# 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-JANUARY, 1931
Vol. 1 • No. 9

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# The Paramount Duty of the Christian Church

THE Church of JESUS CHRIST has many tasks. One, however, takes precedence of all others. This task was assigned it by the supreme Head of the Church when He spoke the words recorded in the eighth verse of the first chapter of the Book of Acts: "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." JESUS was "taken up" immediately after the utterance of these words: they may, therefore, be said to express the final instructions which our LORD gave His Church in person, later instructions having been given through the instrumentality of the apostles.

The paramount duty of the Christian Church, then, is to bear witness, to make known a message—a message that has to do primarily with the death and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST as PAUL tells us in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the CORINTHIANS: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received; how that CHRIST died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures." The New Testament, particularly the Book of Acts, makes perfectly clear that the campaign launched by the apostles, immediately after Pentecost, was a campaign of witnessing. By means of the "foolishness of preaching" they began the task not only of bringing the thoughts and activities of individual men and women into captivity to JESUS CHRIST but of transforming the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of their LORD.

It is not strange that the then-living wise men of this world should have judged it foolish that the apostles thought it possible to achieve any significant results by such means. It is somewhat surprising, however, in view of the signal success that attended the efforts of the apostles—as well as the efforts of their imitators in later centuries—that there should be so many today, even within the Christian Church itself, to whom the apostolic method should seem so foolish that they have largely discarded it in the interest of other methods. For the "foolishness of preaching" many professed followers of CHRIST—despite the clear instructions He left behind Him—are putting their main confidence in organizations, programs, mass movements, and the like, to such an extent that it is more proper to speak of them as "men with a program" than it is to speak of them as "men with a message." It is true that plans and programs and organizations have an important part to play in the great task of Christianizing the world; but in view of the method commended by CHRIST Himself and followed by all His apostles, it should be as clear as day that our chief emphasis should be on the purity and sincerity of our testimony to the truth as it is in JESUS CHRIST. Christianity is indeed a life but it is a life based on a message. In as far, therefore, as the Christian worker denies or ignores or falsifies that message his labor is in vain in the LORD. The primary note of a true Church, as our Protestant fathers ever insisted, is that therein the Gospel is honored and proclaimed.

The campaign of witnessing carried on by the apostles included two elements—both of which were kept constantly in the foreground. In the first place they made known what had taken place, the great historic events that lay at the basis of the Christian religion. In the second place they expounded the meaning or significance of those facts or events. In a word facts and doctrines were inextricably bound together in their testimony.

The apostles were not mere expounders and defenders of certain religious principles which they had learned from the great Nazarene; neither were they mere ethical teachers, interested primarily in persuading men to live as JESUS lived. Certainly they were religious and ethical teachers who recognized JESUS as their final authority; but they were concerned, first of all, to tell men of certain events that had happened, together with their meaning or significance. Here PAUL'S

## IN THIS ISSUE:


75,580 ..... 4
Walter Vail Watson

What Shall We Do With Christianity?—II..... 5
Wm. Bittle Wells

The Sources of National Decay..... 7
J. Keir Fraser

Robert Dick Wilson: Torchbearer..... 8
Harold J. Ockenga

Notes on Biblical Exposition..... 9
J. Gresham Machen

Books of Religious Significance..... 11

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice..... 13

Current Views and Voices..... 15

Facts Concerning Churches and Ministers..... 17

News of the Church..... 19

statement is classic: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received that CHRIST died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures."

The apostles testified to the facts (in the sense of events that had happened) that lay at the basis of their message—facts apart from which their message would not have been a gospel or good news. They bore witness to the fact that JESUS had died and that He had risen. But that is not all they did. They also pointed out the meaning of those facts—that JESUS had died "for our sins," and that He had been raised "for our justification." They did not suppose that the facts alone—what are often called the "bare" or "naked" facts—gave them a gospel of redemption. It is true that apart from such facts as the death and resurrection of JESUS there would be no gospel for a sin-cursed world; but it is also true that there would be no such gospel to proclaim if the meaning and significance of those events were not known. Only as it is known that the death and resurrection of JESUS was the death and resurrection of the GOD-MAN, and that He was "delivered for our trespasses and raised for our justification," do they beget within us a living hope "unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away."

The apostles being judge, the gospel is constituted, not by the facts apart from the doctrines, still less by the doctrines apart from the facts, but by the facts and the doctrines so bound together that in effect they coalesce. "The gospel is no mere proclamation of 'eternal truths,' but the discovery of a saving purpose of GOD for mankind, executed in time. But the doctrines are the interpretation of the facts. The facts do not stand blank and dumb before us, but have a voice given them and a meaning put into them. They are accompanied by living speech, which make their meaning clear. When JOHN declares that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh and is the SON of GOD, he is stating a fact, but he is none the less enunciating a doctrine. When PAUL affirms, 'CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures,' he is proclaiming a fact, but he is at the same time giving an interpretation of it."

The paramount duty of the Christian Church being what has been indicated, it is obvious that it can function adequately only as it bears clear and positive testimony to the facts and doctrines of Christianity. Say what we will, the fundamental things about Christianity is that it is a revelation of truth—in deed and in word. From a Christian viewpoint anything gotten at the cost of this truth is gotten at too great a price. Be the circumstances what they may, there must be no surrender of truth or even any minimizing of its value and importance. Let a Christian Church cease to bear witness to the truth as it is in JESUS, or even ascribe a secondary place to such truth, and it has abandoned the main reason for its existence. No matter what its members or its wealth or its other values, unless it be a "pillar and ground of the truth" it is as the Church in Sardis of which it was written: "I know thy works, that thou hast a name, that thou livest, and thou art dead." The truth must be proclaimed in love; but love itself will permit no paltering with the truth. Truth, particularily the truth as it is in JESUS, is the supreme need of man and he who withholds or even adulterates that truth is man's worst enemy.

If the Church is functioning badly today—as can hardly be denied—it is largely because of the evil of its divided testimony. Even within the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches what one Minister commends as saving truth another Minister denounces as fatal error. As a result the Church's testimony is discordant and contradictory and many are the souls which are confused and distracted. "If the trumpet give an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself for war?" In as far as such divided testimony exists within the Presbyterian Church it finds its explanation, for the most part at least, in the fact that men have been admitted into its ministry, or have persisted in remaining in its ministry, in defiance of its constitutional requirements. But be the explanation what it may in the various churches, a crying need of the hour is the creation of a situation wherein the Church, as far as is humanly possible, will bear undivided and consentient testimony to the gospel of the grace of GOD in its purity. "The trouble is within, not without."

## Preaching in the Language of Today

IT is a mere truism to say that a preacher, if he is to attract and hold the attention of his hearers, must express himself in terms of current thought. Every age has its own language, and, broadly speaking, can speak and understand no other. If, therefore, the preacher of today expresses himself in the language of yesterday it will be as though he spoke in an unknown tongue—as far as most of the men of this generation are concerned. The "Fundamentalists" believe this as fully as do the "Modernists."

But while the preacher should express the gospel in the language of his age, he should never overlook the fact that before he can express the gospel in any language he must first have a gospel to express. Expression is important but it is always secondary, never primary. The thing of primary importance is always *what* we express rather than our manner of expressing it. Expression may change and does change from age to age; but the gospel—we mean the Christian gospel—remains essentially the same as age succeeds age.

We do not pretend to like many so-called modern expressions of Christianity. This is due, however, to the fact that we object to expressions of modern thought in terms of Christianity rather than to the fact that we object to expressions of Christianity in terms of modern thought. Their main concern is with "modern thought"—by which is meant the science and philosophy and scholarship of the day—and what they really seek to do is to make it intelligible and acceptable to those more or less familiar with the terms of Christianity. The result is that only as much of Christianity is given expression as can be brought into harmony with the science and philosophy and scholarship of the present age. It makes all the difference in the world, however, whether it is modern thought that gets expressed in terms of Christianity or whether it is Christianity that gets expressed in terms of modern thought. If the sum of the conclusions commended to us by "modern thought" could be identified with the truth and nothing but the truth, a whole-hearted

acceptance of them would not militate against our holding fast at the same time to a full-orbed Christianity. But inasmuch as it is certain that the sum of these conclusions is not a fixed but a constantly changing total, it is obvious that we can force Christianity into harmony with the science and philosophy and scholarship of today only at the cost of making certain that it will be out of harmony with the science and philosophy and scholarship of tomorrow. The difference here has to do not so much with a question of terms as with a question of standards. For those we criticise, the standard is "modern thought;" for us the standard is Christianity. In our judgment, it is Christianity rather than "modern thought" that is the stable element. It is our firm conviction that Christianity has a definite content of its own, given it once and for all by CHRIST and His apostles, and that while this content must needs finds expression in terms intelligible to each age, yet in seeking to express it in modern terms we should ever be on our guard lest change of form also involve change of content. As regards content the gospel is for all time.

It is one thing, then, to say that we should express Christianity in the language of the times; it is another and quite different thing to say that our beliefs should be re-fashioned so as to bring them into harmony with those phases of belief, or unbelief, that may be most characteristic of the times. We may approve the first statement while wholly disapproving the second. Action in accord with the first statement will further the interests of Christianity, but action in accord with the second will mean a pared-down Christianity if not an extinct Christianity. Nothing is more characteristic of much "modern thought" than its aversion to the supernatural in the form of the miraculous unless it be its aversion to a blood-bought salvation. As a result there are "modern expressions of Christianity" that make no mention of the miraculous or the Cross as an atoning sacrifice, except to reject or even to scoff at them. And yet apart from these things, there is no Christianity, as Christianity is expressed in the New Testament and as it finds expressions in the historic creeds of the Christian Church. It is a high tribute to the significance of Christianity that men should retain the name even after they have given up all that makes it what it is. But those Christian men and women who are concerned not with words but with realities will derive no comfort from such modern expressions of Christianity because what they really express is something other than the gospel of the grace of GOD in which their souls have found rest and encouragement. Let us seek to express Christianity in the language of the twentieth century, but let us see to it that the thing we call Christianity is what CHRIST and His apostles would instantly recognize as such, even if called by another name, not a somewhat that lacks all that is distinctive of the religion they established in the world. How we preach is important, but *what* we preach is always the thing of primary importance.

## The Joy of Salvation

THE New Testament makes clear that joy was one of the outstanding emotions of the early Christians. This joy had its source in their faith in JESUS CHRIST as one who had obtained for them the great boon of sins forgiven and of restoration to the favor of GOD. If that joy is no longer so generally characteristic of Christians, it is because they have no adequate appreciation of the greatness of their indebtedness to CHRIST as one who averted from them evils that could not otherwise be averted and secured for them blessings that could not otherwise be secured. "He loved me and gave Himself for me" was at once the source of their joy and the inspiration of their self-sacrificing devotion.

A pessimistic Christian is a contradiction in terms. And yet apart from Christianity, with its faith in a FATHER-GOD and a SAVIOUR-KING, all informed thinking would be pessimistic. It is not too much to say that apart from Christianity it is only ignorance or thoughtlessness that keeps men everywhere from being pessimists. Christianity does not shut its eyes to the evils of life. It sees the evil of life so clearly that even the literature of pessimism cannot surpass the pathos of its lament. And yet it is fundamentally optimistic in its outlook on life —because of its faith in its SAVIOUR-GOD.

It is easy today to fall into a pessimistic mood. To multitudes the future looks dark and foreboding. The thoughts of many have been so unsettled by the alleged findings of Biblical criticism and science that they are living without fixed convictions, and so without any fixed purpose. Moreover business and political conditions are such as to make many fearful of the future. If we are to maintain our poise in these trying days, if we are to face the future confident that the best is yet to be, we must have faith in GOD as revealed in JESUS CHRIST. Apart from that faith we might well despair alike of our future as individuals and of the future of the race. Firm in that faith, however, we need despair of neither. Rather we cannot but cherish large hopes and expectations for both.

## A Notable Series of Bible Expositions

IT is with great pleasure that the Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY announce the beginning, in this issue, of a series of remarkable Bible expositions by the Rev. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary. Those who are familiar with Dr. MACHEN'S writings know that his great scholarship never obscures the clarity or simplicity of his style. Few men can so open up the great deeps of GOD'S Word. Out of years of rich study Dr. MACHEN will contribute monthly a popular exposition of a portion of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, the great Epistle of the Protestant Reformation. We believe that those who follow his unique treatment will find Galatians opened to them as perhaps never before. The Editors regard the beginning of these notable expositions as a distinct event in the history of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and sincerely hope that through this ministry all may be drawn closer to the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The series will in all probability continue for most, if not all, of the present year. Do you not have friends who you believe would be spiritually helped by these meditations? If you do, and wish to subscribe for them, or to induce them to subscribe, we will glady enter their subscriptions beginning with this issue. Dr. MACHEN'S first exposition will be found on page nine.

# 75,580

By the Rev. Walter Vail Watson, Th.M.
Minister, Number Nine Church, Stanley, N. Y.

SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY is still a large number. It is 3.77 per cent of the total membership of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. listed in the Minutes of 1929. It is the number of names quietly dropped out of the local church rolls in one year. It is found at the bottom of the column headed, Suspended. Only in three years since 1912 has this percentage been exceeded.

In the early days of the flowering of our denomination the number in this column represented largely those dropped by process because of some sort of conduct unbefitting a Christian. It was the thing to do for the local session to keep careful watch over both the residence and the morals of the members of the flock. Those were the good old days, when more people attended public worship than were found on the church rolls, when people took religion seriously, and when the meeting house was the local newspaper and the social center.

