

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

HEADQUARTERS

Wheaton, Illinois

OFFICERS

WM. TREMAN BLACKSTONE, *President*, Princeton, New Jersey
Princeton Theological Seminary

FRED R. TIFFANY, *Vice-President*, Chicago, Illinois
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary

NICHOLAS GOSSELINK, *Secretary*, Holland, Michigan
Western Theological Seminary

JOHN H. DE GROOT, *Treasurer*, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary

GENERAL SECRETARY

WILLIAM J. JONES, M.A., B.Th.

ADVISORY BOARD

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D., Hamma Divinity School

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Westminster Theological Seminary

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., Temple University

"By the word of truth, by the power of God."—2 Corinthians 6:7.

The League of Evangelical Students is a continent-wide organization of students, founded in 1925 by a student group. Its aim is to exalt our Lord Jesus Christ—by setting forth the gospel of His grace as presented in the inerrant Word of God, by promoting the intellectual defense of the evangelical faith, by proclaiming the joy of Christian living through the indwelling power of the Spirit, by presenting the claims of the gospel ministry at home and abroad. By these means it desires to present a well-rounded witness, spiritual and intellectual, to the truths of historic, evangelical Christianity. It is an organization of, and for, students. It is set for the proclamation and defense of the gospel.

A student group in any higher educational institution may become affiliated with the League. Its membership may range in size from three to the total number of students in the institution. The procedure is exceedingly simple, and is explained in the following extract from the Constitution:

"And student association, society, or club of any theological seminary, school for the training of Christian workers, college, or other institution of higher learning may apply for membership in the League upon the ratification and adoption of this constitution by a three-fourths vote of its members. Otherwise, a local chapter of the League may be formed, consisting of not less than three members, such a chapter to have the same standing—in proportion to the number of its members—as an entire student body or association that constitutes a branch of the League.

"Application for membership shall be sent to the Secretary or General Secretary of the League." (Article III, Sections 3 and 5.)

The Evangelical Student is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

VOL. IV

Wheaton, Illinois. October 1929

No. 1

EDITORIAL

“**Y**E SHALL be my witnesses.” These words spoken just before His ascension express the final charge of Jesus to His disciples. And having tarried at Jerusalem until they had received power from on high through the coming of the Holy Spirit, they went out to make disciples of all nations by publishing the good news, that is, by confession of the name of Jesus, giving testimony or bearing witness to Him. The activity of the apostles may be summed up as that of bearing witness to Jesus, and, if we may believe tradition, all save one sealed their testimony with a martyr’s (witness’) death. And John tells us that he was in the isle called Patmos for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus. Of John the Baptist it is written, “There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for witness bearing, to bear witness of the Light.” (John 1:6f.) The apostle Paul informs us that at his conversion he was appointed a witness for Christ to all men. (Acts 22:15.)

And long before this final meeting the disciples must have been informed as to the character of their task. At least as early as Caesarea Philippi the paramount significance of witness bearing was brought home to them in a very forceful way. Jesus asked, “Who do men say that the Son of Man is?” (Matthew 16:13.) Jesus did not ask this question as to what men were thinking and saying about him out of idle curiosity. He knew well enough that among the people he was regarded as a prophet, whether as Elijah or Jeremiah or the Baptist. No, he asked this question because what men were thinking and saying about Him determined their eternal destinies, and He wanted to call forth from Peter, as the spokesman for the twelve, the true confession which touches the heart of the Gospel, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” And He impressed the significance of this confession upon them more when He declared that this confession of Peter was not the product of human observation or human reflection, but the revelation of His Father in heaven; and He then went on to say that upon this confession of Peter, or upon Peter as the first confessing member, He was to establish His church.

Witness bearing is therefore central. The church is true to her King only if she is a witnessing church. The minister is faithful to his Lord only if in season and out of season he proclaims the gospel of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. “For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?” (Romans 10:13f.) The believer proves his loyalty and sincerity by confessing the

name of Jesus. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Romans 10:10.) *This call to bear witness to Jesus is at once the justification for the League of Evangelical Students and its central task.* The indifference and hostility to the claims of Jesus which prevail in the student world led to its organization, and continue to challenge the evangelical students of America to unite in bearing witness to Him.

The early confession of the Christians was that Jesus is Lord. Peter's confession was not a very long statement. The gospel of the grace of God in Christ is very simple—the humblest sinner can grasp it. But the gospel in its simplest terms may not be separated from the gospel in its widest implications. If Jesus is Lord, those who are His servants cannot but be loyal to His Word. The revelation in Christ the Son of the living God, is exceedingly rich in content. And the Christian may not neglect a single aspect of this revelation. He must appropriate the riches of his inheritance. In the very nature of the case our confession may not be pared down to a minimum, but should be enlarged with our increasing understanding and appreciation of the revelation of God in Christ. So the believing church, guided by the Spirit of God, has accepted this revelation as the Word of God, has meditated and reflected upon it, has borne witness to it, and especially in times of great unbelief and denial has given expression to its belief in the historic creeds or confessions.

This is a time when there is a widespread demand that the creeds be shelved. Men desire a creedless Christianity. But the evangelical student is not willing to go along with this current. He accepts the Bible as the Word of God, and therefore also is conscious of the truth that the exalted King of the church is guiding it into the truth by His spirit. Indifference or hostility to creeds is not an isolated phenomenon, but is only one expression of the modern world's indifference or hostility to the truth of God's revelation in Christ, its failure to believe that Jesus is Lord and to bear witness to Him. If revelation is legend and belief is superstition, then confession is foolishness and the creeds are scraps of paper. For the correct answer to the question, What is Christianity? it is necessary to go back to the Bible, to the gospels, to primitive Christianity, to Jesus. Certainly. But Christianity is alive, and its life must be studied not only in its beginnings but also in its historical development. It is a very basic question, therefore, whether, for example, the Christianity of the Reformation and the Christianity of the first disciples of Jesus are one in essence, or whether they represent two quite different forms of religion. The evangelical, taking his stand upon the Bible as the Word of God and trusting in the faithfulness of God to fulfill His promises, is conscious of continuity and essential unity, even though his eyes are not closed to the variegated aspects of the historical development of the church. The evangelical student studies first of all the Scriptures, but he will not be unconcerned about the confessions. The study of the Bible should stimulate one to study the confessions. I believe, therefore have I spoken.

Another expression of this indifference to truth in general, and to the truth of revelation in particular, is found in the common assertion that Christianity has little or nothing to do with theology and doctrine, and in the contention that Christianity is a life. The evangelical does not at all object to a great emphasis being placed upon the cultivation of the Christian virtues. He also has as his goal conformity to the image of Christ. But he will not allow a false opposition to be set up between doctrine and life. He objects when he is told that salvation is by character, and that the justification by faith alone is an immoral doctrine. Men say, God isn't going to ask you about theology, but whether you have lived righteously, and appeal to Micah 6:8, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" But this very text has tremendous doctrinal implications: it proves that theology and life cannot be separated. The prophet is giving a summary of the law of God, which demands perfect religion and perfect morality; and it was to men who found these demands beyond their ability to fulfill that Jesus declared, "Everyone who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven, but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny." (Matthew 15:33.)

But then it may be said that after all the confession of Jesus has very little to do with theology, that the best witness borne to Jesus is in living a Christ-like life. But certainly the imperfect lives of the noblest Christians can never adequately express the fullness of the gospel of Christ. Too close an identification of western civilization with Christianity invariably causes the oriental to stumble; those who are truly concerned about the advancement of the cause of Christ can never be content with the testimony to Jesus which their lives can give. The riches of the gospel are not exhausted in subjective attainment; they are concerned first of all with an objective revelation. And that is why bearing witness to Jesus is primarily an act of speech. In carrying out the task that had been assigned them, the disciples of Jesus were called upon to bear witness to the truth of certain propositions, the truth of certain things that they had seen and heard. They had to tell a story which they themselves believed to be true, and expected others to accept as true. They imparted knowledge of certain events, and the meaning of these events. In short, they concerned themselves first of all with the sphere of truth, appealing to the intellect and understanding. In bearing witness to Jesus, they talked theology.

Were the first Christians really concerned about theology, or were they simple folk whose schooling had been very meager? This is a rather sharp formulation of a question which is often asked with great seriousness, as though we had to do here with irreconcilables. The first Christians were as a whole unlettered, but concern for theology is not dependent very much upon one's learning or ignorance. A doctor of divinity may care nothing for theology; a fisherman who has gone to school only a few years may be truly appreciative of it. The really decisive question is not whether one is learned or ignorant, but whether one loves the truth or is indifferent toward it. And it is evident enough that the first Christians were greatly

concerned about the truth. Whether they followed Jesus or left him depended upon whether they accepted His claims as true or regarded them as blasphemous. Having been nurtured upon the Old Testament they continued to search the Scriptures, which Jesus had given them every encouragement to regard as the Word of God. And after the outpouring of the Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, they went out to bear witness to Jesus, to witness to His suffering and death and resurrection, to proclaim repentance and remission of sins in His name unto all nations.

Still another expression of this widespread indifference to truth is the pragmatist's discounting of theological discussion as getting one nowhere, and his challenge to the church to forget all about the petty theological differences which separate it into sects and denominations and to unite on a big program of Christian activity. Since truth is a relative term, and it does not matter much what men believe, all the energy expended in theological controversy may well be diverted into a channel of activity that the world may be won for Christ. This call to unite upon a program of activity even though there may be no agreement as to doctrine is directly in line with the movement among the largest Protestant churches to unite into one big organization. But the unity of the church is something far deeper than church union. It is not only an aspiration but a reality. The real unity of the churches consists in their common loyalty to their King and to His Word, and a united witness to him. The contention here is not that organic church union is necessarily bad. In fact it is highly desirable that churches unite which are really agreed as to the gospel, and can stand for a common testimony. Church union as the expression of love for the truth and a zeal for witness bearing is admirable. But if men disagree widely as to what Christianity is, how can they unite upon a program of Christian activity? Then church union becomes an expression of indifference to the truth of the gospel, and a willingness to substitute something purely external for it. The League of Evangelical Students is an interdenominational organization, but does not advocate that all denominational lines be wiped out; without favoring the modern movement to unite the churches it is an evidence of the deeper unity of the church. It is a manifestation of deep interest in the truth of the gospel, and of earnest endeavor to witness to the truth.

