occur in nature, and hence are to be rejected. The virgin birth of Christ is contrary to reason and nature, and therefore is to be rejected. Men are as much inspired to write books on practical ethics today as were the prophets of old. Hence, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is a mere myth to the modern mind.

These two minds, the natural and the supernatural, are diametrically opposed. They have nothing in common, and stand at the antipodes in their relation to Jesus Christ and the Christian Scriptures as a supernatural revelation from God. They will never mix or mingle in fellowship or doctrine in our churches or church courts. The antagonism between them is violent, deadly and utterly irreconcilable, as much so as the necessary and inescapable antinomies of love and hate, truth and error, life and death, heaven and hell. A great gulf is fixed between them so that the one can not pass over to the other until his natural, fleshly mind is illumined by the Spirit of God.

The Evangelicals in theology, who have a mind for the supernatural, and love it and preach it, are regarded by the Modernists as fanatics, mystics, obscurants. Hence, the genius of supernaturalism, provocative of their position in the present controversy, is necessarily divisive in its influence upon men and measures, polity and creed. It is not any group of Evangelicals as such that is divisive, but it is the principle of unswerving loyalty to the Word of God as the only supernaturally inspired, inerrant, and authoritative revelation from God to men, and which they hold dearer than life, that is divisive. They would gladly give their bodies to be burned before they would yield one iota to the dictates of the naturalistic, unbelieving mind of men whose compromising, temporizing attitude to the Word of God is a shame and a disgrace to their profession, and an apology to the constitution of their great church which they have in honor vowed to support. The essentially divisive factor, we repeat, is not any particular group, but *the ability to discern the supernatural as the essential, controlling genius of Christianity as a revealed religion.*

Let it be said to the everlasting shame of the Auburn Affirmationists and the many others with them whose names are not inscribed upon that palladium of infidelity that they affirm loyalty to our doctrinal standards in their sacred ordination vows, and declare in the same breath with a studied mental reservation their "liberty of con-

science" to believe and preach what they please. This boasted liberty of conscience, however, proves itself to be but a compromising mental gesture by which they assume license to violate their sacred ordination vows, and betray their constitutional standards, to the support of which they are sworn with an oath more solemn and sacred than the oath of any earthly court, a holy covenant between their Lord, their church courts and themselves, to "receive and adopt the confession of faith," and not to reject and disparage it. Subsequently they scrap it as so much dogmatic junk.

These facts can not be denied or evaded. Furthermore, they may be safely set down as the sole and direct cause of the present unrest among the churches. Many of our congregations are not being fed with the soul-nourishing food of the Word of God because their faithless, disloyal priests have forsaken the altars of the supernatural, and are giving the people for the words of eternal life the commandments of men—social betterment and political reform. And where the Word of God is not honored or believed by the officiating priests, the Spirit of God does not bless the people. Hear the words of Hosea concerning the impiety and idolatry of God's people uttered under identical conditions: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, *I WILL ALSO FORGET THY CHILDREN.*"

God is today "forgetting" the congregations of disloyal priests of the holy oracles of God's Word who are compromising with modern rationalism, and temporizing with current social and educational philosophies. Their gospel is one of mere ethical culture, which is not the Gospel of Christ, and in their desire to be popular they study to please and entertain the people with current social phenomena, political horoscopes, kaleidoscopic bits of travel, literature or the latest scientific extravaganza. This may entertain, but it can not bring repentance and conviction of sin to the soul. Jesus said, "My words are spirit and they are life." "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever."

That these naturalistic religionists do not preach the Word of God needs but a cursory glance at their sermons to convince the most sceptical. Clever moralizings from artfully adapted texts are served equally well by fact, legend or tradition, and whether Jesus really lived or not, or whether He descended by natural generation from the blood stream of the brute little matters so long as a moral lesson is substituted for the staff of bread. Sin, with the Modernist, is merely faulty habits of living to be corrected by education. Hence, the emphasis is being laid today by our denominational publications upon modern educational methods and material to the neglect at least if not the utter evasion or abandonment of the blood and cross of a crucified Redeemer. As Dr. Clarence E. Macartney said in a recent sermon, "The redemptive note is dying out of the Protestant faith."

It was this naturalistic mind that inspired and framed the Laymen's Foreign Missions Appraisal. The Committee's review of the foreign field was kaleidoscopic, and extremely superficial. Having no eyes for the supernatural they missed entirely the work of saving grace because of the quietness of the Holy Ghost, and noted only the absence of trumpet blares, brass bands, sociological fanfares, and bull fights with the red rag of rationalism flaunting the saints of the Most High God.

Dr. E. P. Whallon has this to say in the issue of *The Presbyterian* of July 12th apropos of "Evangelism," "But we do believe that one of the surest ways out (of the present distress in the churches), and the supremely sure way, is for our whole church to engage in a tremendous work of evangelism for Christ's sake and for souls." To this we add a hearty amen with this single observation, that the evangelism of the churches will avail nothing so long as modern rationalism continues to dishonor God's Word in her pulpits and church courts. The Spirit of God is aggrieved, and will never manifest His power until ministers and people reerect the altars of the supernatural, and honor God's Word as the "sword of the Spirit." It is little wonder that the United Presbyterians declined to soil their standards in the mire of our unbelief.

If there has been doctrinal corruption in the Board of Foreign Missions it has been due to the substitution of a gospel of the natural man, which is not a gospel, for the supernatural Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost. The Independent Board was organized to receive the gifts of individual givers throughout the churches who decline further to contribute their funds through the Assembly's Board to the support of rationalistic unbelief on the foreign field. The new Board is not competitive for the reason that it simply receives funds for foreign missions which would not otherwise be given to missions, but diverted to other objects, and possibly not through Presbyterian channels at all. It becomes an adjunct thereby of the Assembly's Board in promoting and fostering constitutional and evangelical foreign missions, and as such should be welcomed by the Assembly and its Board.

The fact on the contrary that the General Council through the Assembly is seeking to crush the School of Bible believing Christianity sponsoring the Independent Board betrays its rationalistic sympathy and animus. Otherwise why should the Assembly oppose the organization of an Independent Board if it augments the gifts of the people to foreign missions by the reclamation of gifts which would otherwise be lost?

That there has been doctrinal corruption in the Foreign Board is attested by the presence of numbers of rationalistic missionaries on our foreign fields today, and the retention of Mrs. Pearl Buck, whose religious beliefs were nothing short of sheer apostacy, a stench in the nostrils of Almighty God, long after her presence in China was protested by the Church at large. This blot upon the Assembly's Board can never be erased. It has shaken the confidence of the entire Church in its doctrinal integrity. Little wonder that large numbers in the Churches decline

further to support such Christ-dishonoring infidelity, and seek new channels for their gifts. The need for a new Board was imperative. Repeated protests and demands for a cleansing of the Assembly's Board were answered by an official whitewash by the Assembly. No alternative remained but a new Board.

The happiest issue for the Assembly out of an unhappy situation is to recognize the Independent Board as an ally rather than a competitor. There is room in the denomination for two Boards. Failing this alternative let the Assembly purge its Board of rationalism, and restore it to its doctrinal and constitutional integrity. The confidence of the people of the Churches in the Board will be restored, and peace and harmony will again prevail. The attempt of the Assembly at Cleveland, however, to crush the Independent Board was ill-advised, and can issue only in strife and division.

The Presbytery of Baltimore recently refused to ordain a student from Westminster Theological Seminary because he would not declare his unequivocal support of the Assembly's Board. The Presbytery of West Jersey deferred balloting on the examination of two students from the same Seminary at a recent meeting until the September meeting upon identically the same ground. They declared that they would support the Assembly's Board "as long as it was true to the constitution of the Church and the Word of God." Could anything be fairer than that? What minister of the gospel of Christ, if true to the principles of honor and integrity implied in his vows of loyalty to the constitution of his Church at his ordination, would be willing to pledge support to a corrupt Board, if corrupt? There is not a man of us that would do it.

The writer holds no brief for any student or group, but he claims to have some degree at least of a sense of righteousness, and stands upon his liberty as a minister of the Gospel of Christ to protest the attempt of the General Council and the Assembly to crush a group of students and theologians devoted to the Word of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ because they regard them as fanatical, schismatic and obscurant. It smacks of the "blood purge" of one Herr Hitler, a revival of medieval despotism. Such persecution has rent denominations asunder, and caused the blood of martyrs to flow.

Is it not inconsistent for the General Assembly to throw obstacles in the way of candidates for the Gospel ministry so splendidly trained as these several young men who have prepared themselves by years of education for the Lord's service; who love His Word as a plenary inspired, supernatural revelation from God to sinners, and who are loyal to the constitution of their church; to say to them upon the threshold of their ministry, with the bloom of youth upon their cheeks, and the fire of hope and holy purpose in their eyes, "We are not willing for you to preach the gospel of Christ to perishing sinners unless you support unequivocally the appointed Boards and Agencies of the General Assembly *whether they be corrupted with false doctrine or not,*" and allow the compromising, temporizing Auburn Affirmationists to remain in the churches and

bore from within, corrupting the doctrine and destroying the peace and unity of the churches? Is this righteous? Is it constitutional?

Is it righteous for the Presbyteries to refuse ordination to young candidates so splendidly evangelical and magnificently equipped to preach the gospel of Christ? If they failed to fulfill the requirements of our doctrinal standards, it would be quite another matter. But here they stand, splendidly orthodox, creditably versed in their academic and theological parts, with a passion for the Word of God dearer than life, and a passion for souls, seeking the authority of their brethren of the Presbyteries to preach the gospel of the Lord of Life to perishing sinners. Shall any minister of Christ, in the presence of his Lord, standing with pleading eyes and outstretched hands with the nail prints, and saying, "feed my sheep," say *no!* to these candidates because, forsooth, of a verbal technicality by which the Assembly seeks to force them against their conscience to pledge support to a Board whose doctrinal corruptions they can not approve? Does not loyalty of the conscience to that great imperative, "feed my sheep," supersede any ecclesiastical *caveat*? The Constitution

concedes the priority of the conscience over church synods or councils, (Conf. XX, II), "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship."

The action of the Assembly reflects the eternal antagonism of the natural man to the supernatural, and marks the attempt of the rationalists of the Church to crush the evangelicals and their School of the Prophets. If the Presbyteries and General Assembly wish to debar true, loyal, evangelical men from preaching the gospel of Christ in their pulpits, let them put the Auburn Affirmationists out of *their* pulpits as an evidence of good faith.

Here is the whole trouble with the churches and foreign fields! Let the Presbyteries charge these disloyal ministers of the gospel (spare the name) with heresy, and with disturbing the peace and unity of the churches, and try them on the charges. There is not one of them that could stand up under an evangelical examination. A few good old-fashioned heresy trials would be a wholesome means of purging the churches of the doctrinal corruption that infests them today.

Professor Bryden's Apologia: A Review

By John Murray

[The Editors feel privileged to be able to publish this evaluation of the new book, entitled "Why I am a Presbyterian," by the Rev. Prof. W. W. Bryden, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History and the History and Philosophy of Religion, Knox College, Toronto. Mr. Murray is instructor in Systematic Theology in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.]