Nowadays members come and go in more senses than one. Like Abraham they have "no continuing city," unlike him they look for none. Sheep are they having no shepherd, and there are many devious by-paths. From 400 to 949 of them have been dropped by four of our churches since April 1, 1929. More than 20 have been "suspended" in each of fifteen more. Thirty more churches have dropped from 100 to 200 members. Fifteen of these churches have lost from one-fourth to more than one-half of previous enrollment, not to mention the one losing more than three-fourths of its members. No matter what has been the experience of the past, this is serious. Something ought to be done about it, can be done about it.

Eight of our largest, our most influential presbyteries suspended in this summary and careless fashion at least 6 per cent of their enrollments, all but one of them losing net members during the year when—it is said because of the absence of Easter with its ingathering—our denomination's net membership decreased 20,359. And this was the case in the year when the Protestant denominations began to concentrate upon the great nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost with all that it implies! In the light of all this, and much more that might be associated with it, it certainly is high time we began to bestir ourselves.

Study of the figures in our "back-door column" points first to several evils which are associated with this whole problem. The first which naturally suggests itself is the almost universally inexact and ineffective systems in use for keeping rolls of members. All pastors are familiar with the utter lack of standardization along this line; few of the members themselves have ever given the matter a thought. It is all too true that 99.44 per cent of the membership rolls are, at any given moment of time, full of inaccurate addresses, members dead and buried but whose cards—if the system be that modern—are not yet interred. Every church should give evidence annually that its membership rolls are up to date, are carefully kept. This inspection should accompany the presbyterial check-up of session minutes.

In the *Digest* will be found all the accrued wisdom of the Church on the matter of suspension by process; but who looks at the *Digest?* There is nothing like uniform practice on the part of our presbyteries or individual churches in determining just who or just when one should be transferred to the "reserve roll" from the active list. When should the slack ones be shifted; when the new pastor arrives and presides over his first session meeting? Should the reserve roll have two compartments: 1. Those whom one can find. 2. Those one wishes might be found? Really the evil is great but the problem of its solution is rather easy.

The third evil if solved will largely solve the second evil above referred to. Is the pastoral office to be forgotten or extended? No one knows just what proportion of full-time Ministers serving our churches are real pastors, but judging by the complaints of the laymen that proportion is not large. Ministers just do not call as they used to. Times have changed but the Minister still has to devise ways and means of ministering, if vital connection between people and the Church is to be set up and maintained. Part of the trouble lies in the fact that our city churches just outgrew the physical powers of a man to do satisfactory calling on the individuals and the families of his church. Nor have the additions of assistant pastors, of church visitors, kept up with the size of these large parishes. The only way out is to devise ways and means of lay ministry in this direction. Many alert pastors have already partly met this need by enlisting their most spiritually minded laymen to assist them and their sessions under a zoning plan. The idea works, can be worked. If the calls can be made—real, purposeful, worthwhile calls—in sufficient quantities a surprisingly small number of members will slip out the back door to be forever lost to the Church's life.

For years the presbyteries have had machinery for establishing the member who changes residence, but there has not been sufficient emphasis upon the importance of conserving the individual to the life and work of the Church in these last days of increasingly bureaucratic tendency, by way of propaganda, by way of constant publicity and promotion, to enable this machinery to function. Most of the lists of the presbytery members note the chairman of this committee on members changing residence, many do not bother with such a designation, counting the likelihood of sufficient opportunities to serve pastors and transient members too slender for notice. Someday when we reawaken to some serious sense of the importance of each individual to the whole Church we may speed our parting friends with greater care and zeal.

We confess it to our chagrin and greatest regret, that many of us are so zealous to receive new members, to swell the roll, to contribute to the greatness of the church we serve, that we impose few if any strictures upon those coming before the sessions as candidates for membership in the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. One prominent young Minister of the denomination openly avers that the only question he asks the youth who come seeking admission to the Church upon profession of their faith is, "If Jesus were here upon earth today, would you seek to follow him?" That this sort of glittering generality gives indication of a total lack of realization on the Minister's part of the thronging and seductive social temptations which lurk in the pathway of the youthful Christian of the day, needs hardly to be mentioned here except as it indicates a phase of the whole trend to disregard need of definite Christian conviction as an undergirding of distinctively Christian living.

A sixth contributing evil is seen in the present lack of clear, concise, loyal definition of just what is expected of a member of the Presbyterian Church in these days. A careful study will reveal the startling fact that while we have our Confession, our questions demanded and answered upon uniting with the Church, we find members-elect entering the Church without a thought of readjusting the life in any particular. Not only are the candidates for admission utterly untaught in the faith; they have no idea of the solemnity of their vows or of their real connotation. This need not go on if the leaders of the denomination will take a definite stand one way or the other in these days, and for today; a stand which can be put in brief and simple English so that a wayfaring man may understand just ex-

actly to what he subscribes. Such a procedure may result in slower accretion; we may be a long time in reaching the third million; but when we reach it we shall not slip back again!

When we get new members how shall we establish them in the life of the Church? We are failing to do it now all along the line! I wonder if it would help any if the prophets of the Lord were to return to their prophetic ministry? With being instant in season goes the scriptural injunction to "preach the Word." The best antidote for the poison of rational criticism of the Bible is a return to the study of the Scriptures, to see if these things are so. The Bereans were critics, but they studied *the Book* with open mind, not textbooks *about the Book*. The entrance of God's Word gave them light; it may be depended upon to do the same for the Bereans of 1931. Where the Word is preached, the people grow today.

It will also help in establishing the new Christian in the life of his Church if the teaching of the preacher directs his mind to the primary mission for which the Church was established and keeps it there. He serves his Lord best who best obeys his Great Commission. The Minister whose church has no "side roll" will constantly impress his people with the truth that those who love God will make Him known, will reach out after the lost—those "not found, yet!" Only so will a failing Church return to possess its own inheritance.

There is a movement on foot within the denomination to put the Church at large face to face with the challenge of its present weakness. One of the forms that this movement is taking is an overture to the General Assembly of our great and much loved Church to study and advertise and face this problem, to resolve to solve it under God's guidance and in His plan. It will need the prevailing prayers of every loyal Presbyterian if the effort lives, for there are many adversaries. From all sides will be heard the cry, "tempest in a teapot!" Nothing, however, is inconsequential which aims at the effort to put the individual communicant in his rightful place in the life of the Church, nothing is of small account which will stop the tremendous leak of man-power, widening from year to year because of our indifference, our careless technique. Thousands of budget dollars are annually lost with the loss of the seventy-five thousand. Yearly grows the creeping paralysis just because someone has not bestirred himself to do the things that are unpopular. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America will inevitably pass if within its ranks are not found men of vision, of quiet persistence, who are not afraid of the buffetings of adversity. Such men will arise and theirs will be the inheritance of the ages! "Truly, if they had been mindful of that from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: *for he hath prepared for them a city.*"

# What Shall We Do With Christianity?

## By William Bittle Wells

### Part Two

THE Gospels claim that Jesus performed miracles for the benefit of humanity. If they were not so performed, the New Testament is a false record, unworthy of acceptance by any intelligent man.

The type of mind, therefore, that can delete the miracles from the Gospels, and yet acknowledge the divinity of Christ, who would lie about performing a miracle, both in word and in deed, is one of the wonders of the age. Neither will it suffice to take the puerile attitude that the miracles were not attested, but the rest of the Gospel was! In their efforts to reason around a circle, the Modernists are insulting the intelligence of a ten-year old child. There is no intellectual quarrel with them if they wish to reject the entire New Testament, but to emasculate it in a most ignoble and senseless way taxes the patience of a Job.

The question of the physical resurrection of Jesus is no more involved than that of the divinity of Jesus or the validity of the miracles. It is purely a question of fact, according to the Gospels. But it is the fashion in Modernist churches to assert or imply that Jesus rose from the dead in a spiritual sense, just, for example, as Martin Luther, Lincoln, Napoleon, John Brown (whose "soul goes marching on"), John Wesley, or any of the great Catholic Saints, have risen from the dead. But that Jesus rose from the dead in the same body as He was crucified—this is considered a matter of no moment by the Modernist, who believes that we should stress the point that the *spirit* of Jesus has gone on permeating and uplifting humanity. Consequently, it is useless and unnecessary to insist that Jesus rose from the dead in a physical sense.

Now, that point of view would not be so wrong and objectionable if it did not discount the whole idea of the resurrection, and make out Jesus a liar. Jesus laid great stress upon the fact that He rose from the dead in a physical sense. He took pains, great pains, to settle this question for all time, seeming to anticipate the controversy that would arise with reference to it. Therefore, again, the denial that Jesus rose from the dead in a physical sense is a direct challenge to His integrity, and must mean nothing less than the rejection of the Gospels. But the emphasis that the Modernist places upon the spiritual significance of the resurrection fools a good many.

Yet, to say that Jesus rose from the dead in a spiritual sense, if words are to have their proper meaning, is simply the equivalent of saying that Jesus did not rise from the dead at all. That is the plain English of it, and, in Heaven's name, why quibble all the time? Why can't men come out and be straightforward upon this point? Modernism is unwilling to take hold, and is unwilling to let go, and yet it is inevitable that it must, eventually, take the ground that Jesus did not rise from the dead, but that we have all been deceived upon this point. And Christianity, of course, is a rank fraud.

But let us bring Jesus into court, and hear Him:

Jesus said, speaking of His life, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (John 10:18.) There is the testimony of Jesus as to His power over His body. If Jesus told the truth, He had power to rise from the dead in a physical sense. Now, let us see what actually happened:

Hear Matthew:

"I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified, He is not here; for He is risen, *as He said;* . . . And as they went to tell His disciples, behold Jesus met them saying, 'All Hail.' And they came and *held Him by the feet*, and worshipped Him." (Matthew 28:5-9.) We submit that it would not be possible to hold a spiritual body by the feet.

Now, hear Luke:

"And as they thus spake, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, 'Peace be unto you.' But they were terrified and affrighted, *and supposed that they had seen a spirit.* And He said unto them, 'Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself: HANDLE ME AND SEE; FOR A SPIRIT

HATH NOT FLESH AND BONES AS YE SEE ME HAVE,' and when He had thus spoken, He shewed them His hands and His feet. And while they believed not for joy, and wondered, He saith unto them, 'Have ye here any meat?' And they gave Him a piece of broiled fish and an honeycomb. And He took it, and did eat before them." (Luke 24:36-43.)

We could close the case here, for there could be no more straightforward, unequivocal, or explicit statement than this. It is absolutely final and conclusive.

In the light of this clear-cut statement, made by Jesus, Himself, that he was *not a spirit* after his resurrection, but that he had "*flesh and bones*," what possible vestige of justification is there for the statement that Jesus rose from the dead in a spiritual sense? The only possible justification, if you can call it that, would be to throw out of "court" every word of the New Testament, discard the God of "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," and have no Christ, no God, no Bible, no religion, no Truth!

But listen, further, to John:

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, 'Peace be unto you.' And when He had so said, He shewed them his hands and his side. . . . But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, 'We have seen the Lord.' But he said unto them, 'Except I see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I WILL NOT BELIEVE.'

"And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas was with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, 'Peace be unto you.' Then said He to Thomas, 'Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.'

"And Thomas answered and said unto Him, 'My Lord and my God.' Jesus saith unto him, 'Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." (John 20:19-28.)

In the light of such testimony, what possible justification is there to contend that Jesus rose from the dead in a spiritual sense? It ought not to be necessary to stress this point in view of the fact that the Scriptures are so absolutely clear upon it. But, strange as it may seem, it is necessary. Yet it would seem that anyone who knows anything whatever about the New Testament, or the significance of Christianity, would admit at once that the actual, physical resurrection of Jesus is one of the distinctly cardinal points upon which the whole structure of Christianity rests.

Paul emphasizes this in Romans 10:9: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved, for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

Peter said: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." (Peter 1:2.)

If Jesus did not rise from the dead in accordance with the gospels, then, as Paul says, "We are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ." (I Cor. 15.)

And John becomes a perjurer, too, because he says: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that His testimony is true." (John 21:24.) And John adds: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath a witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son." (1 John 1:10.)

Men may and do reject that record, but not until this day, when they rejected it, have they pretended to be Christians. It has remained for the Modernist movement to attempt this. The time has, therefore, come when there must be a plea for sanity; when the attempts to undermine the Scriptures in a reprehensible effort to make an inclusive religion must be recognized for what it actually is; and unworthy representatives of God's Holy Word, who defile the purity of the Scriptures, denied the right of Modernist's propaganda in a Christian Church.

Indeed, rather than have the Scriptures thus emasculated and distorted, it would be preferable to take the attitude that Jesus did not even exist; that these accounts are only myths—figments of the imagination. It is possible in some degree to respect that attitude of mind, however much we may differ with it, and it is the only logical attitude to take by those who reject the divinity, the miracles, or the physical resurrection. But to call Jesus a "good man" or "an elder brother," and at the same time to say, as must be said under the circumstances, that He was an imposter and a liar —this sort of intellectual gymnastics is an unmitigated fraud.

There is no escape: either Jesus was the Son of God, as He claimed; either He performed the miracles that He claimed He performed; either He rose from the dead in a physical sense, as He claimed, and not in a spiritual sense, or else this Bible of ours is a tissue of lies from cover to cover. There is no escape, and there can be no honesty in side-stepping this question, or in attempting to make the Bible and its plain teachings something different from what they actually are. And if these statements are lies, and Jesus had a quasi and uncertain divinity, such as we all have, then this Bible is not worth the effort, intellectually or actually, to cast it into the dump heap. Nay, it is infinitely worse than that. This Bible, then, has grossly misled groping and suffering humanity. It has deceived the very heart of the world, committing the greatest crime that the imagination of man can conceive, and we are, indeed, of all men most miserable.

But, to the glory of the Eternal God, these things are not so.