N. B. S.

THE SELF-AFFIRMATION OF JESUS

WILLIAM C. ROBINSON

“**B**UT Ye, who say ye that I am?” With that arresting question Jesus has confronted every generation. And in every generation two answers have been given—the answer of the natural man; and the answer which is the reaction to the Father’s revelation. There is something to be learned from each answer. That others saw in Him the likeness of John the Baptist, or Elijah, is a declaration that Jesus was no moral pacifist, no theological pussyfooter. That others saw Him the compassionate Jeremiah is proof that even the men of the world had before them a matchless revelation of divine compassion. That he was reckoned by the world a prophet testifies to the authority of His words and the response which they elicited in hearts first stamped with the Divine image.

Naturalism’s Answer. And the answer of naturalistic liberalism is today instructive, only as warning. The naturalist today sees in Jesus a unique religious character, perhaps a prophet (a spiritual “sport”). In the day of Jesus there were many religious conceptions. One after another these religious terms were applied to Him and consecutively the meaning of these terms, Christ, Sainted Intercessor, Lord, Logos, were emptied into the conception of Jesus—from the Messianic background of Jewish thought, from the apocryphal teachings of saints as intercessors, from the heathen mysteries, from Platonic and Stoic philosophy until by these successive steps the formula of Nicaea is arrived at. The whole process is a subjective matter—the Christian idea of Jesus is declared only a symbol.

But naturalism cannot stop even here. John long ago assured us that “whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.” The Unitarian Schism is a living proof of the words of the Apostle. Unitarian periodicals boast that their missionaries in the South start by giving the people Channing, since the South is too conservative for the real stuff. Well, Channing has been dead many years, and much water has flowed even under the Unitarian bridge since. The trend and the spirit of Unitarianism today is represented no longer by Channing. In his old church the exalted Bishop of Boston Brahmins can gather only a third or a fourth of a house for a morning service on a clear communion Sunday. A popular present-day Unitarian preacher is John Dietrich of Minneapolis, Minn., whose disciples (“Divinity” students) are sending shivers down the backs of staid Unitarian congregations to which they minister and are applying caustic criticism to those professors who defend theism around Boston. Dietrich advocates a godless religion of evolution and humanity. The only article in his creed is belief in man. In regard to God he is an agnostic with an anti-theistic trend. From Channing to Dietrich—just the journey charted by John; but Southerners ought to know what they are getting when they line up with Unitarian propaganda today.

But this godless religion is not confined to the Unitarian fold. The Boston papers in the month of March, 1927, were full of the fight of the modernistic pastor with the South Congregational Church of Pittsfield,

Mass., which resulted in his resignation being accepted. In the *Boston Globe* of March 18th, Rev. Vincent Godfrey Burns gave out an interview in his own defense. In this interview and an article published in the *Herald* for March 23rd, Mr. Burns was represented as a graduate of Union Theological Seminary (N. Y.) and "an ardent disciple of the Fosdick, modernistic school." The last paragraph of the interview published in the *Globe* (given out by Burns in his own defense) reads: "Millions bow in worship to an imaginary God every Sunday and on Monday they neglect the only God they can really help, their brother at the gate." This end of modernism, then, is a mere rehashing of Comte's "religion" of humanity; and the relegating of God to the limbo of a subjective fear complex, as a Columbia University professor recently declared in trying to popularize his psychology in a Sunday supplement.

Bousset in his *Kurios Christos* raised the question as to whether there was a historic basis for the finite God idea in early Christianity. After toying with it for a moment he dismissed it, as impossible. McGiffert has taken up the idea and presented it in his *God of the Early Christians*. From the Catholic Modernist camp, Dr. George La Piana has voiced a trenchant criticism of this thesis (*Ricerche Religiose*, Nov., 1925).

A review of the early literature shows that it is impossible to accept the idea that the early Christians had no urgent doctrine of a supreme God. R. Seeberg presents as the first of the features common to the Apostolic Fathers, "faith in the One God, the Creator of the world." Cf. e. g. Diognetus. The historic habitat of the religion of a finite God and this "godless Christianity" must be found in the rise of modern religious ideas.

Dietrich professes a supreme passion to save the world from Christian orthodoxy (*The Fathers of Evolution*—John Dietrich, 1927, pp. 249). He endeavors to show that the universe can be accounted for in a purely natural way and that there is no place for the supernatural. Matter and energy he regards as eternal; the universe contains the potentiality of all things; everything is the outcome by natural laws and forces of its preceding states. Alongside of these bald statements of one who professes to be a religious leader and interpreter should be put the broken hearted cry of a father, Louis Untermeyer, critic and poet. The papers of March 11th, 1927, quote Untermeyer on the suicide of his son at Yale to the effect that we are so scientifically orientated that there is no place left for religion; and that he will give his life to the restoring of a faith, at least, in life. Naturalism! Instead of steps up, an apotheosis to glory—steps down to death! "He that denieth the Son has not the father . . . he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life." (I John —).

Faith's Answer. Faith believes that Jesus is true and eternal God, who for us men and for our salvation, became incarnate. That he is the infinite and incomprehensible God; whose depths of being and heights of glory cannot be measured; Who in His days on earth took various names and titles which properly express various aspects of His work and relations as historically manifested; but no one of which exhausts His

meaning or glory. These names He Himself definitely took; or definitely approved in their content. By taking these different titles by wearing them He raised them. Even the name of Jesus, because of Him who bears it, becomes the Name which is above every Name. We believe that Jesus is infinite sided and that no one of these names exhausts His glory, nor all of them put together. Put him in any frame and He ennobles every noble picture; yea He overflows every mental container. The terms Messiah, Kurios, Logos do not add glory to Him; He bears those terms and raises each one to heights of glory, moral and metaphysical, surpassing fondest imaginings of saints, brightest hopes of Isaiahs. More than this, faith believes that in so receiving her Lord she is simply accepting His own lofty evaluation of Himself. Faith accepts Jesus' self-affirmation, she receives His self-disclosure.

Perhaps one of the best examples of this self-disclosure is found in Matthew 11:25-30. This passage is a veritable ocean of inexhaustible riches. We can only hope to dip a few cups from its fullness. For those who are critically minded it may be mentioned, in the beginning, that the essence of the passage is also found in Luke 10:21, 22. This is evidence for the fact that it must be included in any original Quell.

I. Jesus affirms His own Messianic Person and Mission. It is true that here we find a different tone from that of the current Jewish expectations; but that difference is just Jesus taking Messiahship as His garb and by wearing it lifting it to heights worthy of a God. For Him, Messiahship is not Israel-centered; but God-centered. In the midst of seeming disappointments He can rejoice in the Father. His supreme concern in the Messiahship is that presented by Isaiah, the servant. He was identified by baptismal words, "In whom I am well pleased," with the Servant-Messiah of Isaiah. He wrought as His great concern that the Father might be well pleased, might have all the glory and duty and service that would fill full the ideal of Messiahship. And His other great concern as Messiah was to obey the will of the Father in satisfying every need of human souls. He inaugurated His ministry with Isaianic words of good news for the destitute, release to the captive, the opening of eyes to those blinded by dungeon dark, liberty, acceptance with God. Here His matchless words are: Come! all ye that labor and are heavy laden—hither to me; and I will give you rest . . . ye shall find rest for your souls. How Jesus loves to assure us of His fullness of supply for our every need. Does the spirit sag? "I am the bread of life." Does the heart mourn? "I am the Resurrection and the Life . . . I bind up the broken heart." Is the hand blindly fumbling for a guide? "I am the light of the world . . . he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Are the dynamos of life exhausted in lassitude and weariness? "He that believeth in me shall never thirst; for the water which I will give shall be in Him a well of water springing up into life eternal." As our tender Southern poet, Sidney Lanier, wrote: "Where are the strong arms in which I too might lay me and repose and yet be full of the fire of life? And always through the twilight came answer from the other world

—Master, Master, there is one, one Christ. . . . And in His arms we rest.” “Come unto me and I will give you rest.” “Yea, Master,” Augustine replies, “Thou hast made us for thyself and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee.” Jesus took the lowliest Messianic term which Isaiah gave, Servant, and put into it His immense consciousness of His own person. By wearing it and filling and glorifying it in utter obedience to God, in utter service to men, He manifested that the servant of all was the Lord of all. Through the form of Messiahship is seen that other Isaianic picture, Immanuel, the Holy One of Israel, come to be her Saviour.

II. Jesus Affirms His Lordship. “All things have been delivered unto me of my Father.” We do not need to wait for Antioch and Greek mysteries for the quality of Lordship. Jesus took and realized the conception of Lordship or Dominion in His relations with men on earth. His demands, and obligations are those of an absolute Lord. He will brook no second place in men’s affections, no delay in His call, no divided service. Especially the eschatological passages of the Synoptics abound in the loftiest ascriptions of dominion, and often with the use of the word Lord by Jesus Himself. The original Aramaic of this term may have been generally a mere title of respect. But as used by Jesus in these loftiest passages it approximates the ascription of divine glory to Himself. It is hard to see how even the word God could have heightened the glory which Jesus affirms of Himself in His use of Lord as recorded in Matthew 7:21; 25:44. Not lower is the usage of the 110th Psalm, of Jesus. And this usage of the 110th Psalm in the three Synoptics and the early speeches of Acts cannot easily be transferred to Gentile Christianity as Rawlinson (*The New Testament Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*) shows against Bousset’s hypothesis.

The earliest preserved prayer used by the Aramaic-speaking Christians at their celebration of the Lord’s Supper was Marana Tha—The Lord Cometh. Rawlinson and Deissmann find in this an evidence for the fact that Lord was used of Jesus in the original Jewish Christian Church. A careful study of the early speeches of Acts shows that the conception which the first Church had of Jesus was a religious one—fellowship with the exalted Kurios. In the Synoptics and in the early speeches of Acts the term Lord is used; and what is of much importance, the conception of Lordship is present very early. A critical reconstruction of the titles in the Synoptics does not remove the quality of Lordship from the Person there presented, standing self-supported in lonely might and majesty.