THE aim of this volume as the name indicates is to vindicate the refusal on the part of the author to enter the union of Churches consummated in Canada in 1925. A publication of this kind after nine years of retrospect from the pen of one who can view the situation before and after the union with such intelligence and discrimination we welcome as calculated to throw a great deal of light on the history of the Church in Canada for the last few decades.

We find ourselves, moreover, entirely sympathetic to the main thesis of Professor Bryden's book, the justification of the existence of a continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada. The Presbyterian Church in Canada has a great tradition and we are opposed to a union that would sacrifice so great a heritage. This the recent union would without question have done.

It is gratifying to find Professor Bryden expose so frankly "the highly disreputable propaganda" conducted by exponents of the union cause. Our agreement, however, goes much deeper than opposition to many of the methods and arguments used to make the union an accomplished fact. Professor Bryden finds his main argument against union in the realm of doctrine. "In any great movement," he says, "we must first of all be able to perceive that at its heart there are powerful and urgent convictions" (p. 70). "For it would appear almost certain that the

future is with that Church which will courageously take her stand for a more positive and definitely theological understanding of the Christian faith, and this in a renewed and vital understanding of doctrine along the traditional lines." (p. 95.) Much more might be quoted to which we could give hearty endorsement.

It is disappointing, therefore, to have to proceed to disagree so basically with Professor Bryden. We can, however, do no otherwise.

In chapter ii a reference is made to an episode in the early life of the continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada. It is the resolution adopted by the continuing Presbyterian Assembly in 1925, giving enthusiastic reaffirmation of very strict adherence to the Standards of the Church. He recognizes with sympathy that this resolution was largely due to a feeling of resentment in the minds of many against what they believed to be an unfaithful ministry. "At the same time," he proceeds, "we believe that the passing of that resolution was most unfortunate from any angle we care to consider it, and particularly for the continuing Presbyterian Church" (p. 44).

It is quite possible that this action was ill-considered as to method and time. It may have been done as Professor Bryden suggests in an atmosphere of passion and largely in ignorance. Such circumstances are, of course, to be deplored. But Professor Bryden's condemnation embraces

not only conditions of this kind but the thing in itself. This, in the judgment of the present writer, intimates a clear-cut divergence on Professor Bryden's part from the historic position of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The very claim to be *continuing* implied in itself affirmation of adherence to these standards in accordance with the "Basis of Union" of 1875 and the formula of subscription for all officebearers of the Church as in vogue then and now. Otherwise the claim would be blatant hypocrisy.

Those refusing to enter the union of 1925 had, of course, the opportunity to initiate in a constitutional way changes in the creed and constitution of the Church. They could have altered their Standards or relaxed subscription to them. This, however, would have prevented them from the right to use the word *continuing* though they might have by so doing been accorded the right to assume the name Presbyterian. But this is the very thing that was not done. The contention was emphatically that the integrity of the position of the pre-union Presbyterian Church was fully preserved. Hence the reaffirmation of 1925 was simply the affirmation of what was according to their claim already a fact. How can an affirmation of this kind then be an action to be deplored? Indeed, it would appear to have been a peculiarly appropriate time for the declaration of the fact.

The "Basis of Union" of 1875 says explicitly, "The Westminster Confession of Faith shall form the subordinate standard of this Church: the Larger and Shorter Catechisms shall be adopted by the Church and appointed to be used for the instruction of the people; it being distinctly understood that nothing contained in the aforesaid Confession or Catechisms regarding the power and duty of the civil magistrate shall be held to sanction any principles or views inconsistent with full liberty of conscience in matters of religion." The formula of subscription for ministers, elders and deacons on ordination Art. (2) reads, "Do you believe the Westminster Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and in your preaching do you promise faithfully to adhere thereto?" *

These have not changed their meaning and intent. The latter is the solemn vow of every officebearer in the Church. It was surely to this well-defined position that the reaffirmation of 1925 had reference. And yet Professor Bryden says it is to be deplored from every angle we may view it; to reaffirm, let it be remembered, that to which every officebearer had already solemnly pledged himself! The question here is not mainly one of theology; it is one of ethics. Underlying is an attempt by unconstitutional method to get away from the plain terms of solemn subscription.

This rather pronounced divergence of view from that which now in fact obtains of the relation of the Church

to her subordinate standard is necessitated in Professor Bryden's case by what we believe to be his radical departure at vital points from Reformed Theology. The cleavage becomes nowhere more vocal than in his doctrine of Holy Scripture. By our doctrine of Scripture, after all, will be determined our Theology.

There are two wholly different views of what constitutes the Word of God. One view is that the Word of God is to be identified with Holy Scripture, that the Bible is "immediately inspired of God" and therefore in all its extent and in all its parts the Word of God inerrant and infallible. This is the position of our Reformed Theology and is embodied in our Reformed creeds. The other view is that a distinction is to be made between the Word of God and Scripture, that the Word of God is not to be identified with the letter of Scripture. On this position the affirmation that the Bible is God's word in no way involves an infallible Scripture and this because the Word of God is not to be identified with the letter of Scripture but, to quote Prof. Bryden's words, "With the witness of God contained in that Scripture to men of faith." (p. 86.) This is the view given widespread currency today in the Barthian Theology. It is the view Professor Bryden avowedly and wholeheartedly adopts. A concrete example appears on page 16. Referring to John xvii, 11, 21, 22 he says, "Scholars are well aware that there have been grave doubts as to whether this particular *prayer* of Jesus, in which the afore-mentioned verses are embodied, together with many similar passages in this gospel, are to be attributed directly to Jesus Himself. St. John's gospel is not primarily a historic record of the life of Jesus; it is rather an interpretation of that life and of the experience of the Church." (cf. also p. 65.)

Which view is the Presbyterian Church in Canada to hold, the view that allows of many errors, contradictions, unhistoricities in the very autographs of Holy Scripture, or the view that the Bible is from beginning to end "immediately inspired of God" and therefore inerrant? There can be no question as to what the confession of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has historically been and to what view by solemn subscription every officebearer is committed.

But Professor Bryden (as also many others) takes the position that the view he represents is the view of the early Reformers and even of the Westminster Confession. "Moreover," he says referring to the original Reformed Church, "in consideration of their distinctive interpretation of what the Word of God signified—many claims to the contrary—they did not, at first, mean to identify that *Word* with the mere letter of Scripture." (p. 46.) Again he says, "We should not however pass on without observing *what these Reformers meant by Holy Scripture*. . . . Their writings everywhere imply that they were making a distinction between what they denominate at times as the 'Word of God' and Scripture, that is, as the latter may be simply read and understood in an external way," and finally quoting Professor Daniel Lamont's interpretation of the Westminster Confession, "The Scripture is

* The General Assembly of 1889 with the approval of Presbyteries passed a resolution allowing liberty of opinion in respect to the proposition in the Westminster Confession; Chap. xxix, section 4, "A man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own" (c.f. Book of Forms, p. 100).

authoritative only as it is borne home to a man by the testimony of the Holy Spirit." (pp. 91-92.)

Neither Professor Bryden nor Professor Lamont is the first to make this contention. It is now becoming quite ancient. But it is gross misunderstanding and misrepresentation. The Westminster Confession makes no such distinction. In Chap. i, sect. ii, it says, "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these:— . . . All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life." As the late B. B. Warfield points out (cf. "The Westminster Assembly and its Work" Art. "The doctrine of Holy Scripture"), the Confession defines Holy Scripture in this section both extensively and intensively, quantitatively and qualitatively, as in section iii it defines it exclusively. The peculiar quality of Scripture is that it is "given by inspiration of God" or as in section viii, "immediately inspired of God" and because so it is the Word of God and "infallible truth." Inspiration is not defined, but it is stated to be a fact and it is this fact that makes Scripture to be the Word of God. Holy Scripture is the extent of inspiration and since inspiration is, as Warfield observes, asserted to be pervasive, "Holy Scripture" and "the Word of God written" are synonymous. In other words Holy Scripture is identified with the Word of God. We may say not only that the Bible is the Word of God but also—since former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people are now ceased (cf., sect. 1)—that the Word of God is the Bible. Confirmatory of this is what the Confession says in Chap. xiv, 2, "By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein," etc.

In Section iv of this same chapter the Confession deals with the authority of Scripture. "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God, (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God." The ground of authority is the fact that God is its author. It is to be received simply because it is the Word of God and it is the Word of God because given by inspiration of God. Let it then be distinctly marked that the Confession does not rest the authority of Scripture upon the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, but upon the fact of inspiration (cf. also Sect. iii).

It is just here that Professor Bryden's interpretation is fatally incorrect. He interprets the Confession as teaching that Scripture is "authoritative only as it is borne home to a man by the testimony of the Holy Spirit." (p. 92.) He has failed to grasp the simple distinction which the Confession eloquently makes. It is the distinction between the authority of Scripture and our "full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof." With the ground of authority it deals in sections iii and iv; with our full apprehension of that authority in section v. The ground of authority is the fact of inspiration, of divine authorship—something characteristic of

Scripture as a divine product quite objective to us and antecedent in the nature of the case to any reaction on our part. The source of our conviction or persuasion of that divine character and authority is the "inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts,"—a subjective operation that ever continues with the Spirit's saving operations and the effect of which is the fact of conviction in our consciousness. No further explication of so elementary a distinction is necessary. Professor Bryden may disagree with the Confession but he has no right to misrepresent it and introduce confusion where there is plainness.*

We have, however, touched upon what is in this regard the central divergence of the Barthian Theology from Reformed Theology. According to the former, Holy Scripture in its own right as the inspired Word of God does not have objective authority. It could not have because, in its judgment, it is fallible. Consequently the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit involves at the outset a distinguishing operation, distinguishing what in Scripture is the Word of God. It is only what He (the Holy Spirit) distinguishes as God's Word that is authoritative. The effect of this is to get away entirely from what is an objective absolute norm of faith. It is to remove the standard of faith from the objective sphere of revealed fact normative for and binding upon all irrespective of their attitude to it, to something else.

It was not thus that our Reformed Theologians conceived of Scripture nor of the inward testimony of the Spirit in relation to it. They conceived of the inward testimony as having the effect of producing in our minds a full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth of Scripture as *in toto* The Word of God. By reason of the perfection and infallibility of Scripture the Holy Spirit did not need to distinguish. His function they conceived of as regenerative and illuminative in the mind of man, so that the darkening effects of sin being removed we might be persuaded of the divine origin and authority of the whole of Scripture.

The Barthian Theology therefore differs from Reformed Theology on what are the two pillars of the latter, the doctrines of Holy Scripture and of the inward testimony of the Spirit.

It is the conviction of the present writer that the ultimate tendency of such a position is just that subjectivism which has been the bane of Modern Theology and which we generally associate with the name of Schleiermacher.

If this movement of thought becomes dominant in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, then a truly Reformed testimony will be just as effectively destroyed as it would

* Dr. B. B. Warfield in two articles, "The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture" and "The Doctrine of Inspiration of the Westminster Divines," published originally in "The Presbyterian and Reformed Review" (1893) and "The Presbyterian Quarterly" (1894) respectively, and recently reprinted in the volume, "The Westminster Assembly and Its Work," shows conclusively by extended quotations that the high doctrine of inspiration contained in the Westminster Confession was the doctrine of the representative Theologians of the Reformed Church of the time. It is not difficult to show as Prof. T. C. Johnson of Union Seminary, Richmond, Va., has done in "The Evangelical Quarterly," July, 1932, that this is the doctrine of the theologian of the Reformed Church, John Calvin.

be by what Professor Bryden assails as Modernism. May we make our humble appeal to the ministry and people of this Church, which has by the singular grace and providence of God so marvelous an opportunity for true and

consistent witness to the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to avoid such a catastrophe.

Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A.

Sunday School Lessons for October

(International Uniform Series)

By the Rev. Prof. N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D.

Lesson for October 7, 1934

FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST

(Lesson Text—John 15:1-16. Golden Text—verse 4.)

ON the background of the departure of Judas from the intimate fellowship of the inner circle, Jesus sets forth in these verses the character of true discipleship. The branch which fails to bear fruit, he tells us, is cut off and is cast into the fire of judgment, but the branches which have been purified face the happy destiny of bringing forth an abundance of fruit to the delight of the Husbandman.

How can those who have remained with Him make sure of the fulfillment of the purpose of their call to discipleship? The answer of Jesus in this discourse is that this purpose can be realized only if they sustain a living relationship to Christ. They are told that they are *branches*, and branches do not bear fruit of themselves, but only as they retain their organic connection with the vine itself. "Apart from me ye can do nothing" (5); but abiding in Christ they shall be true disciples, and bear much fruit to the glory of the Father (8).

It is important to observe that abiding in Christ is not represented as an act or process which can be carried out by anyone at any time through one's own initiative and strength. The new relationship to which Jesus calls His disciples does not find its origin in man but is God-centered from beginning to end. The whole enterprise in which they are engaged is God's. It belongs to Him, is planned by Him, and exists for His glory. And Jesus presses home the subordinate position which man occupies in the endeavor when he reminds them that their peculiar relation to Him, the true Vine, is not of their own making but His: "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you, and appointed you that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide, that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." To pray in the name of Christ is not, as the treatment of this lesson in *The Westminster Intermediate-Senior Quarterly* states, to pray "in his spirit," that is, "for the kind of things that Christ wants," but is rather to come to God pleading one's unique relationship to Christ as a disciple.

And genuine discipleship, according to

the teaching of Jesus, is not a kind of mystic experience which exists apart from what Christ did for the disciples in dying for them upon the cross. Abiding in Christ is abiding in His love (9). The true disciple is the object of Christ's love, and this love of Christ found expression in His laying down of His life for them (13 f.). No one can possibly understand or obey the exhortation to love as Christ loved unless he grasps the true character of Christ's redemptive work on Calvary. And only the Scriptural teaching of the substitutionary character of Christ's giving of Himself in death in the stead of His disciples adequately expresses the love of Christ. A true disciple, therefore, is one who continues as the object of the love of Him who went even to the cross because He had set His love upon him.

Nor does the experience of abiding in Christ take its rise or sustain itself apart from what Christ has spoken. It was to His disciples, who stand in so intimate a relation to Him that He calls them "friends," that Jesus granted the privilege of knowing all the things that He had heard from the Father (15; cf. Mt. 11:27). And this revelation of Christ, His WORD, is the instrument by which the new life comes to expression and reaches its true fruition. The Word of Christ is the instrument through which the disciples come to stand in a new, decisive relationship to Him who secures for them a future of fruit-bearing to the glory of the Father. "Already ye are clean through the word that I have spoken unto you" (3; cf. 6:68; 17:6). And having become true disciples through the Word that He has spoken, and their reception of it, they are subjected, as fruit-bearing branches, to a further cleansing process at the hand of the Husbandman that they may bear more fruit (2). And the continuous, living relationship to Christ which results will necessarily involve an abiding in the words of Christ (7).

Being a Christian is commonly defined today too exclusively in terms of following Christ's example. So *The Westminster Adult Bible Class*, commenting on this lesson, p. 611, says: "To be a Christian in the twentieth century is to treat people as Christ treated them in the first century, to love the things that he loved, to do such things as he did." True, our passage sets forth Jesus as an example in calling upon us to love as He loved. But a definition of a true

disciple may not leave out of consideration a man's relation to the love of Christ and to the Word that He has spoken. Consequently, the life of a Christian is not merely a life in conformity to Christ's example but also a life of *obedience to His word*. It has been the fashion in recent years for the "leaders" of the church to formulate elaborate programs of social reform which are said to be an expression of the spirit and principles of Jesus, but we lack evidence of a concern to abide in the revealed word of Christ. The fruits of the branches must be the fruits of the Vine, and the surest guarantee that Christ will honor and claim our efforts as His own is for us to order our life as individuals and as a church according to His Word, for it is through the Word of God that He nourishes and cleanses and sustains our relation to Him.

Lesson for October 14, 1934

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS BIBLE

(Lesson Text—Acts 8:26-39. Golden Text—Ps. 119:97.)

The discussion of the lesson for October 7 has shown how indispensable the Word is to the Christian disciple. It was through the Word that Christ had spoken that they had been set apart for fruitful service, and this service which was defined in terms of obedience to His words could be accomplished only if the disciples abode in what He had spoken. The story of Philip and the Ethiopian illustrates the way in which one true disciple, abiding in the Word, used it to the salvation of one to whom he was called to minister.

As a true servant of the Word Philip set forth the teaching of the whole Word. He did not tell the Ethiopian that the Old Testament could very well be dispensed with in the Age of the Spirit and that its external authority would prove a hindrance to his free spiritual development. But he took his stand firmly upon these inspired Scriptures, and beginning with the prophecies of the Old Testament he went on to show how they had been fulfilled in Christ. Only he who accepts the authority of the whole Word of God and recognizes its wonderful unity in its divine authorship is fit to come to the help of those who are perplexed as to its teaching.

And as a true servant of the Word Philip set forth the central and unifying message of the Word: he preached unto him Jesus. Isaiah, he told the Ethiopian in answer to his question, was not speaking concerning himself or any other mere man but concerning the Lord's Anointed. How different the

message of many a modern! For him the Bible is a great book of religious experience of such variety that every possible experience that we may have finds some parallel there. And all that we need to do is to recover the experience from the Bible and use it in our daily life (See *The Westminster Adult Bible Class*, October, 1934, pp. 620 f.). And for the modernist even the experience of Jesus does not go beyond the merely human. But Philip as a true preacher of the Gospel spoke concerning "Another" who had suffered and died according to the Scriptures. The prophets had preached this Gospel beforehand (cf. Romans 1:2; 16:26), and now it had been wrought out in Christ's life and death.

And it was not accidental that Philip began at Isaiah 53. Some have suggested that the reading of this passage by the Ethiopian may have been due to contact with the Christian movement in Jerusalem. However that may be, there can be no doubt that the Spirit who guided Philip to him prepared the way by bringing to the attention of the Ethiopian this passage which had been so much in the thoughts of the early Christians and the early preachers of the Gospel. For this great description of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah was effective at once for the propagation of the Gospel and for its defense against the Jewish blasphemy of the Crucified One.

And finally there is a suggestion here that as a true servant of the Word Philip did not present an abbreviated message nor an emaciated Gospel but the full counsel of God. For is it not evident from what followed that Philip had acquainted the Ethiopian with the ordinances of Christ so that when conviction came the new convert himself raised the question why he should not at once be baptized? A modernist preacher would look upon such procedure as giving too much prominence to the "externals" of religion, or he might go further and condemn Philip for his "magic" and "sacramentarianism." But Philip who preached the Gospel so simply that even a pagan from afar understood at the same time avoided the fatal error of setting forth a reduced Christianity which ends up in not being Christianity at all.

Lesson for October 21, 1934

THE CHRISTIAN AT PRAYER

(Lesson Text—Matt. 6:5-15. Golden Text—Romans 12:12.)

The Sermon on the Mount is not a missionary address but a disclosure to Jesus' own disciples concerning the good news of the Kingdom (4:23; 5:2). To what gross misunderstanding of the Sermon, including the Lord's Prayer, the failure to observe

this fundamental truth has led! If the words of Jesus which make up our lesson text were not really intended for Christians, we should seek elsewhere an answer to the question how we as disciples should pray. But the issue is decided not only from the specific address of the words of Jesus (see also Luke 11:2), but as well from the content of the prayer itself.

Who but a true child of God can address Him as Father? As the *Heidelberg Catechism* so beautifully answers the question why Christ commanded us to address God in this way: "That immediately, in the very beginning of our prayer, He might excite in us a childlike reverence and confidence in God, which are the foundation of our prayer; namely, that God is become our Father in Christ, and will much less deny us what we ask of Him in true faith than our parents will refuse us earthly things." At the same time the disciple is not allowed to forget for even a moment that in prayer he has to do with a holy and sovereign Being. In the teaching of Jesus there is not a trace of the modern notion of the universal Fatherhood of God nor of the sentimentality which is often attached to that name. He is our Father *which art in heaven*. His is the kingdom and the power and the glory; and in earth as in heaven His name must be hallowed, His kingdom must come and His will must be done.

The objection which is most often advanced by those who contend that the Lord's Prayer is not for Christians is raised in connection with the fifth petition: Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. If our forgiveness by God depends upon our forgiveness of those who sin against us, it is said, what of the doctrines of grace and of the blood of Christ as the only ground of forgiveness of sin? But this objection errs in supposing that the prayer mentions anything of the ground of forgiveness, which at all times and for all persons can be only the finished work of Christ. The prayer teaches us *how* we should pray for forgiveness, as for everything else, and the man who turns to God with an unforgiving spirit in his heart and yet presumes to ask for forgiveness is no more likely to have his petition answered than the hypocrites who pray to be approved of men or the heathen who try to worry their deities into a favorable attitude. Only the child of God, who has experienced the grace of God in his heart, including the grace of a forgiving spirit, can turn to his Father in the assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. Quoting again from the *Heidelberg Catechism* the answer to the question as to the meaning of this petition: "Be pleased for the sake of Christ's blood not to impute to us poor sinners our transgressions, nor that depravity which always cleaves to us; even as we

feel this evidence of thy grace in us that it is our firm resolution from the heart to forgive our neighbor."

Lesson for October 28, 1934

THE CHRISTIAN'S STANDARD OF LIFE

(Lesson Text—Eph. 4:17-27; 5:15-21. Golden Text—Eph. 5:18.)

The branches of the true Vine have been made clean through the Word but they are in need of further pruning in order that they may bring forth more fruit—this teaching of the first lesson of the month is developed here in more didactic form. The Christian disciple is a man who has learned Christ, has heard Him and has been taught the truth as it is in Jesus (4:20 f.), and the living, personal relationship with Christ into which the disciple has entered involves from the beginning a life of holiness and fruitfulness. But the Christian convert must grow in sanctification. Sanctification is defined by the Shorter Catechism, in close dependence upon Eph. 4:22-24, as "the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness." There must be a break with the old manner of life which, not being under the control of the Word and Spirit of Christ, was characterized by darkness of understanding and hardness of heart, and resulted in all manner of sin. The life of the Christian is therefore a life of separation from the world because it is a life in union with Christ. The new life, because it has been created in righteousness and holiness of truth, is a life of new interests and new affections. It is a life which has no room for impurity or falsehood but only for a love of goodness and truth so fervent that anger will not be unknown to it, yet withal an anger that is not nursed until it gives the Devil an opportunity to lead to sin (4:25-27). It is a life of new opportunities and new endeavor (5:16); of new exhilaration and new joy because one has so many new reasons to be thankful (5:17-20); and of a new readiness to work for the good of others (4:25; 5:21).