Let Paul speak: "I *certify* you, brethern, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or *an angel from heaven*, preach any other gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed.*

"As we said before, so now I say again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, *let him be accursed.* . . . Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." (Gal. 2:7, 12, 20.)

This campaign of distortion and emasculation of the Scriptures—preaching a gospel diametrically opposed to that which Paul preached—has gone on to such an extent in Christian Churches that the time has come that, in God's name, we must call a halt. The laity is altogether too easy going; too prone to sit in soft, comfortable pews, half awake to the propaganda that is going on all around them to eliminate Christianity from the face of the earth. The time is here—now—when a man must take his stand for or against real Christianity.

## Doctrine and Discipline

IT will interest our readers to know that in a recent issue of the *Noord-Hollandsch Kerkbald* the Reverend Professor F. W. Grosheide has boldly asserted the futility of any attempt to reform the "Hervormde Kerk" (The Established Church of Holland), which harbors both liberals and orthodox, unless a consistent policy of doctrinal discipline be carried out. The eminent divine declares that the church should be either an "inclusive" church welcoming all the liberals and all the orthodox and scrap its confession or it should be a confessional church and require of its Ministers and its membership that they subscribe to the confession without mental reservation.

# The Sources of National Decay

A Sermon by
The Rev. J. Keir Fraser, D.D.

[We are glad to be able to publish this sermon, so appropriate for the New Year. Dr. Fraser, who is now Minister of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Renfrew, Ontario, is well-known in both the United States and Canada.]

*"And he arose out of his sleep and said, I will go out as at other times and shake myself. And he knew not that the Lord had departed from him."*—Judges 16:20.

THESE words are spoken of Samson. They give us the secret of his strength and his loss of strength. Samson's great physical strength, his marvelous capacity for daring, his wonderful hold upon the hearts of the people, were endowments directly received from God. The man in all the higher heroism of his life was but the instrument of Divine unseen forces. When these Divine forces flowed through him he was capable of mighty deeds, when they were shut out of his life he became as other men. He lost himself in the degree that he lost God. He rose above himself in the degree that God moved in and through him.

And the story of Samson is but an epitome of history. It is an epitome of national life. Only as God dwells in the nation can the nation be great. This was the one continual message of every poet, prophet and seer of Hebrew history. The chosen race go into the wilderness, a mere band of fugitive slaves; they become a great nation because God is with them. They go out to battle against mighty enemies and a little one puts to flight a thousand because God marches with them; they go to battle without God and the process is reversed.

Prophets like Elijah defy kings like Ahab; men untrained to arms like Gideon put trained armies to flight; Elisha lonely and forgotten counts those who be with him more than those who be against him, because he sees the chariots and horsemen of the Lord moving in the clouds; David, the shepherd boy, is stronger than Goliath; Daniel in his weakness is more than a match for the tyrannical king who holds him in his power. And what, pray, is the explanation of these triumphs? The Bible furnishes us with but one explanation of this—God was with these heroes of faith and action. They were His vehicles, His instruments; and if they had withdrawn from God, or if God had withdrawn from them, then would they have been as other men; they would have awakened, as Samson did, to find their strength gone.

You may take it for granted, you may lay it down as a fact that God moves in some men, making their lives a marvel. There are many illustrations of this truth outside of Scripture history. Men of genius of all ages have borne their testimony to it. Milton, Cromwell, Chinese Gordon, all recognized themselves as instruments of a Divine power.

And if it be true that a Divine power visits men, it is also true that that power may be withdrawn from men, so that they will waken up to find their strength departed. And this withdrawal is never wilful or capricious or arbitrary. There is always something to account for it in the men and women themselves. There is some flaw which breaks the Divine current, just as there is a flaw which sometimes breaks the electric current.

And moreover, that flaw may be unnoticed, so unnoticed that the man may imagine that God is with him long after He has departed. Now what is that flaw? What is it that makes God withdraw from a nation? What are the flaws which may come in and break off the Divine current and thus rob the nation of its strength, so that when it rises up to shake itself as in the days of old, it finds it can't do it, because the Lord has departed from it? What are these? The story of Samson will, I think, furnish us with the answer.

I

The first great flaw which broke the current of Divine communication in the case of Samson was fleshly lust. No one can read this Bible story without seeing that the strength of Samson was not only physical, not chiefly physical, but moral. Samson was a Nazarite and the vow of the Nazarite was essentially a vow to abstain from fleshly lusts. "He shall separate himself [we read] from wine and strong drink, he shall be holy all the days of his separation, he shall be holy unto the Lord." Such was the source of Samson's great strength; he held himself pure as God's instrument, he refused to yield any of his bodily instruments to evil, his life was nurtured in a simplicity and severity which was almost Spartan. He cultivated self-control, self-reverence, and self-knowledge, and from that discipline his whole soul and body derived strength.

But in an evil hour he forgot the sources of his strength, he defied the springs of his manhood, and then the sequel: "He arose out of his sleep and said, I will go out as at other times and shake myself and he knew not that the Lord had departed from him."

Here then is one flaw which will always break off the Divine current and cause the Lord to withdraw Himself. And when I use the words fleshly lusts, remember I include all those desires and gratifications which minister solely to the lower tastes of the body as opposed to the spirit—intemperance of all kinds, and the desires which pall on the senses. And is there no call for warning here today? Is it not one of the most manifest perils of our day (I ask you) that a looser rein is given to every kind of appetite, that an increased spirit of luxury is found in every class of society? Is not the list of those slain every year by intemperance and immorality far more dreadful and far more numerous than the list of those slain on the fields of battle? Have we not all seen, time and again, the light of promise and genius and power quenched in the corruptions of impurity? Yes, we have seen these things and yet it is possible that there are few of us who have the prophetic eye to see them in their true relation to our national life.

This tendency of our age to seek the gratification of appetite and luxury may go on unchecked until there comes a time when the individual tries to do the strong man's work and finds he can no longer do it, when the soldiers of a nation broken by their vices fall before a cleaner and a sturdier foe and when at last in some tremendous hour of danger the nation awakens from its sleep and says, "I will go out as at other times, and shake myself," and it cannot do it, for the Lord has departed from it.

II

And now for the second flaw in the life of Samson which broke the current of Divine communication between him and his Lord—Pride. And I use the word "pride" as opposed not to humility, but to that from which humility springs—faith, faith in God. Pride is simply self-confidence, that spirit in the individual which makes him think he is sufficient in himself and that he does not need God. "I will arise and go forth as at other times"—there spoke pride.

Even a much stronger illustration of this spirit than Samson is a New Testament character whom all will instantly recall, namely, Peter. Listen to the voice of Pride: "Lord I will go with thee to prison and to death." "Though all should forsake thee, yet will not I." It's a terribly pathetic sight, that of Peter during the last day of his Lord's earthly life. All through these closing scenes he moves as a man blind to danger because he is blinded by pride. Christ warns him, but he scorns the warning; Christ prays for him, but he offers no prayer

for himself. And then at last when the awful hour of darkness comes, he arises and says "I will go forth as at other times." And he goes forth—but not to die with Christ, but to deny him, not to declare his faith, but to curse and swear.

He goes forth—yes, and he goes out, a broken man; his whole life shattered at a single stroke, goes out to shed bitter tears. Oh what an awful darkness must that have been which rushed down upon the soul of Peter when he stood alone in the porch of Caiaphas and the sound of the Divine feet lessened in the distance, and he knew that his Lord had departed from him!

Such is pride. And where such exists, faithlessness always accompanies it. Let me ask you, do you not perceive something of this tendency in our national life today? Is there not a frequent lack of sobriety in our talk of the nation's greatness, a spirit of brag and boastfulness, a calm assumption that our strength is our own, that it is invincible and that we have but to arise and shake ourselves to find our own right arm strong enough for any conflict, and our own might equal to any hour of peril?

So nations always talk that have lost faith in God or are losing it. So spoke Rome in her hour of crumbling empire, so spoke France in that awful year of 1870—spoke with an arrogance which was the fruit of faithless materialism. Let us be warned, for loss of religious faith never yet failed to bring about decay of empire. Faith is the true bond of national security—why? Because faith alone can produce that high spirit of courage, that sense of duty and responsibility by which nations grow into greatness.

But woe to the faithless nation! Woe to the nation where God is no longer reverenced nor loved! Woe to the people whose Churches are empty and whose theatres and music halls are crowded! Woe to such a nation, because sooner or later to it comes the hour when it says "I will arise and go forth as at other times:" and it can not do it, for behold the Lord has departed from it!

III

And now I must mention—in a few words—a third flaw which will always break the current of a Divine communication and cause God to withdraw himself—Commercialism. Here I am leaving my text because I do not find any indication of this spirit in the life of Samson. But I do find numerous illustrations of it in the lives of others and so I must not pass it by in my enumeration of the sources of national decay. If you want an illustration of the effects of commercialism, take the history of Judas Iscariot. Now Judas Iscariot was a man of much finer type than Samson—more capable of ideals and enthusiasms—a man counted worthy to be an apostle of the Lord—and yet he sold both himself and his Lord for thirty pieces of silver. And was there no moment in that unhappy life (think you) when some word of Jesus touched the better heart of Judas and he also said "I shall arise and go forth as in the earlier days," and could not because the spirit of the Lord was departed from him?

There is no evil which more surely exiles God from the human heart than the evil of commercialism.

The long history of the corruption of men and nations prove this. Have we not all seen men of high ideals losing these ideals little by little as the grip of gold fastened itself tighter on the heart? And this is always a peril which threatens the nations—the peril of submitting to the dictates of organized wealth, of making the master principle of national greatness not justice, but gain, not righteousness, but mammon.

Is not the most glaring peril of all to the great commercial nations of today the growing power and insolence of wealth? What matters it that the people starve, that mills are closed, that honest industries are paralyzed, so long as the lords of wealth prosper and flourish?

And so Christ is crucified again upon a cross of gold and those who would stand by him cannot because mammon holds them fast. And then when the voice of the trumpet calls to some great cause—the causes of righteousness, of justice, and humanity—such nations wake themselves and would go forth as in the olden days to God's crusades, and find like Samson that they cannot because the Lord has departed from them.

That is a terrible moment which sometimes comes in the lives of men who have long moved among their fellows in conscious power when they suddenly awaken to find that their day is passed. Their words no longer arouse attention, their books are no longer read, and they become aware that the cold shadows of night are closing around them. They wonder what the cause is. Yet what they cannot discover, others see with glaring distinctness—their power has left them because their faith and hope and enthusiasm have ebbed by some neglect or folly.

That must be a terrible experience. And yet far more terrible is the experience of the man from whom God has departed, the man who whether by fleshly lust or pride of heart or commercialism has shut God out of his life. And terrible beyond all description the path of the nation which arising out of its sleep says "I will go out as at other times and shake myself" and finds that it cannot because the Lord has departed from it.

And so let us pray for ourselves and our nation, that we may have the purer mind, the firmer will, the more faithful heart. Let us pray for ourselves deliverance from the powers of evil that slay the soul, and for our nation that it may become a mighty nation, strong to rule and govern because it is itself ruled and governed by the fear of God. Let us pray that great prayer of Kipling who, though his vision was often clouded by the lust of war did see clearly wherein lay the strength of nations when he wrote:

**God of our fathers, known of old,**
**Lord of our far-flung battle line,**
**Beneath whose awful hand we hold**
**Dominion over palm and pine**
**Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,**
**Lest we forget, lest we forget.**

# Robert Dick Wilson: Torchbearer

A statement by the Rev. Harold J. Ockenga, Assistant in the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., on the occasion of an offering in that Church for Westminster Theological Seminary.

ON October 12th, as we were gathered here at the Lord's table, laying aside every weight and the sins which so easily beset us, the news reached us that one more hero had had his name inscribed on God's honor roll of faith and had joined that great cloud of witnesses which encompass us. That hero was Robert Dick Wilson. On May 6th I last saw Dr. Wilson when with twelve young men graduating from Westminster Theological Seminary I sat at his feet in Witherspoon Hall while he gave his farewell address. There are few words of that speech which I can accurately remember, but the thought was stamped indelibly upon my mind. He quoted:

In Flanders' fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders' fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders' fields.

"So we now give you the torch of the Word and the Gospel for which we have contended. I look back over my life; you look forward. May you be able to say with Paul and with me (and here he drew his withered frame up to its former height), 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me that day.'"

Tears dimmed the eyes of most people present because they realized what that man had meant to and sacrificed for the Truth of God. The question arises as to why that attitude, which is representative of all of the faculty of Westminster, is needful. I do not care to state anything just now about the Princeton situation, but I do about the condition in the Church as a whole. That the majority of our denomination and of other churches have turned away from historical and Biblical Christianity is no longer debatable. It is an acknowledged fact. The reason for this lies in the fact that our schools, especially seminaries, have been taken over by these religious pacifists and dwellers-on-the-fence. The negative mind has pervaded our Church; many of our young preachers know not what to believe; the note of authority has been lost from their message, each constructs his own theology, and everyone can believe what he will. The nerve of evangelism has been cut and the Church is going backward. In evidence, last year we lost over 20,000 members.

Now God says, "when the enemy shall come in like a flood I will raise up a standard against him." Such a standard has been raised in Westminster Theological Seminary. Men trained in firm scholarship and unquestioned loyalty to the Word of God can alone be fitted to stand in the gap. These men Westminster faculty is attempting to equip. It is a challenge flung out by men of God to the Church of today to cling to the old paths. And it is now time to face this issue. If those now in authority in the Church fail to do so, never think that the rising generation shall fail. The issue is clear, the lines are drawn, the banners are up, and the fight is on. May God vindicate His Word by raising up people in this congregation who will align themselves to this cause.