Nor is it possible to accept the view that Paul could have taken over a conception of Christ as that of a heathen cult Lord. Deissmann (*Paul*, translation 1926) declares that Paul ever remained a Jew, a Bible Jew, a *Septuagint* Jew. The Septuagint translated both Adonai and Jehovah by the Greek Kurios. Could this Hebrew of the Hebrews have used Kurios (as a Jew) of the supreme God, and Kurios of Jesus as a finite cult deity? Again, Deissmann finds that Paul speaks of the manifestation of Christ in the same words (ophthen) which the Septuagint uses of a Theophany.

“God revealed His Son in Me;” “just as God created light on the first day so He shined into my heart to give the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ.” This Septuagint Jew with his heart full of the theophanies of God to his people, and his mind full of Israel’s God whom he worshiped as Kurios saw a theophany on the road of Damascus; and heard a voice speaking to him. And to his question who the Kurios might be, the answer came back “Jesus.” Jesus affirmed His Lordship to His disciples in the word recorded in Matthew 11:27; He reaffirmed that Lordship by a divine theophany to Saul a worshipper of Jehovah, as Kurios.

III. Jesus Affirms that He is the Unique Revelation and Revealer of God. This great verse of Matthew in its heavenly grandeur has been called an aerolite from the Johannine heavens. Doubtlessly, many would like to relegate it elsewhere and obviate the need of dealing with the strong critical evidence of the Synoptics. But here it stands a great granite boulder towering above the landscape. As long as it stands Harnack’s learned exposition of the Logos doctrine of Philo; Platonic and Stoic similarities suggested by Justin Martyr will fail to make the Logos doctrine a product of Greek philosophy. True Greek philosophic thinking immediately took up the term and on the basis of it brought in a vast amount of subordinationism, which still clings, in some quarters, to the doctrine of the Person of Christ. But the lofty consciousness of Jesus must be considered as standing behind the great prologue of the Fourth Gospel. He affirms that He, and He alone knows God, yea knows Him fully. Man can only know sense perceptions, we are told. But here is One who professes not only to know the *ding an sich*; but even to know it fully when that reality is the Father in Heaven. There is a fulness of knowledge and an interpenetration of being expressed in these words. The Father in all His fulness and majesty and glory of invisibility is known by no one—save by the Son. And the Son is of such fulness of divine glory and essence that only such an one as the Father can fully know Him. These words of supernal knowledge, of fulness of intimacy and closeness of fellowship bespeak an interpenetration and intussusception of spiritual interrelationship, and of identity of nature between the Son and the Father. Out of this divine Sonship the Messiah is the Revealer of the Father. Out of this transcendent consciousness of His Christhood comes the Logos doctrine found in that Gospel which has the loftiest appreciation of His heavenly glory. But it should be noted that Jesus used the word Son to express His relation to the Father and His likeness and His revealer. And this word Son, even more than Logos, was the basis of the formulation by the Church of the dogma of the consubstantial Deity of the Son.

Faith believes that in these pregnant words Jesus has allowed the veil to be drawn aside and something of His eternal divine glory to shine through. One of faith’s greatest reasons for accepting the deity of Christ is that He taught His own deity; and His word is that of one to be trusted.

A word, then, to those to whom it hath been given to believe Jesus’

self-revelation. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto you but my Father which is in heaven." Faith is a mighty thing, the mightiest thing—not because of him who has it; but because of Him who inspires it and of Him in whom it confides. When the deniers of that faith are legion; and their denials are absolute, let us press to our hearts that great word with which a young scholar by the name of John Calvin used repeatedly to establish the hearts of the little flock of Parisian Protestants, "If God be for us who can be against us?" And it is just this consoling sovereign view of God that was so potent and precious to our Calvinistic forefathers, which is presented in the eleventh chapter of Matthew. The Son on whom our souls depend, the Son whose depths of being only the Father can plumb, is the Son who sits in sovereign judgment upon the men and cities and nations of all history (Matthew 11:20-24), as the supreme, eternal, and final arbiter of destinies. The Father who hath revealed unto us this faith, whose heights of glory only the Son can fathom, is the Father who hides things from the wise and prudent and reveals them to babes, because so to do is well pleasing in His own sight. (Matthew 11:25, 26.) Jesus makes Himself a co-sharer and fellow of the Father in the sovereign glory of God. Jesus assures us that our faith is reaction to the action of the sovereign God. The fact of faith is the blest consolation that the sovereign God is for us, "who can be against us?"

"THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS"*

OSWALD T. ALLIS

THESE words form a brief but very striking summary of the attitude of the New Testament to the Old. When we meet them in such a statement as, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," it is clear that they stand for the Old Testament as a whole. The two great commandments which describe our duty toward God and our duty toward our fellow-men are the great theme of the Old Testament Scriptures. This phrase is significant therefore for two reasons; because it emphasizes the unity of those Scriptures, the fact that they have a common theme and purpose, and also because it indicates that the two great elements of which this unity is composed are the law and the prophets.

THE BIBLE A SELF-CONSISTENT BOOK

That the Bible is a self-consistent, self-interpretative book has been the belief of Jews (as regards the Old Testament) and Christians alike throughout the centuries. It is clearly set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith in the following significant statement: "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one,) it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly." A distinguished theologian, Dr. Charles Hodge, has expressed it as follows: "If the Scriptures be what they claim to be, the word of God, they are the work of one mind, and that divine. From this it follows that Scripture cannot contradict Scripture. God cannot teach in one place any thing which is inconsistent with what He teaches in another. Hence Scripture must explain Scripture."

THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS

The harmony between the prophetic and the priestly elements in the Old Testament which justifies the use of the phrase, the law *and* the prophets, is also very apparent. Moses was a prophet; and in Deuteronomy he is expressly declared to be the type of the greatest of all the prophets, the Messiah who was to come. Yet Moses, we are expressly told, instituted the priestly ritual and ordained Aaron and his sons. Elijah offered a sacrifice to the Lord and was proved to be a true prophet of the Lord by the acceptance of his offering. The 53rd of Isaiah, one of the loftiest, if not the loftiest, of the prophetic utterances in the Old Testament uses distinctly priestly language. Jeremiah of Anathoth, regarded by many as the greatest of the prophets, was of priestly descent. John the Baptist, whom our Lord described as a prophet and much more than a prophet, was likewise the son of a priest; and the words with which he hails the world's Redeemer, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," are borrowed from the priestly ritual of the Old Testament

*This timely article was originally published in pamphlet form in 1925, and is here reproduced with only minor changes. Additional copies can be procured from *The Presbyterian*, 1217 Market St., Philadelphia, Pa., at ten cents each.

law. Clearly, priest and prophet are bound to one another by the closest of ties.

UNITY OF THE SCRIPTURES DENIED BY LIBERALS

It is important to bear these facts clearly in mind because the unity of Scripture has been emphatically challenged in recent years by influential scholars. Far from maintaining that the Old Testament Scriptures are characterized by unity and harmony of teaching, it is the view of those scholars who adopt what is commonly called the "higher criticism" that they contain many contradictions. Thus Professor McFadyen of Glasgow has recently declared that the "Old Testament is too splendidly human a book to be dominated by any mechanical unity: it speaks with a double voice, indeed with many voices." And he asserts that on matters of by no means minor importance there is "an endless variety of opinion in the Old Testament." We need only turn to any one of the numerous "Introductions" to the Old Testament which are written from the "critical" standpoint and notice the way in which the alleged differences in diction, ideas, viewpoint, etc., between the "Jehovist" and the "Elohists," the "Deuteronomist" and the "Priestly" writer are stressed, to convince ourselves that the disintegrating analyses upon which the critics are constantly engaged are based not upon the harmony, unity and full credibility of Scripture but upon the conviction that the "apparent" harmony is the result of a harmonizing process which has only imperfectly succeeded in overcoming and concealing a host of differences and disagreements, which it is the duty of the "critical" student to seek out and explain. We have, according to the critics, two or more accounts of Creation, the Flood, the Crossing of the Red Sea, the Conquest of Canaan, etc.—accounts which are so diverse as to be more or less contradictory. To the "critic," then, the phrase, "the unity of the Scriptures," in the strict and historic sense of the words, is meaningless or at best the expression of a naive, superficial judgment which breaks down at once when put to the test of scholarly investigation.

"PROPHETIC RELIGION" VERSUS "PRIESTLY RELIGION"

And this theory of an "inner contradiction," as it may be called, finds its clearest expression, we are told, in the antagonism between the two great representatives of Old Testament religion, the prophet and the priest. Thus Professor McFadyen tells us: "But all such differences tend to resolve themselves broadly into two opposing categories, the prophetic and the priestly. . . ." While such a statement may come as a surprise to many, it has long been advocated in "critical" circles. Twenty-five years ago Doctor, now Bishop, Headlam spoke of "a tendency which I have noticed is becoming rather common in certain writers, of emphasizing very strongly the distinction between the prophetic and Levitical elements in the Old Testament, and of condemning the latter, or at any rate minimizing very considerably its importance." And even when Dr. Headlam made this statement it was nearly forty years since Graf had asserted that Jer. vii 22-23 proved that "the middle books of the Pentateuch" could not have been known in the days of Jeremiah "who taught that the sur-

render of the heart to God, piety and obedience to the moral law were all that was necessary to true wellbeing." This revolutionary doctrine which means that the bulk of the Law was both *non*-Mosaic and *post*-prophetic soon became a fundamental postulate of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, which is at present dominant in "critical" circles. "It is no new matter," wrote Wellhausen, "but a thing well known, that sacrifices are not what the Torah of the Lord contains."

MINIMIZES IMPORTANCE OF SACRIFICE

This theory of an opposition on the part of the prophets to the priestly element in the Old Testament, has been stated with varying degrees of severity. According to Professor Addis of Oxford the prophets "held that sacrifice was an affair of quite subordinate importance." Professors Bailey (Worcester Academy) and Kent (Yale) declare that, "The prophets knew very well that ritual and sacrifice had little to do with true religion." Professor Fowler of Brown University tells us that according to the prophets, "Mere sacrifices were not the only means of intercourse with the Deity." These statements it will be noted all show an unmistakable tendency to minimize the importance of sacrifice.

