# CHRISTIANITY TODAY

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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor — H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

MID-SEPTEMBER, 1930
Vol. 1 No. 5

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# Christ and Christianity

WHAT is the relation between CHRIST and Christianity? Is it incidental or essential? Suppose it should be discovered that CHRIST never existed or that we lack any dependable knowledge of Him. Would that necessarily spell the death of Christianity or might it continue to thrive despite that discovery? Or assuming that He existed and that we have some measure of knowledge of Him, was He merely the founder of Christianity and its best as well as its first exponent, or does He also constitute its content to such an extent that it is proper to say that CHRIST is Christianity? In other words, from the viewpoint of Christianity, is CHRIST merely the exemplary religious person or is He Himself an object of religion and as such to be worshipped?

The questions that have been put at least suggest what is today the deepest issue at stake between those calling themselves Christians. Modern Christianity, so-called, regards CHRIST merely as an example for faith, not as the object of faith. If CHRIST be merely an example for faith His uniqueness lies in the fact that He was the first Christian and the place He occupies in Christianity does not differ in kind from the place occupied by Buddha in Buddhism or Confucius in Confucianism. If, however, CHRIST be the object of faith it is obvious that the place He occupies in Christianity is infinitely more than that of a pioneer and pattern in the sphere of religion, and that the religion He founded is as dependent upon Him today as it was in the days of His flesh. It is difficult, if not impossible, to exaggerate the difference between those to whom CHRIST is merely an example for faith and those to whom He is also an object of faith. The latter stand in a religious relation to CHRIST; the former do not stand in a religious relation to CHRIST. This difference is so profound that it is to use words without meaning to speak of them as adherents of the same religion. As a matter of fact they are advocates of mutually opposed religions. None the less in all the great Protestant Churches, including the Presbyterian, there are not only members but Ministers who regard CHRIST as merely an example for faith and so those who do not take a religious attitude toward CHRIST.

The width and depth of the difference between those who see in CHRIST merely an example for faith and those who see Him also an object of faith is fully discerned, however, only when it is seen that the sense in which CHRIST is a saviour is involved. If CHRIST is merely an example for faith it is obvious that He is a saviour only in the sense that He shows us how we may save ourselves. There is no room for faith *in* CHRIST as one who saves us from the guilt and power of sin. Only those who see in CHRIST an object of faith can "receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation, as He is offered to us in the Gospel." Those calling themselves Christians who look upon CHRIST as merely an example for faith ignore the dividing line between Christianity as a religion that offers salvation in and by the work of another and a religion that merely calls upon men to save themselves. Let us never forget that the object of the faith of the genuine Christian is CHRIST and Him as crucified to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to GOD. It is not enough that we stand in a religious relation to CHRIST, if we are rightly to call ourselves Christians; ours must also be an attitude of faith *in* Him, of dependence upon Him as our Saviour.

It is hardly open to dispute that those who look upon CHRIST as merely an example for faith have departed from the position of the Church universal, at least until the rise of Modernism. The creeds of the churches, both ancient and modern, more especially perhaps the liturgies and hymns of the churches, both ancient and modern, make clear that, generally

## IN THIS ISSUE:


The "Yes and No" Attitude in the Presbyterian Church ..... 5
Frank H. Stevenson

Joy in Service ..... 8
The Late Geo. T. Purves

Books of Religious Significance

An Emerging Christian Faith ..... 11

St. Augustine ..... 12

What is Lutheranism? ..... 13

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice ..... 14

Letters to the Editor ..... 16

News of the Church ..... 18

speaking, among those calling themselves Christian, CHRIST was and is regarded as an object of faith. Neither is it a matter of serious dispute that those who wrote the New Testament regarded CHRIST as an object of faith. Wherever we open its pages we are confronted by a religious life that is grounded in and determined by JESUS Himself as a divine being in whom and from whom men may obtain salvation from the guilt and pollution and power of sin. Its writers not only worshipped CHRIST as GOD, their hope both for this life and that to come lay in their confidence that He was able to save to the uttermost those who put their trust in Him. It is true, of course, that many attempts have been made by the aid of literary and historical criticism to find behind the records of the New Testament a CHRIST who was merely an example for faith and not also an object of faith; but it may be safely said that all these efforts have ended in failure. Today it is freely admitted that in MARK'S Gospel, as truly as in JOHN'S, CHRIST is the miraculous SON OF GOD. The late JAMES DENNEY was, in our judgment, too concessive in his attitude to naturalistic criticism but that only adds significance to his conclusion that "Christianity never existed in the world as a religion in which men shared the faith of JESUS, but was from the very beginning, and amid all undeniable diversities, a religion in which JESUS was the object of faith. To all believers JESUS belonged to the divine as truly as to the human sphere."

Why then the repeated attempts to get back of the CHRIST of the New Testament to a CHRIST who is merely an example for faith? We think there can be no doubt but that all these attempts are rooted in that anti-supernaturalism of thought and sentiment that is so outstanding a characteristic of the age in which we live. A modern scholar puts it thus: "The real impulse for the whole assault upon the trustworthiness of the portrait of JESUS drawn in the Gospels lies not in the region of historical investigation but in that of dogmatic prejudice—or to be more specific, of naturalistic preconception. The moving spring of the critical reconstruction is the determination to have a 'natural' as over against the 'supernatural' JESUS of the evangelists. There must be a more primitive JESUS than the evangelists'—this is the actual movement of thought—because their JESUS is already a supernatural JESUS." But be this as it may, it is obvious that those who want only an example for faith have no need of a supernatural CHRIST inasmuch as if to be a Christian is simply to share the religious life of CHRIST, to exemplify that attitude toward GOD and man that He exemplified, the more thoroughly He was like us *in all respects,* i. e., the more nearly 100 per cent human He was, the better fitted would He be to be our pattern. On the other hand it is equally obvious that if He is to be an object of faith He must be a divine, a supernatural being, because to make one who falls short of GOD an object of worship would be to yield to a creature that homage and adoration that belongs only to the creator. No less obvious is it that only one whose rank in the scale of being places Him alongside of GOD can be a saviour in the sense in which CHRIST is represented as such in the New Testament.

Possibly no consideration is better fitted to bring out the radical difference between those who see in CHRIST merely an example of faith and those who see in Him an object of faith than the fact that only to the latter is CHRIST absolutely indispensable to what is called Christianity. It may seem strange but really it is not at all surprising that many who regard CHRIST as merely an example for faith declare that as far as their own religious lives are concerned it is a matter of no vital importance whether CHRIST ever existed. For if CHRIST was merely the first Christian, the first of that series of believers of the particular kind we call Christians, so that His value lies wholly in the sphere of teaching and example, it cannot be maintained that CHRIST Himself is absolutely essential to Christianity today any more than it can be maintained that LUTHER is essential to Lutheranism or CALVIN to Calvinism as these things exist today. Even if all knowledge of LUTHER and CALVIN should fade from the minds of men Lutheranism and Calvinism might continue to thrive because what makes a man a Lutheran or Calvinist is not his allegiance to LUTHER or CALVIN, personally, but his acceptance in thought and life of LUTHER or CALVIN'S life and world view. And so if to be a Christian is merely to hold views concerning GOD and man and the world similar to those that CHRIST held, and to manifest in our lives similar graces of the spirit, it is evident that Christianity might continue to thrive even if CHRIST never existed—or assuming that He existed that all knowledge of Him should fade from the minds of men—provided the principles and ideals ascribed to Him should be retained inasmuch as in that case the bond that binds Christians together would be not the relation in which they stand to CHRIST as a person but the extent to which they share the views and imitate His example—real or alleged. There is nothing in the nature of the case, therefore, to prevent those who see in CHRIST merely an example for faith from preaching a Christianity in which CHRIST Himself occupies no essential place. In fact it would seem that the logic of the situation is such that, whether or no they believe that CHRIST actually existed, they perforce preach a Christianity in which CHRIST Himself occupies an incidental rather than an essential place. It is quite otherwise, however, with those who see in CHRIST an object of faith. For them a Christianity without CHRIST, or even a Christianity in which CHRIST does not occupy an absolutely indispensable place, is unthinkable. Eliminate CHRIST or assign Him a place lower than that which GOD Himself occupies and Christianity as they understand it would not and could not exist. Those who never heard of CHRIST may conceivably have faith *like* CHRIST but only those who have some knowledge of Him as a living reality can possibly have faith *in* Him. Is CHRIST the object of our faith? Do we stand in a religious relation to CHRIST? Have we put our faith *in* CHRIST as our Saviour from the guilt and power of sin? Only as we can give an affirmative answer to these questions, and questions such as these, have we any warrant for calling ourselves Christians in the historic meaning of the word. Those who are concerned about realities rather than about names will not contradict us.

It may be said, in fact it is widely said, that a non-supernatural Christianity is the only sort of Christianity that commends itself to the modern man and that

in insisting on a CHRIST who is an object of faith as well as an example for faith we are keeping modern-minded men out of the churches as well as preventing that unity of thought and life so much desired by all. We do not believe that such is the case but even if we did we would continue our present course. Because to us it is a matter of indifference whether men embrace Christianity unless it be a Christianity in which CHRIST is an object of worship and trust. No doubt a non-supernatural Christianity is much easier to believe than a supernatural Christianity—whoever supposed otherwise? The trouble, however, is that a non-supernatural Christianity is hardly worth believing; certainly it does not meet the sinner's need. A non-supernatural CHRIST may be a teacher and example but only a supernatural CHRIST may be our LORD and Saviour. Moreover we do not think that unity of thought and life in the sphere of religion is worth striving for unless it is a unity that finds its center in loving and loyal allegiance to CHRIST as the GOD-MAN. In the days of His flesh there was a division of the people because of Him (John 7:43) and we are sure that there will continue—and that there ought to continue—to be a division of the people because of Him until all men find in Him their common LORD and Saviour. The universal acceptance of a Christianity in which CHRIST was an example for faith but not an object of faith would bring us no satisfaction; for that would mean that Christianity as we understand it had become extinct.

## War, Birth Control and Science

THE bringing together of these somewhat unrelated subjects finds its explanation in the fact that it is the pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference on these matters that have attracted most attention in the public press. A report of this Conference and its findings and pronouncements will be found in our news columns—to which the reader is referred.

While there may be some justified difference of opinion as to the function of the Church as an organization in the sphere of the State there can be no doubt that every Christian is under obligation to do all in his power to avert war. We would not go so far as to say that war is necessarily sinful—we do not regard the phrase, "a Christian soldier," as a contradiction in terms—but surely if it be true that war is "incompatible with the teaching and example of JESUS," as the pronouncement affirms, the Conference should not have contented itself with saying that the Christian Church should refuse to countenance a war until arbitration has been attempted, because in that case war should not be countenanced under any conditions. It seems somewhat of an anti-climax for the Conference to commend the nations for condemning war as a means of settling international disputes and then as a body of churchmen to content itself with withholding approval of only those wars in which the matter in dispute has not been submitted to arbitration. But while we believe that the Christian should do everything in his power to avert war, and while we think that Leagues of Nations, World Courts and such like may do much to avert war and may avert individual wars altogether, we have no hope that there will be a warless world save as the PRINCE OF PEACE rules in the hearts of men. The trouble with our pacifists is that they are bent on setting up a millennium in a sinful world. There is only one way to get a warless world; and that way is the conversion of the world. Until sin is abolished there will be, as JESUS warned us, wars and rumors of war.

The pronouncement on birth control was adopted by a vote of 193 to 67, 47 of the 307 members of the Conference being apparently absent when the vote was taken. By such a majority the Conference gives a qualified endorsement of birth control by other than the primary and obvious method of abstinence. While the use of any methods of birth control from "motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience" is condemned yet we are told that "in those cases where there is a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence" other methods may be employed provided this is done "in the light of Christian principles"—which seems somewhat equivalent to saying that there are circumstances under which we may lie or steal, provided we do so in the light of Christian principles. Apparently the majority of the Conference acted on the principle that motive determines the character of an act—a principle that has only a limited application. For while an act done from a wrong motive is always bad an act done from a good motive is not necessarily good. Otherwise, for instance, it might be held that it is right to steal to feed the poor. We need to keep a firm grasp on the fact that bishops or no bishops what the LORD forbids is always wrong.

According to the pronouncement on science "it is no part of the purpose of the Scriptures to give information on those themes which are the proper subject matter of science," a statement that is amplified in the encyclical letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury who writes, "we are now able, with the help of the various departmental sciences, to trace in outline a continuous process of creative development in which at every stage we find the divine presence and power." It seems obvious that the secular press is correct in seeing in this pronouncement an endorsement of the theory of evolution and of that solution of the conflict between science and Christianity that holds that the Bible does not teach things with which science has a right to deal. We can do not more than touch on the matter here but it ought to be obvious to all thoughtful people that this is a solution that involves the rejection of all that is most distinctive of Christianity, viz., the great saving facts that GOD has wrought for the salvation of His people culminating in the birth, death and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST. To assert that at every stage of history there has been nothing but a continuous development is tantamount to denying that history knows anything of the supernatural in the form of the miraculous, which means in turn that history knows nothing of the SON OF GOD become incarnate for us men and our salvation. Moreover if supernatural events like the resurrection of CHRIST actually took place they were events in the external world and as such a proper subject matter for scientific consideration. We cannot acquiesce in the attractive but superficial solution of the conflict between

science and religion which holds that the realm of facts belong to science but that the realm of ideals belong to religion. Religion itself, certainly the Christian religion is grounded in facts as objective as any with which any department of science deals. It would be suicidal, therefore, for Christianity to adopt such a solution. We believe indeed that there is no conflict between Christianity and Science, true as it is that there is conflict between Christianity and the theories advocated by many scientists. We are confident that in the long run no scientific theory will be judged adequate in which the great facts that lie at the basis of the Christian religion and makes it what it is do not find a natural and logical place. For the present it is imperative that we distinguish between the voice of Science and the voices of the scientists.

## Westminster Theological Seminary

WESTMINSTER Seminary is about to begin its second year. While, in one sense, the youngest of our theological seminaries, it is, as regards its spirit and ideals the oldest of them all. This finds its explanation in the fact that it is doing what it was established to do, viz., to carry on the traditions of Princeton Seminary as it existed prior to its reorganization by the General Assembly. What has happened since its opening on September 25th, 1929, has, in our judgment, added to rather than subtracted from the significance of the conclusion of the address delivered by Professor J. GRESHAM MACHEN on that occasion: "Though Princeton Seminary is dead, the noble tradition of Princeton Seminary is alive. Westminster Seminary will endeavor by GOD's grace to continue that tradition unimpaired; it will endeavor, not on a foundation of equivocation and compromise, but on an honest foundation of devotion to GOD's Word, to maintain the same principles that old Princeton maintained. We believe, first, that the Christian religion, as it is set forth in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, is true; we believe, second, that the Christian religion welcomes and that it is capable of scholarly defense; and we believe, third, that the Christian religion should be proclaimed without fear or favor, and in clear opposition to whatever opposes it, whether within or without the Church, as the only way of salvation for lost mankind. On that platform, brethren, we stand. Pray that we may be enabled by GOD's Spirit to stand firm. Pray that the students who go forth from Westminster Seminary may know CHRIST as their own Saviour and may proclaim to others the gospel of His love."

If it were really true, as has been alleged, that the reorganization at Princeton Seminary was merely in the interest of a simplified administrative organization and that it had nothing to do with its theological position we would be among the first to confess that the establishment of Westminster Seminary was uncalled for and that it is not entitled to the support it seeks. In that case Westminster would be merely "another seminary" striving for a place in the sun at a time when there would seem to be too many rather than too few of such institutions. It is that which Westminster has in distinction from other seminaries rather than that which it has in common with them that has attracted such an able body of students to its class rooms—last year all but one of its regular students was a college graduate—and that has led so many of GOD's people to contribute to its support. In our judgment, recent events, particularly the tone and temper of the last General Assembly, makes it increasingly evident that the founders of Westminster Seminary were divinely led when at great sacrifice to themselves and in face of the scorn and contempt of the world and of a worldly church they launched this institution.

How well fitted Westminster Seminary is to carry on along the lines that made old Princeton so loved and feared throughout the world is indicated by the character of its faculty. All the members of its faculty are Princeton trained. Five of its nine members have taught in Princeton Seminary and would, doubtless, be teaching there today if they had been willing to do so under the existing governing Board. We refer to Professors ROBERT DICK WILSON, J. GRESHAM MACHEN, OSWALD THOMPSON ALLIS, CORNELIUS VAN TIL and JOHN MURRAY —the latter of whom taught at Princeton last year but declined reappointment because of dissatisfaction with the situation there. What is more all of its members are the type of men whom the old Board of Directors would have elected to the Faculty of Princeton Seminary. Put negatively, it is safe to say that not a single one of them would have any chance of being elected *de novo* to a permanent position on the Princeton Faculty under the existing governing Board.

In this connection we should not overlook the scholarly equipment of these men. There is no other theological seminary in America, we believe, that stands four-square for the full truthfulness of the Bible and for the Reformed Faith as the system of doctrine taught in the Bible that can boast of a Faculty that needs to be so little ashamed in the presence of the world's learning. Here is a body of men who not only believe that the Christian religion is capable of scholarly defense but who themselves are able to provide that defense. Such men as ROBERT DICK WILSON, J. GRESHAM MACHEN and OSWALD T. ALLIS are sufficient of themselves to lend distinction to any theological Faculty. And when it is remembered that their younger colleagues give promise of attaining like distinction in the scholarly world it will be seen that Westminster Seminary while it owns no buildings and has practically no endowment, and so is dependent on the voluntary contributions of the friends of Christian education, has the one asset that lends real distinction to any school, viz., an outstanding faculty.

It seems to us that Westminster Seminary meets a real need in the life of the Church today and as such deserves in an increasing measure the support of the friends of Christian education. What is more it seems to us that young men of college education whose hearts GOD hath touched and whose feet He has directed toward the Christian ministry should prize the privilege of preparing themselves for their great work—the most responsible that is committed to the hands of men—under such masterly teachers as are to be found at Westminster Seminary.

# The "Yes and No" Attitude in the Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D.

(Dr. Stevenson, from whose pen we are glad to have this trenchant article, is well known throughout the Church. After a brief but successful career in the business world, he took up the study of theology, graduating from Princeton Seminary. As Home Missionary, Associate Minister in the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, and as Minister of the Church of the Covenant in Cincinnati for thirteen years, his labors have been richly blessed. Dr. Stevenson is a former President of the Board of Trustees of Lane Theological Seminary, and was a member of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary prior to the recent reorganization. He is now President of the Board of Westminster Seminary, and is Lecturer in Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in the same institution.)