One of the great preachers of another denomination said, "This is the first movement in open rebellion against modernism in the Church and I count it the greatest thing in this generation." That man was influential in sending a dozen students to Westminster. And I count a year's fellowship with that group of doctrinally conscious and consecrated youth the greatest privilege that God ever allowed me to enjoy.

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

## I. A MAN WHO COULD SAY "NO"

*"Paul an Apostle, not from men nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead, and all the brethren who are with me, to the churches of Galatin. . . . ." (Gal. 1: 1, 2, in a literal translation).*

### Letters, Ancient and Modern

THE words just quoted, with the three verses that follow, constitute the opening, or the "address," of the Epistle to the Galatians. We know more about the openings of ancient letters than we did thirty years ago; for within the last thirty years there have been turning up in Egypt, where the dry air has happened to preserve the perishable papyrus on which they were written, great numbers of private letters written on all sorts of occasions and by all sorts of people during the very age and in the very language in which this Epistle was written.

These papyrus letters differ widely among themselves. Some of them are written by educated people; some, by uneducated: some concern business affairs; some, the most intimate matters of family life. But widely though they differ in many particulars, they all *begin*, at least, in practically the same way. We discover when we examine them that there was a fixed epistolary form for the opening of Greek letters in that age.

We too, in our day, have an epistolary form for the opening of letters. We begin our letters with "Dear Sir," even when we are tempted to think that some other adjective would be far more in place than that adjective "dear." It is a mere form, and we follow it with great uniformity, no matter what the particular occasion of our letters may be.

So in Paul's day there was a regular form for the opening of letters. The Greek papyrus letters that have been discovered in Egypt begin, with only slight variations, according to the form: "So-and-so to so-and-so, greeting."

### The Originality of Paul

How interesting that is—so we may be tempted to exclaim—for our understanding of the Epistles of Paul! How interesting it is to discover that these Epistles, which we have been accustomed to regard as so stiff and sacred, are just "letters" after all, and that Paul begins them in the way in which ordinary letters were begun at that time! How near that brings them to us, how very "human" it shows these Bibical Epistles to be!

Well, it is all very interesting, no doubt. The only trouble with it is that it is not true. As a matter of fact, no matter what we may think about it, Paul does *not* begin his letters according to the customary epistolary form.

Even the grammatical skeleton of Paul's openings is different from that which appears in the papyrus letters that have been discovered in Egypt. Those letters begin with one sentence: "So-and-so to so-and-so (says) greeting." Paul's letters, on the other hand, begin with the form: "So-and-so to so-and-so," then a pause, then: "Grace be with you and peace." But what is far more important is that Paul, in the openings of his Epistles, is not a slave to *any* form, not even his own form. He follows this latter form for the most part, but into it he sometimes pours the most distinctive things that in each Epistle he has to say.

So the opening of this Epistle to the Galatians, far from being merely formal or stereotyped, as one might expect the opening of a letter to be, is one of the most characteristic passages in all the Epistles of Paul; it contains in summary all that the writer has to say in the glorious Epistle that follows.

In general, an examination of the papyrus letters of which we have just spoken, instead of impressing us with the similarity between Paul's letters and other letters of that day, impresses us rather with the profound difference. As has well been observed, we have still to find, among these Egyptian letters, anything that compares even for a moment with the Epistle to Philemon, the briefest and most informal of the Epistles of Paul.

### The Meaning of the Word "Apostle"

This distinctive quality of Paul's letters is connected, no doubt, with the second word that appears in this Epistle to the Galatians, the word "apostle." It is not merely "Paul," who is designated as the writer, but "Paul *an apostle*." "Apostle," as we all learned in Sunday School, means "one who is sent," and not merely "one who is sent," but "one who is sent with a commission." So the word could be used in the ordinary affairs of life to designate a "delegate" or a "commissioner." It is used in this way in II

Cor. 8: 23 to designate "delegates of the churches"—men, that is, who were commissioned by the Gentile churches to carry the proceeds of the collection to the Jerusalem Church. But where, in the New Testament, the word is used without anything corresponding to the phrase "of the churches," where, in other words, it is not expressly said from whom the commission comes, the understanding is that it comes from Christ, and that it is a commission of a very special and very lofty kind.

So when Paul calls himself at the beginning of this Epistle an "apostle," he plainly is using the word in its highly specialized, extremely lofty and sacred, meaning. He means that the Lord Jesus has given to him, as to the original Twelve, a very special authority to speak, in Christ's name, for the guidance of the Church.

### "Letters" or "Epistles"?

Professor Deissmann has asked, indeed, whether these Pauline Epistles are really "epistles" and are not rather "letters," and he has decided in favor of the latter alternative. An "epistle," he says, is intended for the general public; a "letter" is addressed to local and temporary needs. According to this distinction, he says, the Pauline Epistles are "letters" and not "epistles;" they were not intended for publication, but dealt with special needs as those needs arose among persons whom Paul knew.

This observation has an element of truth in it, and also as an element of error; but the error far over-balances the truth.

It is true that the Epistles of Paul are addressed to special needs and show intimate knowledge of local and temporary conditions. They are not treatises merely put by a literary fiction into an epistolary form, but were intended to answer the questions and deal with the difficulties that had actually arisen in the churches of Paul's day. In so far, they can be called "letters" in Deissmann's sense of the word.

### Paul's Epistles Not Ordinary Letters

On the other hand, however, although they are letters, they are certainly not ordinary letters; they are not letters that were intended, like the letters that have recently turned up on the rubbish-heaps and in the mummy-cases of Egypt, to be read once and then thrown away. Despite their individual occasions, they are not private letters, but were intended from the beginning to be read in the meetings of the Church. Even the Epistle to Philemon, which is the most informal of them all, is addressed not only to Philemon but to the "church" that was in his house; and the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, though they are addressed to individuals, are addressed to them not merely as individuals but as leaders of the Church, and were plainly intended from the first to be read in the congregations over which Timothy and Titus had charge. If, therefore, the Epistles of Paul are "letters," they are not private letters but at least pastoral letters—letters written by a leader of the Church for the edification of those over whom God had made him an overseer. Hence they partake, to some extent at least, of the nature of what Deissmann calls "epistles;" they are letters intended, to say the very least, to be read publicly—and, we may add, certainly not just once but again and again—in the churches to which they are addressed.

### The Authority With Which Paul Writes

But there is something else that differentiates them even more sharply from the private "letters" with which Deissmann is inclined to bring them into connection. It is found in the peculiar character of the commission which gave Paul his right to speak to the Church. Paul did not think of himself merely as an ordinary "bishop" or "overseer," but he thought of himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ, a man who, however unworthy in himself, had been invested by the Lord Jesus with supernatural authority and supernatural power.

We may approve of Paul's thinking of himself thus, or we may not aprove of it; but at least we cannot deny that he did so think. A consciousness of divine authority runs all through the Epistles of Paul.

The Epistles deal sometimes, it is true, with very intimate and individual matters. We can rejoice in that fact. It gives to these writings much of their power to move the heart. They are not cold, theoretical treatises, but are written by a man whose heart was stirred by the actual needs of his spiritual children, and who, because his own heart was thus stirred, can stir the hearts of others from that day to this. But despite this individual and intimate character of parts of the Epistles, Paul never forgets that he is an apostle of Jesus Christ. There is a loftiness of tone in these letters, a dignity, a profound consciousness of authority, that differentiates them sharply from merely private or casual or temporary communications. Despite their special occasions, and the intimate details into which they sometimes enter, they are written throughout by an apostle of Jesus Christ, in the conscious plentitude of apostolic authority, for the upbuilding of the Church of God.

If we forget that fact, as so many readers do today, we may understand some details in these Epistles; we may learn how to construe the sentences grammatically; we may obtain a superficial and piecemeal knowledge of what is said: but the real heart of the writer will remain forever hidden from us. Unless we recognize the consciousness of authority which runs through these Epistles from beginning to end, all the detailed learning in the world will give us nothing but a superficial knowledge of Paul.

### The Duty of Saying "No"

So far we have dealt with only two words of this Epistle to the Galatians, the word "Paul" and the word "apostle." What is the next word after these?

It is a word that is now regarded as highly objectionable, a word that Paul, if he had been what modern men would have desired him to be, never would have used. It is the small but weighty word "not." "Paul an apostle," he says, "*not* from men nor through a man, but....."

That word "not," we are today constantly being told, ought to be put out of the Christian's vocabulary. Our preaching, we are told, ought to be positive and not negative; we ought to present the truth, but ought not to attack error; we ought to avoid controversy and always seek peace.

With regard to such a program, it may be said at least that if we hold to it we might just as well close up our New Testaments; for the New Testament is a controversial book almost from beginning to end. That is of course true with regard to the Epistles of Paul. They, at least, are full of argument and controversy—no question, certainly, can be raised about that. Even the hymn to Christian love in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians is an integral part of a great controversial passage with regard to a false use of the spiritual gifts. That glorious hymn never would have been written if Paul had been averse to controversy and had sought peace at any price. But the same thing is true also of the words of Jesus. They too—I think we can say it reverently—are full of controversy. He presented His righteousness sharply over against the other righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees.

That is simply in accordance with a fundamental law of the human mind. All definition is by way of exclusion. You cannot possibly say clearly what a thing is without contrasting it with what it is not.

When that fundamental law is violated, we find nothing but a fog. Have you ever listened to this boasted non-controversial preaching, this preaching that is positive and not negative, this teaching that tries to present truth without attacking error? What impression does it make upon your mind? We will tell you what impression it makes upon ours. It makes the impression of utter inaninity. We are simply unable to make head or tail of it. It consists for the most part of words and nothing more. Certainly it is as far as possible removed from the sharp, clear warnings, and the clear and glorious promises, of Holy Writ.

No, there is one word which every true Christian must learn to use. It is the word "not" or the word "No." A Christian must certainly learn to say "No" in the field of conduct; there are some things that the

world does, which he cannot do. But he must also learn to say "No" in the field of conviction. The world regards as foolishness the gospel upon which the Christian life is based, and the Christian who does not speak out against the denial of the gospel is certainly not faithful to his Lord. That is true with respect to the denials in the world at large, but it is even more obviously true of the denials within the visible Church. There the obligation of bearing testimony, negatively as well as positively, is particularly strong. A Christian testimony that makes common cause with men in the same church who, like the thirteen hundred "Auburn Affirmationists" in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., cast despite upon the holiest things of the Faith, is hardly worthy of being called Christian testimony at all. The Church of our day needs above all else men who can say "No;" for it is only men who can say "No," men who are brave enough to take a stand against the sin and error in the Church—it is only such men who can really say "Yea and amen" to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We know not in detail what will take place when the great revival comes, the great revival for which we long, when the Spirit of God will sweep over the Church like a mighty flood. But one thing we do know—when that great day comes, the present feeble aversion to "controversy," the present cowardly unwillingness to take sides in the age-long issue between faith and unbelief in the Church—will at once be swept aside. There is not a trace of such an attitude in God's holy Word. That attitude is just Satan's way of trying to deceive the people of God; peace and indifferentist church-unionism and aversion to controversy, as they are found in the modern Church, are just the fine garments that cover the ancient enemy, unbelief.

May God send us men who are not deceived, men who will respond to the forces of unbelief and compromise now so largely dominant in the visible Church with a brave and unqualified "No"! Paul was such a man in his day. He said "No" in the very first word of this Epistle, after the bare name and title of the author; and that word gives the key to the whole Epistle that follows. The Epistle to the Galatians is a polemic, a fighting Epistle from beginning to end. What a fire it kindled at the time of the Reformation! May it kindle another fire in our day —not a fire that will destroy any fine or noble or Christian thing, but a fire of Christian love in hearts grown cold!

### Next Month

We have covered just three words of the Bible, and yet here we are at the end of two pages of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. It may seem like slow progress, but we make no apologies for it. It is worth while, we think, to linger over these words of Paul. Next month, however, we hope to cover more ground than that, if our readers have patience to follow us as we examine further this wonderful Epistle to see what word of God it contains for the Church of our day and for our own minds and hearts.

# Books of Religious Significance

*CALVINISM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE: The Stone Lectures Delivered at Princeton in 1930 by Valentine Hepp, Th.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 223 pages. $1.50.*

THE author of this book is the Professor of Theology at the Free University of Amsterdam and as such the successor of those great Calvinistic theologians, Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck. Though small in compass—the type is large and the margins wide—it is a highly significant book and one that should be provocative of much thinking in Christian circles. Dr. Hepp's discussion of the important subject to which he has addressed himself is suggestive rather than exhaustive—many important phases of the matter are not even touched upon—but he has both outlined a task that has been too long neglected and made an important contribution to its performance. We commend the book to the attention of all thoughtful Christians.

Dr. Hepp believes that one of the great weaknesses of Christianity in the past has been its lack of a Christian philosophy of nature and that this lack must be supplied if Christianity is to preserve its purity and fulfill its calling. If he speaks as a rule of a *Calvinistic* philosophy of nature rather than of a *Christian* philosophy of nature, it finds its explanation in the fact that he looks up Calvinism alone as consistent Christianity. But while his terminology at this point is fitted to frighten away the non-Calvinist yet it would seem that some such mode of speech is imperative in order to avoid vagueness and indefiniteness. The word "Christianity" as employed today has no definite meaning. The same is true of the word "Protestantism"—either it is a purely negative word without content or a word that deniers of the God-man use as a self-designation. The word "Calvinism," however, still has a definite meaning so that Dr. Hepp's terminology is justified—in as far as he is right in supposing that Calvinism is a synonym for "consistent Christianity."