OR REJECTS IT ENTIRELY

But the antithesis can be, and frequently is, much more sharply drawn. Wellhausen, who has told us negatively that "sacrifices are not what the Torah of the Lord contains," tells us positively that the sacrificial ritual was "at first the bond connecting Israel with heathenism." This means, of course, that the Old Testament sacrifices were essentially pagan in origin. It is not surprising then that we should find the alleged antithesis presented in a very drastic way by representatives of the Graf-Wellhausen school. The following statements are worthy of careful pondering: Professor Badé of the Pacific School of Religion asserts that, "Few mistakes have introduced greater confusion into the study of Old Testament religion than the hoary assumption that the great prophets and the ritual laws of the Pentateuch agree in their valuation of sacrifice. In Ezekiel, Leviticus and kindred priestly literature God's favor is dependent upon a strict performance of the ritual. The prophets from Amos to Jeremiah denounce and repudiate this view." Professor Bewer of Union Theological Seminary (New York) in commenting on the popular religion of Israel says, "But Jeremiah was sure that Yahweh had never commanded any sacrifices, but had required from the fathers nothing but obedience to the moral law, and that was His sole requirement now (Jer. vii. 21-26)." A distinguished German scholar, Professor Cornill of Halle, declares that "Jeremiah was the first to set religion consciously free from all extraneous and material elements, and to establish it on a purely spiritual basis." And he holds that this "touches directly the kernel and substance of religion. Another scholar, Professor Eiselen of Garrett Biblical Institute, assures us that Jeremiah "declares the whole sacrificial system to be an abomination to Jehovah." According to the late Professor G. B. Gray of Oxford "Sacrifice and many of the forms of religion Israel shared with the nations, and it is not the institution, but the

repudiation, of sacrifice that distinguishes the religion of Israel." Professor George Foote Moore of Harvard maintains that "It is the fundamental doctrine of prophecy: the will of God is wholly moral. For worship he cares nothing at all; for justice, fairness, and goodness between man and man he cares everything." In commenting on Jeremiah vii. 21-23 which he says "contradicts Deuteronomy and even more strongly Leviticus in their repeated statements that in the wilderness God also commanded sacrifice," Principal George Adam Smith of Aberdeen University cites 1 Sam. xv, Hosea vi. 6 and Amos v. 25 and then says, "And the following passages (he refers to Micah vi and Ps. 1 and li) only render more general the truth that Israel's God has no pleasure at any time in the sacrifices offered to Him with the institution of which—the natural reference is—He can have had nothing to do." Professor J. M. Powis Smith of Chicago University declares, "It is the glory of the prophet at his best that he allowed nothing to share the place that belonged of right to ethics alone. . . . In contrast with the earlier emphasis upon sacrifice, the later prophets are always minimizing it and exalting ethical and social duties, *e. g.* Amos v. 25, Jer. vii. 22, Micah vi. 6-8."

THEORY A VERY POPULAR ONE TODAY

In view of such statements it is not surprising that we should find Professor Lofthouse of Handworth College remarking: "The rivalry between prophet and priest is a commonplace in most presentations of Hebrew history." Indeed "rivalry" is hardly strong enough to cover some of the statements quoted. Prophetic *rejection* of sacrifice could hardly be more drastically stated. It is also clearly apparent that in this "rivalry" the modern critic takes his stand emphatically with the prophet as against the priest, or, as Dr. Orchard of London has expressed it, that he has "restored" the prophets in the Old Testament "to a regulative position." "If it seems dogmatism," Professor McFadyen declares, "to say, as one has said, that it is the prophets who laid the true foundations and proclaimed the essence of true religion, it is at any rate a dogmatism which would be supported by the consensus of Christian scholarship." It is clear then that according to the "critical" scholar the Old Testament Scriptures are not merely not a unity, but that markedly diverse and even contradictory viewpoints are represented in them, and further that these differences of viewpoint find their strongest expression in the antithesis which some of these scholars would express in most drastic terms between the law and the prophets.

HAS DISASTROUS BEARING ON NEW TESTAMENT

This theory of a thoroughgoing antithesis between the law and the prophets has obviously a most important bearing upon the understanding and the valuation of the Scriptures. If the Old Testament Scriptures contradict themselves, this is a matter of far-reaching significance. Two contradictory viewpoints cannot both be true. If the "prophetic" conception of sacrifice as defined by the critics is correct, the emphasis placed by the law upon ritual sacrifice is both false and dangerous. This can only mean that a large part of the Old Testament represents a conception

of religion which is now rejected as unworthy. And the theory does not stop there; its New Testament implications are even more serious. One of the scholars quoted above, Professor Cornill, tells us, "Jesus of Nazareth in contrast to the pharisaical Judaism of his time purposely links his own activity to the prophecy of ancient Israel, himself its purest blossom and noblest fruit . . . The Christian Church has known no better designation for the earthly pilgrimage of its founder than to speak of him in his office as prophet." Another writer, Professor Kirsopp Lake of Harvard, in a recent contribution to the *Hibbert Journal* predicts that the "experimentalist" (a new and very suggestive name for "liberal") will regard Jesus as "one of the greatest of the prophets" although he is careful to state that such advanced thinkers will hardly be prepared to accept as true for this modern world everything that Jesus said. Professor Fagnani of Union Theological Seminary (New York) assures us that "There is one, and only one, religion that is different from all the others, and that one is to be seen in the teaching of the great prophets of Israel . . ." What is this unique religion? "The prophetic religion stresses," he tells us, "the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the establishment on earth of the 'Kingdom of God,' or the organization of the real democracy, which involves world-wide co-operation for the common good." Jesus is set before us by this writer as the greatest of the prophets of Israel, as one in whom the religion of the prophets attained its fullest development. But he tells us definitely that "Jesus was not a Trinitarian, Jesus did not proclaim Himself God, He did not claim worship." And he regards the "Savior-God of Paul, of Hellenism, and of historic Christianity" as a perversion of the "religion of Jesus." "In the religion of Jesus God is a just and tender Father who forgives a prodigal son when he comes back, simply because he loves him and not because an innocent victim has suffered in his stead." A distinguished Jewish scholar, ex-President Kohler of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, uses very similar language. He declares that "No intermediary power from without secures the divine grace and pardon for the repentant sinner, but his own inner transformation alone." "The great prophets of Israel alone recognized that the entire sacrificial system was out of harmony with the true spirit of Judaism." A Unitarian writer, W. H. Fish, uses this theory to justify "the simple rational view which Unitarians generally hold, according to which, after being reconciled or turned away from our selfishness and drawn to God through the impression made by the absolute self-sacrifice illustrated in the death of Christ, we are saved from our sins and the consequent divine displeasure by the help, the guidance and the inspiration of his life." A liberal theologian, Professor G. A. Barton of the Episcopal Divinity School (Philadelphia), assures us that Psalm li anticipates "in principle the parable of the prodigal son. The Father needs no propitiation except the penitence of the son for whom he has waited so long." And he adds, "The Old Testament contains no more spiritual view of religion than this. Here is the flower of its piety." Thus, we see that Reform Jew and Unitarian unite with the Liberal Christian in

making true religion a religion without sacrifice; and further that they support it by an appeal to the theory of an antithesis between the prophet and the priest and reject either avowedly or by implication the atonement of Christ.

CAN THIS DISASTROUS INFERENCE BE AVOIDED?

The serious nature of the inferences—as to both the Old Testament and the New—which are being drawn from the “critical” theory of a prophetic rejection of sacrifice makes it vitally important for the Christian of today to face two questions: Is the critical theory of “prophetic religion” true? and, Is the New Testament inference from this theory necessary? The natural order to discuss these questions would be the order of statement; for the second is of real validity and practical interest only if the first receives an affirmative answer. But, in view of the statements which we have just quoted in which the New Testament inference is stated in uncompromising form, it will be well for us to consider the second question briefly before passing on to the first and fundamental problem. This seems advisable because it will be objected at once that these quotations are not representative of “critical” opinion regarding the atonement of Christ. That the inference is logical and natural will perhaps hardly be denied. But it will be affirmed that there are many Christians who hold “critical” opinions relative to the Old Testament who yet continue to regard the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin. That there are such Christians, perhaps many of them, we are not disposed to deny. The point, however, is this. How do they avoid drawing the natural and logical inference from their acceptance of a conception of religion which makes sacrifice not merely unnecessary but even vicious? There are two principal ways by which this inference is evaded. The first is by ignoring it.

TO IGNORE IT IS DANGEROUS

There are many who simply do not draw the New Testament inference. They accept the conclusions of the critics with regard to the Old Testament, they accept the alleged prophetic rejection of sacrifice; but when it comes to the New Testament, the emphasis placed upon the necessity of the death of Christ and its vital significance for the Christian is so inescapably plain that they dare not deny it. It is also stated so clearly in our hymns, in our historic creeds, and enters so prominently into the historic faith of the Church that they cannot escape it. They are obviously in an illogical and hence unsafe position. The conclusions which they have accepted with regard to the Old Testament are logically destructive of their New Testament faith. It is better of course to be an illogical Christian than a logical unbeliever; but their attitude toward the great Old Testament prefigurement of the atonement cannot but act as a hindrance to a high regard for or insistent emphasis upon the necessity and full meaning of the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin. In other words it tends to the ignoring of it—a tendency which is becoming increasingly apparent in books and preaching which represent the “liberal” viewpoint. We have quoted a statement by Professors Bailey and Kent in which as

compared with some others the prophetic rejection of sacrifice is rather temperately stated: "The prophets knew very well that ritual and sacrifice had little to do with true religion." At the close of the book in discussing "Israel's priceless gifts to the world," this is what they tell us about Jesus and Christianity: "From the Hebrew prophets, as well as from Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth, come those principles of justice to all men and classes, of the equality of opportunity and responsibility for every individual and nation, of good-will between men and races, of service to the poor and needy, and of co-operation in building a perfect society which are the essence of democracy and the watchwords of the modern world movement . . . Above all, the Hebrew prophets, psalmists and sages, and the greatest Prophet of them all, have taught men how to enter into living touch and personal co-operation with him, whom to know aright is life eternal." Here the Cross is not denied, but it is completely ignored; and this is tantamount to its positive rejection.