But the call to live a life of separation because the days are evil is something other than a life of asceticism. Even the evil days are under the control of the Almighty and the earth remains the Lord's. The good gifts of God are to be received with humble gratitude. There is a right use of God's gifts and an abuse of them, and the abuse of them should be corrected by instruction in the right use of them in accordance with the principles of God's Word. It is true that there are times when our exercise of our rights, even in a temperate fashion, may

prove an occasion of stumbling for our weaker brethren, and then we must be ready to give up our rights and be guided by love alone. But the duty of controlling the exercise of our Christian liberty by love may never be construed as the justification for the setting up of a system of asceticism which is imposed upon all. For such a procedure has no basis in the Word of God, and would crush all liberty and suppress the conscience.

The Comfort of the Scriptures

A DEVOTIONAL MEDITATION

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"Let not them that wait on thee, O Lord God of hosts, be ashamed for my sake: let not those that seek thee be confounded for my sake, O God of Israel." (Psalm 69:6.)

TO be sure, the Lord knows those who are His. But they bear about continually the marks of their sonship. Those who are set apart to be holy must actually be holy.

The business of a merchant is known by what he sells. A Christian's stock in trade is not in what he has but in what he hopes for. He sets in store by the promises of God alone. He walks by faith not by sight. His conversation centers about Him who is invisible.

Men command and threaten but they who are the Lord's possession look only and have regard only to what God wills and commands. The outcome of what men might do, the godly are content to leave to the righteous judgment of God.

Whatever the judgment of men may be upon those who will obey only God's commandment and refuse to hearken to earthly authorities, they are commended of God. God smiles upon those who do His will. The smile of God is precious to those who believe. For God's smile they readily exchange every earthly favor.

The Psalmist in his cry to God prays to be kept from ever listening to any but the voice of God. For such yielding, such unfaithfulness will bring not only shame upon himself but will also cast reproach upon the rest of the godly. To disown the Lord's way affects the life of the whole body of Christ. "Let not them that wait on thee, O Lord God of hosts, be ashamed for my sake."

By the unfaithfulness of one the testimony of the true and upright is weakened. Unfaithfulness spreads unfaithfulness and reproach lies at the feet of God's children.

When we are unsteadfast God's grace and power is thought by men insufficient to hold us. God receives not glory from men on our account. If we cause not God to be glorified we have failed in that which should be our chief aim. To fail in this is surely something to answer for in the judgment.

What could be worse than to be a dis-

credit to the work and cause of God among men!

We should greatly fear lest we be a shame to the godly. What man is not weak and ready to fall! This weakness so keenly felt by the Psalmist caused him to cry to God. The guarantee of our steadfastness rests in God. He is able to bear the weakest through the time of testing. "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will

with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it."

"In the hour of trial,
Jesus plead for me;
Lest by base denial
I depart from Thee:
When Thou seest me waver,
With a look recall,
Nor for fear or favor
Suffer me to fall."

Two Open Letters to Dr. Covert and A Minister's Comment

California

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

August 16th, 1934.

REV. DR. W. C. COVERT, *Chairman,*
Administrative Committee of the General
Council, Presbyterian Church in the
U. S. A.

GREETINGS:

Your general letter of August 1st, addressed to "Our Ministers and Church Sessions," is received and will be brought to their attention in due course.

Having made careful study of the spirit and content of your official communication, I am moved to make the following observations regarding this whole affair. Remember that I speak only as a fair-minded Christian layman.

1. In directing this broadside attack upon the "Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" the 1934 General Assembly is undertaking to fight the symptoms instead of the disease. The causes for this "divisive and schismatic influence" which has arisen in our church lie far deeper than the founding of any independent Church Board, whether with or without constitutional authority. If unaware of this, perhaps you are too close to officialdom to sense what is really happening in our beloved Presbyterian Church.

2. This "divisive and schismatic influence" which the last General Assembly seems bent on stamping out had its inception in the signing of the Auburn Affirmation, years ago. *Then* was the time for our church councils to get busy and do some drastic disciplining. Was anything done?

3. In my solemn judgment, the "divisive movement in the Presbyterian Church which five years ago resulted in the establishment of an independent Seminary" flowed inevitably from that Auburn defection which was allowed to go unpunished, or even unrebuked. The Westminster Seminary would not have been established, five years ago, if the forward-looking, soundly evangelistic

element of our Church had not already seen Union Seminary and Auburn Seminary lost to the doctrinal standards of our Church—and felt that Princeton Seminary was slipping.

4. So, too, the "Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" is a natural, historic protest against the "modernistic" tendency of the regular Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. You who should be able to "discern the face of the heavens"—politically and ecclesiastically—surely do not need to have all this explained in detail by "the men in the pew." Tens of thousands of us devoted laymen in the Church understand the whole situation thoroughly. Go slow in "cracking down" on the Independent Board, until you clean house elsewhere.

Yours for a unified, purified Church,
EDWIN B. TILTON,
Clerk of Session, Calvary Pres. Church

New Jersey

Rev. William C. Covert, D.D.,
Moderator of General Assembly,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My Dear Sir:

AS a layman of the Presbyterian Church, it has been laid upon my heart to write with reference to certain statements that recently have appeared in print concerning the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

A quotation from a letter which appeared in the press states that "These independent organizations do not operate as antagonists and critics of our own Board of Foreign Missions, and do not base their appeals upon attacks upon its personnel and methods. . . ."

This seems to indicate that the main reason for the denial of the right to existence of the new Independent Board is based upon the alleged claim that the *new* Board is a "critic" of the *present* Board.

(1) This demonstrates clearly that there

is, therefore, *no basis* whatever for a demand, upon the part of the General Assembly, that the Independent Board shall disband.

(2) The Independent Board has a just right to *criticize* the present Board.

(3) When a person, or a group (such as a Board), seeks to stifle criticism, the person or group becomes a *censor*; and censorship leads to *tyranny!*

Now—consider the following quotation from a book that I have read and which is alleged to have been recommended for devotional use:

"There has been only one human being brave enough to release within himself the full creative power of believing that God was his Father. But unless Jesus' method of making himself divine can be imitated, his achievement is a mockery rather than a challenge. . . ."

The words of that quotation constitute an *insult to Jesus Christ!* Jesus did not, and does not, *stoop* to "achievement"! "Method" and "achievement" have to do with mere humanity.

Here is another quotation:

"The greatest risk God ever took was when he let Jesus, as an actual man, embody his attributes."

These quotations are a plain *denial of the deity of Jesus Christ*. But Jesus Christ is God! Here are three proofs:

(1) Jesus declares: "for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20.)

This is OMNIPRESENCE.

(2) Jesus knows all men and He knows *all things*. (John 2:24; 16:30.) Again—He searches the "reins and hearts." (Rev. 2:18, 23.) This is OMNISCIENCE.

(3) Jesus is *all powerful*; His power is universal, for He has "power over all flesh." (John 17:2.) This is OMNIPOTENCE.

These three attributes belong to God, alone. As Jesus Christ is the only Person who has these attributes, therefore *He is God!*

It is easily seen that the quotations from the aforesaid booklet constitute non-Christian teaching. The denial of Jesus' deity is a denial of Jesus Himself. So, He has pronounced judgment against those who are guilty of such a state of mind, for He declares:

"But whosoever shall deny me before men, him shall I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 10:33.)

Jesus declared Himself to be God, as is seen in John 8:58, 59 and it was for that reason, alone, that they took up stones to stone Him.

What shall we say of a mission Board

that fails to prevent a Committee from recommending literature which accuses Jesus of releasing "within himself the full creative power of believing that God was his Father" (?) What shall we say of a mission Board that fails to prevent a Committee from recommending literature which accuses Jesus of having a "method of making himself divine" (?)

Again—the laymen of our Church surely should not, for one moment, tolerate the spirit of "crack-down-ism"—of religious dictatorship—which is manifesting itself in the actions of the General Assembly of our Church! The spirit of General Assembly in this case is driving the Church not merely to "divisiveness" but to—war within the Church!

We are commanded, by God's Word, to earnestly contend for the faith. To contend is to "combat." It is to "combat" all that departs from the faith "once delivered unto the saints."

It is easily seen why there is a necessity for the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Sincerely,

ROBERT T. LORE.

COLLINGSWOOD, N. J.

Delaware

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR:

Why did I (an obscure minister) have to be instructed concerning a question *so summarily settled* "with great unanimity" by action of the General Assembly? Why these veiled threats of discipline? Was it because I am a presbyter that may be

directed to sit in judgment upon some of those brethren who are pronounced "disorderly and disloyal and subject to the discipline of the church?" Tampering with jurymen is an offence known to courts of justice.

But I needed coaching lest I fail to "detect errors in fact and inference which abound in articles and statements appearing in the 'Press' attacking the constitutionality" of the General Assembly's action, in condemning without one process of trial ministers of the Presbyterian Church for their conscientious loyalty to the *Word* of God and adherence to the standards of the Church. To threaten with discipline for strict adherence to the *Word* of God and the other standards is something *new* and *radical* in the Presbyterian Church! Let us pray rather to be delivered from ungenerous suspicions, evil surmisings, and uncharitable judgments. Even Roman courts refused to condemn without a hearing. (*Acts 25:16.*)

I was not consulted about organizing either Westminster Seminary or the Independent Board of Foreign Missions (my obscurity exempted me). But now the more vital issue of obeying God and maintaining liberty of conscience compels me to heartily approve of both: and as far as in me is, to support their cause now classed as one.

"The right of individual members to give their money or efforts to such missionary objects as they may choose" being conceded, how does it come about that I *an individual* lose this right by becoming a member of a session or Presbytery? Is not a session made up of individuals? I rather thought my liberty would be conserved by the session or Presbytery. Well, Mr. Editor, I am still a Presbyterian, notwithstanding.

T. S. ARMENTROUT.

WILMINGTON, DEL.

News of the Church

West Jersey Presbytery Takes No Action on Independent Board Membership of the Rev. C. C. McIntire

MEETING in regular session at Greenwich, N. J., on September 11th, the Presbytery of West Jersey without a dissenting vote received a report containing no recommendations concerning the membership of the Rev. C. C. McIntire of Collingswood, N. J., on the Independent Board. The chairman of the committee to which the "instructions" of the General Assembly had been referred reported that the committee felt unable to make any recommendation, simply leaving it up to the Presbytery.

After the report had been given, the Presbytery by vote received it, filed it, and passed on to its consideration of other business. It was privately reported that there was too much sentiment in the Presbytery against disciplinary action.

At the same session the Presbytery voted to ordain and install two licentiates, Lorne H. Belden and William T. Strong. When Mr. Belden replied, in answer to a categorical question whether his conscience would be bound by the Word of God above the decision of the Assembly if there were a conflict between the two, that he would be bound by the Bible, a spontaneous and thunderous volume of applause arose from the more than a hundred visitors and members of the Presbytery. The moderator, nettled, called for a vote to go into Executive

session. The vote being carried by a majority, all visitors were expelled. Many of the indignant people conducted a prayer meeting for the Presbytery on the lawn outside.