IT is extremely irritating to hear the distressing answer, "yes and no" to a matter-of-fact question. For example, a conversation leads to politics and John Doe launches a dissertation on Socialism. Thereupon you ask him if he is a Socialist. He replies: "Yes and no. I vote the Socialist ticket, but—." And Mr. Doe proceeds to explain how he is, and is not, a Socialist. The fine nuances of Socialism are amazing. Or you innocently inquire of Richard Roe if he enjoys fishing. The answer comes after due deliberation: "Yes and no. I frequently go fishing but as I review my reactions to the rod and reel I do not see my way clear to commit myself definitely. There is pleasure in fishing; also pain, etc., etc."

These conversations are exasperating, and particularly because every yes-and-no man produces plausible reasons for evading direct replies. Mr. Doe is a Socialist, or he is not a Socialist. So you would imagine. But when he debates the fringes of the question, and you are compelled to listen, you find yourself in the midst of a problem baffling solution. You may resent the wordy circumlocution, but there you are. In the case of Mr. Roe, either he likes to fish, or he does not. After he beats around the bush for half an hour, you make your own guess, and perhaps your conclusion will be right. But you cannot be sure, for Mr. Roe will not be straightforward enough to tell. Mr. Doe and Mr. Roe are undeserving of praise and have none of ours. In an ideal society of honest men they would be among the last to gain entrance. The type of mind exists however, and in an imperfect world is to be confronted with whatever good-nature and fortitude can be summoned.

Strangely, there is one place where the yes-and-no attitude blooms luxuriantly, is highly regarded and in excessive demand. More strangely, it is in the Protestant Churches of America, and nowhere is it as noticeable as in our own Presbyterian Church. To show the development of this yes-and-no mentality in the Presbyterian Church; and to show furthermore, how difficult it may be for the Church to free itself from its entanglements, is a needed, if unpleasant endeavor. Not everyone will approve the effort, and some will question the proofs. All, however, will admit that something has caused the Presbyterian Church to lose vigor in recent years; and will be apt to admit too, that much of the vigor we have retained is not of our own production, but has come from resources of the past—including inherited property and certain continuing habits of conduct that carry us through the forms of church attendance and church support. Slowly dwindling congregations, fading mid-week prayer meetings, hard pressed Sunday Schools, are common. The Church's appeal to the devotion of its own members is diminishing. Conversions from among the unsaved millions at the Church's doors are comparatively rare.

This article will undertake to demonstrate: (1) That the decline has come because equivocation has been substituted for a clear-cut expression of convictions; (2) That the Church, as a whole, is either indifferent to consequences, or uninformed; and (3) That an important work is at hand for those who love the Presbyterian Church and pray for a return of spiritual power.

To speak bluntly of the present state of the Church, it will be shown that while we instinctively despise every form of evasion in ordinary social and business interchanges; yet as a Church, facing the world, and called upon to deal in forthright fashion with the facts of the Gospel, we no longer are scrupulous. Whereas Christ taught us that our communication is to be, "Yea, yea; Nay, nay"; from another quarter we have learned the dark art of saying, "Yea *and* Nay," both together and all at once.

The Presbyterian Church today seems to be another Samson, favored of God, celebrated for past deeds, and trusting that sin will not be held against so blest a child of destiny. Could Philistine chains bind Samson? He thought not, as he slept contentedly in the house of Delilah. He had defeated a thousand Philistines single-handed. He had carried off the gates of Gaza. He could safely follow his own devices. Presently Samson "awoke out of his sleep and said, I will go out as at other times before, and shake myself. And he wist not that the Lord had departed from him." How the analogy applies to the Presbyterian Church can be judged, in a measure, by the following narrative. Whether our Church is doomed, as Samson was doomed, time alone can tell conclusively.

In 1924, six years ago, a movement was started which future historians undoubtedly will mark as the beginning of an epoch in the Presbyterian Church. That many of us have been unaware of the event will not minimize its importance. Most Christians in the third century were unaware of the beginning of the Arian movement, which did not prevent, but rather hastened the mobilization of Arianism, full armed, within the early Church. In Luther's time few Christians realized as he did, the menace of Rome. In fact the necessity for the Reformation never became apparent to most of Luther's contemporaries. Always, dangerous doctrine matures quietly in the Christian household. Invariably it acquires the support of popular leaders and is established before a defense is aroused against it. Then at last comes bold denunciation and a struggle for the mastery of the Church; afterwards division, with one party adhering to the Scriptures as final authority. The dreadful cycle has been begun and completed again and again. We now are face to face at least with another beginning, a school of thought in the Presbyterian Church as deadly as any heresy in the early Church; and as much out of accord with the religion Christ gave the world as the Popery of the Middle Ages. Different from them, it is as elusive as a phantom, as volatile as a magician's disappearing rabbit.

In 1924 a pamphlet, commonly known as "The Auburn Affirmation," was published by what is called "The Committee on Protestant Liberties," a Presbyterian organization, and presenting either the zenith or the nadir of the workings of man's mind, depending on how one views these things. The paper is a statement of a new attitude to the Christian faith, and offers the substance of a new creed. Occasioned by definite doctrinal declarations of the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in 1910 1916, and 1923, the pamphlet is a protest on the part of about thirteen hundred Presbyterian ministers. We are led to assume that others are in agreement with the protest, but for one reason or another did not add their names to the list. The signers include men influential in the Church's life and work. By writing to the headquarters of the Committee, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York, possibly copies of the document still can be secured upon request, and the reader will see for himself its revolutionary character and impressive endorsements.

"The Committee on Protestant Liberties" is not charged with conspiracy. If what was done in 1924 was accomplished quietly, it is not maintained that it was accomplished secretly. The thirteen hundred Presbyterian ministers and their supporters are not engaged in a plot to wreck the Presbyterian Church. They are expressing their beliefs and letting consequences take care of themselves. We will look at these beliefs, and then at their effects. What this yes-and-no attitude signifies should then be apparent. The story is interesting.

The pamphlet contemplates the Bible. All signers hold that while they believe "the writers of the Bible were inspired of God," they are unwilling to say that "the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Scripture as to keep them from error." In other words, the dependability of God's inspiration is open to debate; we can trust it, and we cannot. Thus, and at the start, a neutral position is found between contending opinions as to the truth of the Bible. Heretofore Presbyterians have stressed the fact that the Bible is God's word. A skeptical world as flatly has said: "No; the Bible is

man's word." The new attitude halts between the two opinions and there the tents are pitched. Sympathetic to both sides, not wholly agreeing with either side, an inquirer will question in vain if he expects a more positive declaration on this basic issue of revealed religion.

Having taken this stand, the thirteen hundred Presbyterian ministers consider: (1) The Virgin Birth of Christ as a theory which may be true, but which they say no Presbyterian minister is required to believe (and here the argument is strained to the breaking point), since other theories are "allowed by the Scriptures and our Standards"; (2) The Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord with the same body in which He suffered, which they conclude no Presbyterian minister is required to believe, for the same reason; (3) The Miracles of Christ which were not contrary to nature, but superior to it; and which they claim no Presbyterian minister is required to believe, for the same reason; (4) Christ's Death as an offering to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, which they say no Presbyterian minister is required to believe for the same reason.

Now we must be fair. From the above declaration it looks as if these men have forsaken the Christian faith. This is not the case. Never yet have yes-and-no minds forsaken any position that affords opportunity for an argument. A positive position may have disadvantages; but they will find its compensating merits. A negative judgement may seem untenable; it will not be untenable for them. Clear white or jet black become non-existent; but there does remain a neutral gray. In the Protestant Liberties' pamphlet a yes-and-no theology finds consistent exposition.

The signers are unwilling to certify that Christ was born of a Virgin; they do testify that God was manifest in the flesh. Denying the Church's right to insist upon ministers accepting the record of the resurrection of His body; they believe His spirit rose from the dead. Although Christ may not have died to satisfy divine justice; His death was "vicarious." Hesitating before actual miracles; they affirm Christ wrought mighty works. In their own words: "Some of us regard the particular theories . . . . as satisfactory explanations . . . . But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our Standards."

That the Bible and our Standards allow no such latitude of interpretation will occur to anyone familiar with either. The language of Scripture is unmistakable and the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church is explicit and precise. Moreover much of what is questioned are the historic beliefs of all Christendom. When gentlemen profess to discover in them wide shades of meaning on the cardinal truths of Christianity, they are trifling with words. The root of the yes-and-no idea is not in the Bible, and not in the Protestant creeds. It is in a modern, "scientific" literature written around the Bible and the creeds, and called "scientific" only because it perpetually fears to make the slightest affirmation unless that affirmation has qualifying clauses. A serious indictment can be drawn against the Protestant Liberties' movement on this score alone.

But that is not the point. It is not what the pamphlet has done to the signers that most concerns us. It is what the pamphlet has done and will continue to do to the Presbyterian Church. The thirteen hundred signers are hardly one-seventh of the total number of Presbyterian ministers. Not a great proportion. The point is, these thirteen hundred men, placed in conspicuous and responsible posts, as they are, are changing the character of our Church's witness to Christ.

In the first place, many conservative Presbyterians have been affected, and to their injury. Entangled in intimate relationships with signers of the pamphlet, they have been constrained to regard them with an easy toleration and with subsequent sympathy. It is right, they persuade themselves, to collaborate with them, and, when occasion arises, to give them whatever preferments the Presbyterian Church offers. If they are out of accord with the Church's belief, the General Assembly has glossed over their irregularity; and why not go along with them in confidence and fellowship? Multitudes of Presbyterians have drifted into this Laodicean frame of mind, and the yes-and-no attitude has invaded the whole Church. Beginning as a non-committal attitude toward essential truth on the part of hundreds, it quickly became a non-committal attitude toward law and discipline on the part of thousands. The Church is not disposed to call offenders before ecclesiastical courts when they are so numerous, so popular, and, in very many instances, represent wealth and heavy contributions to benevolences.

Of course the disloyalty involved in giving a cooperating hand to Presbyterian ministers who have avowed a skeptical attitude to the teaching of the Gospels, is plain. When a man, no matter who he is, collaborates with a Modernist, he shares responsibility for Modernist propaganda. He may be constrained to associate with Modernists in various relationships, and in the Presbyterian Church such associations are unavoidable. Indeed they are praiseworthy if an evangelical churchman emphasizes how widely he differs from them. But to go along with Modernists, passively partake in their plans, apologize for them and defend them, is another matter and wholly wrong.

No amount of casuistry will alter the New Testament pronouncement: if we are not for Christ we are against Him. In the conflict between the world and the asseverations of the Gospel, men are classified automatically. Saul of Tarsus affords a striking illustration of the extent of the rule's application. When he was a youth, a group of his friends murdered Stephen. So far as we know, Saul threw none of the stones. Like a small boy at a fight, he held the coats of his friends while they stoned Stephen to death. Does Paul believe himself guiltless? He does not. When he was converted, and Saul had become Paul, this outspoken man speaks frankly to his Lord: "When the blood of Thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him." To the last Paul saw the light on Stephen's face, and heard his dying prayer, and recognized his own guilt.

It cannot be different with us. In the place of Stephen the Lord's martyr, put the Bible, the Lord's book. Thirteen hundred Presbyterian ministers are casting doubt upon its trustworthiness. Others also are standing by, and consenting. These excuse themselves in the thought that they are not destroying the Bible's effectiveness: they are simply keeping the raiment of them that are. The excuse does not avail for a moment.

The second result of the Protestant Liberties' movement is even more disastrous. It reaches beyond individuals to the Church's corporate testimony, to the agencies which are the Church's voice. We see it clearly in our missionary enterprise, in seminaries where the Church's future ministers are educated, and in the Church's organs of publicity. Before 1924 a trend away from the old Presbyterian orthodoxy was observable in some of the boards and agencies and in some magazines and papers. After 1924 that trend was sanctioned by the support of thirteen hundred prominent ministers, and in 1926 the General Assembly decided that there was nothing to be done about it. Thereupon restraints were lifted generally.

Ask the "Candidate Secretary" of the Board of Foreign Missions about the Board's attitude to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. His reply could well be: "Why, I myself signed the Protestant Liberties' pamphlet, and so did eleven members of the Boards of Foreign and National Missions." Ask him about the missionaries, and he could well counter with a question of his own: "Do you expect missionaries to be more orthodox than members of the Boards employing them?" This would be a reasonable question, and descriptive of the missionary outlook in the Presbyterian Church today.

Sound missionaries are on the field, but it is not because the boards insist upon it. Vulnerable themselves, the boards are in no position to insist. And no cheer comes from shifting back to Presbyteries the responsibility for the missionaries' soundness of doctrine. Presbyteries are not likely to maintain higher standards than the boards in the case of candidates. What the Mission Boards say, and do, and are, determines missionary qualifications. Similar influence is exercised by the Board of Christian Education and is reflected in every Presbyterian academy and college, in the literature for Sunday Schools, and in young people's organizations under the Board's care.

We turn to the theological seminaries where our future ministers are taught what, and how, to preach. Presbyterians have erred in considering the Church's seminaries to be dull, anemic institutions, necessary but unimportant. As a rule, a preacher bears the marks of his seminary upon him as long as he lives. If *preaching* is important, the seminaries that mold the plastic mind of a student according to their own fashion, give him their viewpoint, and send him to a pulpit, are the main spring of the Church's life. Eventually a Church is made by its theological seminaries, whether for good or ill. What they are today, the Church will be tomorrow.

Take Princeton. On the newly organized Princeton Board of Trustees are signers of the Protestant Liberties' propaganda, commonly known as "The Auburn Affirmation," their presence welcomed and defended by the President of the Board and the President of the Seminary. A Board so constituted cannot logically or reasonably demand a continuing orthodoxy from teachers and students at Princeton, lest they in turn advise the Board to set its own house in order. The coming order of events is readily foreseen in the light of the experience of scores of institutions similarly administered. The Church's other theological seminaries are not in much better condition. Some are more unfortunately handicapped. They will not aggressively contend for fundamental Christianity, nor can they be required to imbue their students with a zeal that is an improvement on their own compliant attitude. Pledges and inaugural oaths

are hardly more than gestures, for they are always subject to the interpretations currently accorded the Church's Constitution.

Glance at the weekly and monthly publications in the Presbyterian Church. *The Presbyterian Advance*, printed in Nashville, seems to have the largest influence, and is edited by a signer of the manifesto on Protestant Liberties. *The Banner*, of Pittsburgh, gives a reader the disconcerting idea that controversy in behalf of the purity of the Church's message is gloomy and profitless, if not downright malicious. *The Presbyterian*, of Philadelphia, has changed editors because of the former editor's resolute stand. The Church has an official journal. Its deficits, (twelve thousand dollars a year) are paid through appropriations from the General Council. This *Presbyterian Monthly Magazine* has as its editor-in-chief another of those ubiquitous persons, a Protestant Liberties' signer. Not among these publications is one champion of what were considered, twenty years ago, the marching orders of the Presbyterian Church. Good articles are neutralized by comments that hurt, and the yes-and-no rationale prevails. When the hitherto aggressive, conservative organ which had been conducted by Samuel G. Craig was dramatically withdrawn from the line-of-fire some eight months ago, the field was cleared of the last of a vanishing type of fearless and polemic Church newspapers.

One cannot charge the downward trend against a single group. But it is entirely possible to trace the trend to that group when their sympathizers are included. The thirteen hundred signers of the Protestant Liberties' document are a symbol of a new Presbyterianism and their supporters are legion. Like leaven their activities permeate everywhere, and not helpfully but destructively. It is appalling to note their ascendancy in the General Assembly held in Cincinnati in May. Three of the chairmen of the permanent committees appointed by the Moderator, and two of the three ministers elected as members of the Permanent Judicial Commission, are Protestant Liberties' signers. Were not far sounder men available? They were; and they received some recognition, for the starting of Westminster Seminary and of CHRISTIANITY TODAY have proved that a remnant of Presbyterians are not going to surrender, and they must be reckoned with. But Modernists take what they please, and expediency alone induces them to delay taking all.

The Presbyterian Church, not merely the heir to an estate of faith, but the sworn executor of a sacred trust, shows every sign of wearying of the obligation. Remembering that "it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful," and impelled by a noble tradition of fidelity, there is some notion of duty's stern demands. But when objectors are numerous, persistent and troublesome, an executor's task grows distasteful. "And it came to pass, when Delilah pressed Samson daily with her words, and urged him, so that his soul was vexed unto death, she made him sleep; and she called for a man and caused him to shave off the locks of his head; and his strength went from him." So giants fall.

To measure the distance the Church has travelled in the wrong direction, recall the sturdy manifestations of convictions a few years ago, and the unbroken uniformity of testimony. The change in attitude is so pronounced one wonders if it is the same organization. There was the tribute President Benjamin Harrison paid the Presbyterian Church because it stood unflinchingly, "stiff as a steel beam," he said, for that essential doctrine. The Inspired Word. His spirited praise used to be printed annually in the Handbook published in the office of the General Assembly, and it rang true. There was the prompt discipline set in motion against Drs. Henry Preserved Smith, David Swing, and Charles A. Briggs, eminent Presbyterian ministers who had repudiated the trustworthiness of Scripture. A Cromwellian hatred of indirection characterized a Church that then cared nothing for the persuasions of unbelief, and would not take a step to appease the contempt of the world. Neither blandishments nor ridicule; neither emoluments nor disdain of men, could deviate by a hair's breadth, the Church's appointed course. Opposition outside the Church was ignored; opposition inside was dealt with by a firm hand. They were days of conquest. The Bible was proclaimed. From Genesis' abyss of darkest waters to the splendors of the New Jerusalem in the vision of St. John, the Scriptures were accepted and taught without addition or substraction, without fear or favor.

With a dependable Bible, missionaries had a message for China and India and Africa infinitely more appealing than a mere system of ethics. They did not go out to give and take, to barter religions with the shadowy concepts of the heathen. They believed that when God comes, the half-gods must go. Great missionary conventions were conducted by Student Volunteers. These were not young men groping in a twilight zone of grayness. "Their eyes saw the boundless sapphire of Heaven and the awesome glow of Hell." Called to foreign lands, they were like a strong man rejoicing to run a race. They had a Saviour to announce and a divine salvation, and were impatient to set forth. The average Presbyterian Church promoted the work of the missionary with enthusiasm. One cannot compare the present mechanical activity with the fervid devotion at the century's turn, without being sensible of the distinct fall in temperature. Modern religious teaching, oblique in its approach to the truths of the Gospel, and timidly shying away again, produces a cool agnosticism that mocks at enthusiasm. An immediate casualty is evangelical missions.