"PROPHETIC SUFFERING" NO SUBSTITUTE FOR "PRIESTLY EXPIATION"

The other way to avoid drawing from this theory the New Testament inference that the sacrificial meaning of the death of Christ must be rejected is by seeking another basis for it than the Old Testament sacrificial ritual. This view has been ably advocated by Principal Smith. He tries to save the Cross by substituting the Old Testament prophets for the ritual sacrifices as the type of the suffering Savior. Thus, he speaks of Jeremiah as breaking "from one type of religious solidarity," by which he means the ritual sacrifices prescribed by the priests, "only to illustrate another and a nobler" type, the necessity of personal vicarious suffering as experienced by the prophets. He speaks of Jeremiah as "the symbol, if not the conscious preacher of vicariousness." More specifically he says of him, "He had given his back to the smiters and his cheeks to them who plucked out the hair . . . He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief . . . It is the second greatest sacrifice that Israel has offered for mankind." And he sums up by saying of this prophet: "he foreshadowed as far as mere man can the sufferings of Jesus Christ for men." This means that the Old Testament prophets notably Jeremiah, are to be regarded as prefiguring by their sufferings with and for their people the atonement of Christ.

MAGNIFIES TYPE AT EXPENSE OF ANTITYPE

The objections to this theory are obvious. There is first the idealizing of the human. Jeremiah was a man, a mere man, a sinful man. Yet his sufferings are made to differ only in degree—"second greatest"—from those of Christ. Israel was a sinful nation, false to its divine vocation, desperately in need of salvation, soon to suffer exile for its sins. Yet Israel is here represented as making an offering for the sin of the world. But the atonement of Christ was not Israel's greatest offering for mankind; it was God's offering for the sin of Israel and of all mankind. There is only one Savior; not Jeremiah, not Israel, but Christ alone. It is not a question of lesser or greater. He is the *alone* Savior. This is emphasized in the typical sacrifices. The sufferings of bull and goats were but slight;

they had no value in themselves; no importance is attached to them. We would never think of comparing their sufferings with His. They served only as feeble types of the perfect sacrifice to come. Principal Smith so magnifies the sufferings of Jeremiah as to make them *almost* equal to the sufferings of Christ. The idealizing of the prophet amounts almost to an apotheosis.

CANNOT EXPLAIN THE CROSS

The second objection is that this theory tends to ignore the meaning and necessity of the *death* of Christ. We do not know how Jeremiah died. We do know that he was expressly spared when Jerusalem fell. We do not know how Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah died. Of Elijah, the great epic figure of prophecy, we are told expressly that he did not die. How then, if the prophets were types of Christ, if Jeremiah "foreshadowed as far as mere man can the sufferings of Jesus Christ for men," can we attach particular significance to His death? And how, if the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice, which makes the shedding of the blood of an innocent victim the means of expiation, is rejected as essentially pagan, can a meaning be attached to Jesus' death which differs essentially from the meaning of His life or the lives of the prophets? The logical tendency of this theory is to regard Christ's death as the supreme expression of that law of vicarious suffering which was so splendidly typified in the heroic witness of the prophets and in all the splendid acts of self-sacrifice which meet us on the pages of human history, whether we think of Leonidas and his Spartans at Thermopylæ, or of the "Unknown Soldier" of the fields of Flanders, and to deny that His *death* was a *unique* act of *expiatory* suffering for the *sin* of the world.

CRITIC CANNOT AVOID DEPRECIATING THE CROSS

Now it is true that Principal Smith's words, "foreshadowed as far as mere man can," leave it open to us to attach, as he apparently does, an expiatory significance to the death of Christ which we cannot give to the sufferings of the prophets. Consequently those who accept the critical theory of "prophetic religion" and yet wish still to believe that Christ died as "a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God" may be thankful to Principal Smith for making it *possible* for them to do this. But it is clear that unless expiatory significance is to be attached to the sufferings of the prophets, which seems to be expressly forbidden by such passages as Jer. xv. 1 and Ezek. xiv. 14 (cf. Jer. vii. 16) and also by the consistent teaching of the Bible that sinful men cannot perform works of supererogation, we are not logically justified as far as the Old Testament is concerned in regarding the sufferings of Christ as expiatory. Consequently while this theory is intended to save for the "liberal" Christian the evangelical doctrine of the Cross, it logically tends toward the very thing it is designed to avoid, the denial of the necessity of atonement for sin. His rejection of the expiatory sacrifices of the Old Testament is the critic's nemesis when he stands before the Cross. He cannot consistently use the words of the Institution of the Supper, or the language of Hebrews where the death of Christ is explained as the fulfilment of

the sacrifices of the ceremonial law. For he has rejected that law of expiation as essentially pagan and hostile to "prophetic religion." And the substitute which he has found, "prophetic suffering," need not be and clearly cannot be regarded as expiatory.

IS "PROPHETIC RELIGION" TRUE? A VITAL QUESTION

This makes it clear how vitally it concerns the Christian to know whether the critical theory of an antithesis between the law and the prophets is true. The law typifies expiation, priestly expiation. If "prophetic religion" rejects sacrifice and if "prophetic religion" is true, the denial of the expiatory significance of Christ's death is the natural and logical inference; and while the sufferings of the prophets may be regarded as typifying the sufferings of Christ and as permitting us to regard them as expiatory, the rejection of the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice with its emphasis on expiation makes it difficult for the Christian to hold on to the expiatory significance of His death. Consequently all those to whom the Lord Jesus Christ is precious as Savior from the *guilt* and *penalty* of sin, should realize the importance of thoroughly investigating this modern theory of "prophetic religion." The Cross is the central truth of Christianity. Any teaching which obscures the Cross, which minimizes or denies its necessity or unique efficacy, is a menace to Christian faith. Is "prophetic religion" true?

"PRIESTLY RELIGION" VERY PROMINENT IN OLD TESTAMENT

It is to be noted in the first place that "prophetic religion" requires the rejection of a large part of the Old Testament. We have but to think of the prominent and important place which "priestly religion" takes in the Pentateuch and in the historical books to realize this. Leviticus and parts of Exodus and Numbers have to be rejected; Deuteronomy, although usually regarded by the critics as a prophetic book, has to be carefully edited. Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, because of their "priestly" emphasis, have to be largely discounted. In short the religion of the early period in which sacrifice figures conspicuously must be regarded as primitive and the religion of the late period in which sacrifice figures no less prominently must be regarded as decadent. The worship of the Tabernacle, Temple, and Second Temple with its tremendous emphasis in act and word on expiation through sacrifice—all falls under the ban of "prophetic religion." This is very significant.

"PROPHETIC RELIGION" NOT TAUGHT BY *all* THE PROPHETS

In the second place it is to be noticed that in defining "prophetic religion," the critic is forced to distinguish carefully not only between *prophet* and *priest*, but between *prophet* and *prophet*. Joel, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, must all be regarded as inferior or renegade prophets because of the emphasis which they place on priestly ritual and the worship of the temple. In other words, the status of a prophet, whether he is a "great" prophet or not, is determined by his attitude towards sacrifice. It is a common thing to denounce Ezekiel. He is called by Wellhausen a "priest in prophet's mantle." Professor McFadyen in speaking of one of his great utterances remarks, "When a priest or a prophet with a

priestly heart stumbles into saying a great thing, it is seldom so great as it looks." This almost contemptuous reference to Ezekiel is due solely to the fact that Ezekiel does not hold that conception of "prophetic religion" as a religion without sacrifice, which the critics regard as the true one. But such language as applied to a prophet of the Lord is its own sufficient condemnation. It is significant that when Professor McFadyen speaks of "prophetic religion" he is obliged to qualify his language by referring to the prophets of the "golden age of prophecy." There are clearly other prophets who hold a very different conception of "prophetic religion" from that announced so confidently by the critics.

NOT TAUGHT BY *any* OF THE PROPHETS

But we observe further that Professor McFadyen is obliged to make a second significant qualification. He speaks not merely of "the prophets of the golden age of prophecy" but also of "certain utterances" of these prophets. This seems to imply that there are utterances of these prophets which do not support the critical theory. We do not need to look far to convince ourselves that such is actually the case. Jeremiah xvii. 19-26, xxx. 14, xxxiii. 11, 18, are clearly out of harmony with the theory that "prophetic religion" was opposed to sacrifice. The same is true of Isa. lvi. 7, lx. 7, lxii. 9, lxvi. 20, passages which the Christian Church has always regarded as Isaianic, and which many critics now deny to their "Great Unknown" of the exilic period largely because of the favorable attitude toward sacrifice expressed in these verses. No wonder then that Professor McFadyen should confine himself to "certain utterances" of the "great" prophets. What are these "certain utterances"?

PROOF-TEXTS OF "PROPHETIC RELIGION"

Among the most important of the "proof-texts" of "prophetic religion" are the following: "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" (Amos v. 25); "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Hosea vi. 6); "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi. 8); "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?" (Isa. i. 11); "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices" (Jer. vii. 22). It will not be possible for us to discuss all of these passages in detail, but we shall take them up in order.

THE CRITICS MISINTERPRET AMOS

Amos v. 21f. is frequently cited as proving that Amos rejected the ritual of sacrifice. The passage reads as follows:

I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as water and righteousness as a mighty stream. Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch

and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves. Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord, whose name is The God of hosts.

Regarding this passage Graf affirmed about fifty years ago that it proved that "in Israel's time of special nearness to Jehovah" there was no sacrifice required. Robertson Smith has used almost identical language regarding it: "The whole ritual sacrifice is to Amos a thing without importance in itself. The Israelites offered no sacrifice in the wilderness and yet Jehovah was never nearer to them than then." Principal Smith likewise refers to "Israel's ideal days in the desert."

ERROR POINTED OUT YEARS AGO

In view of the definiteness of the statements which we have just quoted, it is important to observe that fully a generation ago Keil opposed this interpretation of the critics on the ground that the "forty years" here referred to "denote the time during which the people were sentenced to die in the wilderness after the rebellion at Kadesh"; and he pointed to the fact that in this period the rite of circumcision was allowed to lapse as an indication that Israel ceased to obey the law. Six hundred thousand men (in round numbers) heard the law at Sinai (Ex. xxxviii. 26, Num. ii. 46), six hundred thousand reached the Jordan at the close of the wilderness period (Num. xxvi. 51). Was it the same six hundred thousand and had these years been to them a time of special nearness? We need only read a few verses farther in Num. xxvi. to receive a very definite answer:

These are they that were numbered by Moses and Eleazer the priest, who numbered the children of Israel in the plains of Moab by Jordan near Jericho. But among them there was not a man whom Moses and Aaron the priest numbered, when they numbered the children of Israel in the wilderness of Sinai. For the Lord had said of them, They shall surely die in the wilderness. And there was not left a man of them save Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun.