Dr. Will H. Houghton, Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York, to Become President of Moody Bible Institute

DR. WILL H. HOUGHTON, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, New York, since 1930, announced his resignation on Sunday, September 9th, to become president of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago.

The resignation was tendered to the congregation at the Sunday morning service, after Dr. Houghton had spent a week in Chicago conferring with the Institute leaders there. The call to the presidency was extended unanimously by the Board of Trustees. He will succeed Dr. James M. Gray, who becomes president emeritus, but who will remain on the teaching faculty and as editor of the Moody Bible Institute Monthly.

The call to head the Moody Bible Institute climaxes a religious career which has been eminently successful. Dr. Houghton first commanded attention when as pastor of the Tabernacle in Atlanta, Georgia, he added 2000 members to the church rolls during a period of four years. From this unusual ministry he came to New York in January, 1930, virtually unknown in that section, to succeed the spectacular Dr. John Roach Straton in the Calvary Baptist Church.

Delaware-Maryland Letter

By the Rev. Henry G. Welbon

ABIBLE Conference was held July 26th to 29th at the Forest Presbyterian Church, Middletown, Del., the Rev. Robert H. Graham, pastor. The speakers were the Rev. Franklin W. Stevens, pastor of the Delaware City Presbyterian Church; Ira V. Smith, the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, secretary of the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the Rev. John McComb, pastor of the Forest Park Church, Baltimore, Md., and Grace Livingston Hill.

At a pro re nata meeting of Presbytery held July 27th, the pastoral relations existing between the Rev. William W. Thompson of the Elkton Church, Md., and the Rev. Albert E. Thomas of the Olivet Church, Wilmington, were dissolved. An exchange of pastors was effected by the Rev. William W. Thompson being made stated supply of the Olivet Presbyterian Church until the meeting of Presbytery to be held next spring, and the Rev. Albert E. Thomas being made stated supply of the Elkton Church until the same time.

A number of the churches of the Presbytery have been conducting Summer Bible

Schools. The writer knows of the following: First and Central, West, Westminster, and Eastlake of Wilmington; Forest Church of Middletown, and Head of Christiana near Newark. It is hoped that this ministry to the children will continue to grow in this section.

Since the beginning of April the writer has been conducting a weekly program over Station WDEL on Saturday at 5 P. M. for children. The program is called The Radio Bible School.

NEWARK, DEL.

Minnesota-Wisconsin Letter

By the Rev. H. Warren Allen

ANUAL reports show a marked gain over last year in the number of accessions to the Church in the State of Minnesota. The financial report is about the same. The increase of members received is no doubt due in part to the Loyalty Crusade under the direction of Dr. Dowey, held last November.

Goodrich Avenue Church of St. Paul, Minnesota, observed its fiftieth anniversary on April 15th. The Rev. David V. Richardson is the pastor. The Minnesota Presbyterian and Congregational Churches held an anniversary service in the chapel of Fort Snelling on Sunday, May 6th, in celebration of the arrival of Samuel and Gideon Pond to the Fort to do missionary work among the Indians on May 6, 1834. Dr. J. T. Bergen gave the address. These brothers had a part in organizing the First Presbyterian Church which celebrates its hundredth anniversary next year.

Robert E. Speer is to be present at the June meeting of the Synod of Minnesota at Macalester Church, St. Paul.

A Brotherhood Day service was held at Westminster Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis on April 29th, Dr. W. H. Boddy, pastor. George D. Dayton, prominent Presbyterian layman, presided, and two Jewish rabbis took part in the service and gave addresses along with other prominent ministers of the city. This program, under the auspices of the Federation of Churches, was hailed as a great step forward in the movement for a world religion with brotherhood as its creed. To be brotherly to our fellowmen of whatever race or creed is nothing new. Every sincere Christian has maintained that attitude toward all men. But to set Christ aside and engage in worship with modernists and Jews who do not acknowledge Christ as Saviour is an insult to the Son of God and instead of being modern is to move backward two thousand years. The cross of Christ is no longer a stumbling block to the Jew, for the cross of Christ has been set aside.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Reformed Church in America

By the Rev. Gerard M. Van Pernis

A Revival of Calvinism?

Calvin and Calvinism.

Little need to be said about the man John Calvin. His biography as a Reformer of the first rank, though not the first in point of time, is so well known, that no detailed account of his life and work are required. Born at Noyon, Picardy, in 1509, he lived and labored until 1564. At the time of the Reformation which followed upon Luther's posting of the 95 thesis, Oct. 31st, 1517, John Calvin was a mere lad. His conversion to the "new learning" as the Reformation movement was called, took place in the year 1532. At that time Calvin was connected with the Roman Church, having served for some time as chaplain of the church at Noyon. He labored in turn at Paris, Basel and Geneva. While in Basel (1536) he wrote and issued his "Institutes of the Christian Religion." He also wrote several tracts, and a commentary on the various Biblebooks of the Old and New Testaments. At Geneva he established a church government for the municipality. After an illness of some two years, he died in Geneva, May 27, 1564.

Calvinism.

As a rule, Calvinism, is thought of as a system of religion, which places itself over against Lutheranism, Anabaptism and Socinianism. Among these various systems Calvinism is distinctive as being diametrically opposed to Arminianism. Again, Calvinism is spoken of as being: Sectarian, Confessional, Ecclesiastical or even Scientific. When spoken of as being sectarian, it is usually the enemies who do so, particularly Rome, who sees in Calvinism, the most dangerous form of Protestantism. Confessionally, Calvinism is usually referred to as promoting the doctrine of "Election." The term is thus applied by those who oppose the doctrine of Eternal Election. It should be remembered however by those who oppose Calvinism on that score, that Augustine antedated Calvin also with respect to this dogma.

There have been Baptists and also Methodists who prefixed their denominational name with the word "Calvinistic," as a derivative from Calvinism. Spurgeon for one called himself a "Calvinistic Baptist." The Whitefield Methodists of Wales call themselves "Calvinistic Methodists." The purpose of the use of the term in this "Ecclesiastical" way, is no doubt to differentiate the particular confession of these groups. If truly "Reformed," we shall not call the church of Jesus Christ after any man. Then there is still a third use of the term "Calvinism." This use is still in vogue today. That is the Scientific Method. Calvinism thus becomes a scientific term to be used partly in a historical,—or in a philosophical,—or in a

political sense. Science speaks of Calvinism "Historically" to differentiate the process of Reformation, in so far as the form of this process was not Lutheran, neither Anabaptistic, nor yet Socinian. Calvinism is spoken of as a philosophy, in so far as it presents a system of ideas, concerning various spheres of life, to which Calvin gave special emphasis. Politically Calvinism is spoken of as a movement in state economics, which, in the constitutional life of the state, guaranteed liberty to the nations. This liberty was first enjoyed by Holland; after that by England; and since 1776 also by the United States.

Calvinism, however, is not to be regarded in the narrow sense of either sectarian, confessional, or ecclesiastical. Calvinism indeed is to be regarded from a scientific standpoint. And then we see that Calvinism instead of being sectarian, confessional or merely ecclesiastical presents to us a "Life and World View." And we further see, that this Life and World View, as presented by Calvinism, is the broadest, the profoundest, the noblest and the highest, any system ever has presented.

Calvinism is also the purest of all systems. And when we say this, we take for our standard of comparison the Infallible Word of God. Compared by that Word we confess that Calvinism is in harmony with these Divine Scriptures. Hence in speaking of Calvinism, we do not think of the man John Calvin, who, under God, was permitted to present this Life and World View. He was not the originator of this Life and World View, but an able exponent of the same at a time, when it pleased God, to give unto the church a season of refreshing in the Reformation. For that reason we said in the beginning of our article, that not much need to be said about the man John Calvin. And while some may object: "but since you do not favor calling the church after a man, why then call the system of truth after a man?" We answer, that necessity demands this. The name "Protestantism" is too vague, too meaningless. Even Atheists, Pantheists and Modernists call themselves by that name. We must have a name which is specific. The name "Calvinism" fills that need, because Calvinism returns to the Bible as being the Inspired Word of God. Calvinism begins and ends with God. Thus Calvinism gives us a unique and all inclusive concept of life and of the world, as it concerns our relation to God, to man and to the cosmos. Thus we are led back to the Origin of all life; we are shown the purpose and the manner of life; and also what is the true development of life. And in all these we center in God. The true secret of life, or, let us say: life as such, concentrates itself in these three principal relations: (1), to God; (2), to our fellow man; (3), to the world.

It is true that other complexes of human life concern themselves with these three

great central thoughts. Paganism, Mohammedanism, Roman Catholicism all present their views. Paganism brings God down to the creature, by means of the creature. Mohammedanism puts God at a great distance from the creature. Roman Catholicism brings God and man together by means of the Pope and the church. Calvinism brings God and man together through Christ and the Creator and the creature can have fellowship together by means of His Spirit.

The conception of this threefold relationship determines what our individual life, our home, our common wealth shall be and is directly responsible for conditions in the world. The wrong conception shall lead to a wrong life and to wrong conditions in life. Paganism determines the life as also the conditions under which that life is lived. Mohammedanism in turn shapes the lives of its followers and creates a peculiar atmosphere in which the Mohammedan moves. Roman Catholicism also, witness those people and countries that are dominated by Roman Catholicism, shapes the lives and forms the conditions of that life controlled by the same. So also, the right conception of this threefold relationship shall regulate and govern our life and conduct and bring about conditions which tend towards true happiness. Undoubtedly Calvinism presents the true Life and World View. Time has tested it; history has proven it to be such. And that because Calvinism is God's revelation. Long before Calvin, Augustine taught it. Before Augustine, Paul preached it. We find it in the prophets, by Moses, among the Patriarchs. It is of God. Hence there is no "Neo-Calvinism," neither is there an "old-Calvinism." Had John Calvin thought it out and had it been improved upon by others, we might then speak of an old and a new. Calvinism presents the truth of God and seeks to apply it to all spheres and walks of life. It begins with God in Eternity in the Election and it ends with God in Eternity with its *Soli Deo Gloria* as its result and aim. Such then is Calvinism.

What a sad fact it is to observe that in many circles historically Calvinistic, this Calvinism has been shelved, hence forgotten and become unknown. Sadder still, Calvinism, because it is unknown, is not loved. If, however, as we believe it does, Calvinism alone presents the true Life and World View, and conditions in the life of the individual, the home, the school, the church, the state, the world, are what they are, then, so we ask very soberly: Should there not be a Revival of Calvinism? The Reformation of the middle ages presented this Life and World View. Its acceptance by the masses brought a deepened spiritual life and a veritable awakening in industry, commerce, art and discovery. Not only the intellectual, the æsthetic, or merely the economic, but the soul life revived. The reiteration of this view a century after the Reformation,

as Calvinism opposed Arminianism, quickened the churches and brought anew all honor to the Sovereign God. The placing anew of emphasis upon this System, by men like Dr. A. Kuyper and Dr. H. Bavinck on yonder side of the Atlantic and a Dr. Warfield on this side, has blessed the Reformed Churches. Both its membership and ministry have been established in the truth. These men have been called to their eternal reward. Once more the churches are influenced by "der Zeitgeist." A spiritual depression is upon us in the sphere of special grace, and a material depression in the realm of common grace. True, progress is being made along certain lines, but a retrogression along other, the more important, lines. Instead of Paganism we have Modernism; instead of democracy, dictatorship is the vogue. Instead of maintaining the doctrine of creation, evolution has taken its place and with it God is denied in part or "in toto."