Presbyterian ministers were preachers of an uncompromising doctrine. It was the rule, not the exception, to preach on vital themes like The Creation; Man's Fall; Original Sin; God's Covenant; The New Birth; The Judgment; Hell; Heaven; The Precious Blood of Christ; The Justice of God; The Justification of the Sinner. Conversions were many; revivals stirred the people. We did not dream that within a few years plain Bible facts would be called doubtful theories by a large section of the Presbyterian ministry, nor did we dream that the Church would accept the consequences as of little moment.

Apart from ministers and congregations here and there that conspicuously maintain a witness, and are conspicuous because they are exceptional, the new attitude to the Bible seems all-pervasive. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick was not exaggerating when he exclaimed this summer: "A man dogmatic in his religion is fairly well outlawed from intelligent society." He was glad; some of us are very sorry. But the statement cannot be challenged. The positive "yes" and the decisive "no" are about done for in the pagan religious atmosphere surrounding highly educated men. They will not hear them. Like other Christians, Presbyterians realize that they must be vague and indefinite in their affirmations, or lose standing in circles of cultured respectability. Mr. Chesterton once said: "Many are willing to be martyrs for the sake of Christ: few are ready to be accounted fools." Few they are in the Presbyterian Church, according to all indications.

Because they started with the most sweeping convictions of all, Presbyterians have gone further than other Christians to become a party to the boycott aimed at "fundamentalists." But they have arrived. In the councils of his Church a Presbyterian is regarded with ill-favor the instant he contends for purity of doctrine. His convictions are plainly out of date and they get in the way of harmony programs. Moreover with half an eye he is able to discern an ecclesiastical gibbet, stark against the sky, whereon hang the bodies of quite a company of men who have expressed themselves not wisely, and too well, on the subject of faithfulness to the trust imposed upon the Church. That kind of witness is not borne without penalty.

Local congregations feel the strictures. Alert Modernists and Pacifists often are in commanding positions in a congregation to the discomfiture of a Minister who otherwise would lead his people to an unequivocal stand for a revival of historic Presbyterianism. Or else a Modernist or Pacifist pastor prevents an orthodox congregation from asserting itself. Either way the situation is abhorrent. When faithful men would speak out if they could, and are frustrated, they become depressed, feel deserted, and are tempted to give up.

But, granted that duty is hard. Granted that the noble faith of the Presbyterian Church apparently is dying in the hearts of men. Granted that in many instances the most loyal Presbyterians are yoked side by side with fellow Presbyterians whose aims are not theirs, and to whom they become offensive when they so much as intimate the falling-away of ministers and boards and agencies. What then? Shall conservatives give up their task as hopeless?

Let us look at the items on the other side of the balance. They are not negligible. The Confession of Faith remains in the Constitution of the Prestyterian Church, neglected, well-nigh forgotten, but unamended, untinkered with in twenty-five years of doctrinal confusion. It is the creed of the Church, and every line sustains a courageous stand. Not for its own sake alone, but because it gives full honor to Christ, it is a worthy standard beneath which to carry on what Paul prophetically calls "the good fight of faith." Conservatives possess also that indispensible asset, a theological seminary. Westminster Seminary is not under ecclesiastical control and church politicians will not shape its policy. A home of learning with a famous and brilliant Faculty and with a high quality of students—as Westminster sends graduates to Presbyterian pulpits, young, well informed and ambitious to serve the cause, the reinforcement will be something like the arrival of the American troops in France when the Allied Armies had their back to the wall.

Conservatives have a journal, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, new, but with a rapidly growing circulation; perhaps the most interesting, most carefully prepared paper available to Presbyterians. While both Westminster Seminary and CHRISTIANITY TODAY are dependent financially, it is significant that both have been established in this time of emergency, and that

both are prospering. They will live and increase in strength in proportion as we give them the money they need and the prayers they ask for.

Best of all, there is an indication that possibly one-third of the Presbyterian Church, in the country and in the city, has not succumbed to doubt and indifference, and has not been crushed under the wheels of relentless machinery. At any rate about one-third of the Commissioners to successive General Assemblies regularly have been standing up in behalf of the old beliefs, and in behalf of men who have espoused these beliefs. When doctrinal issues were drawn they were willing to go down to defeat, but they kept the flag flying. Surely this was true in the stormy sessions at Baltimore, San Francisco, Tulsa and St. Paul. All these resources are substantial, and for them we can be thankful to God.

Obviously we are a minority. But a determined minority with the impetus of a dynamic motive need not fear the vastest majority. A minority, given a righteous purpose, and organized, can afford to hope, and to wait. God is not limited because His forces are few, or the adversary a host. If it is His intention that the walls of Zion shall be built, He will provide the captains, show the way, and make the victory sure. Hard though it is to wait, while waiting, a good soldier of Jesus Christ will be preparing.

Subsequent to the Great War, and due to her own folly, Hungary was a broken nation. To see what men in extremity can accomplish, even men whose ambition is selfish, it is well to ponder her case. In every school, children are taught a certain lesson, line upon line, precept upon precept. Each day the lesson is different, but each day the lesson ends with the stirring words: "I believe in the resurrection of Hungary." A small proportion of the Hungarian people are resolved to recapture a former glory. And they are likely to succeed. The Powers in Europe are against them, the League of Nations discourages them, their own countrymen hold themselves aloof. But the little band presses on. And this they do "to obtain a corruptible crown; *but we an incorruptible!*"

Right now, in our Sunday Schools, in our Sessions, in our Presbyteries and General Assemblies, unexpected allegiance might be roused for the old Book and the old Faith were we to repeat, regardless of our relatively few numbers: "We believe in the resurrection of the Presbyterian Church." No one has the right to concede the destruction of a Church of such prayers and tears. No one knows enough to predict what instrumentalities the Lord will set aside, or what He will use. We do know the greatness of the Presbyterian Church as it was manifested a generation ago, and what, by God's grace, it may be again. We do know that He has given us posts of duty with the day's work clearly indicated.

Yes-and-no religion, call it Liberalism, Modernism, or any other name, is not permanent. It is a religion of suspended judgement, looking for a place to rest. It may become worse before it becomes better, but finally it must return to the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture where alone the Christian Church finds security; or else take its stand with Rationalism and unbelief. One may shilly-shally about politics and the things that belong to this earth's fleeting experiences. He cannot long evade the issues on which depend his belief in God and in the destiny of his own soul.

The Presbyterian Church is close to the parting of the ways. Having had its little game of blind-man's buff, it is time to take off the handkerchief and walk ahead with open eyes. Every man with Christian convictions can help guide the Church along the right way. It is a narrow way, but it leads unto life and the Church will take it or die. Who will join in the great march? Many, we think, who are perplexed, unsettled, unsatisfied. With patience and understanding, with a true love for men, for the Church, and for God, let us call, on our knees, for a genuine revival, a rallying once more to that definite faith the Lord has asked us to protect, and to project. Discipline is not necessarily gone forever. The Pilgrim Church is a Militant Church under orders. In those orders one will look in vain for any command that justifies the halting, hesitating, confused maneuvers of the last six years.

# Joy in Service

## A SERMON

**By the Late Rev. Geo. T. Purves, D.D., LL.D.**

**Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary; Minister, Fifth Ave. Presbyterian Church, New York, N. Y.**

*"Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work."—John* 4:34.

THIS is one of the sentences that dropped from the lips of Christ, which let us into His personal spiritual life and in some measure lay bare His mind. Viewing Him from a distance, we may admire His character; viewing Him in history, we may confess His incomparable power; viewing Him when convincing us of our own sin, we may adore Him as our Saviour; but we desire, and may have, a still more intimate acquaintance. He permits us to share His secrets, and all that we otherwise feel of reverence, admiration, and gratitude gives new value to these disclosures of the spiritual life of the God in man.

Now, in the words before us, Christ describes His joy in the service of the Father. They reveal a devotion so complete as to entirely control His mind. They reveal a soul so absorbed in doing the Divine will as to be insensible for the time to ordinary physical needs. They reveal a self-consecration which is absolute, and yet which is so spontaneous and glad as to be self-sustaining; so that Christ needed no other support in serving the Father than simply the opportunity of such service. We, on the contrary, require support to enable us to serve. We must be rewarded for our work, must be encouraged by sympathy, must be fed with promises and spiritual gifts, in order to be strong enough to do our duty. Christ found duty its own reward, service itself joy, obedience a source of renewed strength. His will was one with the Father's; and thus He discloses the, to us, marvelous spectacle of one who could truly say, Not my desire or my duty, or my purpose is, but my meat—my food—my source itself of life and strength—is to do the will of God, and to finish His work.

And yet our Lord Jesus was a very genuine man. He did not impress observers with the common insignia of holiness. It was the Pharisees, not Christ, who stood at the corners of the streets to make long prayers, who enlarged the borders of their phylacteries and chose the chief seats in the synagogues. It was the Baptist, not Jesus, who clothed himself in a garment of camel's hair and ate locusts and wild honey. Jesus, on the contrary, lived the outward life of other men, consorted with them in their usual place of resort, dressed and spake as they did; so that, in outward manner, it was impossible to distinguish Him from the common mass in which He moved. All the more precious, therefore, is this revelation of His inner life. What a soul was His! The thought uppermost in His mind was devotion to the Father's will. The joy which most gladdened His lonely life was the joy of unknown, but sublime and perfect, obedience. He had been pointing a Samaritan woman, sitting by the wellside, to the salvation of God; and though she was but one, and that to human eyes an unworthy subject,—though she was a Samaritan and an open sinner,—His soul found such intense pleasure in bringing her—as the Father had sent Him to bring men anywhere—to the knowledge of the truth, that fatigue and hunger were forgotten, and all His energies were absorbed in the delight of the task. In this I think Christ appears simply Divine. No later fame or success, no gaudy robes of human praise, no gilded crown of human admiration, are needed to adorn Him. He discloses the very ideal of a godly life. All our poor efforts at obedience, all our faint aspirations after the knowledge and love of God, all our unfulfilled prayers, and falling flights, and unredeemed promises and sin-stained attempts to serve, confess the ideal perfectness of Him who could truthfully say, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work."

I. Let us first then, draw a little closer to

NOTE: *This sermon is reprinted with the kind permission of the American Tract Society, publishers of the volume entitled "Joy in Service" by Dr. Purves.*

this peerless soul, in which there was such perfect sense of the worth of infinite things, and let us note more particularly, and appreciate as far as we are able, this phase of the character of the Son of Man.

I have said that Christ was a very natural man. But He was more than that. I am sure that none can study His character without admitting and admiring the perfect proportion in which truth evidently lay in His mind. This is one of the rarest beauties of character. Most of us are very one-sided. We can grasp but a part of truth; and in order to grasp that part firmly, we have to absolutely let other truth go. In order to be devoted to duty as we see it, we commonly have to leave other duties untouched. Our spiritual growth ought to take just this direction of including broader views of truth and duty, of obtaining a conception of life in which the various elements shall be held in their proper relations and proportions; no one allowed to eclipse the others, but each modified to a proper extent by the presence and influence of the rest. I say this is a rare achievement. No one but Christ has ever achieved it perfectly. It is easy to see that even the apostles, inspired as they were, did not equally appreciate all sides of revelation. They have their distinguishing doctrines and points of view.

It is still easier to see that Christian churches and theologians differ for this same reason, and to a much greater extent. No creed, no church, no theology, that builds on the Word of God, can be wholly wrong. Its difference from others must lie in its partial appreciation of the truth, in its inability to take in all truths in their relative proportion. And so in literature and science and philosophy some men are impressed with material evidences, others with moral. Some men are poets, others are logicians; some critical, others dogmatic. The hope of the future for the Church and for humanity is in the slow approximation and combination of these partial views, until at last, "in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, we shall come unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Meanwhile, at the beginning of our Christian history, Christ stands perfect. To see this is to appreciate His authority. As Paul said, He is the corner stone of the spiritual temple which the Divine Spirit is building.

I do not mean that He taught explicitly all the truth which later times have discovered, or which after Him apostles taught. But He laid the living germs of all later religious truth, and He held them in such perfect proportion that when the long course of history shall be finished, when that which is in part shall have been done away, and that which is perfect shall have come, the result will be but the reproduction on a large scale of the already perfect stature of Christ.

And this is particularly manifested in Christ's views of life. His peerless spirituality did not make Him an ascetic. His clear vision of the future did not lead Him to despise the present. His love of God did not destroy His love of nature or of man. His hatred of sin did not cause Him to shun the sinner. Hence, though our Lord was the model of a religious man, He was no enthusiast, still less a fanatic. The enthusiast is a man who sees but part of truth and magnifies it out of its proportion; and the fanatic is one who, in addition to this, hates what he cannot understand. According to Isaac Taylor, "Fanaticism is enthusiasm inflamed by hatred." But Christ exaggerated nothing and hated no man. He hated sin, but no sinner. His boundless, tender love itself prevented such moral distortion. And, therefore, He is the ideal or model of human life. We do not feel that in striving to imitate even His most spiritual qualities we shall become impractical or unnatural. We do not feel this in the case of most other holy men. They become examples of one virtue by exaggerating it. But Christ never did this. Lofty as the view of life was which He discloses in our text, sublime as was its spiritual consecration, it existed in Him in harmony with the life which by its thoroughly human and practical features proves that we too, in at least some measure, can make even His highest traits our exemplars. Look, therefore, at this text which discloses His mind, and mark its principal elements.

1. There is first disclosed the strong and constant consciousness that He had a distinct errand in the world. He knew that He had been born for a purpose, that a divine aim was in His coming, and that a positive result would follow His life. This sense of a definite errand was expressed by Him on numerous occasions: in some of them quite incidentally, and in others more directly. You remember how, as a boy in the temple, He said to His mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" You remember how, at the marriage in Cana, He said to her again, "My hour is not yet come." So with that precious phrase which on several occasions fell from His lips, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." He regarded Himself as one sent from God; and when His life was about over He lifted up His eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour is come; I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."

So in our text, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." He was here on a special errand, and that errand was always before His mind. Earth was but a place of appointed work. Life was to Him an office, a stewardship. He had this consciousness, even when He seemed to be accomplishing nothing. It gave unity to all His acts and words. To Galilean peasants and to Jewish scribes He could speak with equal assurance, because His errand was to both. Yet He knew its limitations. He said to the Syro-Phœnician woman, "I am not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." He had come do a special work among the Jews, and in that a work for all mankind. He had not come to be glorified. He had not come to be ministered unto, but to minister. But He had come on a distinct errand; and whatever be your doctrine of Christ's person, you must confess that He considered Himself no accident of history; that He did not regard His life work as originating in His own choice; that His sense of a mission did not come as an afterthought to Him, or grow clear as He advanced in life. He felt His special errand from the start. It was always before His mind, so that life was to Him the performance of a given task and the fulfillment of an assigned duty.

2. But furthermore, our text discloses that, to Christ's mind, this errand of His in the world derived its sanctity from the fact that it was the will or wish of His Father. Every man is governed by some controlling motive or class of motives. The lowest of all is the motive of personal gain and pleasure, and the sorrows and sins of men chiefly spring from the tyranny of this degraded passion. Higher than it is the motive of pity and compassion, which may lead us to do good for the sake of benefiting others. This is the spring of much charity and philanthropy, and, so far as it goes, it is of course to be commended. But there is a higher motive than even it, and Christ reveals it to us here. It is the wish to do God's will. Such was His motive. To Him the will of the Father was the perfect good. He knew of nothing nobler than it, so that the whole energy of His character consisted in the force of obedience.

This phrase may carry us back to that time in the counsels of the Godhead when, as we conceive such matters, the Father determined to save the world that had rebelled against Him. The question was, where to find a Saviour; and the spirit of the Divine Son was manifested in His self-dedication to the work. He, too, loved man, but that was not His main motive. He loved the Father. He appreciated the Father's wish to save. He gave Himself to carry out that wish. "Lo, I come," said He, "to do thy will, O God." Thus we may perceive, I think, the deep reality in the Divine Sonship of Christ; and certainly on earth this was His controlling motive. He was obedient even unto death. To obey to the very least particular the Father's will was the principle of His being. To Him the Father's will was not hard, stern law, as we with our rebellious instincts so often regard it; it was the Father's wish. When love exists between two persons, the will of one it is the other's joy to do, if possible. Love impels to its accomplishment. Love rejoices in being of service in giving the loved one pleasure, in carrying out the other's desire. So the will of God was, to Christ, His Father's wish. Obedience was the mainspring of His soul's life, and His errand in the world derived its sanctity and its glory—in spite of man's antagonism and in spite of apparent fruitlessness—from the fact that it was the will of God. In this Christ discloses the very highest spiritual life which it is possible to conceive. How marvelous was this! He who has won the greatest influence over the race,

He before whom the head bows in adoration, He who has changed already the course of history, and will change it until every knee has bowed to Him, was one whose supreme wish was to be an obedient Son. Instead of conquering by selfishness He conquered by self-abnegation. Instead of doing His own work, He gave Himself up to doing His Father's. Here is at once a miracle of history and a model of life of which man would never have dreamed.

3. As a consequence of all this we can perceive in the language of the text Christ's joy in the discovery of a special opportunity of carrying out the highest purpose of the Father's will. It would seem that His meeting with the Samaritan woman awakened almost a state of excitement in His mind. It lifted Him above the reach of physical desires. This I suppose was because He recognized in that meeting an opportunity of doing what He knew was dearest to His Father's heart. His errand was to ultimately save the world, and now He was engaged in saving at least one soul. No doubt His devotion to the Father's will sustained Him, even in the darkest hour. When the will of God consigned Him to the hatred of men, to the rejection of the people, to the bitter sorrow of the cross, He could bow His head in humble compliance and say, "Thy will, not Mine, be done." But He knew well that the Father willed His sorrows in order to the world's salvation, and that the object dearest to the Father's heart was the recovery of lost souls. He Himself has told us of the angels' joy over such. And He has described the whole object of His appearing to man by these matchless words: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life." And therefore His love of God the Father, no less than His love of man, made Him hail with especial joy such an opportunity as this. We may fairly say that Christ followed the lead of providence. He did Himself what He requires of us; He was quick to recognize opportunities. He heard in them a divine call; and by all His sense of His mission among men, by all His desire to please the Father, did He hail the rising faith of that Samaritan and rejoice in bringing to her the message of salvation. Hence I say His evident excitement, if we may use the phrase. Hence His obliviousness to hunger. Hence His forgetfulness of His former fatigue. "Lift up your eyes," He cried to His disciples, "and look on the fields, for they are white already unto harvest." The Father's will would be accomplished, and in the joy of service His soul found its food. He wanted nothing else. Such fruitful obedience was to Him its own reward.