Dr. Hepp holds that there can be no philosophy of any sort, and so no philosophy of nature, without presuppositions; and hence that it is impossible to get along without a world-view: World-views, he maintains, can be sub-sumed under three heads: "The unbelieving, the accommodation-Christian, and the consistent Christian or Calvinistic." The trouble in the past has been that Christians while drawing their swords against the unbelieving philosophy of nature have neglected to build up a believing philosophy of nature. Moreover in as far as they have set forth a world-view of their own it has been for the most part of the accommodation-Christian type with its sacrifice of what is essential to a consistent Christian view. What is needed is a consistent Christian world-view; and this Calvinism alone is capable of supplying. "It (Calvinism) puts all rationalism under the ban. Human reason is not considered an autonomous power, but a gift of God which must always remain subject to the revelation of God. Knowledge is not cut off from faith, neither has it the right to exercise dominion over faith, but it must be guided by faith. Nature is a product of the Creator, and whoever wishes to be taught concerning the origin, the purpose, the essence of nature, must sit down at the feet of the Creator as an un-knowing child. Only in Calvinism do you find the correct appreciation of nature. It has an eye for all the disharmony in the world through its unsparing doctrine of sin, while the doctrine of common grace helps it to see everywhere traces of the original harmony. It confesses that God is infinitely transcendent above nature, but that at the same time He is imminent and that He works in the smallest particle of matter and the most minute cell. Calvinism casts no furtive glances at the unbelieving science; it does not beg; it does not dicker with it; it does not accommodate itself to it; it lives exclusively out of the Father-hand of God" (pp. 51-52).

Scripture, according to Dr. Hepp, supplies the principles for a philosophy of nature, of which Calvinism avails itself. Calvinists do not play fast and loose with the matter of the infallibility of Scripture. They "persevere in the confession that the Spirit of Christ so laid hold of the holy men, that they wrote down nothing but the truth, truth about re-creation, to be sure, but also truth concerning creation; truth about grace, but no less truth about nature. The Scripture is not truth and error, not 'Yes' and 'No,' but truth, and again truth, yea and amen!" (Pp. 149-150). Dr. Hepp does not indeed maintain that the Scriptures contain

*data* for a philosophy of nature. "Whoever, therefore, attempts to construct the natural sciences only from the principles revealed in Scripture, would act contrary to the sense and meaning thereof. He would discard nature itself, and would thereby disregard a work of God. . . . The Calvinistic doctrine of science insists that the Scripture is no manual for chemistry, physics, geology, astronomy and other branches of natural science" (Pp. 87-88).

But while Dr. Hepp does not suppose that we should look to Scripture for *data* for natural science, he does insist that we are dependent on Scripture for a knowledge of the principles for a sound philosophy of nature. General revelation does not suffice in this connection. "If mankind still lived in the state of innocence, if nature were not cursed, if the intellect were not darkened, then the revelation of Scripture would be entirely unnecessary. But even though, thanks be to common grace, the knowledge of principles for a correct view of nature taken from the general revelation has not been completely lost, still it is not sufficient. The fact that so primordial a principle for the philosophy of nature as, for instance, the creation of the world, cannot be found in any pseudo-religion or heathen philosophy, is sufficient evidence for this "(P. 86).

Dr. Hepp does not profess to give a complete list of the principles which the Scriptures yield for a philosophy of nature. He states rather that it is impossible to provide such a list because "Scripture is inexhaustible for the natural sciences as well as for your faith and theology." He mentions the following, however, among the chief principles that the Scriptures supply for a philosophy of nature: (1) the origin of the cosmos by means of creation, (2) nature as only a part of reality, (3) the unity of nature, (4) the finiteness of nature both in time and space, (5) the origin of the great categories of creation such as the heavenly bodies, plants, animals, man through separate formation-acts of God, (6) the constancy of nature in spite of innumerable possibilities of change and development, (7) the polyphylogenesis of plants and animals, the unbreakable connection between causality and finality, between aetiology and teleology in nature, (9) the discontinuity in nature as the consequence of sin and the partial continuity as remnant of the original state of nature, (10) the imminence of God working always and everywhere as an invisible factor in the events of nature, (11) the culmination of nature in man, (12) the end of the present form of nature through fire in the last tremendous world-crisis (Pp. 92-94).

"The Calvinistic philosophy of nature," writes Dr. Hepp in words that reveal both his spirit and his intellectual outlook, "is bound to these and other principles. Bound! To the philosopher of nature there is no more unbearable or hateful word. The men of the accommodation-Christian view try to quiet that hatred by hiding many of these binding principles. But the Calvinist, just as stubborn as regards his principles, repeats it with a whole heart: Bound! And he goes on to say to the defenders of other philosophies of nature: you are bound no less. You are the slave of your fantasy, permitting yourself to be thrown back and forth with it. You never approach reality. This is the irreconcilable contradiction between you and me: you live by fantasy, I live by revelation. You please yourself with your myths, while I find my joy in the Logos Who hath made all things and Who reveals Himself in the Scripture. Logos or Myth! That is the tremendous dilemma before which the philosophy of nature places us. The non-Calvinistic philosophy chooses partly or entirely for the Myth and at its heart it is nothing but mythology. But the Calvinistic philosophy on the contrary chooses the Logos, and that makes it the only logical and reality-philosophy. It is bound, but her bonds do not annoy. By bowing before the dictates of the Scripture it submits itself to the leading of the Spirit. And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (Pp. 94-96).

It is widely and confidently asserted that the Scriptural philosophy of nature has been antiquated by findings in the fields of astronomy and geology. Dr. Hepp devotes a chapter to each of these sciences which while they raise many questions which are left unanswered yet make clear that the last word has not been spoken on these subjects and that indicates that it is by no means certain that Scripture has been out-moded in this connection.

In the field of astronomy Dr. Hepp takes the position that "there is no conception of the universe presented in the Scripture at all, since a world-image is a product of science, and such the Scripture is not." "How then," he asks, "must those expressions which seem like statements of a world-image be explained?" "In this way," he replies, "that the Scripture writes about things as they are *seen* by the ordinary man or the poet or the prophet." In harmony with this Dr. Hepp denies that either the Ptolemaic or the Copernican or the Modern conception of astronomy is taught in Scripture. Especially noteworthy is his refutation of the notion that the ancient Babylonian world-image is imbedded in Scripture as is so often said. He defends an oeranocentric conception of the universe rather than the geocentric or heliocentric conception. Whether heaven is the astronomic as well as the spiritual center of the universe he leaves undecided, but he says that it is recognized as its spiritual center as often as we pray: "Our Father which art in heaven."

In the field of geology Dr. Hepp while taking the view that the Scripture is silent concerning the age of the earth or even concerning the age of man yet says that its indications are so clear that the Christian who reveres it cannot and may not take part in the paleontological and geological hunt after millions or even billions of years. "The Scripture excludes the possibility of the human race being two hundred thousand years old. And that organic life came into being millions of years ago must be judged a myth. It is not true that the data of the natural sciences demand such high numbers; the evolutionistic principle demands this. It is the antithesis against faith in creation that drives to these excesses. This movement is called into being by the desire to depose the Creator of the universe and the Former of the earth willingly or unwillingly" (Pp. 200-201). Dr. Hepp will have none of that "apologetic" exegesis that seeks to reconcile the Biblical and the evolutionistic natural-philosophical order lest he be thought unscientific. With this in mind he writes: "The tendency to make exegesis serviceable to the decrees of unbelief is very evident here. In appearance the authority of the Scripture is saved, in reality it is undermined." It is significant that he rejects even that exegesis that conceives of the "days" of the first chapter of Genesis as "periods." "The entire periodistic theory which transforms the days of Genesis into geological periods," he writes, "must be opposed in the strength of faith" (P. 211). He says that the writer of Genesis meant an ordinary day when he wrote of creation-days but adds that in his judgment "the length of those days was not determined by the sun, but by the rotation of the earth upon its axis." This does not mean that Dr. Hepp denies geologic changes or that he ignores the fossil material or the differences in the earth's strata; but it does mean that he rejects the uniformitarian theory and believes that since its creation the earth has been subjected to great crises, the last of which was the Noachian deluge. This chapter like the one on astronomy contains much food for thought.

Dr. Hepp's central purpose is to show that "Calvinism has a message for present day science and that it has invaluable elements for the construction of a philosophy of nature." He is not disheartened by the fact that he voices the viewpoint of a minority. Certainly he sounds a genuinely Christian note when he says: Whether or not we are in the minority quantitatively, does not matter. Qualitatively, because of our principle, we are in the majority."

S. G. C.

*WHY THOUSAND YEARS? OR WILL THE SECOND COMING BE PRE-MILLENNIAL? By William Masselink, Th.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 224 pages. $1.50.*

THE main title to this book seems to us unfortunate because more or less unmeaning. The sub-title, however, is largely expressive of its contents as it indicates that the book for the most part is an attempt to show that the pre-millennial view of Christ's return is in conflict with Scripture. Dr. Masselink's own position is that of the

A-millennialists. How little of a Post-millennialist he is, is indicated by the fact that in one place he writes: "To our mind there is nothing more foolish than what popularly passes as the post-millennium view. There are some people who think that this world is gradually getting better and better until at last it will be perfect, and then perhaps Christ will return. . . . Now nothing could be quite so senseless" (P. 214).

Dr. Masselink writes in the consciousness that the differences of opinion that exists between Pre-millennialists, Post-millennialists and A-millennialists is a difference between Christian brethren. This does not mean, however, that he judges leniently of the views of those who deny the second coming of Christ except in the sense that the "Spirit of Christ" will gradually gain control. He frankly says that the view that Christ's return is to be identified with the increasing realization of the "Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man" "can hardly pass as Christian." How important he regards the second coming is indicated by the following: "The first and second coming of Christ are the two epoch-making events on this side of eternity. As before the incarnation of Jesus everything that took place was directly connected with the Saviour's birth so we may say God is now preparing the world and the Church for the Lord's return. We believe the Second Coming of Christ to be the most imminent event on the horizon of time" (P. 7).

Whatever the reader's own view of the Second Coming may be, it seems to us that he ought to welcome a discussion of the matter from the view-point of the A-millennialists. This view, though it perhaps has the best claim to be called the historic Protestant view, has for some unknown reason received but little attention in recent books and articles. To such an extent is this true that many otherwise informed persons look upon it as a new and strange doctrine instead of the view that is most deeply imbedded in the creeds of the Protestant Churches—including the Westminster Confession of Faith. This view, as the name implies, holds that there is no mention of a millennium in the Scripture as appearing either before or after the return of Christ, alleging that the contrary view rests on a misunderstanding of scripture, especially the twentieth chapter of Revelation. It agrees with the pre-millennial view in holding that Christ's return may be imminent but rejects the thought of an earthly reign of Christ in the future, holding with the post-millennial view that the return of Christ will be immediately followed by a general resurrection, a general judgment and the final consummation. It is a view that is held by many of the very ablest students of eschatology and deserves much more attention than it has been receiving.

Dr. Masselink's book, however, should be welcomed not only because of its viewpoint but because of the ability with which he sets forth that viewpoint. We are confident that his book will take rank with the best that have been written on the subject with which it deals. Whether or not the reader agrees at every point, he can hardly fail to find the book exceedingly helpful. We are disposed to think that many convinced Premillennialists will judge the book wholesome as over against certain extremes to which some of their adherents go.

The table of contents indicates the scope and range of the book. It is divided into fifteen chapters entitled as follows: Introduction; The Main Features of Chiliasm; The History of Chiliasm; Erroneous Interpretation of Prophecy; Present-day Dispensationalism and its Denial of the Covenant; The Repudiation of Infant Baptism; Unbibical Conception of the Kingdom; Undenominationalism and its Undervaluation of the Church; The Opposition to the Church Creed; Confusion Concerning Law and Grace; Unscriptural Pre-eminence of the Jew; The Thousand Years and the Attending Events; The Two-fold Resurrection Error; The Thousand Years in Revelation XX; The Doctrine of the Last Things and How Biblical Eschatology Excludes Premillennialism. The claim would seem to be well-grounded that this book "covers as complete a range of subjects on the Millennium and allied questions as any book published on the subject." While the book contains almost the same number of pages as Dr. Hepp's "Calvinism and the Philosophy of Nature" it contains at least twice as many words. While the product of many years of study it is a book that will be readily understandable by the people.

S. G. C.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Eternal Punishment

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*As a reader of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY *I would like you to comment in your next issue upon the teaching of our Lord on punishment after death, as suggested in Matt. 8:12 and 25:46. Did our Lord use the words ascribed to Him or did He not? Are not the words of those two passages just as much the words of Christ as the words of Matt. 11:28?*

*My reason for this request is that in reading in a newspaper the other day I found the following: "In the New Testament there are certain passages speaking of 'everlasting fire,' and 'eternal punishment,' but the Bishop of London has said that these words were not said by the Saviour at all."*

*Yours very sincerely*

*W. M. L.*

IN view of what we have said in our September and November issues—this inquiry was written before our November issue appeared—our readers are fairly well apprized of what we regard as genuinely Christian belief concerning punishment after death. We, therefore, confine ourselves to the inquiry as to whether Matthew 8:12 and 25:46 are as much the words of Christ as Matthew 11:28. Our reply is that we have just as much reason to say that Christ uttered the former of these texts as we have to say that He uttered the latter seeing that there is no warrant for rejecting any of them as interpolations. What is more we must take into consideration the class of texts represented by the first two of these texts as well as the class represented by the latter of these texts if we are to have anything but a one-sided conception of Christ's teachings as a whole. In fact we cannot understand what Christ teaches about heaven unless we take into consideration what He says about hell as is evident from the fact that in His teaching, as elsewhere in the New Testament, heaven and hell appear in contrast. In our judgment there is absolutely no warrant for the representation ascribed to the Bishop of London that our Lord never uttered the reference to "everlasting fire" and "eternal punishment," attributed to Him in the Gospels. No doubt these statements must be taken in the same sense in which Christ used them if we are to hold Him responsible for the meaning we attach to them; but to deny that He uttered them or to empty them of their obvious meaning is equally unwarranted. It is representations such as that ascribed to the Bishop of London that that notable New Testament scholar, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, had in mind when he penned the following: "Modern writers have abandoned the historical method of approach. They persist in confusing the question what they could have wished that Jesus had been with the question what Jesus actually was. . . . It may be that we do not make much of the doctrine of a future life, but the question whether Jesus did so is not a matter of taste but an historical question, which can be answered only on the basis of an examination of the sources of historical information that we call the Gospels. And the result of such examination is perfectly plain. As a matter of fact, not only the thought of heaven but also the thought of

hell runs all through the teaching of Jesus, It appears in all four of the Gospels; it appears in the sources, supposed to underlie the Gospels, which have been reconstructed, rightly or wrongly, by modern criticism. It imparts to the ethical teaching its peculiar earnestness. It is not an element which can be removed by any critical process, but simply suffuses the whole of Jesus' teaching and Jesus' life. 'And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell;' 'It is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire'—these words are not an excrescence in Jesus' teaching but are quite at the center of the whole" ("What is Faith?" p. 25).