We know the ends of the world are upon us. We know also that Christ shall return, yes! but to judgment. Shall it please God to give us once more seasons of refreshing as in the days of the Reformation? We know not. But this we do know, namely, what God requires, to *return to Him and to His Word.*

Here and there a voice is heard which encourages the children of God. Not all are bowing before Baal. God still has His watchmen on Zion's walls. We have had in the last years a Hodge and a Warfield presenting this Life and World View. Rev. R. B. Kuiper (now of Westminster) wrote his: "As to Being Reformed," with its hope and opportunity for Calvinism. Dr. Valentine Hepp in his Stone Lectures spoke of "Calvinism and the Philosophy of Nature." Then came along Prof. Boettner pointing to a "Five Pointed Calvinism." Of late, Rev. J. F. Heemstra in our own circle has been bringing us so faithfully and untiringly his lecture on "One Pointed Calvinism." Rev. Leonard De Moor of Central College (Pella, Iowa), is now writing in *The Leader* on "Toward a Christian Philosophy of the Self."

Is there going to be a Revival of Calvinism? Surely the world needs it! Surely the church needs it! For the world and the church, yes and the individual need God! Where must this revival begin? Well, where otherwise than there where Calvinism is still known? Let us take it from the shelves there where it has been shelved. Let all that which is truly Reformed awake and co-operate, working while it is day, before the night cometh in which no man can work. The meanwhile praying: Oh Spirit of God, revive Thy work in the midst of the years! FULTON, ILL.

The Southern Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. Prof. Wm. C. Robinson, Th.D.

Presbyterian Committee of Publication Changes Personnel

THE last six months have witnessed important changes in the personnel of the Executive Committee of Religious Education and Publication, located at Richmond, Virginia. Dr. Gilbert Glass and Dr. R. A. Lapsley, of the editorial department, have died. Mr. R. E. Magill was retired by the action of the last assembly, having reached the age of retirement. Dr. Edward D. Grant is now Executive Secretary of Publication; and Dr. John L. Fairly, Executive Secretary of Religious Education. Dr. Grant was formerly Educational Secretary of Foreign Missions and Secretary of Stewardship. Dr. Fairly was formerly Coordinate Secretary of Religious Education. The prayers of the Church should go with Drs. Fairly and Grant, as they assume full responsibility for this work, which is second to none in the life of the Church.

Shall We Lower the Standards?

Under this caption Dr. S. A. Cartledge, of Columbia Theological Seminary, has a vigorous defense of the continuance of Hebrew as a requirement for a candidate for the Presbyterian ministry. The last Assembly sent down an overture to the presbyteries suggesting that Hebrew be made optional. Dr. Cartledge shows that this is a step in the wrong direction, both from the standpoint of scholarship and of inspiration. When so many are disavowing the authority of "the Old Bible," Presbyterians should continue to require "the Old Testament in Hebrew . . . and the New Testament in Greek." Dr. Cartledge closes his able article in *the Christian Observer* with the following from the inaugural address of Professor Donald Mackenzie: "I, therefore, hope that the day will never come when an impatient Church will lay itself open to Tennyson's indignant reproach: 'Priests who know not how to read their own sacred books.'"

"Modernism at Massanetta"

With the above title Rev. J. E. Cousar, Jr., of Covington, Va., offered an able objection to Dr. Kirby Page's being invited to the conference for elders and deacons in Virginia. Mr. Cousar shows from Dr. Page's *Jesus or Christianity*, Doran, 1929, that the author thereof is a typical Modernist. Cousar particularly charges Page with the Unitarian "Fatherhood-of-God-and-universal-brotherhood-of-man religion"; and with repudiating "the vicarious sacrifice of our Lord."

However, a news item in *The Presbyterian of the South* (which also carried Mr. Cousar's article) declares of Dr. Page: "His unqualified statements of his belief in

the Deity of Jesus Christ; His sacrificial death; His resurrection; and of the New Birth as an antecedent necessity to Christian living formed the solid background for his addresses." Since this statement conveys the impression that Page is theologically sound it is desirable to compare the teachings of *Jesus or Christianity* with the teachings of the Westminster Standards.

(1). In this volume Dr. Page rejects the authority of the Old Testament, condemning the doctrine of God there taught repeatedly and going so far as to speak of the O. T. ideas of God as "savage concepts," pp. 16, 82, 171-172. Likewise he expressly rejects the authority of the New Testament in condemning its teachings on eternal punishment, pp. 17, 18, 173, 174. In other words, Mr. Page not only contrasts Jesus and Christianity; he contrasts a Jesus of his own construction with both the Old Testament and with the real Jesus of the Gospels.

(2). His doctrine of God is utterly different from that taught in the Scriptures. As stated he rejects the O. T. idea of God and fundamental elements of the N. T. doctrine of God. He equates God with man by declaring that God is a "person in exactly the same sense" as man, p. 47. This allows no place for the distinction between the Creator and the creature, the Infinite and the finite, the Eternal and the temporal. His denial of eternal punishment, capital punishment, and penal substitution shows that he does not hold that justice is a fundamental attribute of God as is taught in our Standards and by such representative Presbyterian theologians as Dabney, Hodge, Thornwell and Shedd. In denying that God is in any sense the cause of epidemics and pestilences he denies the sovereignty of God, p. 172; and naturally finds our emphasis on foreordination and predestination "exceedingly distressing," p. 268. Following the real Jesus of the Gospels who said that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without the Father, Calvinism teaches that there are no events beyond the plan of God, and that He is the highest cause of everything that occurs.

(3). Page's doctrine of salvation is radically different from that of the Westminster Standards. He may have affirmed a belief in Jesus' sacrificial death. Horace Bushnell, who taught the moral influence theory, entitled his book "Vicarious Sacrifice." But Page does not mean by these words what the Westminster Standards and Mr. Cousar mean. Dr. Page says in his book: "It is blasphemy to say that the death of Christ was necessary in order to appease the wrath of an angry deity," p. 46. Positively he affirms "the cross of Calvary represents the highest pinnacle of human achievement," p. 49. Both the Larger and the Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly affirm that Christ did undergo the wrath of God. The doctrine of Christ as our penal

substitute which Dabney so vigorously vindicated in his lectures at Davidson is dismissed by Dr. Page as "repugnant to ethical minds today."

Dr. Page denies subjective soteriology in the sense of justification ("salvation is not an act; it is a process; we are not saved, we are being saved. We grow into redemption," p. 45); and also in the sense of glorification ("salvation is not release from future punishment or the enjoyment of eternal bliss"). His doctrine of the New Birth is certainly not that of Paul, Augustine, and Calvin, for he says: "Jesus can never save us unless we are ready to cooperate. Every person has the power to shut Him out and to ignore His offer of salvation," p. 48. "Man is made in the spiritual image of the Creator and is capable of rising Godward. By nature he is equipped to live in the home" (of which God is the Father), p. 50.

Space forbids further discussion. Page's minimistic treatment of doctrine is very objectionable. He misstates, perhaps misunderstands, the "five points" of the Northern Assembly, p. 269. That body did not declare that these were "the five essential doctrines," but five among the essential doctrines. Apparently Page thinks the Arian controversy was of no moment. The volume is so typically Modernistic that one fears that Dr. Page's doctrine of the Deity of Christ and His resurrection are *a la Fosdick, The Modern Use of The Bible*.

DECATUR, GA.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. B.

THE week of July 2nd to 9th was an important one in the Synod of Saskatchewan. For from all over the province, from Meath Park in the north to Weyburn in the south, young people gathered in Saskatoon for the third annual Presbyterian Summer School. Last year there were 28 delegates; this year there were 85. The W. M. S. Residence for Girls was filled to capacity. The Rev. W. A. Cameron was Dean and Mrs. Cameron House Mother. Morning and evening prayers were conducted by the student missionaries and ministers, respectively. The addresses each morning were by Dr. Frank S. Morley, student at Biggar, whose subject was "The Kingdom of God," and by the Rev. Ronald Rowat of Tisdale and the Rev. W. Lyall Detlor of Melfort, who on alternate mornings took the topic of "The Challenge of Youth to the Church." Mr. Rowat and Mr. Detlor graduated from the Presbyterian College, Montreal, in 1934, and took one year at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia. Mr. Detlor, when asked along with the other speakers to recommend some books, completed his list by mentioning CHRISTIANITY TODAY and *The Evangelical Chris-*

tian (Toronto). Each morning except Saturday closed with the School divided into four discussion groups. Miss L. M. MacArthur of Regina was the leader of the one on Girls' Work; the Rev. J. A. Munro of Rosetown dealt with Boys' Work, and the Rev. D. K. Perrie of North Battleford with the Sunday School; and the Rev. H. R. Horne's subject was "Stewardship." On Saturday morning this period was thrown open, and personal evangelism was the subject that aroused the most interest. A young lady from Regina told of her difficulties in winning a friend to Jesus Christ, and many young people got up and spoke from their own experience and made suggestions. Finally it was made a matter for prayer.

On Tuesday and Thursday evenings Miss Lily Simpson, on furlough from India, spoke on that country and showed lantern views of the work of our Church in the Jhansi district. Another evening there was a lantern lecture by Mr. James Duff on "The Wonders of the Sky"; Friday evening there was a concert, and Saturday evening the Rev. R. G. MacKay of Prince Albert spoke on "Our Work at Home." A Federation of Presbyterian Young People in Saskatchewan was organized with the Rev. Ronald Rowat as president and the Rev. W. A. Cameron as honorary president. A constitution was drawn up and the Aim was expressed, as being first and foremost, to win other young people to a faith in Jesus Christ. And all through the week first things were put first. The week came to an end with the School attending St. Andrew's Church Sunday morning, the Rev. W. G. Brown preaching, and Parkview Church in the evening, the Rev. W. J. Pellow preaching, after which there was a Consecration Service.
DINSMORE, SASK.

Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

ON July 26th, Mr. John Sproule, B.A., was ordained and installed as Minister of Donoughmore Presbyterian Church, County Donegal. Mr. Sproule was converted through the ministry of W. P. Nicholson, the Irish Evangelist. After graduating in Arts at Trinity College, Dublin, he studied theology at Princeton Seminary and Assembly's College, Belfast.

During the summer the Children's Special Service Mission held services in a number of seaside resorts, including: Portrush, Portstewart, Castlerock, Bangor, Donaghadee, Newcastle, and Greystones. The leaders of these missions included the Rev. W. G. Ovens, M.A., LL.B.; Mr. R. Hudson Pope, and Mr. T. B. Rees, all of the C.S.S.M. staff. The C.S.S.M. is a splendid interdenominational organization, with headquarters in London, which seeks to bring the Gospel to the boys and girls.

The 1933 Report of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society (Anglican), which

has just come to hand, tells of another year of progress. The income for the year exceeded £50,000 and there are now over 200 missionaries and missionary candidates in connection with the Society. The B.C.M.S. now works in Morocco, Lake Rudolf District (Africa), The Arctic, Northern Canada, Burmah, China, India, and Persia. This Society was formed in 1922 following the rejection of proposals to exclude Modernism from the older Church Missionary Society.