I say again, therefore, what a spiritual life was this! Praise itself seems almost to defile it. It was perfect. It was sublime. Thus can we understand His sinlessness. We can imagine no higher ideal; and marvelous to say, here was the ideal realized. We cannot wonder any longer that over this Jesus of Nazareth God should say, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

II. And now, while admiring, we are to ask if it is possible for us to imitate in principle this spiritual life, of which the Master gave so fine an example. Possibly, you may say, we may imitate some of the least remarkable traits, but scarcely this. And yet this lies at the root and soul of the rest: imitation of them is but external and spurious if it does not reach this. Only by this can we have real fellowship with Him.

We are met at the outset by man's natural reluctance to even think of regarding the will of God as aught but repulsive. Very often objection is openly made to the spiritual view expressed by Christ. God, it is said, must surely want to educate us into the love of virtue and truth for their own sakes. He does not want merely to conquer us, to break our wills by superior power. He wants to lead us to share His own spirit and life; and, therefore, would not ask us to submit merely to His will. To train men, therefore, to merely obey is not so noble as to train men to reason, or to love truth and righteousness for their own sakes. But we reply that we should attain to the most exalted love of truth and righteousness and every other noble thing in no way so well as through loyalty to God. Certainly God does not want to merely conquer us by force, but of all things in the world that is the one not exhibited in Jesus Christ. His was the obedience of love. It sprang from His admiration of the Father's nature. And so must ours. God has laid us under immeasurable obligations of gratitude. He has condescended to reveal Himself to us. He has given proof of His wisdom, His love, His holiness, His righteousness. And, therefore, the will of God is no arbitrary commandment. It is the wish of our dearest Friend. It is the direction given from the world's Pilot. It is the direction of infinite wisdom and righteousness and love; and to be devoted to His will is but to be confident that all His glorious attributes are being expressed for our guidance.

And then, what should we say of one who seeks after truth and righteousness, and yet does not yield obedience to Him who is the source of all things—the truth, the righteousness? We should probably conclude that His search was a fancy, His aspiration an illusion. No! What we need is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, to feel that He is the wisest, the most lovely—the embodiment and the source of all other wisdom and goodness; the Sun by which the other planets shine, by whose rays the world of nature receives its life and beauty. We need to love God supremely; and if we do, then the will of God will seem to us always good, even as it did to Christ.

"Man's weakness, waiting upon God,
Its end can never miss;
For men on earth no work can do
More angel-like than this.
"He always wins who sides with God,
To him no chance is lost:
God's will is sweetest to him when
It triumphs at his cost.
"Ill that He blesses is our good,
And unblessed good our ill;
And all is right that seems most wrong,
If it be His sweet will."

Let man behold, through Christ, the infinite Father, the source of all life and blessedness and good, and man will put God first, and find his highest glory in acting out the prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

But even so, we are met by the further difficulty that, unlike Christ, we are not always sensible of being sent on any special errand into the world. We lose what aim we have, amid the diversities of toil to which we are compelled. We lose what breadth of view we have, amid the multitude of trifles of which our loves are composed. We can imagine Christ's sense of His mission, and how it could absorb Him; but what in our lots can correspond? It may indeed be true that, unlike Christ, you have no clear idea of why God sent you into the world. Few have, but it would seem to quite remove God from actual government of the world to say that, therefore, He had no purpose. That glowing picture which the apostle paints of the rising temple should forbid the doubt. Every stone has its place and is needed. It may need to be broken and hewn, to be polished; it may be hid in an unseen place within the wall; no man may notice it. But the Builder meant it to be there, and it contributes its share to the work before which the ages of eternity shall fall in wonder; that work which is to manifest to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God. We may dismiss the doubt therefore, since God is God. We have been made and sent here for a purpose. God's will is meaning to use us, and it is our duty and privilege now to carry out, as far as possible, that will of Him that sent us, so far as He has made it known. And certainly, brother man, enough of the Father's will is made known to teach us our work.

We may rejoice to do His will as revealed *in conscience*. He has placed within the soul of man a guide which, within certain limits, and as applied to special acts and circumstances, infallibly indicates his will. So far as it acts, no man can say he is ignorant; and the true child of God will give heed and say, "This is the will of God." Conscience will itself be reenforced by being so regarded; and it is practically impossible to question conscience, as to most of the practical duties of life, without plainly hearing, "This is the way."

But we may further rejoice to do His will as revealed *in Scripture*. Here He has gone beyond the starlight of conscience and flooded the world with the sunlight of His revelation. The Scriptures contain the will of God for our salvation. They speak in no doubtful tone. We may be as certain as Jesus was what the will of the Father is. Paul called himself an apostle "by the will of God"; so may we. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." It is the will of God that we trust Him, that we serve Him, that we be holy as He is holy, that we extend His knowledge. These are as absolute commands as are those of the Decalogue; and the true child will take this revelation for his guidance,

and by its light will try to carry out his Father's will.

But you may say, "Much of this direction is general, it is not specific. What is the specific will of God for me?" I answer therefore, finally, that we may, like Christ, rejoice to do His will as revealed *in providence*. I have tried to show that even Christ followed where the Father led, embraced opportunities, met new circumstances, prepared for "the hour." And certainly, we are to do so. The will of God for each one of us is unfolded by the events of life. These are not causeless. They are not a chance medley of good and bad. God rules: not a sparrow falls without Him. And therefore, as providence unrolls the will of God for us, the true child is to accept and obey. Now He brings an opportunity; now He lays a burden. Now He tries us with prosperity; now with sorrow. Now He sends us into battle and temptation; now He lays us on beds of pain and idleness. Now He wounds, and now He heals; the way opens under His Divine guidance. It may lift us up, it may cast us down. As with Christ, I say, so with us. It may give us a soul to save, it may cause our plans to be rejected, it may lead to Gethsemane, it may translate us to glory; but in all it is the will of Him that sent us, the work He has for us to do. In all, infinite wisdom, the Father's goodness, and eternal righteousness move. He shows the way, and man's highest privilege—yea, man's strength and food—is to do His will, because we love and trust and adore Him so entirely that what He wishes, that we are glad to do.

I hold, therefore, before us Christ's joy in service as not beyond our power to imitate; and I ask if conscience and reason do not testify that this is the loftiest ideal in life which we can have. When we reach heaven, this will be realized. But here, in the desert, now, in this world of sin, is the time to begin. I do not show you so exalted a Jesus as to put Him beyond the reach of imitation. He came to make us like Himself. And I ask if any other ideals of life can compare with this —if they are not poor and mean—if this does not soar above them. You claim to seek nobility and greatness and victory. Here they are. Come, learn from Jesus the love of God. Let it win your heart; and as at His feet you look in that infinite, eternal sea of love, whose depths are fathomless and whose billows break on the shores of time—that love of God to man out of which Christ came to save our souls by death—as you gaze on it, rise with this resolve: "By thy grace, O Christ, I too will joy to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work."

# Books of Religious Significance

*AN EMERGING CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Justin Wroe Nixon. Harper and Brothers.* 1930. *Pp.* 320. $2.50.

DR. NIXON is the Minister of the Brick Presbyterian Church of Rochester, N. Y. It is the position held by the author—a position that requires him to profess belief in the Bible as infallible and acceptance of the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith—that more than anything else lends significance to this volume. That a man of intelligence holding the views expressed in this book should continue to minister in a Presbyterian Church constitutes a moral enigma difficult to solve. Small wonder that Dr. Nixon writes in one place: "I wonder if in all the world there is any institution with such vested interests, material and spiritual, which tolerates such public criticism of its faith, organization, and methods on the part of its paid servants as does the Protestant Church" (p. 285). The fact that the Church at large tolerates it, however, does not alter the fact that it is difficult to believe in the moral integrity of one who preaches and teaches what is obviously out of harmony with what he is under vows to preach and teach.

According to Dr. Nixon "the Christian religion needs a new house of faith." To supply that need, or at least to make a contribution to that end, he has written this book. Readers of *Fundamental Christianity* by Dr. Francis L. Patton will recall that he tells us there are two ways of pulling down a house. You can put dynamite under it and blow it up. Or you can begin at the top and carefully remove stone after stone. The second way, he remarks, "is a slower method, but much to be commended because of its neatness, the absence of any unsightly *debris*, and the avoidance of a rude shock to the feelings of those who have lived in the old home and loved it for the sake of the old associations. Besides, the material thus carefully removed may serve a useful purpose in constructing another building of a different design and intended to serve another purpose. What once entered into the structure of a church may now find a place in building a hall for ethical culture; and what was once part of the religious life of a people may usefully enter into the moral fabric of society." It is the second of these methods that Dr. Nixon has adopted.

If the new house of faith that Dr. Nixon builds made use of the main stones that went to make up the old house of faith, we could readily admit that the *Christian* faith could find a home within its walls. It is a matter of secondary importance how the materials that enter into a theological building are arranged provided the separate blocks of doctrine used in its construction are hewn from the quarry of Christian revelation. As a matter of fact, however, Dr. Nixon in rebuilding the house of faith makes use of very little of the material that constituted the old house of faith. The result is that his volume but serves to afford added evidence that Dr. Machen is right when in *Christianity and Liberalism* he maintains that within the Church itself "the great redemptive religion which has always been known as Christianity is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is the only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology." That Dr. Nixon in rebuilding the house of faith throws into the discard practically every block of doctrine that gave strength and substance to the old house of faith is hardly open to question. He lays great, almost exclusive emphasis on what he calls Jesus' "insight" that led him to the "conviction that life with God and with men was capable of being organized upon the basis of love, of mutual sharing, of fellowship;" but such a conviction is not a distinctive Christian conviction and may exist in those to whom Christianity is anathema. In this connection it may be noted not only that he explicitly repudiates the idea of Biblical infallibility—despite his ordination vows—but that he expressly repudiates such conceptions as hell, the devil, the virgin birth and second coming of our Lord —the whole world of the supernatural in fact as ordinarily conceived in Christian circles, and by implication many others. It would, however, be superfluous to attempt to call attention to all the Christian conceptions he directly or indirectly rejects in view of the fact that he regards Jesus Christ Himself as one-hundred-per-cent human. This means of course that no matter what elements of Christian truth he employs in building the superstructure of his house of faith he builds it on other than a Christian foundation. It was no merely human Christ, it was the Son of God who became incarnate for us men and our salvation that Paul had in mind when he wrote: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Dr. Nixon calls his book "An Emerging Christian Faith." If he had been reared in a non-Christian faith and so could be thought of as one in his thinking was moving in the direction of Christianity we could find much in his book to commend. In that case we would be quite hopeful that in the end he would attain to something like an adequate Christian faith. As a matter of fact, however, he was reared in a Christian home and for more than twenty years has been a Minister, first in the Baptist and later in the Presbyterian Church. It would seem, therefore, that this book records a movement away from rather than a movement towards a genuine Christian faith. If we mistake not, it would have been more accurately named if it had been called "A Disappearing Christian Faith."

S. G. C.

*SAINT AUGUSTINE. By Giovanni Papini. Harcourt, Brace and Company. New York. 336 pp. $3.00.*

THE writings of Hilaire Belloc and Gilbert K. Chesterton in behalf of the Christion faith have long been familiar to Protestant readers. Papini is another gifted Roman Catholic to whom Protestants are becoming indebted. Probably all three depend upon a general interest in their books and care far less for the praise of the Vatican than for favorable comment from readers outside their own Church. In their religious writings they rightly consider themselves heralds of good tidings for all people. They are not numbered with the makers of blue-prints of the Roman Catholic superstructure to the neglect of the basic facts of Christianity. They are usually catholic rather than Catholic.

Papini is young, but for fifteen years he has been a notable man of letters in Italy, shining with remarkable talents against many a dark background. At various times an anarchist, a nihilist, a pragmatist, a Buddhist, and an atheist, he has recently become a Christian. He was attracted to the mighty Augustine as to a kindred soul. "I fancied there existed a resemblance between us; he also has been a man of letters and a lover of words, a restless seeker after philosophies even to the point of being tempted by occultism; he also had been sensual and had sought fame. I resembled him in what was bad in him, but after all I did resemble him. And the fact that a man of this sort, so like me in his weakness, had succeeded in achieving a second birth, was encouraging to me. The parallel ends here, for today I am as much like Saint Augustine as a winged ant is like an eagle."

Papini's English translators have done good work. His "Life of Christ" owes much to the skill with which Dorothy Canfield Fisher decanted Italian prose into English that lacked nothing of the bouquet of the original. Mrs. Mary Pritchard Agnetti had been equally faithful in translating "Saint Augustine." A tyro in the field of literature will recognize the flavor of Italian idiom on every page.

Of this latest book Papini says, "I am no theologian nor could I without grave risk, have ventured into the forest, dense and living, of Augustine's system. I have written as an artist and a Christian, not as a patrologist or scholastic." His main purpose is to write, not for believers in Jesus who therefore in a way can get along without help, but for "indifferent people, irreverent people, and for people whom Christ has lost." He classifies the books he has read on Christian topics as of two types. First, those written by orthodox authors for the use of the orthodox, and secondly, those written by scientists for the use of non-believers. Evidently he has been spared the floods of American books which are neither the one thing or the other: in Italy the lines are sharply drawn. At any rate, in estimating the books he knows he finds them lacking in appeal to the wayfaring man who is groping for religious truth. The pious ones exhale "a sort of withered mustiness, an odor of burnt-out lampwick, a smell of stale incense and of rancid oil that sticks in the throat." So, without surrendering any of the piety, he proposes to take his pen in hand as an artist takes his brush, to paint pictures, vividly, beautifully, unforgetably, for the sake of Christ.

He begins Augustine's biography at the scene of his birth in North Africa in the year 354. "Augustine placed Carthage on an equal footing with Rome as regards power and glory, and his epic description of the descent of Hannibal is vaguely tinged with personal satisfaction. Africa gave Rome many of her authors, from the comic Terence to Cyprian and Tertullian. Just as ancient Italy appeased her hunger with the corn of Egypt, so throughout ten centuries did the whole of Christianity feed upon the thoughts that emanated from the same continent."

"To ancient geographers Africa was but the mysterious lair of lions and horned serpents; later on to Europeans it became a very hive of corsairs, a breeding place for slaves; in our own day it is a source of rubber, cotton, and the black flesh that becomes food for cannon. But to the Christian it has ever been and still remains, the land of Aurelius Augustine."

Papini spends several chapters on Augustine's youth. His father, Patricius, was cruel and lustful, and we are informed of the details. He was subject to fits of rage when he would become so violent that Monica's friends marvelled that she did not show traces of the blows inflicted by her fierce spouse. Augustine did not love his father. "The son was well aware that the passions—lust, ambition, and greed of money—which it would cost him such a struggle to conquer, had come to him from his father. He is the son of Monica and *grace*. He became what he is, and what he will remain to all eternity—a saint—only by suppressing in himself all that was of his father. Patricius was but the instrument of sin to clothe his spirit in flesh."

Monica, an ideal mother, had her own shortcomings. At school Augustine was brutally chastised by his teacher. Both Patricius and Monica "laughed at the strokes his master dealt him,—to the boy, an intolerable humiliation." Monica was not tactful, and it was this frailty that led to the incident always associated with her name. She annoyed Bishop Antigonus with her anxieties over Augustine, giving way to many outbursts of grief. It was in exasperation that he exclaimed: "Enough! Enough! Go thy way! As thou art a living woman, it is not possible that the son of such tears should perish."

The wild, pagan wickedness of Augustine was responsible for his mother's tears. Papini omits no dark episode, and comments: "It is precisely in the fact that Augustine has succeeded in rising from the depths of sin and soaring to the stars that his glory resides and the power of *grace* is made manifest. The deeper the valley the brighter the light upon the heights."

But Augustine paid dearly for his excesses. When he was converted, at thirty-two years of age, he wrote: "Too late I loved Thee, Thou Beauty of Ancient Days. Too late I loved Thee." He had yielded times without number to every imaginable vice and the battles against temptation continued. The old Adam was in part enchained and in part exalted. He still existed. Papini observes: "One need not be a reader of Freud to know that the libido is woven into the fabric of our life from earliest childhood to the beginning of old age. Sophocles rejoiced that he was grown old, because at last he was free from that cruel and terrible master, sex. This gadfly stings common men, and perhaps even more sharply, great natures. 'Thou didst *begin* the change in me,' said Augustine to his Lord. Twelve years after his conversion he is goaded by sinful tendencies in his nature. They no longer triumph, but they are not destroyed. After so many years of works and prayers he feels his imperfections and wretchedness. Augustine's prayer at forty-four is: 'We praise Thy mercies, O Lord, that having begun our liberation, Thou mayest free us entirely; that we may cease to be wretched and know bliss in Thee.'" Says Papini: "In Augustine we find the true mark of sanctity, which is not believing oneself a saint."

Augustine's healthy distrust in his own merit is revealed in another direction. He suffered much from bodily infirmities, particularly asthma. "Therefore when a certain man came to his bedside and begged for his blessing on a sick relative, that he might be restored. Augustine's answer was: 'My son, did I possess such power I would begin by healing myself.'"

The tender story of Augustine's conversion, when the voice of an unseen child caused him to open the epistles of Paul, and he stumbled onto the last three verses of the Thirteenth Chapter of Romans, is well told. "Two friends hastened to Monica and told her. The worried mother who had paid the price of her son's tears with so many of her own, now wept afresh, but the tears of that hour were of triumph and rejoicing. For Augustine and for them all, a new life was beginning. God's decrees should be honored until the end."

The next forty years of Augustine's life were largely given to belaboring heretics, and on a titanic and majestic scale. Of their influence on the development of Christian belief, Papini remarks about heresies: "Not only do they force the orthodox to a clear defining of true doctrines, but they provoke the vitality of faith. The worst enemy of religion is not heresy but indifference. A Church without heretics is a Church fossilized, and one that has become a mere juridical institution. But heresies are of use only when they are fought against, overcome and conquered, and therefore Augustine, who was the most heroic fighter of his day, owes to the heretics some of his most profound thoughts and a part of his glory."

His first antagonists were the Manichaeans, who, thinks Papini, were not unlike Nietzsche, Steiner, Madame Blavatsky and others of our own contemporaries with "the cunning to

deaden all sense of guilt in their followers by removing direct responsibility for evil doing." Augustine argued the freedom of the will clearly enough to rout these ideas from Christian thought. "Sin is not of God's creating, although it is a consequence of the divine and dangerous give of free choice He bestowed upon His creatures."

Pelagius was a more important opponent than Manichaeans proved to be. Papini compares him with Rousseau, "that patron of all the rehabilitators of the innocence of our passions. Pelagius held that of his own will man can accomplish all things, and that he may attain to virtue and attain salvation without the help of Divine Grace. Christ did not come to redeem us from original sin and therefore from death itself, but merely to set us an example and to raise us to a higher life. Original sin does not exist. Man is born pure and virtuous as was Adam before he sinned. We can be saved through obedience to the moral law.