## Are All Those Dying in Infancy Saved?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*What do you believe concerning the fate of those dying in infancy? When the Westminster Confession says that "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ" (Chapter X, sec. 3) does that not clearly imply that there are non-elect infants, dying in infancy, who are not saved? Is it not true that Presbyterians have taught that infants are lost? . . . .*

*Sincerely yours,*

*R. D. C.*

WE have received a number of inquiries having to do with the matter of the fate of those dying in infancy. What is said below is intended as a reply to these inqurries as a whole, as it seems impracticable to consider each separately. While this means that some phases of the questions raised in this connection will not be touched upon yet we believe that what is said answers most of the questions asked. In our October issue (p. 14) we stated that " in the near future" we hoped to show "that it is the Calvinist and the Calvinist alone who can consistently hold that all those dying in infancy are saved." That task we now somewhat tardily attempt to also perform.

The notion that the reference to "elect infants, dying in infancy" in Chapter 10, section 3 of the Confession of Faith implies a body of non-elect infants dying in infancy who are not saved, though frequently asserted, not only rests on a mistaken understanding of the passage but is precluded by the history of the clause. Chapter 10 of the Confession of Faith is entitled "Of Effectual Calling" and deals with the method by which God saves his elect, sections 1 and 2 dealing with the method by which God ordinarily saves adults while section 3 deals with the method by which He saves those of His elect who die in infancy together with those adults who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word—imbeciles for instance. Section 3 with which we are especially concerned states that such of God's elect as die in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth; it says nothing however with regard to the question whether all or only a part of those dying in infancy are included in the elect. Moreover the history of the phrase "elect infants dying in infancy" makes clear that the contrast implied was not between "elect infant's dying in infancy" and "non-elect infants dying in infancy" but rather between "elect infants dying in infancy" and "elect infants living to grow up." However in order to guard against misunderstanding, furthered by unfriendly controversialists, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. adopted in 1903 a Declaratory Statement which reads as follows:

> "With reference to Chapter X, Section 3, of the Confession of Faith, that it is not to be regarded as teaching that any who die in infancy are lost. We believe that all dying in infancy are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how He pleases."

It is obvious that the Declaratory Statement goes beyond the teaching of Chapter X, section 3 of the Confession of Faith inasmuch as it states positively that all who die in infancy are saved. Some hold that the Declaratory Statement goes beyond the Scriptures in teaching that all those dying in infancy are saved; but, be that as it may, it makes it impossible for any person to even plausibly maintain that Presbyterians teach that there are non-elect infants who die in infancy. No doubt there have been individual Presbyterians who held that some of those who have died in infancy have been lost; but such was never the official teaching of the Presbyterian Church and as matters now stand such a position is contradicted by the Church's creed.

We are particularly concerned to point out that it is the Calvinist and the Calvinist alone who can consistently hold that all those dying in infancy are saved. Note that we do not say that all Calvinists have so held, but rather that the Calvinist and the Calvinist alone can so hold in harmony with his conception of the plan of salvation. As a matter of fact there have been Calvinists who have held that some of those dying in infancy are lost—probably Calvin himself so held. But while we believe it will be found to be true that relatively few Calvinists have positively taught that any of those dying in infancy are lost yet most, at least outside English speaking countries, while affirming that the children of believers dying in infancy are saved have contented themselves with an agnostic position as regards the children of others, i.e., they have held with Dr. Abraham Kuyper:

> "Constantly and unwaveringly the Reformed Confession stations itself on the standpoint of the *covenant* and withholds baptism from all who stand outside the covenant, because it belongs to those within the covenant. To be sure, the Reformed Confession does not pass judgment on the children of heathen who die before coming to years of discretion. They depend on God's mercy, widened as broadly as possible. But where the Scriptures are silent, the Confession too preserves silence. Men know nothing here and can know nothing. The lot of these numerous children belong to the hidden things that are for the Lord God, and is not included among the things which He has revealed to the children of men."

But while some Calvinists have taken the position that only the infants of believers are saved, and while many Calvinists have taken the position that while we may be certain that the infants of believers are saved we know nothing about the fate of the children of others; yet it ought to be clear to all that a man can be a perfectly good Calvinist and at the same time take the position that all those dying in infancy are saved, seeing that the Scriptures no where teach that any are lost and seeing that according to Calvinism salvation ultimately rests on God's electing grace alone. In harmony with this, in the course of the last century, English-speaking Calvinists at least have all but universally taken the position that all infants are included in the election of grace. Such for instance was the position held by Charles Hodge, W. G. T. Shedd and B. B. Warfield.

But though the doctrine that all dying in infancy are saved finds a natural and logical place in Calvinism, it cannot be said to be able to find a natural and logical place in any other Christian system of thought —true as it is that others than Calvinists have taught that all dying in infancy are saved. We take it that no doctrine of infant salvation is *Christian* that does not assume that infants are lost members of a lost race for whom there is no salvation apart from Christ. It must be obvious to all, therefore, that the doctrine that all dying in infancy are saved will not fit into the Roman Catholic or Anglo-Catholic system of thought with their teaching of baptismal regeneration; as clearly most of those who have died in infancy have not been baptized. It is obvious also that Lutheran system of thought provides no place for the notion that all dying in infancy are saved because of the necessity it attaches to the means of grace, especially the Word and the sacraments. If grace is only in the means of grace—in the case of infants in baptism—it seems clear that most of those who have died in infancy have not been the recipients of grace. Equally clear is it that

*(Continued on page 22)*

# Current Views and Voices

## Atheism, Indecency and the Magazines

Editorial in *The Sunday School Times*

THE American colleges and universities were founded and endowed chiefly by Christian men as a basis for a Christian civilization. They have become nurseries of unbelief. The great publishing houses had a similar origin. Macmillans was established by a Scotch Baptist, Harpers by Irish Methodists, Scribners by Presbyterians, the Century Company by New England Congregationalists, Houghton, Mifflin by Methodists, and Funk and Wagnalls by Lutheran clergy. How far some at least of them have slipped from the Christian point of view and Christian ideals can be quickly determined by a glance at their price lists or a cursory study of their magazine publications.

In the *Forum* for March, Harper and Brothers, under the caption of "Man's Unending Battle Against God," advertised a coming article in *Harper's Magazine*. This is what the advertisement says of it:

"Many honest, thoughtful people are wandering—lost—in the debatable ground where the frontiers of science, religion, and morals meet. To all readers blessed with inquiring minds, Elmer Davis' 'God Without Religion' will come as a revelation of integrity of thought combined with lofty spiritual force. Mr. Davis' bold plea to discard the religion that deceives us for our own comfort is an inspiration to the reader. It represents, moreover, the kind of reading that *Harper's Magazine* gives you each month."

Too true. What would Mr. Davis do? In his article in *Harper's* for March, 1930, he writes that "the bulk of the old-time religion is incredible." "The Fall-and-Atonement drama which is the core of traditional Christianity has had to go overboard," he tells us. "The code of conduct that had been unwisely tied to an obsolescent theology fell with it; unless men lose heart and surrender themselves to the bishops, that particular Humpty-Dumpty (*i. e.*, Christian ethics) can never be put together again." . . .

The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism could ask for nothing more satisfactory.

*Scribner's Magazine*, not to be outdone, publishes an article in the June, 1930, issue by Henshaw Ward entitled "The Disappearance of God." This writer points out without apparent regret that "it is the friends of God who have made God incredible." By "the friends of God" he means professors in various theological seminaries, whom he quotes,—Professor G. B. Smith of the University of Chicago, Professor E. S. Ames, Professor Douglas C. Mackintosh of Yale, the former Baptist minister Dr. J. H. Randall. Mr. Ward calls attention to "a collection of testimonies gathered by a man who was once a Baptist minister in Texas and is now an editor of *The Christian Century*. After I have read it I can think of nothing but the massacre of God that is being made by the best religious thought of the day." This includes "the Gods of fifteen well-known thinkers." He later speaks of these men as "an eminent band of specialists whose majority vote is that the God to whom I once said, 'Now I lay me' has disappeared."

Turning to the *Forum* one finds a continuous flow of anti-Christian essays. Some of these are printed under the title of "What I Believe," the belief being in most instances a repudiation of Christian theism and the Christian revelation. H. G. Wells in the August, 1930, issue, concludes his paper with an appropriate "vanity of vanities." He says that we are "face to face with the ultimate frustration of every individual desire, in age, enfeeblement and death." His only comfort is that when we die "we shall never know that we are dead." . . .

Then comes Professor John Dewey, who has scrapped the idea of God. This with the related ideas of the soul and its destiny, of fixed revelation, and the like, "have been made impossible for the cultivated mind of the Western world." Dewey seems to regret this in a way, for with these spiritual losses has gone the older "philosophy of hope, of progress," and no "new, coherent view of nature and man" has yet been discovered.

Mr. Mencken's reasoned "belief" is given in the September *Forum*. He holds that Copernicus' discoveries proved that "the so-called revelation of God, as contained in the Old Testament, was rubbish;" that the authors of the New Testament were ignorant and credulous men who "put together a narrative that is as discordant and preposterous . . . as the testimonies of six darkies in a police court." So low has the *Forum* sunk! A future life is to Mr. Mencken an absurb concept for which there is as little evidence as for witches. He believes that religion is done for in America. "Alone among the great nations of history we have got rid of religion as a serious scourge—and by the simple process of reducing it to a petty nuisance." . . .

These extracts are perhaps sufficient to classify certain magazines as purveyors of atheism, magazines that go into college reading-rooms, Y. M. C. A.s, public libraries, and American homes. . . .

## The Dogma of the Anti-Dogmatists

Editorial in *The Western Recorder*

ONE of the outstanding characteristics of Modern Liberalism is its sustained propaganda against the value of Scripture doctrines and theological dogma. The naturalistic presuppositions of the Liberals leads them to place very small valuation upon revealed Scripture teachings.

But for them frankly to say so would be bad strategy. Not even babes in Christ would be seduced by them, after such a frank revelation of their views, any more than they were seduced by the frank infidelity of Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll in America.

In that remarkable small work, "The Theology of Crisis," by Professor Brunner, the author, though he has somewhat to say against the adequacy of the attitude of conservative theology, goes after the inconsistencies and fatal weaknesses of the Liberals in utterances that penetrate to the heart. On the question of the dogmatism of the anti-dogmatists Dr. Brunner has the following:

> The modern slogan, "not doctrine but life, not dogma but practice," is itself a doctrine, even a dogma, but it is not a Christian doctrine nor a Christian dogma. It is the dictum either of an ethical pragmatism or of mysticism. This attitude is characteristic of contemporary theology and religion. But it is not the only symptom. It merely points to the real cause of the disease. The substance of Christian theology, the content of Christian faith is (under the manipulation of this school) in a stage of complete decomposition. Christianity is either faith in the revelation of God in Christ or it is nothing.

Christianity is a system of truth based upon certain historical facts, together with their revealed significance. Their truth may be *demonstrated only through faith*. The tragedy involved in the position of modern Liberalism, which means nothing less than the destruction of revealed Christianity, grows out of its refusal to accept any truth which it cannot demonstrate by human reason.

Yet this same school is inconsistent, in that it is unable to offer such demonstration for its own basal presupposition, namely, that man is essentially good and able without the atonement of Christ to grow into acceptance with God.

There is other truth in the world than that

demonstrable through test tubes, logic or mathematics. This the Liberals do not fail to accept in other fields than that of Christian faith. Their failure at this particular point tends to prove the very thing their system fights—namely, that man is in *heart* in search of an alibi against confessing he is what God reveals him to be—a sinner.

It ought not to be necessary, with such overwhelming testimony, to stress or insist upon the actual physical resurrection of Jesus. But, strange as it may seem, it is necessary. Yet it would seem that anyone who knows anything whatever about the New Testament, or the significance of Christianity, would admit at once that the actual, physical resurrection of Jesus is one of the distinctly cardinal points upon which the whole structure of Christianity rests.

## "Missions Uncongenial"

Editorial in *The Restoration Herald*

"MISSIONS" was a very distasteful word, we are told, to the young people gathered in Toronto at the 1930 "Christian Youth Council of North America."

Why?

Margaret E. Burton sympathetically states their viewpoint in a recent issue of *The Baptist:*

> At least a part of the answer to this question is suggested by the response of a mother to the comment, "So your son is going to India as a missionary?" "Well," was the answer, "I suppose you would call it that. But he wouldn't like to hear himself called a missionary. He is going, he says, to receive and to share."
> The old terms "missions" and "missionaries" are uncongenial to the young people of today largely because the suggestion in them is of people going out to give and to teach rather than to receive and to shares. There is a connotation of superiority and condescension in them, which is very distasteful to young people whose appreciation of the contributions of other nations and other races to the life of the world family is so keen that their realization of how much they have to receive and to learn is perhaps even more vivid than their sense of what they have to share.