The Minutes of the General Assembly have just been published. Ministers of the Irish Presbyterian Church on active service in 1933 numbered 453 with 86 on the retired list. There were 47 students for the Ministry as compared with 62 in 1932 and 58 in 1931. In 1933 communicants numbered 112,700, as against 111,760 in 1932 and 110,330 in 1931. The downward tendency in Sunday School enrolments seems to have been checked. 1933 shows 81,026 compared with 79,659, 80,275 and 82,308 in 1932, 1931 and 1930 respectively. Young People's organizations also reported a large increase.

Miss Elise Sandes, C.B.E., founder and honorary superintendent of the Sandes' Soldiers Homes passed away on August 19th at Ballykinlar Camp (County Down), at the advanced age of 83. Miss Sandes began this work at the age of 18 and now there are numerous "Homes" in England, Ireland and India. The Sandes' Soldiers Homes have been carried on for over 60 years on sound Evangelical lines, and have been the means of bringing many soldiers and others into the light of the Gospel. The remains were interred at Tyrella Military Graveyard (County Down), with military honors. Lord Craigavon (Premier of Northern Ireland) was present at the funeral.
BELFAST.

Union of South Africa Letter

By the Rev. P. S. Latsky

ALTHOUGH the drought and financial depression have lifted to a certain extent, there is still a great deal of unemployment in South Africa. This unemployment naturally affects the Church, too. Not only do many congregations find it difficult to make ends meet but there is also an increasing number of young men who have taken the full course at the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church but who have no prospects of permanent work in the immediate future.

About 14 years ago there was such a dearth of candidates for the ministry that the number of students at the Theological Seminary at Stellenbosch dwindled down to 28; at the moment there are, however, far over a hundred. For a Church which has a membership of almost three-quarters of a million, this number should not be

impossible to absorb. The difficulty is, however, always one of finances.

Much has been written in the press about ways and means of utilizing these forces for the benefit of the Church. The fields are indeed white unto harvest and the labourers are not few but many, and yet without funds there is no way of setting them to work to gather the harvest. More than one congregation lately acquired an assistant minister and the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in the Transvaal Province has passed a resolution reducing the minimum salary to be paid to a minister. This will undoubtedly help to ease the situation as it sometimes happens that a new congregation could be formed on a smaller guarantee of salary than the previous \$2000 per annum. It has been thought that a possible solution for the whole problem would be to centralize all funds from which a uniform salary could be paid to all ministers with a local allowance in certain instances. Such a scheme may meet with much opposition, as local bodies tend to guard their rights jealously.

Recently the General Assemblies of the churches in the Transvaal and Free State Provinces met and some important resolutions were taken. In the past the only institution for the training of pastors for the four federated Dutch Reformed churches has been the Theological Seminary at Stellerbosch. Years ago it was suggested that the Transvaal should have its own seminary and now the Transvaal Synod has decided to co-operate with the Theological Faculty at the University of Pretoria to train young men for the ministry of the Dutch Reformed Church.

In how far this decision will affect the cordial relations which exist between the four federated churches is difficult to say. The Theological Seminary at Stellenbosch will certainly be affected.

CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

Letter from Melbourne, Australia

By The Rev. H. T. Rush
(Secretary, the Bible Union of Victoria)

MY last referred to the stir created by the case of Dr. Angus. The publication of his book, "Truth and Tradition," in which, among other things, he remarks touching the Deity of Christ, "Whence arose this dogma? What does it mean? Does it mean that Christ was and is God? If so, who administered the functions of Godhead during the Incarnation of Jesus and who suffered on the Cross, God or Jesus?" It seems quite clear that the great issue is between a Christ who is Deity in the sense which the Church has held it for centuries, and a Christ who is something less or something other than Deity (His

humanity is not in question). Does Professor Angus hold the former view? Evidently not. Dr. Macintyre has issued a book against Dr. Angus in which he quotes Dr. R. H. Macintosh of Edinburgh and Dr. Strachan of Cambridge. The former says: "By simple transcript of experience we predicate of Christ true Deity. Nothing more high is possible, nothing lower is veracious."

Rev. R. J. H. McGowan has a book giving substantially his speech in the Melbourne Federal Assembly. On the other side Dr. Kenneth Edwards has written a book in which he aims to show that the theology of Professor Angus is true in spirit to the doctrines of the church. This letter is necessarily a brief summary of the proceedings in the N. S. W. Assembly. From the first it had been evident that there was on the part of some a desire to find a way out. This seemed to be favored by the appointment of the Rev. Joseph Lundie, a friend of Professor Angus, as Moderator. Early in the hearing of the case he created surprise by asking the principals on both sides to meet him, and he asked the house adjourn meanwhile. The conference was fruitless.

Rev. D. F. Brandt was prominent in moving that the charges against Dr. Angus respecting his teaching are apparently well substantiated, Dr. Macintyre seconded. Rev. A. D. Marchant, Steele lecturer at Lindfield College, moved an amendment to the effect that the church was wide enough to hold men of different views, that Dr. Angus did not depart from the substance of the faith, and expressing confidence in him.

A number of amendments had been tabled and as the Moderator refused a time limit for speeches; after a conference of two hours all amendments were withdrawn in favor of a consolidated amendment by Rev. A. D. Marchant. The Moderator in spite of protest allowed Dr. Angus to state in answer to a question the difference between his views and Unitarianism. Professor Angus stressed the doctrine of Divine imminence against Unitarian dualism. "God transcendent is also God immanent and the God who was in Christ in that supreme degree which made Him supreme Lord and Master was also in them and that their lives were also in God."

Dr. Angus says that he does not deny the Trinity. But his statements in regard to the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit must be interpreted in the light of the stress he lays on the imminence of God. He claims to get his doctrine of the Trinity from the New Testament in opposition to the dogmas of the church.

An amendment by Rev. R. J. H. McGowan that the church should proceed by judicial process was lost.

A number of speeches were recorded on one side or the other, and eventually by 174 votes to 83 an amendment was carried to the effect that the Presbyterian Church

is wide enough to hold men of different views and that while not accepting Dr. Angus' views, it accepted his assurance that he was true to the faith.

Notice of appeals to the judicial committee had been given by Rev. R. J. H. McGowan, Rev. A. J. Carter and others. MELBOURNE.

Karl Barth in Paris

By Pastor A. Cruvellier, of the
Eglise réformée évangélique
(A Translation)

THE movement of doctrinal fidelity which is making itself felt in our French churches by an ever more marked return to the sovereign authority of the Bible should be strengthened by the visit of Professor Karl Barth to Paris. The three lecture conferences which he held on the 10th, 11th and 12th of April on the subjects: *Revelation, The Church, and Theology*, gave him an opportunity to recall to his large Parisian audiences, which have been long unaccustomed to hearing such things, some essential truths of evangelical Christianity. The ovation which he received shows how these truths find an echo in spirits and hearts eager for certitudes. From the unusual account given by the journal, *Le Christianisme* (in its issue of April 19th) we take some extracts which will certainly interest our readers:

Revelation. There are a multitude of religions but only one Revelation; act of God and not *idea* of God; given once for all: the Cross does not repeat itself. And this truth is not left in any degree to our choice. Revelation is God Himself, present there where Jesus is, and the Holy Spirit, there also where we are. Out of our death, in Christ, He has made His death. He has taken upon Himself our destiny, our hell, placing Himself in our place, turning aside the blow. And the Holy Spirit in His turn intervenes to pray for us. Revelation is the divine act of creation, of pardon, of sanctification, of promise, without which man has no merit, no capacity, no will. And this is not something which *comes* from God, it is God Himself. He has given us nothing less than Himself. We have only to bless Him for what He has done for us.

The Church. The Church is there where man hears God. What the world is waiting for is not to hear the Church, it is to hear God speaking. The Church appears to be becoming somewhat fashionable again. May she not forget that what is important for her is to listen to God, lest the true victory escape her. The world peoples nature with its gods. But the true God is not a being whom man can discover. It is He who comes to meet man and finds him. The Church which hears God knows the secret of the world. Although many books speak to us of gods only one speaks to us of God, the Bible. Scripture is the rock upon which the Church is built. It is not the duty of the Church to administer the Scripture. The

latter is an instrument in the hands of the living God. The human witness of Revelation is said with good right to be inspired in its entirety, and it should be humbly plumbed and explained. Faithfulness to God is likewise faithfulness to the Book. The Church will give to Caesar those things that are Caesar's, but she will not give an unconditional "Yes" to any form of the state or of domination, nor will she render herself to any such forms in order to succeed or perish with it. The Church lives only from what God says. She is not the Church of pious men, but the Church of Jesus Christ. She is the body of which He is the head; she moves, her eyes toward the eyes of the living God.

Theology. Theology derives all of its right, all of its legitimacy from the Church and from Revelation. Its theme is the Christ who came and who will return. Theology must refuse not only to be a philosophy, but also to attempt to demonstrate her existence alongside of philosophy. May she dare to be herself and follow her own proper course. She is in the service of the Church which hears God. God has spoken: that is the only foundation of theology. She cannot choose the truth which it is her duty to affirm in the Church, for the truth is already chosen, not by her but for her. Theology has nothing in common with *gnosis* which has always believed itself to be an intermediary between Revelation and reason. In theology Revelation speaks, human reason listens, grace gives, and nature receives. The theologian fulfills the function of a watchman against ever-menacing error; his science consists in the knowledge of the text. He will make use, to be sure, of dogmatics but will preserve in doing so solid contact with the sacred text without secretly preoccupying himself with constructing a system. He will need to make use of practical theology which teaches us to preach or to teach in such a way that God may be heard and understood by the men of a determined age. If theology fails here, it is because it has made a failure in its exegesis and its dogmatics.

(Extracts from *Le Christianisme*.)

VAUVERT, GARD.

News from the Rainbow Empire

By the Rev. Jas. L. Rohrbaugh

MISSIONARIES in Kambatta, a province pioneered by the Rev. Clarence Duff five years ago, are rejoicing in their first baptism. Two weeks ago they baptized a boy who had come to attend their school and while doing so had learned to love the Lord. In spite of the opposition of his family and friends he asked for baptism and in the presence of others who profess to believe was baptized. The workers in that province are praying that the courage of this one may lead others who profess to believe to come forward openly and make a profession and be baptized.

In these days of missionary retrenchment we are glad to report that the Sudan Interior Mission is planning to open three new stations in the hitherto untouched northern half of Abyssinia. A party of missionaries are leaving next week to open work in Laliballa, an old Coptic stronghold about two hundred and fifty miles north of here. They will trek by mule the entire distance and when they arrive will be just two hundred and fifty miles from the nearest evangelical white missionaries. Laliballa is famous for its old churches hewn out of solid rock and its baptistries, similarly hewn with steps leading down and another set leading out. Thus the newly baptized cannot be accused of coming out the same way they went in. In the near future the Mission plans to open stations by Lake Tsana, a circular lake thirty-five miles in diameter with densely populated shores, and at Debra Markos, another Coptic stronghold in the north country.

The school season here is summer rather than winter, due to the fact that the heavy rains all come in the summer, and other work is practically impossible. The Christian schools in the country all opened within the past two weeks and all report more students than they can handle. There is a growing desire on the part of natives to learn to read and many of them attend these mission schools where the Bible is the main text-book. Many, of course, attend government schools, and for these it is imperative that we get Scriptures and Christian literature into their hands. By Christian literature I mean expositions of the Bible in language that they can understand.