"What troubled and offended Augustine most in this romantic doctrine was the proclamation of the original innocence of man. He was well aware from painful experience that man even in childhood is pursued by every weakness. To hear Pelagius calmly proclaim that man is virtuous by nature, and that his own will is sufficient without any supernatural remedies to maintain him in a state of innocence seemed to Augustine, as it seemed to the Church, a piece of foolishness based upon complete ignorance of the human soul, and a jumble of anti-Christian errors. Augustine recognized man's part in the work of salvation, but he deemed it a small part and one ever subject to Divine Grace."

It was Augustine's great doctrine of predestination that finally set against him all the half-Christian elements in the Church and arrayed him against every man who belittles the sovereignty of God. He overcame them, and predestination entered the beliefs of the universal church. Papini writes cautiously on the immense theme. "For the present, in spite of heretical boastings, we continue to maintain that man is not God. What to man with his limitations appears injustice may be a higher justice in the eyes of God. The doctrine of predestination in which many see an offense against God's loving kindness, may be a further proof of His mercy. If some, isolating a single principle without thought to the rest, and forcing it to the point of absurdity, have fallen into error, the fault is not Augustine's. Everything that is sublime is dangerous." Predestination has been accepted because it is Scriptural, logical and inevitable.

It is not possible to praise all of Papini's book. After writing fully of Augustine's propensities as a youth, one cannot help smiling at this touch: "Only eunuchs, the cold-blooded, Pharisees and *Quakers* will find them incredible." Certainly this is unexpected light upon the Society of Friends. Equally far-fetched are Papini's judgments upon John Calvin and Martin Luther. But his strictures are so manifestly caused by lack of information that the writer of this review does not take them seriously, and probably few other readers will.

We have more than a hint from Papini that Augustine's relationships to Rome were strained. "By birth he did not belong to the class of presbyters and monks. In the eyes of the clergy two circumstances of his past, connected with Manichaeanism and literature, still told against him. It was as if a poet and a freemason (anti-Church in Italy) should suddenly become converted and succeed in entering the priesthood. The Church would take him to her heart with rejoicing and on occasion make good use of his genius and erudition, but he would ever remain an object of suspicion to sheep grown old in the fold, as one from whom a fresh surprise might be expected. Augustine remained ever, if not precisely an irregular soldier, at least one who often fought alone, with his own weapons and regardless of ancient rules, and although he always respected the supreme commander who resides at Rome and was prompt to obey him in all things, yet he was never entered on the lists for promotion." Was Augustine another John Henry Newman? They must have been similar spirits, even if Newman at last was made a Cardinal.

"Saint Augustine" is concluded with the following paragraph:

"At once the eagle and the diver, Augustine lifts us up among the constellations and guides us in the immensities of abysmal space. By his intellect we are led up to loopholes which afford glimpses of impenetrable mysteries, and his loving and fiery heart still, after so many centuries, finds the way to the heart of man and causes it to beat in unison with his own. We recognize in him not only the architect of theology and the giant in philosophy but also the brother who, like ourselves, has suffered and sinned, the saint who has scaled the walls of the city of eternal joy and seated himself at the feet of the God to Whom he is reunited for all eternity."

A note on pronunciation, *not from Papini:* "St *Aug*ustine is in Florida; Saint Au*gus*tine is in Heaven."

FRANK H. STEVENSON.

*WHAT IS LUTHERANISM? A Symposium in Interpretation. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. The Macmillan Company.* 1930. 300 *pp.* $2.50.

THIS is a useful and informing book that claims to give a representative cross section of the thought that obtains among American Lutherans. The particular occasion of its appearance is the fact that this is the four hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the Augsburg Confession, the Mother Symbol of Protestantism, which more than any other is the common bond of union among Lutherans throughout the world. It will be surprising to many non-Lutherans to learn how sharply divided the Lutherans are among themselves, despite the much that they hold in common. The foreword advises us that this is the first time in the history of the denomination in America that Lutherans of different schools of opinion have met within the covers of the same volume to interpret the broad features of Lutheranism as a whole. It will no doubt serve to give the Lutherans themselves a better understanding of themselves as well as give readers in general a better appreciation of the genius and character of Lutheranism. It would have added to the representative character of the volume if a Lutheran of the "Fundamentalist" type had been asked to contribute a chapter, as the volume itself makes frequent reference to the fact that there are many Lutherans of this type. No doubt most of its contributors belong to the "Fundamentalist" rather than the "Modernist" type—the Lutheran Church is doubtless the most orthodox of the leading American denominations—but the absence of a chapter by a "Fundamentalist" of the type that many of the other contributors criticise detracts from the claim of the book to present a cross section of the thought that obtains among American Lutherans.

This book is a product of twelve different men. Each was asked to write with the following questions before him: "What is Lutheranism: What is its essential character? In the light of its unique character what is its unique contribution to modern Christianity or to Protestantism? What is the relation of Lutheranism to the historic confessions, especially to its own confessions and symbols? How far are these normative? Are the declarations set down in the post-Luther period an essential part of Lutheranism? Is its theology fixed? What is the attitude of essential Lutheranism to such problems as: modern biblical scholarship with the implications involved in textual criticism, historic method; such contemporary issues as modernism, fundamentalism, naturalism, humanism, evolutionism, etc.? What is meant by the 'Word of God?' What is Lutheranism's very *raison d'etre* as a distinct communion in the twentieth century? Has it fulfilled its mission as a distinct body?"

It is not to be supposed that each writer has expressed himself on all these matters, or that they manifest equal ability or equal loyalty to fundamental Christianity in connection with such of them as they discuss. The least satisfactory of all is the foreword and conclusion by the editor of the book, Dr. Ferm, who by the way is the professor of Philosophy in Wooster College—a fact that is not fitted to add to the reputation of that institution as a sound Presbyterian institution. The contributions by Drs. Evjen and Wendell are of doubtful value while that by Dr. Weigle (who is no longer a Lutheran) is slight and not very significant. Those, however, by Drs. Offerman, Wentz, Reu, Hefelbower, Scherer, Haas, Dau and Rohne while not of equal value are all of high value and breathe the spirit of genuine Lutheran culture and scholarship. It is regrettable, it seems to us, that such worthy articles should have been published under the auspices of one occupying not merely so un-Lutheran but so un-Christian a position as that of Dr. Ferm. Dr. Ferm has done what he could (unwittingly of course) to destroy the value of

this volume but despite his efforts it has great worth and is to be commended to the attention of all those interested in learning about contemporary Lutheranism. As was to be expected there is considerable criticism not only of Romanism but also of Calvinism and Fundamentalism (taken in its narrow rather than its broad meaning).

Dr. Ferm's contribution reveals the influence of Professor Macintosh of Yale and, in seeking to indicate the essence of Lutheranism, adopts the thoroughly vicious principle that Professor Macintosh had previously adopted in seeking to indicate the essence of Christianity, viz., that "the essence of a thing is that which it is necessary to retain, after sloughing off adiaphora, to realize its valid purpose"—a principle that ignores the fact that the question, "What is Lutheranism?" is primarily an historical question and that enables one to substitute his own conception of what Lutheranism ought to be for what Lutheranism actually is. The result is that Dr. Ferm virtually maintains that essential Lutheranism is what Luther would teach if he were living today; which being interpreted means that essential Lutheranism is what Dr. Ferm thinks Luther would teach if he were living today. Those interested in a thorough refutation of this method of determining the essence of any historical entity, more especially of Christianity, are referred to Dr. B. B. Warfield's discussion of Professor Macintosh's use of it in the article "The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ" in the recent volume *Christology and Criticism* (Oxford University Press, $3.00). S. G. C.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Ordination Vows and the Bible

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*What in your opinion is the meaning of that part of the ordination vow of ministers and elders in which they affirm that they "believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?" If I say that I so believe, do I merely say that I regard the Bible as infallible only in as far as it is a rule of faith and practice or do I also say that I regard it infallible in all its statements? I am told that the ordination vow of Presbyterian ministers and elders does not commit them to the belief that "the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error." Do you take that view of the matter?*

*Very sincerely yours,*

*L. R. C.*

IT seems to us quite inadequate to say that the ordination vow of a Presbyterian minister or elder necessitates belief in the Bible as "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." At their ordination ministers and elders affirm a great deal more than that about the Bible. They affirm that they believe the Bible *"to be the Word of God."* Every candidate for ordination is required, first of all, to affirm that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments *are the Word of God.* Having done that he is required to go on and affirm that said Scriptures are also, or, therefore, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. It is absurd to say that the Bible is the "Word of God," and therefore infallible *only* as a rule of faith and practice—if it is the "Word of God" we may be sure it is altogether trustworthy—but it is quite fitting to say that the Bible is the "Word of God" and therefore "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." It seems altogether clear to us that every candidate for ordination who honestly and intelligently answers the question put to him in the affirmative—as he must before he can be ordained—affirms in effect that he believes the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be trustworthy in all their statements.

Not only is it true that a fair exegesis of the double statement (1) that the Bible *is* the Word of God and (2) that it is the only infallible rule of faith and practice preclude the minimizing interpretation we have rejected; it is also true that the history of this interpretation makes clear that it does not express the view held by the framers of the Westminster Standards. It had its origin among the Socinians. Later it was adopted by the Dutch Arminians and Rationalists. And it was not until 1690, nearly half a century after the completion of the Westminster Confession, that it was introduced into England by the translation of Le Clerc's *Letters.* Generally speaking it has been adopted by those who have been content with maintaining the least that must be defended if Christianity is to exist rather than by those interested in maintaining the whole truth of God as it has been made known. The view that the ordination vow merely binds one to the acceptance of the Bible as trustworthy in as far as it is a rule of faith and practice is, therefore, to be rejected on historical as well as exegetical grounds.

It is important to note in this connection that the doctrine of Scripture taught in the Confession of Faith lends no support to the supposition that the ordination vow merely binds the candidate to belief in the Bible as a rule of faith and practice. Rather it accords with the conviction that the Bible is free of error and trustworthy in all its statements. In the Confession of Faith the Scriptures identified with "all the books of the Old and New Testaments" are spoken of as "the Word of God written" and as "given by inspiration of God" (Chap. I, sec. 2), as of "authority in the Church of God" (sec. 3), as having "God (who is truth itself)" for their "author" (sec. 4), as of "infallible truth and divine authority" (sec. 5), as "being immediately inspired by God" so that "in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal to them" (sec. 8), as so trustworthy that a "Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in them" (Chap. 14, sec. 2)—not to mention other references. If the ordination vow is to be interpreted in the light of the doctrine of Scripture taught in the Confession of Faith, as seems reasonable, it is clear that it commits the candidate to belief in the full trustworthiness of the Bible.

## "The Lost Books of the Bible"

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*I have a copy of a book called "The Lost Books of the Bible." According to the statement on its title page it contains "all the gospels, epistles and other pieces now extant attributed to Jesus Christ, his apostles and their companions not included by its compilers in the authorized New Testament; and the recently discovered Syriac Mss. of Pilate's letters to Tiberius, etc., translated from the original tongues." The book is arranged in chapters and verses like the King James version and has the appearance and reads very much like the regular Bible. Is it really true that this book contains writings that ought to belong to our Bible so that we have an incomplete Bible without them. . . . I would like very much to know about this. . . .*

*Very truly yours,*

*C. A. B.*

A GREAT deal of publicity was given to the book described above some two or three years ago. Full page advertisements appeared in daily papers as well as in magazines of national circulation commending it to the attention of their readers in language that gave the impression that numerous lost books of the Bible had been discovered; with the result no doubt that many copies were sold. And inasmuch as these advertisements were accepted by papers and magazines that would not knowingly accept advertisements for fake stocks, for instance, it is probably true that a considerable

number were misled. As a matter of fact, at any rate, there is no warrant whatever for thinking that this book contains any lost books of the Bible or that our Bible as ordinarily printed is not complete.

As a result of the misleading advertising that was given to this book the Oxford University Press, issued in 1927, a statement by Dr. Montague R. James, an English scholar who had devoted many years of study of the Apocryphal literature of the New Testament, for the express purpose of warning the public against these "Lost Books of the Bible," falsely so-called. That statement was as follows: "Just over a hundred years ago, in 1820, an Apocryphal New Testament was issued by William Hone. Hone's book has long held the field; it is constantly being reprinted, and it has enjoyed a popularity which is in truth far beyond its deserts. For it is a misleading and an unoriginal book. Misleading, because all its externals suggest that it is a supplement to the New Testament. Printed in double columns, with all the books divided into chapters and verses, with a summary prefixed on every page, it presents the familiar aspects of the English Bible to any one who opens it. Misleading, again, because about half the volume is occupied by the writings of the Apostolic Fathers which are not apocryphal. Misleading, also in a more serious way, because title-page and preface tells us that it contains the writings which were not included in the New Testament by its compilers when it was first collected into a volume. Unoriginal, because the whole content of the book except the prefaces are borrowed bodily from two books about one hundred years older than Hone's."

It will be seen therefore that "The Lost Books of the Bible" are but a reprint of books that have been known to scholars for hundreds of years and which no informed person puts on a par with the books of the New Testament. As a matter of fact small value attaches to any of these books.

## Westminster Confession and the Second Coming

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*I wish you would state in the next issue of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY *what you consider is implied in the last clause of the Westminster Confession. How is it possible for a Presbyterian minister to accept the said Confession and then deny the coming of the Lord and state that Paul in the closing days of his ministry gave up expecting Christ. Such an attitude on the part of a presbyter is to me amazing. . . . I am sure a full statement to the above question would be appreciated by many of your readers. Many of the great scholars of the Church have believed this doctrine as taught in the New Testament. Why then do so many reject it and almost ridicule it.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*J. H.*

The clause in the Westminster Confession to which our questioner refers reads as follows:

> "As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin, and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity; so will He have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen."

WE share our questioners amazement at the fact that there are Presbyterian ministers who deny the coming of the Lord inasmuch as His coming is not only clearly taught in the Bible but also in the Westminster Confession of Faith. That there are such there can be no doubt. Before us as we write there lies a book written by a Presbyterian minister in which we read: "We are frankly not expecting that 'the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat;' nor that 'the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up' . . . Biblical criticism has revealed the eschatology of the early Church as the product of, and only pertinent to, a specific environment." We are at as much a loss as he is, however, to explain such an attitude on the part of those who are committed to the belief that the Bible is the Word of God and that the Westminster Confession contains the system of doctrine taught in the Bible. It is not surprising that those who reject the Bible as the Word of God should deny the coming of the Lord—in the nature of the case we have no warrant for affirming belief in the coming of the Lord apart from a supernatural revelation—but it is more than surprising that those who both professes to believe that the Bible is the Word of God and that the Westminster Confession correctly sets forth the system of doctrine taught in that Word should make such denial. To attempt to explain such a denial would seem to be a case of attempting to rationalize the irrational and to moralize the immoral. Christian scholars may and do differ as to what has been revealed concerning the events that will precede or follow the return of our Lord—some hold the a-millennial, some the pre-millennial and others the post-millennial view—but all worthy of the name look forward to the actual return of our Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover it should be manifest to all that both in the New Testament and in the Westminster Confession the doctrine of the return of our Lord is a fundamental belief. We would not go so far as to say that those who reject it are all non-Christians—the faith which savingly lays hold on Christ is not necessarily conditioned by the thoroughness with which the contents of Christianity are grasped by the intellect—but certainly those who reject or ignore the "Blessed Hope" hold to a truncated type of Christianity. We confess we find it difficult to believe that any genuine Christian—certainly no informed Christian—ridicules this belief.

The Westminster Confession of Faith while affirming the coming of our Lord seems to leave it an open question whether His return will be a-millennial, pre-millennial or post-millennial. It would seem to be least favorable to the pre-millennial view inasmuch as the answers to questions 53 and 56 of the Larger Catechism say that the second coming will be at "the last day" and "at the end of the world." At the same time one looks in vain in either the Confession or the Catechisms for any positive support of the post-millennial view. If the Presbyterian Standards can be said to favor any particular view it seems to us that it is the a-millennial view, which agrees with the pre-millennial view in holding that Christ's return may be more or less imminent but with the post-millennial view in holding that His return will be immediately followed by the general resurrection and judgment. It is this latter view which perhaps more than any other has the right to be called the historic Protestant view; and yet from much of the discussion one would hardly learn that there is such a view, so true is it that many write as though we had to choose between the pre-millennial and the post-millennial view. In our judgment while belief in the return of our Lord is a fundamental Christian belief—and as such essential to the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession—yet such differences as exist between a-millennialist, pre-millennialists and post-millennialists while important are such as may exist among Christian brethren.

## The State of the Lost

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In your July issue, you give the platform of the Fundamentals Association, and as you do not take exception to any of the clauses I assume you endorse them. If that is so, would you kindly explain in clause 9, the use of a word not only not found in the Bible, but used in a sense that appears absolutely to contradict many plain Biblical statements. I refer to "Everlasting* 'conscious' *punishment of the wicked."*

*In all references to the destiny of the wicked except those of parable and symbols, it states "The wicked shall be destroyed."*

*I would be very much interested in having your answer to the above.*

*Yours very truly,*

*A. C. T.*

THE fact that we printed the doctrinal statement of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association in news columns of our July issue for the information of our readers carries no implications either of approval or disapproval. We question the wisdom of insisting on belief in the "pre-millennial and

imminent" return of our Lord as a condition of membership in the Association as it seems to us that this excludes many genuine "Fundamentalists," but apart from that clause the statement contains nothing that we do not endorse. Certainly we take no exception to clause 9 which reads, "We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust, the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting, conscious suffering of the lost," as it seems to us that awful as are the implications of the latter of this clause it accords with the clear teachings of Scripture. No doubt we often wish we could persuade ourselves that the Bible taught the annihilation of the lost, but as a matter of fact such is not the case. It is true that the Bible says that "the wicked shall be destroyed" but the word "destroy" as employed in the Bible does not carry with it the idea of annihilation. Its English equivalent is "to ruin" rather than "to annihilate." It may be noted that if death meant annihilation for the wicked there would be no degrees in punishment for such—a conclusion at variance with many express statements of Scripture. Moreover it is not open to reasonable doubt that the punishment of the wicked as truly as the blessedness of the righteous is represented in the Scriptures as both conscious and everlasting; and nowhere so clearly and insistently as in the teachings of Christ Himself. See for instance, Matthew 25:31-33, 41, 46; Mark 9:43-48; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25; Luke 16:22-23; Matthew 10:28; Matthew 13:41-42; Luke 12:9-10; Matthew 26:24; Matthew 13:49-50 and John 5:28-29. It is not without adequate warrant that Dr. W. G. T. Shedd wrote: "Jesus Christ is the Person who is responsible for the doctrine of eternal perdition. He is the being with whom all opponents of this theological tenet are in conflict. Neither the Christian Church nor the Christian ministry are the authors of it. The Christian ministry never would have invented the dogma; neither would they have preached it in all the Christian centuries, like Jeremiah, with shrinking and in tears, except at the command of that same Lord God who said to the weeping prophet, 'Whatsoever I command thee, thou shalt speak.'" Beyond question it is more agreeable to our hearts' desires to speak about the felicity of the saved than about the sufferings of the lost; both must be proclaimed if we are to preach the whole truth as God has made it known to us. Moreover the saving love of God can be adequately appreciated only as it is seen against the background of that estate of sin and misery from which Christ came to save us. Reject what the Bible tells us about hell and we can have no adequate understanding and appreciation of the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Only in its light can we see the real significance of the question, "What must I do to be saved?" or the greatness of our indebtedness to Christ in having come to seek and save the lost.

# Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editors. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked to kindly sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In response to your request for "comments," "suggestions," etc., permit me to say, in justice to myself and you, that I have carefully read every word of your first two issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY with the following results, viz:—

(1) As in all the past of my 50 years in the ministry, I find myself in *fullest accord* with your conceptions and interpretations and also your defense and proclamation of the "faith once delivered to the saints," and take "second place" to no Minister, or layman, in *conservative, evangelical orthodoxy.* I have, therefore, approved and enjoyed much that my dear brethren have contributed to these first two issues, and am grateful to them for it.

(2) Believing, however, that "orthodoxy of *motive, spirit, character* and *conduct* should be the self-evidencing fruitage and manifestation of an *"orthodox creed"* I find it impossible to believe that in much of the other contents of these issues you have been logical and consistent and appealing in the esteem of the mass of those who fully share your *doctrinal views.* Furthermore—

(3) If the animus and purpose of your efforts is to discredit Princeton Seminary and leave the impressions upon the Church and the world that it is no longer worthy of support by evangelical Christians and that those in control have not acted in good faith with the mandates of the General Assembly,—and that Westminster Seminary is now the only embodiment and exponent of orthodoxy in the Presbyterian Church, etc., etc., etc.—then I protest against both the rival and competitive seminary and its official organ with all my convictions of what is fair, just and Christian! Until I can be re-assured on this point, you will at least not expect me to be a supporter of any party or faction, of so subversive a policy and program of proclaiming the Gospel of peace and good will and of edifying the saints; converting sinners and building the Kingdom of Heaven!

As you may know, by voice and pen, I steadfastly opposed the "Auburn Affirmation" and the "reorganization of Princeton Seminary," but never on the grounds that *all the signers of the former were heretics;* or that the majority of them were even "Modernists" and forever unworthy of, ineligible to, any of the honors or offices of the Presbyterian Church. Nor in the case of Princeton did I even fear its apostasy if *one board* of control were substituted for the former *two boards.* Furthermore, when neither the *faculty, trustees* nor *directors* could suggest any policy upon which either, or all, of these three bodies could agree, I became entirely willing that the General Assembly should adjust the issue in accordance with its own wisdom and judgment, under the guidance of the Spirit, and the results have vindicated its action to my entire satisfaction and gratification. I sincerely regret that any reflection, or suspicion, should be cast upon any member of the new Board of Trustees of Princeton, which has so faithfully, cheerfully and efficiently carried out every particular of the Church's mandate to effect this reorganization in a *legal conformity* to the laws of the State and the historic standards of our Church.

To have entered on a "friendly suit" to prove that the Board had so performed its duty would have stultified the General Assembly and discredited and dishonored the Board of its own selection and commission! Hence there can be *no answer* but silence to a "protest" against the Assembly's approval of the Board's final action on the part of any member of the Assembly.

I am henceforth committed to a prayerful effort to promote the *unity, peace* and *prosperity* of the Church and to avoid having part, or lot, with any person, project or effort that is subversive of the prayer and commission of our loving God, "whose we are and whose we serve."

REV. J. A. LIVINGSTON SMITH.

York, Pa.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: We have read Dr. Smith's letter with mingled feelings. It contains much to approve but, apart from the misunderstanding that it reveals, it contains even more to disapprove. It seems to us, in fact, that it affords an admirable illustration of that "Yes and No Attitude" which, as Dr. Stevenson points out on another page, is proving so harmful to the Presbyterian Church. On the one hand Dr. Smith declares that he is second to none in his loyalty to "conservative, evangelical orthodoxy": on the other hand he declares that signers of the "Auburn Affirmation" are not necessarily "heretics" or "modernists" and affirms that the fact that a man signed the "Auburn Affirmation" is no reason why he should be regarded as unworthy of, or ineligible to, any of the honors and offices of the Presbyterian Church.

Judging as he does of the "Auburn Affirmation"—according to which even a Presbyterian minister may be in good standing and deny or refuse to affirm that the Bible is altogether trustworthy, that Jesus was born of a virgin, that His death was a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, that He rose from the dead in the same body with which He suffered and that He wrought miracles in

the days of His flesh—Dr. Smith's satisfaction over the present situation at Princeton Seminary can hardly be a source of comfort to those who are intelligently loyal to the historic standards of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Smith writes as though the main issue at Princeton had been the issue between a one board and a two board control. Such a notion has no basis in fact. The question of one or two boards was quite secondary. The main issue concerned the policy in the interest of which the Seminary was to be conducted. Moreover the fact that the new board of control has two Auburn Affirmationists among its members, more especially the fact that the new board as a whole has officially commended these Auburn Affirmationists to the confidence of the Church, makes clear that as a result of th reorganization the Seminary is under a board of control that is out of accord with the doctrinal position the institution formerly maintained.

It is noteworthy but not surprising that while Dr. Smith expresses concern about the "unity, peace and prosperity" of the Church he is silent concerning its purity. In our judgment, however, to obtain the unity, peace or prosperity (seeming) of the Church at the cost of its doctrinal purity is to obtain it at too great a cost. Try to imagine Paul glossing over the difference between him and the Judaizers in the interest of the unity, peace and prosperity of the early Church!

Dr. Smith is mistaken in thinking that CHRISTIANITY TODAY is the "official organ" of Westminster Seminary. Moreover, in our judgment, he writes without knowledge when he implies that the new board at Princeton carried out, in every particular, the Assembly's instructions. The Assembly at St. Paul instructed the new board to function as "Directors," "in place of the heretofore existing Board of Directors," "*until the Board of Trustees shall have reported to the General Assembly* that it has secured the proposed amendments to the Charter" (1929 Minutes, p. 134); and yet in defiance of those instructions they began to function as a Board of Trustees months before the matter had been reported to the Cincinnati Assembly. It is more important to note that the Assembly at St. Paul instructed the Board of Trustees "to take all steps which may be required to ensure the validity of the amendments" (Minutes, pp. 80 and 109), but that the Board utterly ignored this mandate. Not one iota of evidence was presented to the last Assembly to indicate that the Board had obeyed this mandate. Moreover it must be obvious to all intelligent persons that in view of the difference of opinion that exists among lawyers as to the legality of these amendments nothing short of a decision by the court of last resort in the State of New Jersey can ensure their validity. How the General Assembly would have stultified itself if it had taken steps to see that its own instructions be carried out, it is somewhat difficult to see. In our judgment the real reason why the last Assembly did not attempt an answer to the "Protest" filed (1930 Minutes, p. 135) was that to have attempted a reply would have been to reveal the weakness of its position.]

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: To students of church history the Modernists-Fundamentalists controversy is nothing new to our day but has existed from time to time for at least nineteen hundred years.

When Jesus left this earth He told His followers that there was much that He would like to tell them but that unfortunately they could not understand it. But to be of good cheer for if He, Jesus, went away it would be best for them and for us, for He would send the Holy Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, who would lead us into the knowledge of all things.

Under the leading of His spirit that first Pentecostal Church was powerful in its preaching of Christ, the Risen Lord, and the, "You must be born again," gospel of Jesus. Things that Jesus had taught them while on earth they had not understood or lived but when He had sent the Holy Spirit their hearts rejoiced for under His leadership they learned to know their Risen Lord and Master, and to have the power to convince others of their vital religious experience.

The spirit of Truth is ever giving testimony down through the ages of Jesus as Risen Lord and Saviour. It is leading us into more and deeper understanding of Jesus than even the disciples had at Pentecost. The challenge of the Holy Spirit to the vital church of our day is a call back to the religion of the early Pentecostal Church with even new and deeper meaning of just what Jesus wants to and can do for us today, not just a Saviour, "from our original sin in justification of Divine Wrath," but a very real and personal Saviour who stands with hands worn with toil and pierced with nails, outstretched to all who labor and are heavy-laden with this burdensome life of ours; pleading for all those who will to come to Him and learn through experience of His yoke (comradeship); for His yoke is easy and His burden light. A Saviour for our hearts as well as our souls.

But ever a few so-called Fundamentalists faction of the Church have opposed the leading of the Spirit of Truth; feeling that during some age past, "the faith for all time was delivered unto the saints." Saul of Tarsus was an arch Fundamentalist of his day. He persecuted with great zeal the new in the existing church of his day. Wise church leaders of Saul's day, like Gamaliel, Saul's teacher, counseled tolerance towards the new vital religion, saying that if it be of God it should not be interfered with and if it be of man it would come to naught anyway.

We hope that the same still, small voice of Jesus will speak to the ardent Sauls of our day asking the same question. "Why persecute Me? Is it not hard to kick against the goad?" (The urge to vital religious experience.)

We hope that the Sauls of our day may become Pauls, speaking and preaching as in that great thirteenth chapter of the First Corinthians. "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 though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge and though I have all faith and have not love I am nothing. For now we know in part and we prophecy in part, but when that which is perfect is come then that which is in part shall be done away." (Read entire thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.)

We need church leaders in our day who like Paul can say from the heart, "I know WHOM (a Personality, a Being, Jesus Christ the Lord) I have believed; and not I know What (things of doctrine, dogmas of the Church)." Oh, let us be persuaded that Jesus our Lord and Saviour, persuaded through a vital, personal religious experience that He is able to keep all that we commit to Him. Let us commit our lives anew to Him.

M. A. ROBLEE, M.D.

St. Louis, Missouri.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. Roblee has expressed himself so vaguely that we are at a loss to know the exact measure of our agreement with him. We share his concern for a vital religious experience and his insistence on the indispensableness of the Holy Spirit in its production and growth. This does not mean, however, that we share all his presuppositions or agree with all his implications. For instance it is hardly true that there is nothing new in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in view of the fact that it has its roots in the 18th century when for the first time Christianity was attacked by a system of thought and life that turned its back on all supernaturalism with the result that while in the past the choice has been between more or less pure and more or less impure forms of Christianity the choice is now between Christianity in any form and what is not Christianity at all. Again while there may be some warrant for calling Paul a Fundamentalist, there would seem to be no warrant whatever for calling Saul of Tarsus such seeing that he was not then a Christian at all. Surely there is something wrong with any view that requires us to speak of Gamaliel as a wise church leader. Dr. Roblee seems to hold that the Holy Spirit is continuously making new revelations of truth but if so he misunderstands John 16:12. Since Apostolic days the Holy Spirit has been leading God's people into a better understanding of the "faith once for all delivered" but there has been no new revelation. Not to mention other matter the contrast drawn between "Whom" we believe and "What" we believe is a false one. It is impossible to have trust in a person without knowledge of that person—the two things are inseparable and the latter conditions the former. There is no such thing as a non-doctrinal belief in Christ. Surely also it is a strange exegesis that finds any direct reference to "the urge of vital religious experience" in Acts 26:14.]

# News of the Church

## Statistics Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. 1926—1930

| | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Synods | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| Presbyteries | 299 | 299 | 294 | 295 | 293 |
| Ministers | 9,900 | 9,961 | 10,013 | 9,966 | 9,987 |
| Licentiates | 214 | 215 | 225 | 194 | 208 |
| Local Evangelists | 154 | 156 | 166 | 141 | 138 |
| Candidates | 1,214 | 1,294 | 1,246 | 1,267 | 1,265 |
| Licensures | 227 | 194 | 194 | 193 | 195 |
| Ordinations | 236 | 169 | 187 | 167 | 205 |
| Installations | 745 | 711 | 719 | 643 | 654 |
| Pastoral Dissolutions | 657 | 641 | 647 | 613 | 595 |
| Ministers received | 115 | 114 | 132 | 96 | 87 |
| Ministers dismissed | 52 | 75 | 49 | 41 | 40 |
| Ministers deceased | 178 | 219 | 201 | 233 | 194 |
| Elders | 48,416 | 48,916 | 49,730 | 49,651 | 50,079 |
| Deacons | 20,498 | 20,908 | 21,462 | 21,577 | 21,652 |
| Churches | 9,565 | 9,497 | 9,432 | 9,361 | 9,327 |
| Churches organized | 53 | 64 | 54 | 46 | 52 |
| Churches dissolved | 129 | 105 | 78 | 121 | 92 |
| Churches received | .... | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Churches dismissed | 6 | .... | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Every member plan churches | 6,342 | 6,424 | 6,424 | 6,281 | 6,469 |
| Stewardship instruction churches | .... | .... | .... | 3,630 | 3,739 |
| Stewardship enrollment churches | .... | .... | .... | 992 | 956 |
| Communicants: | | | | | |
| Added, Profession | 110,715 | 90,416 | 106,545 | 113,995 | 70,724 |
| Added Certificate | 71,959 | 64,713 | 68,522 | 67,631 | 53,050 |
| Restored | 12,055 | 11,028 | 11,107 | 11,708 | 10,308 |
| Dismissed, etc. | 61,328 | 54,657 | 55,996 | 52,221 | 48,259 |
| Susp. Roll | 65,133 | 67,060 | 65,722 | 67,305 | 75,580 |
| Deceased | 26,370 | 22,182 | 22,960 | 25,257 | 23,308 |
| Whole Number | 1,909.111 | 1,927,268 | 1,962,838 | 2,004,467 | 1,984,108 |
| Net increase or decrease | 35,252 | 18,157 | 35,570 | 41,629 | *20,359* |
| Resident | 1,778,680 | 1,777,828 | 1,816,104 | 1,859,614 | 1,830,463 |
| Non-resident | 130,431 | 149,440 | 146,734 | 144,853 | 153,645 |
| Baptisms, profession | 35,560 | 31,017 | 35,404 | 36,720 | 23,299 |
| Baptisms, infant | 44,057 | 42,333 | 44,624 | 45,470 | 36,572 |
| Sunday School mem. | 1,580,780 | 1,596,515 | 1,614,013 | 1,595,313 | 1,596,030 |

### Contributions to Causes by the Churches

| | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Missions | $5,143,129 | $5,093,460 | | | |
| Foreign Missions | 4,069,695 | 3,924,903 | $11,924,305 | 11,540,610 | 10,694,436 |
| Christian Education | 2,251,482 | 1,681,721 | | | |
| Pensions | 657,938 | 1,124,057 | | | |
| General Assembly | 391,918 | 412,881 | 430,243 | 428,606 | 437,757 |
| Current Receipts | | | 34,682,203 | 35,951,737 | 35,283,966 |
| Special Receipts | | | 13,843,576 | 14,498,949 | 14,012,865 |
| Congregational expenses | 44,731,062 | 46,612,753 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Misc. benevolences | 3,865,459 | 3,857,702 | 3,718,203 | 3,693,208 | 2,619,039 |
| Misc. | 76,039 | 75,430 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total | $61,186,722 | $62,782,907 | $64,598,530 | $66,113,110 | $63,048,063 |

### Receipts of the Boards from the Churches

| | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Missions | $4,290,881 | $4,559,914 | $4,195,640 | $4,404,123 | $4,114,784 |
| Foreign Missions | 3,792,370 | 3,691,636 | 3,667,962 | 3.806.946 | 3,565,968 |
| Christian Education | 875,613 | 833,418 | 817,029 | 926,000 | 881,723 |
| Pensions | 685,525 | 626,524 | 524,736 | 423,877 | 360,403 |
| American Bible Society | | | 39,346 | 42,588 | 38,689 |
| Federal Council | | | 9,162 | 8,864 | 9,410 |
| Total | $9,644,389 | $9,711,492 | $9,253,875 | $9,612,398 | $8,970,977 |
| Benevolence Quota | | | $11,424,967 | $11,766,180 | $11,234,899 |

## Committees to Discuss Organic Union

WITHIN a month of the adjournment of the Cincinnati Assembly, plans were made for a study of the proposed union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Presbyterian Church in the U. S., United Presbyterian Church, and the Reformed Church in America (Dutch Reformed). Representatives from these churches (with the exception of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.) together with a representative of the Reformed Church in the U. S. (German Reformed), met in Pittsburgh, on June 24th. At this meeting it was decided that six subjects must be studied in contemplating the proposed union. Six subcommittees were therefore appointed to deal with them. The subjects, together with the committees appointed to study them are as follows:

### Doctrinal Standards and Terms of Subscription

Robert E. Speer, D.D., LL.D., New York, Presbyterian, U. S. A.

H. C. Swearingen, D.D., LL.D., St. Paul, Minnesota, Presbyterian, U. S. A.

Ben R. Lacy, D.D., Richmond, Virginia, Presbyterian, U. S.

Harris E. Kirk, D.D., LL.D., Baltimore, Maryland, Presbyterian, U. S.

Wm. M. Anderson, D.D., Dallas, Texas, Presbyterian, U. S.

F. Raymond Clee, D.D., Jersey City, New Jersey, Reformed in America.

John H. Raven, D.D., New Brunswick, New Jersey, Reformed in America.

Siebe C. Nettinga, D.D., Holland, Michigan, Reformed in America.

Wm. J. Reid, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.

John McNaugher, D.D., LL.D., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.

### The Spirituality of the Church

Lewis S. Mudge, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia, Presbyterian, U. S. A.

Wm. P. Merrill, D.D., New York City, Presbyterian, U. S. A.

J. B. Hutton, D.D., Jackson, Mississippi, Presbyterian, U. S.

W. R. Dobyns, D.D., LL.D., Birmingham, Alabama, Presbyterian, U. S.

J. A. McClure, D.D., St. Petersburg, Florida, Presbyterian, U. S.

Malcolm J. MacLeod, D.D., New York City, Reformed in America.

Gerrit J. Hekuis, D.D., Grandville, Michigan, Reformed in America.

Henry A. Vruwink, Albany, N. Y., Reformed in America.

W. E. McCulloch, D.D., Los Angeles, California, United Presbyterian.

E. C. McCown, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.

#### Boards and Agencies

Joseph A. Vance, D.D., LL.D., Detroit, Michigan, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
Mr. Holmes Forsyth, Chicago, Illinois, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
R. A. Lapsley, Jr., D.D., Columbia, South Carolina, Presbyterian, U. S.
J. L. Fowle, Chattanooga, Tennessee, Presbyterian, U. S.
Wm. I. Chamberlain, Ph.D., New York City, Reformed in America.
Wm. Bancroft Hill, D.D., Litt.D., Poughkeepsie, New York, Reformed in America.
Jacob Van Ess, Catskill, New York, Reformed in America.
W. B. Anderson, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia, Pa., United Presbyterian.
A. H. Baldinger, D.D., Butler, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.