Such drivel shows to what extent "modernism" has done its work among our young people. Our "forward looking" missionaries and "approved" college professors have become so broad that Christianity is to them no longer the perfect and authoritative religion. Christ is no longer the *only* name whereby men *must* be saved. The Bible is no longer profitable for doctrine, for reproof and correction in righteousness "that the man of God may be *thoroughly* furnished unto *every* good work." We do not blame our youth for such pronouncements as those made in Toronto. They are simply mouthing the vaporings of their "modernistic" leaders. We feel sorry for them. Left to themselves they would be better off.

* * *

Either Christ is the *only* Saviour of the world, or He is *no* Saviour.

Either God's Word is *the* divine revelation, or it is a book of lies.

Either the Gospel is the *all-sufficient* scheme of redemption, or it is a fake.

Either Christian missions is the only hope of the world, or it is a presumption upon the intelligence of mankind.

The Great Commission of our Lord does not read: "Go ye into all the world, receive and share." It says: "*Go and make* disciples of all the nations, *baptizing* them, *teaching* them to *observe* all things which I have *commanded* you." No youth to whom the word "missions" with its "old connotations" is distasteful is fit to go to the mission field.

## Jewry and the Passion Play

J. De Forest Murch, in the *Christian Standard*

OUR friends the Jews are greatly perturbed over the "anti-Semitism of the Passion Play." Ever since Oberammergau, this year, they have been raising a hue and cry about it, and calling upon "broadminded, liberal Christians" to correct the evil. Dr. Cadman will undoubtedly look after the matter.

The fact is that the Jews *did* kill Jesus. Peter seemed to be rather wrought up over the matter, on the day of Pentecost, A.D. 30. He accused a great audience of Jews from every nation under the sun, in the sacred precincts of the temple itself, of being guilty of the blood of the Son of God. He called upon them to repent, and three thousand did so. If the Passion Play at Oberammergau is to be true to historic fact, it must represent Jesus slain by the Jews.

We fail, however, to see why this faithful portrayal should arouse anti-Semitism today. Was not Jesus also a Jew? In His illustrious words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," is not every hint of hatred eradicated from the crucifixion scene?

Can it be that modern Jewry is developing a conscience on Christ? If so, it is a most encouraging omen. Now is the time for Christians to quicken these promptings of the soul, not by a blanket endorsement of Judaism, not by compromising the historic record as it appears in the New Testament, but by a tender solicitude for the salvation of the Jews through "the Lamb of God slain for the sin of the world."

## The Dead Hand of Compromise

Kennedy Stewart in *The Scots Observer*

WHEN the history of the twentieth century comes to be written the tremendous influence of the Lambeth Conference as an institution will be one of the most significant factors to be noticed. The world owes much to that institution. Out of conferences—conferences of nations, conferences of movements, conferences of all sorts—many of the greatest blessings of our times have come, but the record of the conference is by no means a record of unmixed success, and many thinkers must have asked themselves if the twentieth century were not in danger of making a fetish of the institution. The failure of Lambeth makes that question an urgent one.

Mr. George Malcolm Thomson describes the bishops as sheep who came to Lambeth "to huddle together in order to keep their spirits up." Is that not really the hidden reason for many conferences? Amid the tremendous perplexities of this post-war world of ours does it not happen often that the leading figures of all sorts of movements, recognising their inability to cope with the problems that face them, take refuge in "huddling together" in conference? No student of contemporary political or social history can possibly doubt it. A big percentage of conferences are called, not for the real purpose of conference—to settle clearly defined difficulties by reconciling sharply differing, but quite definitely held views—but in the desperate hope that out of a common pool of ideas some great inspiration may come.

In nine cases out of ten that hope must be unfulfilled. The essence of conference is compromise. Compromise is the key to the settlement of quarrels. It is not, and it never can be, a fount of leadership. The inherent object of every conference is to produce a report which can be subscribed to by all its members. To attain that object it is essential that a compromise be reached on every point, that each idea brought to the common pool have an edge rubbed off it here, a corner there, in order to make it suitable for general consumption. Such a process cannot but mean the sacrifice of conviction in favour of convenience, and with the sacrifice of conviction must go the sacrifice of leadership.

Talking of Union, Mr. Thomson says "After all, religion must be a thing men are willing to suffer and die for, and though men are willing to suffer and die for the maddest, the most incredible, creeds and causes, they are not willing to die for a phrase which has been deliberately made meaningless so that it may have more meaning than one. Mankind may be mad, but it

*(Concluded on page 18)*

## Letters to the Editor

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: After I have read the first number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, I was so happy and thankful that I subscribed at once. Every new number increases my gratitude for a paper that has such a tonic effect, strengthening me to do the work of the Master in these days before His Coming. My friend, the Minister of the German Methodist Church of this city, enjoys with me the rich food your paper offers to people who believe in true Christianity. We firmly believe that God has called you to this testimony and will strengthen and bless you. Our prayers are with you.

The note of Dr. Stewart MacLennan led me to write these lines, as the Session of my Church has passed similar resolutions and has also unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed the program of Westminster Seminary. It has voted to put it on our budget and to support it by an annual gift of at least $50.00.

God's Blessing be upon you and your paper and upon all who work and pray for Westminster Seminary!

RICHARD R. LANGE.

German Presbyterian Church,
Lawrence, Mass.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: At Oteen, N. C., there is a U. S. Veterans Hospital in which are about 600 disabled veterans of the World War. Nearly ten per cent of these are members or affiliates of the Presbyterian Church. They come from thirteen states, representing both the Northern and Southern parts of the Union.

Put yourself in their place and you can readily see how much it would mean to have a minister of their own denomination to speak words of good cheer, to read to them out of God's Word, to pray with them, to administer the Communion, and to be a friend with ever ready sympathy in their loneliness and depression.

We have been fortunate enough to secure for this work Rev. Charles B. Chapin, D.D., a member of the Lehigh Presbytery, Synod of Pennsylvania, who served most successfully as Chaplain in Camp Wadsworth at Spartanburg, S. C., during the World War. Since that time he has been teaching in Converse College, Southwestern University, and Chicora College.

Two friends, who are acquainted with Dr. and Mrs. Chapin and the work they did at Camp Wadsworth, have agreed to pay half of the salary for one year.

The Home Mission Committee of Asheville Presbytery, having no funds from which to make an appropriation for the support of a Chaplain and believing that it is the privilege of individual members of the Presbyterian Church throughout the country to provide for the spiritual comfort and welfare of these stricken men of our own faith, is issuing this appeal with the confidence that it will not go unheeded. It is a venture of faith and love.

Send your contribution to Rev. H. B. Dendy, Treasurer, Weaverville, N. C.

Yours for these Soldiers of our Country and of the Cross,

R. F. CAMPBELL,
Chairman of the Home Mission Committee of the Asheville Presbytery.

# Interesting Facts Concerning Churches and Ministers

## Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

### Calls

Wm. H. Koper, Sprague Memorial Church, Tacoma, Wash., to be Assistant First Church, Seattle, Wash. (declines);
V. C. Detty, Burnsville, N. C. to be Stated Supply, Wysox and Orwell, Pa.;
Paul Sappie, Johnsonburg, Pa. to Galeton, Pa.;
Raymond E. Muthard to Beecher's Island, Nelson, Pa., Parkhurst Memorial Church, Elkland, Pa. and Lawrenceville, Pa.;
John C. Moore, Phila., Pa. to Grove Church, Danville, Pa.;
B. W. Jones, Delta, Pa. to Lewisburg, Pa. (declines);
John Hammond, D.D., Lime Springs, Ia. to Rehoboth Church, Delta, Pa.;
H. O. Hofstead, D.D. to Redlands, Cal.
Raymond E. Muthard to Elkland, Pa.;
E. G. Lindberg, Oneida, Ill. to Calvary Church, Peoria, Ill.;
Wm. L. Robinson to Elmhurst, Pa.

### Calls Accepted

Harry W. Hansen, Seward, Neb. to Holdrege, Neb.;
Frank H. Bisbee, Lyndonville, N. Y. to Andover, N. Y.;
J. R. Browne, Volga, Ia. to Axtell, Kans.;
Edward G. Atkinson, San Luis Valley, Colo. to Taos, N. M.;
H. D. Ewing, Summerville, Pa. to New Rehoboth Church, Clarion, Pa.;
Cyril G. Carter to Westminster Church, Orange Co., Cal.;
Wm. K. Howe, La Crescenta, Cal. to be Stated Supply First Church, Downey, Cal.;
Thos. M. Cornelison, Lincoln, Kans. to Logan, Ia.;
H. L. Manning, Nebraska City, Neb. to Kimball, Neb.;
Richard Henry Sellway, Antler, N. D. to Red Lake Falls, Minn.;
A. H. Stephens, Broken Arrow, Okla. to Holden, Mo.;
Willis B. Gillis, Westminster Church, Wichita, Kans. to La Junta, Colo.;
Vern W. Butler, Mackinaw City, Mich. to Mt. Hope Church, Lansing, Mich.;
Charles E. Bovard, D.D., Rockledge, Pa. to St. Petersburg, Fla.;
Walter P. Fink, Hedrick and Martinsburg, Ia. to Ida Grove, Ia.;
Thos. W. Chisholm, Sharon, Ia. to Olivet Church, Sioux City, Ia.;
Arthur W. Ratz, D.D., Mankato, Minn. to Fargo, N. D.;
Robert H. Wood to Spring City and Kingston, Tenn. churches;
L. B. Hensley, to be Stated Supply, Southminster Church, Cumberland, Md.;
R. J. Wohlgemuth, Mt. Pleasant, Kans. to Natoma, Kans.;
Claude S. Conley to Mercer, Pa.;
Lewis H. Knight, First Memorial Church, Dover, N. J. to Hoosick Falls, N. Y.;
E. W. Griffith, Crawfordsville, Ia. to Salem Church, Oshkosh, Wis.;
Clinton W. Clough, McFadden, Wyo. to be Stated Supply, Evanston, Wyo.;
Douglas V. Magers, Tulsa, Okla. to Bethany Church, Joplin, Mo.;
Paul C. Voris, D.D., Winnebago, Minn. to Litchfield, Minn.;
William Wright Stoddart, Toronto, Canada to Westminster Church, Keokuk, Ia.;
Wm. F. Fulton, to be Stated Supply, Salida, Colo.;
Wallace L. Kennedy, to be Stated Supply, Glenwood Springs, Colo.;
John Roos, Riley, Kans. to Hope and College Hill and Ramona, Kans.;
R. M. Truesdale, Herington, Kans. to Eldorado, Kans.;
W. W. Alverson, Frankfort, Kans. to Walters, Okla.;
Francis J. Malzard, Immanuel Church, Cleveland, O. to Galloway and Grove City, O.;
Douglass V. Magers, Tulso, Okla. to Bethany Church, Joplin, Mo.;
Wm. P. Lemon, D.D., Andrew Church, Minneapolis, Minn. to First Church, Iowa City, Ia.

### Changed Addresses

Paul Sappie, Galeton, Pa.;
Ralph Johnson, 517 Reis Ave., Evansville, Ind.;
J. M. Thompson, Macomb, Ill.;
Thomas Murray, D.D., 997 Pearl St., Denver, Colo.;
Benjamin H. Freye, 2001 Fulton St., Aurora, Colo.;
John W. Armstrong, McLeansboro, Ill.;
D. T. Brandenburg, Phelps, Ky.;
Eugene W. Love, 1621 S. Main St., Joplin, Mo.
J. Hammond Tice, Gunnison, Colo.;
Adrien J. Muyskens, 200 E. Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.;
O. O. Russell, D.D., Brinkley, Ark.;
John W. Armstrong, White Pigeon, Mich.;

### Ordinations

Norman E. Barnett, Assistant Pastor, Pine Street Church, Harrisburg, Pa., Nov. 20;
T. Chandler Burton, Glen Avon Church, Duluth, Minn., Dec. 28.

### Resignations

B. A. Matzen, Kenilworth, Washington, D. C.;
W. H. Topping, Neelsville, Germantown, Md.;
C. L. De Prefontaine, Mt. Tabor and Mill Creek, Pa.;
Harold E. Ingersoll, Community Church, Lomita, Cal.;
Paul Stratton, D.D., Westminster Church, Rochester, N. Y.;
Roger F. Cressey, Corry, Pa.
O. Curtis Griffith, Eastminster Church, Erie, Pa.

### Installations

H. D. Barley, D.D., Central Church, Zanesville, O.;
Francis D. Malzard, Columbus Grove, O.;
J. Wayne Kurtz, Benton Boulevard Church, Kansas City, Kans., Nov. 25;
Melvin W. Riddle, Central Church, Chambersburg, Pa., Nov. 20;
Wilbur M. Smith, Coatesville, Pa., Nov. 20;
James C. McConnell, J. R. Miller Memorial Church, Upper Darby, Pa., Dec. 2;
Herman L. Turner, Covenant Church, Atlanta, Ga., Dec. 11;
Lester F. Eisel, First Church, Vallejo, Cal., Dec. 14;
Andrew H. Neilly, Dewey Ave. Church, Rochester, N. Y., Nov. 12;
Theodore Shepard, Humboldt, Neb., Nov. 20;
G. Henry Green, S. Broadway Church, Denver, Colo., Nov. 6;
A. L. Axt, D.D., First Church, Virginia, Minn., Nov. 6;
Robert Excell Fry, D.D., First Church, Duluth, Minn., Nov. 13;
W. Wallace Thompson, Elkton, Md., Dec. 18;
Glenn L. Sneed, Westmnister Church, New Orleans, La.;
W. T. McCandlass, Conemaugh, Pa., Dec. 16.
Francis E. Piper, Rifle, Colo., Oct. 3;
Elmer W. Blew, Woodburn and Bethel, Ore., Oct. 8;
Alfred L. Taxis, Huntingdon Valley, Pa., Nov. 18;
Jack Masters, First Church, Sullivan, Ind., Dec. 20.