Dr. R. V. Bingham, general director of the Sudan Interior Mission, is completing a four-month visit to the field, inspecting the work and examining possibilities of new work.

His Majesty the King, whose official title is "Power of the Trinity, Elect of God, the Conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah," seems to be looking with increasing favor upon the missionary enterprises in the land, a very significant thing in view of the fact that there is a large group of young radicals in the country whose sole desire is the expulsion of every foreigner from the land. Humanly speaking, every advance depends wholly on the favor of the King. Haile Selassie I is undoubtedly the most enlightened monarch Ethiopia has had and many who know him believe that at heart he is a true believer.

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

India Letter

By Margaret W. Haines

THE Lord has blessed and strengthened us through the various joys and disappointments that come into a missionary's life. I wish I could tell of wonderful conversions and many turning to Christ. That is what we would love to see but the ingath-

ering has not come yet. I think the Mohammedans are difficult to win and the Hindus are about equal. We do praise God for the evidence of His working in the hearts of some and He has promised that His Word will not return void.

In March there was a United Evangelistic Campaign of churches and missions throughout Northern India and on the frontier. This campaign is held every year, the object being that every Christian will realize his responsibility by endeavoring to witness of his faith to non-Christians and distributing tracts and selling Gospel portions.

Some Indian Christians here met with us for prayer and to plan the campaign. We got out sort of an announcement and had 1500 copies printed on bright colored sheets of paper. Then on three different days four or five of us went out in a group to proclaim in public this announcement. No public preaching is allowed out in the streets and moreover as there is no man here to do any preaching of this sort, we could not have any open air meetings. However, we stopped at various street corners for a few minutes to give out this announcement. Miss Davidson gave it out in Urdu, one of the sweeper Christian men gave it out in Punjabi, and Isaac, our man servant and general helper who is a recent convert from Mohammedanism gave it out in Pushtu. Then when people gathered around, the announcement printed in Urdu was distributed to them and we sold Gospels to those who would buy. The announcement was as follows: "Listen carefully!"

"1. Jesus Christ says, 'Oh ye that labor and are heavy laden, come unto me, I will give you rest.' He was a perfect sacrifice and bore the burden of our sins. Then he arose from the dead and now is interceding for us.

2. Jesus Christ says, 'I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man can come unto God but by me.'

3. Jesus Christ says, 'He that believeth on me hath Everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from death into life.'

So then, oh people! How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

Some of the plans we had made were interrupted because of three days of heavy rain. However, the Lord blessed the small efforts we made. All of the 1500 tracts were given out and altogether 280 Gospel portions were sold by various ones who took part. Others went out selling who did not come around with us giving out the announcements. Also Miss Davidson with whom I am working made several trips to villages and sold a lot of Gospels.

After the campaign was over there was quite a stir in the town. Men got up and preached in the Mohammedan mosques against us, warning people to have nothing to do with us. Various rumors went around the town that the people were going to have

a mass meeting and go with a request to the Deputy Commissioner who is the highest British Civil authority here to have us put out of Kohat, threatening that if we were not put out they would riot.

The Lord has undertaken in answer to prayer and their various threats seem to have vanished. They called a Maulvi (Mok priest) over from Peshawar to preach against us. He came to see us and told us this himself but said he thought he would see what we were like first. We had some good talks with him and gave him literature to read. The first time he came he advised us to stop our work here saying that all the time and trouble we were taking was of no avail, that we weren't making converts and that it was useless for us to continue! I told him that God had called us here and that we must obey Him rather than man. He came several times for talks and has been quite friendly. He told us that he warned the people that they had better not do anything against us because they might get into trouble. We don't know whether he is interested or whether he is playing a double game or trying to please all parties, but please pray for him and for his disciples.

KOHAT CITY N. W. F. P., INDIA

China Letter

By the Rev. Albert B. Dodd, D.D.

AUGUST 1, 1934, was the hundredth anniversary of the death of Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary to China. We may be sure that the Church in China has not allowed this occasion to slip by unremembered. It is to be hoped that, in the coming weeks, the important lessons from the noble consecrated life of this good soldier of Jesus Christ whom no hardship could affright nor discouragement baffle may be brought powerfully to bear upon the Church throughout this land. May there be a return to his principles all over China, especially on the part of many who have been led astray from his love of and loyalty to God's Holy Word! Probably the most far-reaching service this true-hearted Scotch Presbyterian rendered to the cause to which he so unreservedly devoted his life was his translation of the New Testament into Chinese, the language of more people than any other in the world.

This centennial almost coincided with the semi-centennial celebration of the entrance into Korea of the pioneer Protestant Mission, which, by the way, also was Presbyterian. At this celebration, the Northern Presbyterian Missions in China and their constituency were well represented. Rev. T. W. Mitchell, D.D., of Hunan, was the delegate of the Church of Christ in China. Although the Presbyterian Church of Christ in China was not directly represented, at least three able ministers belonging to or serving that Church were among the delegates from this country and unofficially rep-

resented that Church, which is one in heart and doctrine with the sound and loyal Presbyterian Church in Korea. These three were the Rev. A. N. MacLeod, who as alternate for Rev. C. E. Scott, D.D., officially bore the congratulations of the League of Christian Churches, a truly evangelical fellowship containing the entire Presbyterian Church of Christ in China; Vice-President H. K. Chang, who was especially sent to convey the cordial greetings of the North China Theological Seminary of that Church, and the Rev. H. G. Romig, who represented the Shantung Mission of the Northern Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A. in the same way. Your prayers are asked that this fraternal contact with one of the most wonderfully used Missions in the world may do much to set the heart of the Chinese Church on fire with a new love to Christ and zeal for the spread of His Gospel.

The noted evangelist, Dr. French Oliver, has returned to China for another series of evangelistic campaigns, one of the first of which, it is understood, will be at Chikung Shan, a summer resort for missionaries and a stronghold of fundamentalism. Earnest prayers should ascend for Dr. Oliver in these campaigns that he may be filled, guided and powerfully used by the Holy Spirit.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE, CHINA.

News Letter from Japan

By the Rev. L. W. Moore

THE Christian Church in Japan and the World has lost another leader in the passing of Dr. Etsuji Mizoguchi, on May 31st, after an illness of over a year. Born in Oita Prefecture, Dr. Mizoguchi was educated at Steel Academy, a Middle School of the Dutch Reformed Mission in Nagasaki (now united with Meiji Gakuin of Tokyo). After serving ten years in Kochi Prefecture with the Southern Presbyterians he attended Princeton Theological Seminary, graduating with the Class of 1907. On returning to Japan he was called immediately to Kobe Theological Seminary (later united with the Osaka Theological Seminary) which had just been established. For 25 years he served as professor of Apologetics and kindred subjects. For an equal length of time he served as pastor of the Shinko Church of Kobe (Church of Christ in Japan). In 1913 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Davidson College, North Carolina. An ardent Calvinist, Dr. Mizoguchi preached and taught the doctrines of the Reformed Faith with all his might. Also an ardent churchman he served on most of the important committees of the Synod. His place will be hard to fill.

A new translation in Japanese of Calvin's "Institutes of the Christian Religion" has appeared from the pen of Professor Yasuki Nakayama, of Meiji Gakuin, Tokyo. The

Westminster Seminary
will hold its opening exercises on
Wednesday, September 26, 1934,
at 3 P. M. in Witherspoon Auditorium, Walnut and Juniper Sts., Philadelphia. The speaker will be President Joseph Dupuy Eggleston, LL.D., of Hampden-Sydney College, Virginia, who will speak on "Our Search for Truth: To What is it Leading?"
The public is cordially invited.

"Fukuin Shinpo," official organ of the Church of Christ in Japan (Presbyterian) takes occasion to welcome the translation and commends it to the Japanese public in the interest of a thorough knowledge of the Christian Religion as expounded by the ablest of the Reformers. Professor Nakayama has done extended work in translating, having to his credit, Dante's "Inferno," Thomas a Kempis' "Imitation," Augustine's "Confessions" and others. There is no doubt that a renewed interest is being taken by Japanese Theologians in the work of the Reformers, especially of Calvin.

Less than three years ago a new Hymnal was issued by a joint committee representing five denominations. Special attention was paid to inserting hymns of different national background as well as new hymns. Although there has been some objections to the changes made, especially in wording as well as arrangement, the popularity of the new Hymnal is manifest in the sale of 290,000 copies since it first appeared. The committee also announced a net profit of 15,000 yen. Since the old Hymnal is no longer published one had no other recourse than to buy the new.

The question of paying homage at Shrines

will become more and more acute as the days go by. Two years ago a Roman Catholic University was censored for not attending the ceremony of the Yasukuni Jinja, the Shrine dedicated to all soldiers and sailors who have died in action. With the national spirit running high since the Shanghai and Manchurian Incidents every occasion is seized upon by the Army and Navy authorities to impress on the minds of the nation, especially the students, the necessity of fostering the spirit of loyalty to the Imperial Family and National Heroes by attending the Shrines. Now if they could confine themselves to memorial services for the heroes there could be little objection. But when the papers speak of (Admiral) "Togo to be Deified" and show pictures of "Priests praying to the departed spirit of the veteran of the Russo-Japanese War," the enlightened conscience of the Christian begins to ask questions. The common people of Japan make no distinction between Patriotic Shinto and Religious Shinto except to quote the words of the Minister of Education that Patriotic Shinto is not religious.

The question was brought to the fore again last year when an independent missionary in Ogaki, a small inland town, had her street meetings broken up. Her group was accused of treason due to a controversy with the principal of the Primary School as to the child of a Christian attending a National Shrine. There was much that was said and done on both sides which could have been left out, but the final outcome was that the Mission was deprived of its license to run a kindergarten and forbidden to hold any services of any kind in the Prefecture.

The question of Shrine Worship was before the meeting of the Synod of the Church of Christ in Japan last fall when a resolution was introduced to ask the government to either stop the acts of worship in connection with the Shrines or excuse from attendance those who object. A clear-cut stand was desirable no doubt, but a question that can be shelved as not of a spiritual character is too soon dismissed as "not essential." However there are those who are alive to the issues, chief among them being Rev. Rinzo Onomura, of Sapporo. As their numbers grow the Church and the State will be compelled to face the issue squarely, for those who love the Lord will not be satisfied with indefinite evasions. And when the issue is drawn those Christians who have convictions on the subject will be accused of high treason. Many Christian parents have told their children to simply break rank and come home when the school visited the Shrine, and nothing more was said. But when pastors, even, are known to feel that Shrine worship is necessary to the existence of the nation, one wonders how the problem will ever be settled without much bitterness and heart burning.

TOYOHASHI, JAPAN.

IN THIS ISSUE:

EDITORIALS

Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith 108
SAMUEL G. CRAIG

The Genius of Supernaturalism in Religion 112
WILLIAM H. TOPPING

Professor Bryden's Apologia: A Review 116
JOHN MURRAY

Sunday School Lessons for October 118
NED B. STONEHOUSE

The Comfort of the Scriptures 120
DAVID FREEMAN

Two Open Letters to Dr. Covert and A Minister's Comment 120

News of the Church 121