#### The Polity of the Church

W. O. Thompson, D.D., LL.D., Columbus, Ohio, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
Hugh K. Walker, D.D., LL.D., Los Angeles, California, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
James I. Vance, D.D., LL.D., Nashville, Tennessee, Presbyterian, U. S.
George Summey, D.D., LL.D., Austin, Texas, Presbyterian, U. S.
J. M. Alexander, D.D., Columbia, Missouri, Presbyterian, U. S.
Harry W. Noble, D.D., Jersey City, New Jersey, Reformed in America.
Thomas H. MacKenzie, D.D., Flushing, New York, Reformed in America.
John A. Dykstra, D.D., Grand Rapids, Michigan, Reformed in America.
R. W. Thompson, D.D., West Allis, Wisconsin, United Presbyterian.
D. F. McGill, D.D., LL.D., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.

#### Educational Institutions

H. G. Mendenhall, D.D., New York City, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
J. M. T. Finney, M.D., Baltimore, Maryland, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
G. F. Bell, Louisville, Kentucky, Presbyterian, U. S.
E. B. Tucker, Batesville, Arkansas, Presbyterian, U. S.
I. C. H. Champney, Montgomery, Alabama, Presbyterian, U. S.
John Wesselink, D.D., Pella, Iowa, Reformed in America.
M. Eugene Flipse, Douglaston, Long Island, Reformed in America.
John M. Kyle, New York City, Reformed in America.
C. J. Williamson, D.D., New Castle, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.
Hugh Moffet, Monmouth, Illinois, Uinted Presbyterian.

#### Property Rights

Judge John H. DeWitt, LL.D., Nashville, Tennessee, Presbyterian, U. S. A.
Mr. Thomas D. McCloskey, Pittsburgh, Pa., Presbyterian, U. S. A.
Judge Wm. A. Everett, Atlanta, Georgia, Presbyterian, U. S.
Ernest Thompson, D.D., Charleston, West Virginia, Presbyterian, U. S.
Chris Matheson, Shawnee, Oklahoma, Presbyterian, U. S.
James E. Hoffman, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey, Presbyterian, U. S.
Francis B. Sanford, New York City, Reformed in America.
James S. Kittell, D.D., New York City, Reformed in America.
J. B. Eichenauer, LL.D., Bellevue, Pennsylvania, United Presbyterian.
J. M. Lashly, LL.D., St. Louis, Mo., United Presbyterian.

It will be noted that no names of representatives of the Reformed Church in the U. S. appear upon these lists. This is due to the fact that the General Synod of this Church did not meet this year, but its committee feels that it can shortly determine to what extent it can cooperate with the committees of the other churches.

The sub-committees will meet on November 12th, probably either in Washington, D. C., or Pittsburgh, Pa. The general committees will meet the next day.

## Russian Laws Concerning Religion

THE British Government has issued a White Paper [Cmd. 3641] giving translations of extracts from "certain legislation respecting religion in force in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Under Article 4 of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic [Russia proper] it is provided:—

In order to assure to the workers true liberty of conscience, the Church is separated from the State and the schools from the Church, and liberty of religious belief and of anti-religious propaganda is recognized as the right of all citizens.

Article 69 lays down that "ministers of religion of all beliefs and doctrines actually following their religion and monks" may not vote or be elected to the Soviets [Councils].

The Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R. contains the following provisions:—

ARTICLE 122.—The teaching of religious belief to young children and persons under age in State or private educational establishments and schools, or violation of the regulations on this subject, is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding one year.

ARTICLE 123.—The commission of acts of deceit, with the object of encouraging superstition among the masses of the population and with a view to deriving profit of any kind therefrom, is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding one year, with partial confiscation of property or a fine not exceeding 500 roubles [approximately $250].

ARTICLE 124.—The enforced collection of contributions on behalf of ecclesiastical or religious groups is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding six months or a fine not exceeding 300 roubles [approximately $150].

ARTICLE 125.—The assumption by religious or ecclesiastical organizations of administrative, judicial, or other functions appertaining to public law and of the rights of juridical persons is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding six months, or a fine not exceeding 300 roubles.

ARTICLE 126.—The performance in (the buildings of) State or public institutions and undertakings of religious ceremonies, or the installation in such institutions and undertakings of any form of religious representation (*e.g.*, picture) is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding three months or a fine not exceeding 300 roubles.

ARTICLE 127.—The prevention of the performance of any religious ceremony, provided it does not violate public order and is not accompanied by any infringement of the rights of citizens, is punishable with compulsory labour for a period not exceeding six months.

Rules as to the elective rights of persons associated with religious organisations are set out in instructions issued by the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. [Soviet Union] on September 28, 1926. Those not deprived of such elective rights are persons hired or elected for employment in the economic administration or technical service of the buildings of religious cults, such as watchmen, cleaners, bell-ringers, singers, etc., as also members of church councils, provided that those persons are not deprived of their elective rights by other articles of the Constitution of the Allied Republics.

Instructions of the Central Executive Committee of the R.S.F.S.R. of November 4, 1926, state that among those deprived of elective rights are:—

Servants of religious cults of all religions and persuasions, such as: Monks, lay brothers and sisters, priests, deacons, psalmists, mullahs, muezzins, rabbis, bi's, kazi's, cantors, shamanists, baksi's, Roman Catholic clergy, pastors, readers, and persons with other names who carry out similar duties, independently of whether they receive a salary for the execution of those duties.

## Princeton Seminary Opening

THE second session of Princeton Theological Seminary under its new board of control will begin on October first, with exercises in Miller Chapel. Added interest is anticipated in view of the fact that at that time the Rev. Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., will be inducted as Professor of Missions in the Seminary. Dr. Zwemer, who has had a varied and noted career, is in his sixty-fourth year. He is considered an authority on Mohammedanism and is the author of a number of books. He was recently received as a Minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. from the Reformed Church in America.

# The Seventh Lambeth Conference

ABOUT every ten years, Bishops of the Church of England and of other churches throughout the world in communion with the Anglican Church, are invited to meet for conference at Lambeth Palace, the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, "Primate of all England." The last Lambeth conference was held in 1920, and was distinguished chiefly for its effort to provide in the Anglican communion a middle ground to which Protestant churches on the one hand, and the various "Catholic" churches on the other, might be drawn into union. The "Lambeth Conferences," of course, have no legislative authority over all the Episcopal Churches of the world, or over any one of them. The weight of their opinions, however, is great within their own sphere.

After being in secret session for some weeks, the conference of 1930 has issued the results of its deliberations in three parts,—(1) An Encyclical letter addressed to "the Faithful in Christ Jesus," (2) the Resolutions of the Conference, and (3) voluminous committee reports. As the latter do not carry with them the formal approval of the whole conference, chief interest is centered in the Encyclical and the Resolutions.

The letter, which is somewhat prolix, is, in part, as follows:

## The Encyclical Letter

WE, Archbishops and Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, three hundred and seven in number, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year of Our Lord 1930, give you greeting in the name of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We who write are bearers of the sacred commission of the Ministry given by Our Lord through His Apostles to the Church. In His Name we desire to set forth before you the outcome of the grave deliberations to which, after solemn prayer and Eucharist, we have for five weeks devoted ourselves day by day. We take this opportunity of thanking from our hearts all those, both far and near, who have prayed God to give us His Spirit's present aid. We hope that the results of our work may bring encouragement and help to this great circle of intercessors, even in remote parts of the earth. Our deliberations were preceded by careful inquiry upon many sides into the matters about which we speak. In this Letter we propose to give a connected view of these matters, in the hope that it will make our Resolutions more intelligible, and lead many to study them, together with the Reports of our Committees on which they are based.

The Bishops who were present at the last Lambeth Conference ten years ago found that one idea ran through all their work and bound it together in a true unity. It was the idea of *fellowship*. In like manner we have discovered one idea underlying all our long deliberations: it is the idea of *witness*. These two ideas are closely related. On the one hand, the purpose of every true human fellowship is to bear witness to certain great principles—the principles of truth, goodness and love, which express and fulfil the kingdom of God: among these fellowships the Church is called to bear witness to the supreme revelation of God—of His nature; His will, His kingdom—which has been given to the world in Jesus Christ our Lord. On the other hand, witness, if it is to be made effective among men, must be borne by a body, a fellowship. So we learn in every branch of human endeavor. And it would be a true description of the Church of Christ to say that it is a fellowship of witness. Our Lord Himself, in His last recorded words, laid this charge upon it, " Ye shall be witnesses unto Me . . . . . unto the uttermost parts of the earth." There comes into our mind the vision of the great succession of those who have borne this witness in past generations. They encompass, like a radiant cloud, each new generation, as it takes up the age-long testimony. They add their voices to ours, as we now specially and solemnly summon every member of the Church of our day to the fulfilment of Christ's parting charge. Here we find another link with the last Conference, for the long list of its Resolutions ended with the words, "if Christian witness is to be fully effective, it must be borne by nothing short of the whole body of Christian people."

### The Christian Doctrine of God

Our appeal in this Letter begins, as the series of our reports begins, with a *Sursum Corda*. The primary witness which the Church is called to give is the witness of its faith in God, and we would have men everywhere lift their minds and hearts with new confidence and expectancy to Him as ultimate Reality, to God in his Majesty as Creator, to God in his even greater Majesty as Redeemer.

We are aware of the extent to which the very thought of God seems to be passing away from the minds and hearts of many even in nominally Christian nations. The ten years since we last met have seen the development of one vast political and social experiment which is, at least professedly, rooted in the denial of God's existence. Even where God is still acknowledged, He is often regarded as too elusive or remote to be relevant to the practical concerns of life. And it is not surprising that where belief in God has weakened, the sense of sin has in large measure disappeared, morality has shown signs of degenerating into little more than a recognition of the value of kindness, and the supreme good has almost come to be thought of in terms of comfort and excitement.

But more significant is the increasing consciousness of thoughtful men and women that the emancipations which they have lately won do not yield deep or lasting satisfactions; that selfishness is self-defeating; that the heart of modern life, with all its exuberance of interest, is disquietingly void of conviction, and that once again experience proves personal happiness to be, in fact and not merely in pious words, linked with spiritual ideals and with moral standards and endeavours.

Many, too, of those who at present sit loose to the faith and practice of the Church are not opposed on conviction to the claim of Christianity; they are not thinking about it; they have not revolted against the Gospel, but against a presentation of the Gospel which falls far short of its true range and splendour.

Perhaps most noteworthy of all, there is much in the scientific and philosophical thinking of our time which provides a climate more favourable to faith in God than has existed for generations. New interpretations of the cosmic process are now before us which are congruous with Christian Theism. The great scientific movement of the nineteenth century had the appearance, at least, of hostility to religion. But now, from within that movement and under its impulse, views of the universal process are being formed which point to a spiritual interpretation. We are now able, by the help of the various departmental sciences, to trace in outline a continuous process of creative development in which at every stage we can find the Divine presence and power. Thus scientific thinking and discovery seem to be giving us back the sense of reverence and awe before the sublimity of a Creator Who is, not only the cause and ground of the universe, but always and everywhere active within it.

Christianity more than any other of the great religions has undergone the discipline of contact with scientific methods of thought, and emerges therefrom still strong to redeem and to inspire.

* * *

If our vision of God's glory is thus to be renewed, it will involve for most of us, clergy and laity alike, a new readiness to read and ponder afresh, with some of the many aids which modern research gives us, the Bible and in particular the New Testament. It will also involve a new readiness to acquaint ourselves, according to our capacity, with some of the best thinking of our time about the meaning of life, and to identify ourselves, as best we may, in thought and conduct, with some of life's more serious endeavours. Not many men are called to be students, but all can do something to learn and to think more intelligently about the religion which they profess and about its bearing on life around them.

But we must not only do what we can, to read and think. We must pursue, some of us, perhaps, as a new act of faith in God, and all of us with new devotion and diligence—the practice of personal prayer and strive to grow in the ability to pray. Not only will more serious thinking about our holy religion and about life thus quicken our prayers, but prayer can and will quicken our thought of and faith in God.

* * *

# The Life and Witness of the Christian Community

### Marriage and Sex

* * *

The beauty of family life is one of God's most precious gifts, and its preservation is a paramount responsibility of the Church. Its foundation is the life-long union of husband and

wife on which our Lord decisively set His seal. "One flesh," He said they were to be. Holy marriage is part of God's plan for mankind. It follows that any community disregards this at its peril. Empires have perished before now because the dry rot of laxity and corruption in home life set in. To maintain the ideal of marriage is therefore to preserve the social health of the community. It is a national interest of supreme value. It follows that divorce is unnatural. It destroys the security of the union and the stability of the family. If there are children, they are deprived of the guardianship to which God called both their parents. To the defence of Christ's standard of marriage we summon the members of the Church, for on it depends all that makes the magic of the word, home.

Indeed, we must lift the whole subject of sex into a pure and clear atmosphere. God would have us think of sex as of something sacred. Many influences in our day tend to concentrate attention on sex, and not always upon its sacredness. Among the tasks that confront the Church to-day, none is more noble or more urgent than that of rescuing the whole subject from degradation in thought and conversation. We must set it in the light of the eternal issues of right and wrong, and reveal the noble origin of sex in the creative activity of a Father Who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. We believe that the way to do this can be summed up in one word: education. Here the duty of parents is plain, and its fulfilment is part of that witness to truth and purity which members of the Church are bound to bear, and not least to their own children. If the children have learnt from the first to connect sex instincts with the beauty and goodness of God, they will not only themselves be proof against some of the worst evils of our age, but will also become diffusers of that moral atmosphere where purity lives, and all that is impure must die. We think that this duty of education needs far more careful attention than it has received. Rightly we set before our people Christ's standard of marriage, but we have done all too little to prepare them for it. It is admitted that no one should approach Confirmation or Holy Communion without careful and prolonged preparation. And Marriage is sacramental. It is, as St. Paul said, a great mystery. It is not only sacramental in its nature, it is a vocation for life. Therefore careful preparation is needed for it.

Bound up with that high and holy vocation is the vocation to parenthood. Here we would sound a call to all who will listen. Every child is for the State a potential citizen, for the Church a potential saint. When healthy parents refuse for selfish reasons to have children in homes where there is, or by self-denial may be, provision for them, they deny to both Church and nation lives which, with a Christian training, might be of priceless value to the community. We are familiar with the difficulties. We deeply sympathise with those who have burdens which are hard to bear. But we appeal to the whole community of the Church to remember that in home life, as in personal life, we are called to take up the cross, to endure hardness, and to count upon the enabling power of the Spirit of God. And, indeed, when the sacrifice is made for the sake of the family, that cross becomes a crown.

### Race

We have spoken of the family. But every family is a reflection of that great human family of which God is Father, and of which the nations and races are the members. We who address you are ourselves representatives of that great family. For among the bishops here assembled there are representatives, not only of the Western races, but of the races of Japan, of China, of India, and of Africa. We have found our brotherhood in Christ, and we are sure that only in His world-wide community can that brotherhood be securely established. No vague humanitarianism is enough. When men of different races and nations can say, "Our Father," believing in God Who was made visible in Jesus Christ, then a unity begins to be felt which transcends the differences of colour and tradition.

### Peace and War

As we witness to the truth that "God has made of one blood all nations of men," so also we must witness to God's will for peace among the nations. We thank Him for the achievements of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact which condemns war as a means for settling international disputes. If these movements towards peace are to be effective and permanent, there is need of a new strength of conviction, clearness of purpose, and courage in action among the peoples of the world. Here the Church should take the lead. For the Christian must condemn war not merely because it is wasteful and ruinous, a cause of untold misery, but far more because it is contrary to the will of God.

Peace is indeed something greater than a mere refusal to fight. Peace within the nation and among the nations depends on truth and justice. There cannot be peace unless we are trying to obey our Lord's command, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." As citizens of that kingdom we are summoned to make war on injustice, falsehood and covetousness within ourselves and in the world around us. Evil social conditions—such as slums or unemployment—are causes of unrest because they are outward and visible signs of inward and spritual wrong. We dare not acquiesce in them, for the remedy lies not only in the best means that economic science can devise, but also in the active witness and willing self-sacrifice of Christian people. Indeed, we cannot be true witnesses to God's kingdom of peace if we allow self-interest to be the ruling principle of any sphere of life. Neither industry nor commerce nor finance lie outside the borders of the kingdom of God, for at every point they touch human values and depend on human motives, and nothing human is alien to Him Who came that men might have life and have it abundantly. Only when we witness always and everywhere to His principles and rely upon His power, can we obtain from Him those gifts of truth and righteousness and love of which peace is the perfect fruit.

### The Unity of the Church

We pass to the subject of the Unity of the Church which was assigned to our third Committee.

Our Lord Himself prayed that those who should believe on Him might be one that the world might believe that His Father had sent Him. The witness which He wishes us to bear to Him before the world is our unity in Him. A world torn with divisions is pathetically ready to acclaim our unity, when it comes into sight, as an evidence of the power of God.

In the Conference of 1920 we felt the constraint of a great impulse which we believed to be of Divine origin, and under its influence we sent out the appeal to all Christian people. In this conference we have something even greater to chronicle, definite actions tending to unions of Churches, in which some of our Churches are closely concerned. If holy aspirations are great, God-guided actions are greater.

Many movements towards unity have taken place in the last ten years. These we cannot here describe. Particulars of them will be found in the report of our committee. We will write specially of two movements, because they are now approaching the phase of definite action.

The first of these concerns some of the oldest Churches in Christendom. A most important delegation from the Orthodox Churches of the East arranged by the Œcumenical Patriarch and headed by the Patriarch of Alexandria visited our Conference. Another delegation headed by the Archbishop of Utrecht represented the Old Catholics. Both of these delegations came to tell us that they desired definite and practical steps to be taken for the restoration of communion between their Churches and ours. This is a notable advance crowning a long period of increasing friendliness. The Conference has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Commissions of theologians to confer with similar Commissions if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and of the Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these Commissions may find such a unity in faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches, that restoration of communion may become possible as soon as the appropriate assemblies of the various Churches can meet.