Six hundred thousand at Sinai, six hundred thousand on the plains of Moab; but only two of them the same! The rest perished because of their unbelief in the wilderness. And yet the critics speak of this as a *time of special nearness!* This is all the more remarkable because the Old Testament record is clearly supported by the New. Let us turn to Stephen's speech in the Book of Acts where this passage in Amos is expressly cited:

Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you beyond Babylon.

Likewise in Hebrews we read, "But with whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?" (Heb. iii. 17). And still the critics assure us that this was a *time of special nearness!* Yet is not the point of Amos' argument inescapably plain, especially when interpreted to us by Stephen? Israel

had disobeyed God. The generation which wandered in the wilderness was a generation of wrath; it was to perish there, it was not to see the promised land, and it gave itself up to idolatry. Why then, asks Amos, should the Israel of the Northern Kingdom, which was likewise a generation of wrath, had given itself up to the idolatry of the calves, and was shortly to be swept away into exile, keep up a hypocritical and vain worship of Jehovah? Amos, be it remembered, is speaking at Bethel, one of Jeroboam's calf temples, and he upbraids its devotees with their false loyalty to Jehovah. Let them follow their fathers and not offer to Jehovah, their covenant God whom they had rejected, sacrifices which were meaningless and valueless. Certainly this interpretation is worthy of consideration. It is favored by the Old Testament and confirmed by the New. Yet it would seem as if the critics had never heard of it. So expert are they in ignoring objections to their theories and those that make them.

HOSEA, MICAH, ISAIAH, JEREMIAH

We can speak only briefly of the other passages cited above. Of Hosea it should suffice to point out that no less eminent a critic than Stade has said: "For him a relation to Yahweh without external worship, without priest and offerings, is inconceivable." But we may add that in the verse cited, the antithesis is not absolute as the critics allege but only relative: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." Some critics render the second part "to the exclusion of burnt offerings," but this is unnatural and the forced interpretation of the special pleader. Micah vi. 8, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?" is often cited by the critics as expressing the quintessence of "prophetic religion" as a religion without sacrifice. But what does "walk humbly" mean? These exact words occur only here in the Old Testament; but there is good reason for believing that they mean walk in accordance with the Law of God. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the preceding verse the conception of "ritual" worship which is rejected is not the one taught in the law but an essentially pagan conception—hecatombs and infant sacrifice, which means Baal or Moloch worship. In Isa. i. it is made perfectly clear that the people whose sacrifices are rejected are a rebellious people. It is said of them, "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward." Their leaders are called "rulers of Sodom," and they themselves "people of Gomorrah," and they are enjoined to "give ear unto the law of your God." Clearly the rejection of their sacrifices can be fully explained as due to the wickedness of those who offer it. And as a proof that it is not a rejection of sacrifice as such we need only observe that as Professor Kittel has pointed out their *prayers* are rejected as emphatically as their *offerings* (vs. 15). Yet prayer is given by the critics an important place in "prophetic religion." The same facts should be borne in mind in regard to the great Temple Address recorded in Jer. vii. It is not denied that the Temple is the Lord's House; but it

is affirmed that the people have made it a "den of robbers." The whole picture is of a perversion of religion which made the temple worship a farce, an impious fraud, a means of escaping the consequences of sin while enjoying its pleasures and profits—in short, an utter perversion of religion as redemption from sin. The language of vs. 22 may be, Professor John D. Davis points out, "the rhetorical negation, frequently employed for emphatic antithesis (e. g. Deut. v. 3)." It is certainly better to understand it in this way than to assert with Principal Smith that "it contradicts Deuteronomy and even more strongly Leviticus, in their repeated statements that in the wilderness God also commanded sacrifices." Psalm li, is especially instructive in this regard. In vs. 16 the Psalmist says, "For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering." This verse the "critics" regard as a particularly clear statement of the spirituality of "prophetic religion," its rejection of all external ritual. Yet in vs. 19 we read: "Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offerings and whole burnt offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." This verse asserts with equal clearness the validity and acceptability of sacrifice. How shall we treat the two? The critics cut out vs. 18, 19 as a later addition which is out of harmony with "prophetic religion" as a religion without sacrifice. But if we interpret vs. 16 *in the light of* vs. 19 it is evident that both are to be interpreted in terms of the great prophetic utterance of Samuel: "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams." Sacrifice is not a substitute for obedience. Sacrifice without repentance and new obedience is vain. It is worse than vain. It is an affront to a gracious and holy God, an abuse of His mercy. But repentance and obedience are not a substitute for sacrifice, nor do they make sacrifice unnecessary.

"PROPHETIC RELIGION" A MISREPRESENTATION

We have now examined the "certain utterances" cited by Professor McFadyen. There are no other utterances more confidently cited by the critics as providing that the prophets rejected sacrifice than these. Yet all of these passages can be explained as the expression of the burning indignation with which the prophets regarded that fearful abuse of the externals of religion which was so prevalent in their day. It is not necessary to infer from them a deep-going and fundamental antagonism between the law and the prophets. There is no real warrant for such an inference when we consider these passages in connection with the other teachings of the prophets, and in the light of the Scriptures as a whole. Why then has a theory with such meagre and specious Biblical basis and such radically destructive tendencies become so popular?

RESTS ON FALSE ANTITHESSES—"SPIRITUAL" VERSUS "EXTERNAL"

The great reason for the popularity of "prophetic religion" is due, we believe, to the fact that certain popular but false antitheses have been very skilfully used in its support. We can only discuss them very briefly. The first is the antithesis between spiritual religion and external ritual. True religion, we are told, is a thing of the heart. Outward ceremonies

and prescribed duties may be performed, creeds and dogmas may be accepted, and yet the heart be untouched by the power of a living faith. These things may even be used to cover up grievous sins, secret sins of the heart and outbreking sins of the life. All this is true. Yet the antithesis is fundamentally false. The rich who cast much into the treasury may have done it from wrong motives. This does not prove that in the case of the poor widow the gift of two mites was not an act of true worship acceptable to God. We have the best authority for so regarding it. It was the expression of a faith which had gripped the heart and moved the will. The lawyers were not condemned because they *knew* the law, but because they made it a burden for others and did not practice it themselves. The rich were not at fault because they *gave much* but because giving much cost them little and they desired their good works to be seen of men. There is no divorce between head, heart or hand in true religion. Yet this attempt to set the one over against the other, illustrated here in an alleged antithesis between spiritual religion and external rites, is one which is made a good deal of today. Ultimately it leads to the old false antithesis between "faith" and "works." There is an antithesis between a barren and a fruitful faith, and between good works which are the expression of a true and living faith and those which are a substitute for it. But a true faith will ever express itself in true acts of worship and of service.

"ANGRY GOD" VERSUS "GOD OF LOVE"

The second antithesis is that between an "angry god" and a "god of love." The "critical" student of the Old Testament has singled out those passages where the dreadful consequences of sin are most terribly shown. He has divorced these passages as much as possible from others in which the love and mercy of God is plainly manifested. He has largely neglected the fact that this anger of the God of the Old Testament is an anger against sin. With the help of "comparative religion" he has *constructed* as the God of ancient Israel a Yahweh who is like the Molochs and Chemoshes of the ancient Semitic world, vengeful, capricious, unethical—a "national god" in the worst sense of the word. This god is an "angry god" he contrasts with the "god of love" revealed by the Old Testament prophets and by Jesus. And since sacrifice is connected with worship in ancient times, he makes it a part of the worship of the "angry god" and rejects it accordingly. But it should not be necessary to point out that this "angry god" is not the God of the Old Testament. That God is a God who hates sin, but loves the sinner, and has Himself prepared a way of escape; He is a God of mercy and of grace. The God of Israel in the time of Moses was not the fearful monster that many of the critics represent Him as being. And on the other hand the God of the prophets was not merely a "god of love"; he was also a God of justice. Amos shows this very clearly, as the critics are fond of pointing out. He was then as He is now, "merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth," yet a God "that will by no means clear the guilty." He is both an angry God *and* a God of love. The sacrifices which He

ordained were typical of that perfect sacrifice that was to come, when this "angry" yet "loving" God would Himself bear the sin of men on the Cross. The sacrifices of the Old Testament are not man's offering to a bloodthirsty and vengeful god. They are God's way of reconciling man unto Himself; and they point forward to the Cross of Christ. Love and justice are not mutually exclusive; they meet in the Cross. It is the Cross that proves to us most fully that the "angry" God who hates sin is a "God of love," the only hope and refuge of the sinner. And this God of love is revealed in the Old Testament as well as in the New: in the Promise to Abraham which already includes "all the nations of the earth" in its ample scope as really as in the Incarnation and the Death of Christ. The antithesis is merely a new form of the old argument that a loving God cannot punish sin, and requires no atonement.

"SERVICE OF MAN" VERSUS "SERVICE OF GOD"

The decalogue has two tables. Jesus' summary of its contents, a summary based on the Old Testament itself, brings this out clearly. First there is man's duty to God, then his duty toward his fellowmen. The two belong together, and the order of importance is the order of statement: God first, man second. There is a great tendency today to shift the emphasis, or to ignore the first duty altogether in the interest of the second: to reduce Christianity to philanthropy. This tendency is strongly manifest in "prophetic religion," with its rejection of the greatest Old Testament act of worship, sacrifice. As we have seen, Professor Moore speaks as if the two were mutually exclusive: "It is the fundamental doctrine of prophecy: the will of God is wholly moral. For worship he cares nothing at all; for justice, fairness, and goodness between man and man he cares everything." This reduces the Old Testament prophet from a spokesman for God to a social reformer; and social service becomes the all important thing. But the antithesis is false, fundamentally false. True devotion to God is now and has ever been the impelling motive for real service of man. It is when we truly love God that we learn to love our brother also.

THE "PRIMITIVE" VERSUS THE "TRUE"

The fourth antithesis and in some respects the most important is that between the *primitive* and the *true*. In the Book of Genesis we find the institution of sacrifice immediately after the Fall. This has been understood to mean that the necessity of sacrifice was revealed to man or at least realized by him as soon as sin brought about its fatal alienation from God. And as proof of the correctness of this view which makes sacrifice the expression of a universal need it has been customary to point out that in ancient times the rite of sacrifice was practically, perhaps actually, universal. This great argument for the truth and necessity of a practice derived from its antiquity and universality has been very generally accepted by Christians in the past. Yet Professor Shotwell of Columbia University assures us that to the "trained mind . . . there is nothing more suspect than the conclusions of a universal belief. The catholic appeal to what all men have believed, everywhere, at all times, is just what

the psychologist is least sure of." And Pfeleiderer has told us quite definitely that, "What is essential in religion is least of all to be recognized in its historical beginnings." Now what is responsible for this sudden loss of prestige? Why is the argument from antiquity and universality regarded as no longer valid? The answer is, because of the popularity today of the theory of evolution. Evolution as a theory of development from the germinal and imperfect to the mature and perfect tends naturally to regard the word ancient or "primitive" as the antithesis of "true." "Primitive" man, "primitive" religion—primitive here means crude, childish, false. Consequently if sacrifice is ancient and universal the evolutionist will be disposed to regard it as primitive and crude and probably mistaken. The "angry god" with his bloody sacrifices represents, he tells us, primitive man's misconception of the "god of love" whose religion demands no sacrifice. And if this "god of love" requires no sacrifice, of course the Cross loses its sacrificial meaning. The critical conception of "prophetic religion" is thus emphatically an evolutionary conception. It is evolution with its doctrine of the primitive which enables the critic, as he thinks, to treat the sacrificial system of Old Testament religion, despite its tremendous importance, both essential and typical, as a crude and mistaken conception. And it is to be remembered that back of and fundamental to its rejection of sacrifice as primitive, is evolution's rejection of the "Fall" as a myth. According to the Bible, sacrifice followed sin and sin came from the Fall. But Professor Dulles of Auburn Seminary assures us very positively that "The supposition that man had a 'Fall' which exposed him to endless wrath is no longer a tenable foundation on which to build a theology." And Professor Fagnani to whom we have referred above as applying the theory of "prophetic religion" to the New Testament in very drastic form tells us: "It is the Pauline belief in a Fall in Adam that makes necessary an atonement through Christ. But if Adam is not historical and the Fall is not historical, then the Atonement is not necessary and the religion of Jesus stands forth freed from all the additions and complications that the theological speculations of the early Church have added to it." Why must we assume that the Fall is un-historical? Sir Oliver Lodge gives us the answer of many evolutionists when he says: "We did not make the world; and an attempt to punish us for our animal origin and ancestry [note the words!] would be simply comical if any one could be found who was willing to take it seriously." This does not mean, of course, that there are no evolutionists who regard the Biblical account of the Fall as essentially true. But the consistent and thoroughgoing evolutionist is quick to see that a "fall upward" is really a contradiction in terms. But if man did not fall into sin, how can he need redemption from sin? Where is the necessity for expiatory sacrifice, for the Cross of Christ?

"PROPHETIC RELIGION" AN EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

It is not our purpose to discuss evolution here. This would carry us too far afield. But it is of great importance to the proper understanding of "prophetic religion" and of Old Testament criticism and theological

liberalism in general to observe how unmistakably evolution figures in all the popular antitheses which we have been considering,—not merely in the last, but in all of them. The antithesis between “prophetic religion” conceived of as a lofty, “spiritual” religion and contrasted with a “priestly” religion which is regarded as crude, external and even immoral; the antithesis between “prophetic religion” as the religion of a “god of love” little inferior to the God of the Christian, and “priestly religion” pictured as the worship of the horrible “angry god” with his capricious temper and his thirst for blood; the antithesis between “prophetic religion” as a religion of self-forgetting, Christlike “service of humanity,” and “priestly religion” conceived of as a selfish and servile bondage to an oriental despot kind of god—all of these antitheses are wrought out and interpreted in terms of evolution. And it is evolution with its emphasis on man and human progress, with its belief that this progress is brought about by the cultivation of resident forces, with its tendency to deny or ignore sin and substitute eugenics and education for salvation, with its tendency to lose sight of God in the study of man and the world, which has cast its subtle spell over “prophetic religion.”

THE SPELL OF EVOLUTION

We realize what this spell of evolution is when Sir Arthur Thomson tells us:

Immense gaps in our knowledge are immediately apparent when we inquire into the origin of living organisms upon the earth, the beginnings of intelligent behavior, the origin of Vertebrates, the emergence of Man, and so on. We know very little as yet in regard to the way in which any of the “big lifts” in evolution have come about, and yet we believe in the continuity of the process. That is implied in our ideal conception of evolution, which we accept as a working hypothesis. It is not very easy to say what it is that is continuous, but we mean in part that there is at no stage any intrusion of extraneous factors.

This statement is very significant for two reasons: because of what it *admits*, and because of what it *asserts*. Sir Arthur *admits* the “big lifts,” the missing links. He admits that the evolutionist has grappled in vain with the deepest and weightiest problems. Indeed he goes on to call attention to the difficulty when he says: “But this continues to raise in the minds of many the difficulty that the results seem much too large for their antecedents. Can we believe that the world of life, with its climax in Man, has been evolved from a nebulous mass?” But he *asserts* with a dogmatism worthy of a far stronger case that this ideal conception must be allowed to bar out all extraneous factors. It need not, of course, be maintained that this view of evolution is necessary or inevitable, that it is the only view. But there is deep significance in these words and they remind us that Edward Clodd said years ago: “If the theory of evolution be not universal, the germs of decay are in it.” However much we may try to make terms with it, to christianize it, to find room in it for the Supernatural, for God, for sin, for salvation, this “ideal conception” of evolution as a law of *continuity*, a uniformitarianism that brooks at no stage “any intrusion of extraneous factors,” tends to overthrow us and

engulf us in the sea of Naturalism. Yet it cannot be too strongly emphasized that this *law of continuity* is not an established scientific fact, but, on Sir Arthur's own admission, "a working hypothesis," the formulation of "an ideal conception," which still leaves "immense gaps in our knowledge."

THE PRESENT CRISIS

Is it any wonder then that we are hearing so much about "theories" of inspiration, "theories" of the atonement? Is it strange that the liberals are trying to distinguish between an "inspired" Bible and an "errorless" Bible, between "vicarious suffering" and "a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God," that the now historic "Five Points" are so objectionable to them? Is it not obvious why evolution has become such a burning issue in Christian circles? "Prophetic religion" as portrayed by the evolutionary critic of the Old Testament is a totally different thing from "prophetic religion" as set forth in the Old Testament itself. Which shall we choose? Shall we accept the *ipse dixit*s of the rationalistic critic however much they contradict the Bible, or shall we hold to the authority of Scripture even though its statements are challenged by evolutionist and critic? There is no question where our Church has stood in the past. Our Standards tell us this plainly. The first question asked every candidate for ordination to the ministry is this: "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?" The liberals would like to abolish it altogether or to be granted the right so to "interpret" it that "infallible" will mean "fallible" and "only" will not deny to evolutionary theories the right to determine Christian faith. Will it be in the interest of harmony and peace to make this concession? Our Standards tell us further that Christ's death was an act of "priestly" expiation: "Christ executeth the office of a priest, in His once offering up of Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, and in making continual intercession for us." Are we prepared to admit that the "priestly" conception of religion is "primitive," and that Jesus is only the last and greatest of the prophets, the supreme illustration of the great law of vicarious suffering? Are we prepared to admit that the right to hold such a "theory" of the atonement is guaranteed by our Standards and that those who hold such views are keeping within "evangelical bounds"? If so we would better simply admit that "inspiration," "infallible," "atonement," "Christ," "Christianity," etc., are terms so elastic and elusive as to be meaningless and that the great saving facts which they represent have lost their value for us, that we do not care enough for our Presbyterian, our Christian heritage to maintain it in the face of opposition and denial. Shall we do this? Or shall we say,

*Faith of our fathers, holy faith!
We will be true to thee till death.*

CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN ETHICS

GORDON H. CLARK

WHILE Stoicism and Epicureanism were at their height, there spread through the Greco-Roman world several eastern religions. One of these was Christianity. In the literature on the relationships among the eastern religions, the Greek philosophies and Christianity, arguments are advanced to show that Christianity is nothing more than a particular combination of pagan ideas. These attempts to explain Christianity in terms of Greek philosophies and Hellenistic religions have been occasionally extreme. For example, that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is an adaptation of the Neo-Platonic trinity is hardly tenable. The two trinities are totally distinct in attributes, activities, and purposes. Again, the attempt to find in Hermes Trismegistus the source of the Christian plan of salvation, the Christian sacraments and other Christian tenets has been definitely defeated.

Nevertheless there are relations and marked similarities between elements of Christian teaching and elements in the pagan systems. Plato, when he forbids the good man to wrong anyone and declares it is better to suffer than to commit injustice reminds us of Christ's words, "Love your enemies . . . do good to them that hate you." Stoicism, too, in one respect profoundly anticipates Christian thinking. To people whose civilization is permeated with Christian ideas, this element will seem common-place, but in an age whose greatest thinkers hardly attained it and whose ordinary people never dreamed it, it was an epoch-making revelation. Before this time, right living had generally been considered as a matter of external action; now the Stoics were the first to emphasize the inwardness of true morality. Internal reformation was essential. Further, the Stoics are similar to the Christians in dividing all people into two groups, the wise and the foolish, the saved and the lost. They again were no less severe in their manner of asserting that "whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Like Christianity, too, Stoicism appealed to all classes of society, it welcomed the slave as well as the Emperor.

It was the differences, however, and not the similarities which attracted the attention of those to whom Christianity first was preached. Superficial agreement did not obscure the fundamental antagonism. To the educated, respectable citizen of the first century it was not paganism but Christianity which appeared immoral and atheistic. The Greeks charged Christians with defective education, the Romans accused them of defective patriotism. In the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* the Romans designate the Christians as atheists, and Lucian slurringly puts Epicureans, atheists, and Christians into one class. And finally, the persecution through which the church was called upon to go shows that in the minds of those who saw paganism and Christianity at first hand, the latter was not merely another innocuous pagan sect.