In the second place we must refer at greater length to a scheme for the union of Churches in South India, which had been begun a year before the last Lambeth Conference, and has now reached an advanced stage. Our brethren of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, who will have the responsibility for carrying it through, if it is to be consummated, have reported the scheme in its present state to the Conference, and asked for our advice. Our Committee has tendered advice on many points in its Report, to which the Conference has given its general approval. This scheme is for a union in South India between the members of our Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and the South India United Church, so called because it unites the converts of cer-

tain Presbyterian and Congregationalist Missions. The general conception of the scheme is that these different elements will come together in one body, possessing the traditional framework of faith and order which characterised the whole Church for so many centuries. Within this one body the constant intercourse of the different members will, it is hoped, gradually bring about a unity, in which all those things that are of God in their several traditions will be not only preserved but enriched by happy combination. This process cannot be initiated without sacrifices, and must in its early stages involve anomalies and irregularities—a prospect which gives rise to serious misgivings in many minds. But these misgivings are outweighed by hope and by our trust in God's will to perfect His work of reconciliation.

We rejoice that one part of the Anglican Communion should be found ready to make this venture for a corporate union with certain non-episcopal Churches. We feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches. They are our pioneers in this direction of the movement for unity. The whole Communion will surely stand by them with earnest prayer and generous loyalty. But we are well aware that the constituency which we represent is not universally convinced about all the provisions of the Scheme, and wishes to see how it works out, before committing itself to definite approval. To meet this situation we have recommended to the Churches concerned arrangements which we desire to explain to our people in the clearest terms.

The Anglican Communion is a group of Churches bound together by very close ties of history and tradition, doctrine and practice. After the Union in South India, Anglicans who will be included in the united Church will not give up the use of the Prayer Book or discard any of the doctrines held in the Anglican Churches. Yet the united Church in South India will not itself be an Anglican Church; it will be a distinct province of the Universal Church. It will have a very real intercommunion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, though for a time that intercommunion will be limited in certain directions by their rules. Its Bishops will be received as Bishops by these Churches. Its episcopally ordained ministers—a continually increasing number—will be entitled under the usual rules to administer the Communion in the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Its communicants will be entitled to communicate with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, except in cases forbidden by the rules of these Churches. On the other hand no right to minister in the Churches of that Communion will be acquired by those ministers who have not been episcopally ordained.

The fact that the Church in South India will not be a member of the group of Churches called the Anglican Communion will inevitably impose on our brethren a temporary severance of close and treasured relationships, in council and synod, with their brethren in North India. But these are sacrifices which we believe they will make cheerfully in the hope of achieving a union between episcopal and non-episcopal Churches such as has never yet been effected, and of building up a real and living Church in India. For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned nor deserted by the Anglican Communion. It will preserve for them unimpaired their welcome to its love and fellowship, to its altars and its pulpits. For it will be looking forward to the day when their work will be rewarded and the unity of these Churches, not only in South India but the whole of India, will be completed and there will emerge a Province of Christ's Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, within whose visible unity treasures of faith and order, nowhere in the Church at present combined, will be possessed in common, and the power of Christ will be manifest in a new richness.

It was with unanimity and with profound sense of thankfulness that the Conference adopted the Resolutions relating to South India.

* * *

## The Anglican Communion

We turn next to the subject of the Anglican Communion, with which our Fourth Committee was occupied. This subject is very closely connected with the last. For it is our duty to envisage the one Church of Christ as it will be reunited, and to shape the Churches of our own Communion so that they will, even now, conform as much as possible to that ideal, and be ready to take their places within it, when it is realized.

Such a direction of our thoughts is almost forced upon us by certain changes which are being now observable in the Anglican Communion. This Communion is a commonwealth of Churches without a central constitution: it is a federation without a federal government. It has come into existence without any deliberate policy, by the extension of the Churches of Great Britian and Ireland beyond the limits of these Islands. The extension has been of a double nature, and the Churches overseas bear its impress. Some of them are, primarily, Churches of the British people scattered throughout the world; others are, primarily Churches of other peoples, planted by our Missions. Hitherto, they have all been Anglican, in the sense that they reflect the leading characteristics of the Church of England. They teach—as she does—the Catholic Faith in its entirety and in the proportions in which it is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. They refuse—as she does—to accept any statement, or practice, as of authority, which is not consistent with the Holy Scriptures and the understanding and practice of our religion as exhibited in the undivided Church. They are, in the idiom of our fathers, "particular or national" Churches, and they repudiate any idea of a central authority, other than Councils of Bishops. They combine respect for antiquity with freedom in the pursuit of truth. They are both Catholic and Evangelical. This is still to-day a true description of the facts and ideals of the Anglican Communion.

But these very ideals are working a change. Every Church of our Communion is endeavouring to do for the country where it exists the service which the Church of England has done for England—to represent the Christian religion and the Catholic Faith in a manner congenial to the people of the land, and to give scope to their genius in the development of Christian life and worship. As the Churches founded by our Mission in India, China, Japan, or Africa, more and more fully achieve this purpose, they may, in many ways, grow less and less like to each other and to their Mother, and, in consequence, less and less Anglican, though no less true to Catholic faith and order.

At the same time as we anticipate this progressive diversity within the unity of the Anglican Churches, we have before us a prospect of the restoration of communion with Churches which are in no sense Anglican. Our negotiations with the Orthodox Church and the Old Catholics illustrate this possibility in one direction, and the creation of united Churches—such as that proposed in India—illustrates it in another.

Thus beyond, but including, the federation of strictly Anglican Churches—which is now called the Anglican Communion—there may grow up a large federation of much less homogeneous Churches, which will be in some measure in communion with the See of Canterbury. This federation, however little centralised, would need some organ to express its unity. It is our belief that the Councils of the Bishops were in antiquity, and will be again, the appropriate organ, by which the unity of distant Churches can find expression without any derogation from their rightful autonomy. The Lambeth Conference with its strict adherence to purely advisory functions has been, perhaps, preparing our minds for participation in the Councils of a larger and more important community of Churches. Every extension of this circle of visible fellowship would increase the power of the Church to witness to its Lord by its unity.

These two sections of our work have dealt in different ways with unity between Churches. This is necessary, if the Church is to bear the witness which its Lord requires. We must now draw attention to the equally urgent necessity for unity within each Church. We appeal to all our brethren to remember that their right to a place in the Church of Christ lies in His call to each of them, in His love that embraces them, and in His Spirit that dwells in them, far more than in the opinions which they profess or the methods which they pursue. It may even be necessary to the Church that men in it should hold and expound different opinions, in order that the Church as a whole should have the whole of truth, even as the rays of many colours which the spectrum shows combine to make the light of the sun. Let us all listen to His voice Who still has to say to His disciples, after all these centuries, "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another."

* * *

### Conclusion

As we close, we return to the main theme of our message. The Church of Christ, a fellowship of witness—this is the ideal we would put before all who may read or hear our words.

We who send forth this letter are men called by their office to be leaders of the Church in all parts of the world. But leadership is powerless without the willing loyalty and service of the whole body. There are times in the history of nations when some crisis quickens in the hearts of the people their sense of the honour and claim of citizenship. They make the cause of their country their own. In the service of their country, even to self-sacrifice, they become aware of their love of it. So, at this present time in the history of the Church of Christ, we are convinced that the pressure of material needs and comforts and pleasures and the spiritual perplexity and confusion which mark our generation can only be overcome, if all the members of the Church, moved by the Divine Spirit Who dwells within it, identify themselves with its mission and its witness. Through their service they will come to look upon it as the "beloved community." They will realise afresh the splendour of its calling. They will gain a new and joyful sense of the greatness of the gifts God has entrusted to it— the "good news" it proclaims, the faith tried and tested by the thought and experience of centuries, the presence of the living Christ assured to it even to the end of the days. We long to see the Divine Society moving among the societies of men with the light of the Gospel upon it and the strength of a corporate witness within it. It is to this corporate witness that we summon the people of our own Church throughout the world, humbly desiring that we with them may follow the example of our Master, Who said, "To this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the Truth."

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

COSMO CANTUAR:

GEORGE CICESTR, Secretary.

MERVYN HAIGH, Assistant Secretary.

## RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

### The Christian Doctrine of God

1. We believe that the Christian Church is the repository and trustee of a Revelation of God, given by Himself, which all members of the Church are bound to transmit to others, and that every member of the Church, both clerical and lay, is called to be a channel through which the Divine Life flows for the quickening of all mankind.

2. We believe that, in view of the enlarged knowledge gained in modern times of God's ordering of the world and the clearer apprehension of the creative process by which He prepared the way for the coming of Jesus Christ, there is urgent need in the face of many erroneous conceptions for a fresh presentation of the Christian doctrine of God; and we commend the Report of our Committee to the study of all thoughtful people in the hope that it may help towards meeting this need.

3. We affirm the supreme and unshaken authority of the Holy Scriptures as presenting the truth concerning God and the spiritual life in its historical setting and in its progressive revelation, both throughout the Old Testament and in the New. It is no part of the purpose of the Scriptures to give information on those themes which are the proper subject matter of scientific inquiry, nor is the Bible a collection of separate oracles, each containing a final declaration of truth. The doctrine of God is the centre of its teaching, set forth in its books "by divers portions and in divers manners." As Jesus Christ is the crown, so also is He the criterion of all revelation. We would impress upon Christian people the necessity of banishing from their minds ideas concerning the character of God which are inconsistent with the character of Jesus Christ. We believe that the work of our Lord Jesus Christ is continued by the Holy Spirit, Who not only interpreted Him to the Apostles, but has in every generation inspired and guided those whose seek truth.

* * *

5. We recognize in the modern discoveries of science—whereby the boundaries of knowledge are extended, the needs of men are satisfied and their sufferings alleviated—veritable gifts of God, to be used with thankfulness to Him, and with that sense of responsibility which such thankfulness must create.

* * *

7. We welcome an increased readiness in many educational authorities to accept the influence and assistance of the Church in its teaching capacity, and we urge that every effort should be made throughout the Church to seek such opportunities and to use them with sympathy and discretion.

As the intellectual meaning and content of the Christian doctrine of God cannot be fully apprehended without the aid of the highest human knowledge, it is essential that Christian theology should be studied and taught in Universities in contact with philosophy, science and criticism, and to that end that Faculties of Theology should be established in Universities wherever possible.

* * *

## The Life and Witness of the Christian Community

### Marriage and Sex

9. The Conference believes that the conditions of modern life call for a fresh statement from the Christian Church on the subject of sex. It declares that the functions of sex as a God-given factor in human life are essentially noble and creative. Responsibility in regard to their right use needs the greater emphasis in view of widespread laxity of thought and conduct in all these matters.

10. The Conference believes that in the exalted view of marriage taught by our Lord is to be found the solution of the problems with which we are faced. His teaching is reinforced by certain elements which have found a new emphasis in modern life, particularly the sacredness of personality, the more equal partnership of men and women, and the biological importance of monogamy.

11. The Conference believes that it is with this ideal in view that the Church must deal with questions of divorce and with whatever threatens the security of woman and the stability of the home. Mindful of our Lord's words, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," it reaffirms "as Our Lord's principle and standard of marriage, a life-long and indissoluble union, for better, for worse, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, and calls on all Christian people to maintain and bear witness to this standard."[1]

In cases of divorce:—

(*a*) The Conference, while passing no judgment on the practice of regional or national Churches within our Communion, recommends that the marriage of one, whose former partner is still living, should not be celebrated according to the rites of the Church.

(*b*) Where an innocent person has remarried under civil sanction and desires to receive the Holy Communion, it recommends that the case should be referred for consideration to the Bishop, subject to provincial regulations.

(*c*) Finally, it would call attention to the Church's unceasing responsibility for the spiritual welfare of all her members who have come short of her standard in this as in any other respect, and to the fact that the Church's aim, individually and socially, is reconciliation to God and redemption from sin. It therefore urges all Bishops and Clergy to keep this aim before them.

12. In all questions of marriage and sex the Conference emphasises the need of education. It is important that before the child's emotional reaction to sex is awakened, definite information should be given in an atmosphere of simplicity and beauty. The persons directly responsible for this are the parents, who in the exercise of this responsibility will themselves need the best guidance that the Church can supply.

During childhood and youth the boy or the girl should thus be prepared for the responsibilities of adult life; but the Conference urges the need of some further preparation for those members of the Church who are about to marry.

To this end the Conference is convinced that steps ought to be taken (*a*) to secure a better education for the clergy in moral theology; (*b*) to establish, where they do not exist, in the various branches of the Anglican Communion central councils which would study the problems of sex from the Christian standpoint and give advice to the responsible authorities in

[1] Lambeth Conference, 1920. Resolution 67.

**Due to the large number of requests from new subscribers for back numbers, we regret to announce that supplies of our June and July numbers are exhausted. We have still a number of the May and August issues on hand.**

## Lane Seminary Opening

DUE to legal difficulties that have arisen, it has been found necessary to reopen Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati this Fall. Assembly approval of the merger of Lane Seminary and the Presbyterian Seminary of Chicago (McCormick) was conditioned upon these difficulties being removed. When and if the way is clear, Lane Seminary will remove to Chicago as planned this year.

diocese or parish or theological college as to methods of approach and lines of instruction; (*c*) to review the available literature and to take steps for its improvement and its circulation.

13. The Conference emphasises the truth that the sexual instinct is a holy thing implanted by God in human nature. It acknowledges that intercourse between husband and wife as the consummation of marriage has a value of its own within that sacrament, and that thereby married love is enchanced and its character strengthened. Further, seeing that the primary purpose for which marriage exists is the procreation of children, it believes that this purpose as well as the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control should be the governing consideration in that intercourse.

14. The Conference affirms (*a*) the duty of parenthood as the glory of married life; (*b*) the benefit of a family as a joy in itself, as a vital contribution to the nation's welfare, and as a means of character-building for both parents and children; (*c*) the privilege of discipline and sacrifice to this end.

15. Where there is a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, the method must be decided on Christian principles. The primary and obvious method is complete abstinence from intercourse (as far as may be necessary) in a life of discipline and self-control lived in the power of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless in those cases where there is such a clearly-felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, the Conference agrees that other methods may be used, provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles. The Conference records its strong condemnation of the use of any methods of conception-control from motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience.

[Carried by 193 votes to 67.]

16. The Conference further records its abhorrence of the sinful practice of abortion.

17. While the Conference admits that economic conditions are a serious factor in the situation, it condemns the propaganda which treats conception-control as a way of meeting those unsatisfactory social and economic conditions which ought to be changed by the influence of Christian public opinion.

* * *

19. Fear of consequences can never, for the Christian, be the ultimate effective motive for the maintenance of chastity before marriage. This can only be found in the love of God and reverence for His laws. The Conference emphasises the need of strong and wise teaching to make clear the Christian standpoint in this matter. That standpoint is that all illict and irregular unions are wrong in that they offend against the true nature of love, they compromise the future happiness of married life, they are antagonistic to the welfare of the community, and, above all, they are contrary to the revealed will of God.

*(Concluded in our next issue)*

**Readers of Christianity Today will note that the opening exercises of Westminster Seminary will be held on October 1 at 3 P. M. in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia, instead of September 30th as formerly announced. All are cordially invited.**

## Westminster Seminary News

THE Registrar of Westminster Seminary reports that, in addition to the curriculum offered by the Seminary last year, which will be maintained with few changes, a number of new courses have been announced for the fall semester.

Professor Machen will offer in the New Testament Department, in supplement to the work he has previously been giving, two new courses. One of these will have for its field the exegesis of the Gospel according to John, and the other the exegesis of the Corinthian Epistles.

Professor Allis has added to his schedule a special course in the study of the period of the Exile and Restoration. This will enable him to deal more fully than is possible in his general course on the Prophets with the Prophets of the Exile, with the return of the Chosen People from captivity and with the history of these periods.

In the Department of Apologetics, Professor Van Til will offer an entirely new course on the subject of Christian Evidences. This course will be part of the required work of the members of the Middle Class.

Mr. Murray, who is this year assuming the work of the Department of Systematic Theology and whose coming is looked forward to with glad anticipation by the members of the Faculty and student body, will give the required courses in Systematic Theology for both the Middle and Senior classes. In addition to these courses, Mr. Murray is offering an elective in "The Reformed Doctrine of the Atonement—its Roots and Development," tracing the historical growth of our knowledge of this subject.

Professor MacRae, of the Department of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism, is planning to give, in addition to his work in Hebrew and other Semitic languages, what promises to be a most valuable introduction to the study of Archaeology. This course will be entitled, "The Old Testament in the Light of the Monuments," and will lay particular emphasis upon the latest archaeological studies and their bearings upon the trustworthiness of the Scriptures. There have been a number of important discoveries made in the course of the recent excavations in Palestine, Iraq (Mesopotamia) and Egypt which have not yet been freely made available to the Bible students of this country. Mr. MacRae's recent studies in Berlin and in Palestine itself under some of the leading archaeological experts, and his field trip over the ground where much important work is being done, give him particular advantages for leading a study of this sort.

The Department of Homiletics and Practical Theology will this year be under the direction and supervision of the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D., formerly Minister of the Church of the Covenant, Cincinnati, Ohio. Dr. Stevenson's experience in large city churches is of particular value in this connection. He will take charge of the work in both Homiletics and Pastoral Theology and will be assisted by other lecturers on church government and related topics.

Although the opening of the year is rapidly approaching, a steady volume of continued inquiries from prospective students is coming in and it is expected that a number of these will enroll on Registration Day, September 30th. It is impossible to state as yet the actual registration figures for this year as these will not be known until after Registration Day, but it may be said that there is still room for further enrollments.

One of the most difficult tasks in connection with the Seminary is to be compelled to disappoint the number of men who wish to enter the institution but who find themselves without sufficient preparation to meet the entrance standards of the Seminary.

While student registration will take place throughout the day on Tuesday, September 30th, at the Seminary building, 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia, the opening address will be delivered in Witherspoon Hall in that city at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, October 1st., This will marke the formal opening of the second year of Westminster's life. The address will be delivered by the Rev. F. Paul McConkey, D.D., Minister of the Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Michigan. No cards of admission will be required, and every friend of the Seminary is cordially invited to be present and to take part in this happy occasion.

The improvements carried out throughout the summer on the Seminary building have been practically completed. Three new classrooms will be in use, replacing two of the rooms used last year and adding to the number available. The library space has been extended, providing better facilities for study and consultation of the volumes upon the shelves. A fire escape has been added to the building, thus permitting the above mentioned expansion of the classrooms and making ample safety provision. Repainting and other work of this nature has been carried out.

During the course of the summer one of the members of the Westminster Board of Trustees, the Rev. Roy Talmage Brumbaugh, D.D., formerly Minister of the Bethany Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, has begun his work as Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma, Washington. This church has a membership of some 2,650 and a Sunday School of about 1,600. Dr. Brumbaugh will, of course, retain his membership on the Westminster Board and his invaluable counsel, advice and assistance will continue as heretofore.

BENJ. F. EMERY CO. PHILA