There is one fundamental difference between the pagan and Christian

theories which makes all other differences appear subsidiary. According to Greek philosophy the chief end of man was the perfect development of his natural abilities. Aristotle made contemplation the height of man's attainment because he regarded reason as man's highest function. The Stoics said, "nature herself never gives us any but good inclinations." And also, according to Epictetus, "you are a distinct portion of the essence of God and contain a certain part of him in yourself," cultivate, therefore the god within you. And other schools say similar things.

But Christianity has a totally different aim, indeed not merely a different but a radically opposed aim. In the New Testament there is no exhortation to develop the natural abilities, the desirable thing is rather the death of the natural man and the birth of a new and supernatural man. As originally born and even before birth, man is guilty of sin and fatally impaired by it throughout his whole nature. No individual can escape its terrible consequences for it is inherent in the race. In Adam all die, with the result that their understanding is darkened, being alienated from the life of God because of the blindness of their heart. All have sinned, there is none righteous, no not one, and they are hereby rendered incapable of pleasing God in any respect whatsoever. To man so conceived no wonder it is said, "except a man be born from above he cannot see the kingdom of God." And a few verses below that just quoted the contrast between the natural and the spiritual is made very distinct. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." The chief aim of man, then, will not be the development of his natural but of the spiritual nature. The new life which begins with the new birth leads in precisely the opposite direction to the Greek formulae. "For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." From this fundamental proposition flow all the other differences.

In Greek ethics it was customary to distinguish between the practical or moral virtues, such as courage, justice, honor, and the theoretical or intellectual virtues. In both of these departments of life the fundamental chasm appears between the widely separated results. The names by which the virtues are called are sometimes the same but the concepts for which they stand are often quite different. For example, both the Greek and the Christian would call wisdom good. But what Aristotle and Epicurus called wisdom and thought good, the Christian might call foolishness. Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics, we might say all pagan antiquity, so emphasized wisdom as to consider only the wise man, only the philosopher, as strictly virtuous. In the Bible as well, not only in the books of Solomon but in many other passages also, wisdom receives no meagre praise. But in the New Testament the natural wisdom of the Greeks which engenders pride is regarded as a possible stumbling block on the way to the Kingdom of God. Christ sent Paul "to preach the gospel; not with wisdom of word lest the cross of Christ be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness. For it is written I will

destroy the wisdom of the wise. . . . Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"

First Corinthians clearly states that the natural man is by his very nature incapable of understanding true wisdom. The wisdom of God is Jesus Christ himself, a reference to the opposing claims of the Gnostics, and in Him, as Colossians continues, are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And the evil deeds proceeding from the darkened understanding mentioned in Romans 1:21-28 and elsewhere, include among them some of the moral or practical virtues which were so highly praised by the Greek philosophers.

It may seem strange at first that the moral virtues, even of a pagan, are considered worthless from a Christian standpoint. But Christianity goes further and declares them to be not only worthless but actually dangerous and harmful because, seeming good, they deceive. They lead us to put our trust in them, to rely on them alone, whereas "without faith it is impossible to please God." The virtuous Greek was not able to see his need of a new birth. Deceived by his own morality he was blinded to his own imperfection.

The most highly valued virtue in the ancient world and the one least prized by Christians was courage or patriotism. This, as Aristotle said, mirroring the prevailing conception, was essentially a political and war-time virtue. But the followers of the Christ who told Peter to sheath his sword, who declared that his kingdom was not of this world, abandoned the practice of courage and patriotism. They were willing to bear persecution; fortitude was their strong point but patriotism was a vice. In this world the Christian is a pilgrim and a stranger. He is looking for a city whose builder and maker is God, his citizenship is in heaven. The followers of Christ were willing to render to Caesar what was Caesar's. Obedience to all laws which did not conflict with Christian principles they insisted upon. But their main attention was directed to rendering unto God what was God's.

Among the virtues catalogued by Aristotle, pride or high-mindedness is called the "crown of the virtues." Though Aristotle warns against conceit, yet the high-minded man "will be only moderately pleased at great honors conferred upon him by virtuous people, as feeling that he obtains what is naturally his due or even less than his due." Christianity, on the contrary, emphasizes humility. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," and "whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be the servant of all."

The astounding thing is that while the Greek schools in general appealed only to a select class of especially educated people and even with those usually failed of actual reform, as is pictured for us in Kingsley's gripping novel *Hypatia*, and while the comparatively wide appeal of the Stoics neither affected the masses nor stayed the corruption of the Emperor's court, Christianity within twenty-five years of its inception gave a totally new life to thousands and thousands. This new life most noticeably

expressed itself in a virtue which the Stoics condemned and which certainly was absent from the practice of the public. In *Ben Hur*, or in the sources if they be open to us, the most abominable cruelty makes us recoil. Against this the Christians preached and practiced love, pity, mercy. The Founder had a word of compassion for the woman taken in adultery, for the thief on the cross and for the very ones who crucify him, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." And in *Quo Vadis* the Christian, as he is being tortured on a cross, forgives and thereby converts Chilo Chilonides, his betrayer.

Stoicism never achieved this state of mind. While it taught that all men were brothers, that the Sage will serve all, one would err if he admitted their troubles to his heart. For the Stoic's unperturbedness is all important and the anguish of vicarious suffering, the very foundation of Christianity, is absolutely foreign both to Stoicism and to all the other schools. Love, then, is the striking Christian virtue. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," and, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. . . . And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

We can note only in passing that Epictetus says we must not be too hard on men who are unchaste before marriage; and Aristotle is somewhat similar. But Christianity has hardly had in the eyes of the world a more singular success than its erasure of the distinction between bond and free, male and female, for all are one in Christ. And if anyone point to Christianity's shortcomings in this and in many other respects, it is because he refuses to compare conditions here and now with what is in India today or what was universal in the time of Christ. The love of God in Christ reflected in the lives of his followers is a conquering power that the forces of darkness cannot withstand.

And finally. While the philosophers gave up the dreary conceptions of an after life as taught by Homer, they had nothing very definite as a substitute, and certainly the ordinary Greek never conquered his fear of death. His affections were set on this world and death meant defeat. Among the papyri there is a friendly letter on the death of a child. The most conspicuous thing about it is its utter lack of consolation; it says in so many words that consolation in such a case is impossible. But for the Christian death is swallowed up in victory and the grave has lost its sting. This is the actual result of that other-worldliness which some condemn as sour and glum. But it is the pagan, of today as well as of that time, who comes to be sad if he considers life seriously, while the Christian through a very sure hope can remain happy in the face of misfortune. "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

NEWS AND NOTES

MR. WOOLLEY'S FAREWELL LETTER

Princeton, New Jersey, July 15, 1929.

Dear Friends and Readers:

This half-page belongs to the old editor for this issue. All the rest of the magazine he has turned over to the new General Secretary and editor, but this half-page he reserves for himself in order that he may talk with you.

It is not a pleasant task to say "Good-bye," particularly when it is to so many good friends and readers, great numbers of whom have become personally known to the editor during his visits to the League chapters and branches and to schools scattered over the country who are interested in the League. Yet that is what he must say. Because of the hope and expectation of going to China in the autumn, he has resigned his League connection.

He resigns with all the greater confidence in the safeguarding of the principles for which the League stands, because he can introduce to the League membership as his successor, Ned B. Stonehouse, Th. D.

Ned Stonehouse was the only man considered for the position by the League's Executive Committee. He was elected unanimously. He accepted without hesitation. As the first national President of the League, he helped to start it on the road to successful service for God. Now after two years of study abroad, and after taking his doctor's degree at the Free University of Amsterdam, he returns to take up service with the League as its General Secretary and editor of "The Evangelical Student."

The past year has shown me that there are truly evangelical students, students who love the Word of God and who want to stand for its truth, all over the United States. Their enthusiasm for the Bible has often surprised me by its warmth and spontaneity. In the course of the year many have joined the League and are now serving God more actively than ever before through their witness to Him on the university, the college, or the seminary campus. I have had the joy of working with them for the Lord.

Now that joy is to belong to Ned Stonehouse. He is a true scholar and a lover of the Word. I trust that he will find that same enthusiasm for God's cause which greeted me.

Wishing God's richest blessings upon every League member, and trusting that you will work to the utmost capacity with the new General Secretary to give the witness to other students,

Faithfully yours,

PAUL WOOLLEY.

Mr. Woolley's letter describes the situation of July 15. Since that time both he and the secretary whom he introduces have become associated with the new Westminster Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. It was with real regret that the new secretary found it necessary to leave the work of the League before it was fairly begun, but the League is assured of an able and energetic secretary in the person of the Rev. William J. Jones, M. A., Th. B., who has already taken over the work. Mr. Jones is a graduate of Wheaton College and of Princeton Theological Seminary, and earned his M. A. taking graduate work in English at Princeton University. Last year he taught at Des Moines University. It is the confident expectation of the writer that the work of the League is safely intrusted to Mr. Jones, and his hope that he may receive the fine support which the League secretaries have received in the past. The League is ready for the biggest year in its history.

Dr. Stonehouse is responsible for the material in this issue, but Mr. Jones is seeing it through the press.

FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

The convention this year in November will be held under the auspices of the Western Theological Seminary at Holland, Michigan. Plans are under way for making this convention a very worthwhile event, and all chapters and branches should send delegates if at all possible. The chapters will receive information by letter from the new secretary as to the exact date, speakers, etc. Readers of the STUDENT who are interested in the coming conference can write the General Secretary, League of Evangelical Students, Wheaton, Ill.

NEW HEADQUARTERS

All communications and contributions for the work of the League should be addressed, to the League of Evangelical Students, or The Evangelical Student, Wheaton, Ill.

WHO ARE THESE WRITERS?

William Childs Robinson, M. A., Th. D., is Professor of Church History and Polity in Columbia Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.

Oswald T. Allis, Ph. D., D. D., is Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

Gordon H. Clark, Ph. D., is an instructor in the philosophy department of the University of Pennsylvania.