### Deaths

Henry N. Faulconer, D.D., West Chester, Pa., Nov. 13;
Thomas M. Gossard, Hollywood, Cal., Nov. 20;
Wm. Franklin Padgett, D.D., Oct. 18;
Milton E. Gabard, D.D., Nov. 23;
Frank N. Palmer, Dec. 1.
Charles Bremicker, H.R., Dubuque, Ia., Nov. 26;
T. K. Bridges, Idabel, Okla.

## Presbyterian Church U. S.

### Calls Accepted

G. S. Frazer, Litt.D., Memphis, Tenn. to First Church, Pensacola, Fla.;
P. W. DuBose, Westminster Church, Miami, Fla. to Presidency of Palmer College, De-Funiak Springs, Fla.;
Claude H. Pritchard, Charleston, W. Va. to Oakhurst Church, Atlanta, Ga.;
S. L. Hunter, Cornelia, Ga. to Porterdale and Bethany churches, Ga.;
John W. Caldwell, D.D., Westminster Church, Atlanta, Ga. to Montreat, N. C.;
L. B. McCord, Orangeburg, S. C. to Manning, S. C.;
Clement Ritter, Palmyra, Mo. to Dothan, Ala.;
H. H. Thompson, First Church, Baton Rouge, La. to First Church, Bristol, Tenn.;
J. A. Christian, D.D., Tupelo, Miss. to First Church, Baton Rouge, La.;
T. C. Bryan, Whitmire, S. C. to First Church, Gastonia, N. C.;
J. F. Forsyth, Memphis, Tenn. to Juan, Ky.;
E. E. Neff, Atlanta, Ga. to Quicksand, Ky.;
L. B. Hensley, D.D., Beverly, W. Va. to Cumberland, Md.;
A. C. Smith, Glenwood Church, Charleston, W. Va. to First Church, Biloxi, Miss.;
Hugh E. Bradshaw, Paduca, Ky. to First Church, Mansfield, La.

### Changed Addresses

B. D. Kennedy, D.D., 726 E. Ashby St., San Antonio, Texas.
J. A. Warren, Collins, Miss. to Germantown and Eastland, Miss.;
Wm. Thorington, Louisville, Ky. to Woodlawn Church, Birmingham, Ala.;
E. P. Tucker, Presidency of Arkansas College to Presidency of Austin College, Sherman, Texas.

### Resignations

John T. Young, Milton and Bagdad, Fla.;
Paul B. Freeland, Opelousas, La.;
B. S. Kennedy, D.D., Coleman, Texas;
M. A. DuRaut, First Church, Natchitoches, La.;
J. V. Johnson, D.D., Westminster Church, Memphis, Tenn.;
Wm. Easson, Bloomfield and Big Spring, Ky.

### Installations

J. Leighton Scott, Shawnee Church, Louisville, Ky., Nov. 9;
W. R. Buhler, Mulberry Street Church, Montgomery, Ala.;
B. B. Long, Union Springs, Ga.;
W. O. Nelson, Norwood and Jackson Churches, La.;
J. R. Hooten, Little Mountain Church, Abbeville Co., S. C.;
Cochran Preston, Dominick and Smyrna, Newberry Co., S. C., Nov. 16;
T. K. Young, D.D., Idlewild Church, Memphis, Tenn., Nov. 16;
Dunbar H. Ogden, D.D., Napoleon Avenue Church, New Orleans, La.;
R. Matthew Lynn, Coleman, Texas, Dec. 14.

### Deaths

C. P. Browning, Boonville, Mo., Nov. 11;
N. B. Campbell, Gerardstown, W. Va.

## Presbyterian Church in Canada

### Calls

J. C. Robinson, Uxbridge, Ontario to St. Andrew's Church, Campbellsford, Ont.;
John Riddell, Millbrook, Ont. to Georgetown, Montreal (declines);
J. S. Patterson, Victoria, B. C. to Knox Church, Victoria;
Kenneth McCaskill, McDonald's Corners, Elphim and Snow Road, Ontario to Westport, Ont.

### Calls Accepted

J. A. MacLean, D.D., Moose Creek, Ont. to Argyle and Duff, Ont.;
A. D. Sutherland, St. John's Church, Hamilton, Ont. to Avonmore, B. C.;
D. H. Currie, Wiarton, Ont. to Smithville and Wellanport, Hamilton.

### Inductions

J. A. Sutherland, Stated Supply, Keene, Westwood and Warsaw, Ont.;
John J. Cowan, Boissevain, Man., Dec. 3.

### Deaths

A. D. MacIntyre, Cote Des Neiges, Montreal, Nov. 19;
Arpad Govan, D.D., Williamstown, E. Ontario.

## United Presbyterian Church

### Calls

W. P. Aiken, D.D., Canonsburg, Pa. to Central Church, Omaha, Neb.;
Ira G. McCreary, Pittsburgh, Pa. to Sixth Church, Cleveland, O.;
S. A. Foster, Crafton Heights, Pittsburgh, Pa. to Beaver Falls, Pa.

### Calls Accepted

J. B. Patterson, Third Church, Spokane, Wash. to be Stated Supply, Albany, Ore.;
J. Campbell White, D.D., President of Wooster University to West 44th Street Church, New York, N. Y.

### Changed Addresses

A. Theodore Smith, Klamath Falls, Ore.

### Resignations

W. L. Kenney, Glenwood Springs, Colo.

### Installations

R. H. Gordon, Washtucna, Wash., Dec. 4;
Craig Whitsel, Stated Supply, Pullman, Wash.;
J. Edgar Lindsey, Stated Supply, Spring Lake, Idaho;
J. E. McCall, Dayton and Beracha, Pa., Nov. 18.

## Cumberland Presbyterian Church

### Calls Accepted

John R. Morris, Columbia, Tenn. to Wagoner, Okla.;
J. H. Tally, Columbia, Tenn.;
John Grimes, Lebanon Church, Fairfield, Ill.

### Changed Addresses

L. L. Bryant, McKenzie, Tenn.

### Deaths

Horace McMurtry, Eldorado, Ill.

## Reformed Church in the U. S.

### Calls

C. H. Riedesel, Kimama, Idaho to Bucyrus, O.;
C. G. Chalmers, Dayton, O. to Grace Church, Lancaster, O.;
D. A. Winter, Jeffersonville, Ind. to Basil, O.

### Calls Accepted

Ellis Hay, D.D., Toledo, O. to Saegertown, Pa.;
R. Ira Gass, Yukon, Pa. to Cochrantown, Pa.;
Charles Woods, Akron, O. to Greensboro, N. C.

### Changed Addresses

Reginald Bard, 655 Carlisle Ave., Dayton, O.

### Installations

Frank J. Stucki, Waukon, Ia., Dec. 7;
Harvey A. Fesperman, Christ Church, Hagerstown, Md.;
H. L. Hart, Bethel Church, Sugar Grove, O., Dec. 3.

### Deaths

H. Luisbacker, Porterfield, Wis.;
W. Stuart Cramer, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.

## Christian Reformed Church

### Calls

Wm. Van Peursem, Zutphen, Mich. to Second Church, S. Holland, Ill.;
C. Spoelhof, Lodi, N. J. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich. (declines);
J. L. Van Tielen, W. Sayville, N. Y. to Hoboken, N. J.;
F. Doezema, First Church, Roseland, Ill. to Archer Ave., Chicago, Ill. (declines);
P. Hoekstra, Vancouver, B. C. to be Home Missionary for Hamshire, Tex. and Classis Pella;
H. Bel, Bethel Church, Paterson, N. J. to Lagrave Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.;
John O. Bouwsma, Graafschap, Mich. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.

### Calls Accepted

I. Couwenhoven, Tracy, Ia. to McBain, Mich.;
J. L. Van Tielen, W. Sayville, N. Y. to Hoboken, N. J.;
D. Flietstra, Allen Avenue Church, Muskegon, Mich. to Platte, S. D.;

### Resignations

J. A. Mokma, Sullivan, Mich.

### Ordinations

Wm. H. Rutgers, College and Holland churches, Iowa.

## Reformed Church in America

### Calls

J. A. DeJong, Leighton, Ia. to Firth, Neb.

### Calls Accepted

Charles A. Stoppels, Hull, Ia. to Bethel, Holland, Mich.;
M. J. Den Herder, Mellenville, N. Y. to Middlebush, N. J.

## The Dead Hand of Compromise —Concl.

is not so mad as that." The making of such a "meaningless phrase" must be the result of most indeterminate conferences. Under such a banner no army would march. No leader would raise it.

Leadership is born only in conviction. A real leader is inspired and goes to his task as to a mission. He can succeed only in so far as he is capable of passing that conviction on to his followers. The danger of a too great reliance on the institution of conference is not only that a conference cannot produce leadership but that it may actually stifle leadership. If we continue to try to solve our problems by "huddling together" we are going not only to make it difficult for a great leader to appear, but we are going to evolve in our people a state of mind in which inspiration is suspect and conviction tremendously difficult to get across. The practice of constantly trying to share our burdens must inevitably atrophy the power of strong, individual thought. Does history not prove to us that the great inspirations of the world only come to strongly individual minds? We are waiting for such a man, a man inspired and passionately convinced of his own inspiration, who will sweep us along with him through the power that has been given him.

That such a leader will arise we must believe—if we believe at all. Is it not our plain duty to make ourselves ready for his coming? He will come the sooner to a community who have prepared for inspiration and conviction by using their own minds to the absolute limit of their powers and by doing their best to stand four-square to their difficulties. It may be that he is among us now—but while we continue to "huddle together" how can he step out into the van?

# News of the Church

## The Cook Lectures

THE Rev. J. Harry Cotton, Minister of the Broad Street Presbyterian Church of Columbus, Ohio, widely known as a brilliant young member of the liberal party in the Church, has been selected by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to deliver the "Cook Lectures" in the Orient in the fall and winter of 1931-1932.

This lectureship was established by Joseph Cook, famous for his Boston Monday lectureship, who left his entire estate, subject to the life interest of Mrs. Cook, to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., with the provision that it should be used for the establishment of *"a fund whose income would be devoted to founding and maintaining learned and evangelistic lectures in defense of Christianity by some thoroughly competent preacher or theological professor who shall be chosen by the said board to visit in succession the principal cities of India, China and Japan."* Mr. Cook died in June, 1901 and was survived many years by Mrs. Cook. It was not possible for the board to carry out the provision of his will until after Mrs. Cook's death and the accumulation of sufficient income to provide for the expenses of the lectureship.

The first incumbent of the lectureship was the Rev. Cleland B. McAfee, who spent the year 1924-25 in delivering the lectures subsequently published under the subject of "The Christian Conviction" in the principal cities of Egypt, India, Siam, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan and Chosen. The income of the lectureship now warrants another appointment. Considerable comment, both favorable and unfavorable, has been occasioned by this selection.

## Overtures from the General Assembly

THE last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., which met at Cincinnati, Ohio, submitted two constitutional changes for the approval of the Presbyteries. According to the Constitution of the church, proposed changes in it must be first passed by the General Assembly and then approved by an absolute majority of all the Presbyteries. Since there are now two hundred and ninety-three Presbyteries, one hundred and forty-seven Presbyteries, therefore, must vote affirmatively on any overture "sent down" by the Assembly if it is to be adopted.

"Overture A" of 1930-1931 from the Assembly proposes a change in the constitution and powers of Permanent Judicial Commission, and in the powers and rights of the General Assembly in relation to the Commission. At present the decision of the Commission is final when accepted by the Assembly, unless the Assembly refuses to accept it, in which case, the Assembly itself, as the Supreme Court of the Church, hears the case and disposes of it finally. Briefly, the rather complicated terms of the proposed overture provide that when the Permanent Judicial Commission shall report its judgment, the Assembly may either accept or reject it. If the judgment is accepted it "shall be the final judgment in each case." If it is rejected, the case is automatically recommitted to the Commission for a rehearing. If a second judgment of the Commission be rejected, the General Assembly shall appoint one, or not more than five, persons to represent it before the Commission in further consideration of the case. A third judgment of the Commission shall stand as the final judgment of the General Assembly, provided such judgment is concurred in by not less than twelve members of the Commission and confirmed by the General Assembly. * * * Should a third hearing of a particular case by the Permanent Judicial Commission result in less than twelve members of the Commission concurring in the judgment and the Commission so report, the General Assembly shall refer the case to a Special Judicial Commission.

There is no provision whatever in the proposed statute covering an important contingency. If a third judgment rendered by the Commission, and concurred in by twelve of its fifteen members, is *rejected* by the Assembly, there is no provision for anything further being done with the case, for the clause permitting reference to a Special Commission only comes into operation if, after a third hearing, less than twelve of the members concur in the judgment. This has been declared to be a serious defect in the proposed machinery. While the case would undoubtedly remain alive, there is no authority delegated either to the Commission or to the Assembly, for taking action in this contingency. It is also pointed out by competent church lawyers that, while permitting a possible transmission to a special Judicial Commission, the overture nowhere reserves to the Assembly the final right of hearing and decision in any case. This is regarded by many as a drastic and direct violation of the whole Presbyterian System of Church courts, in that, if the overture be incorporated in the law of the Church, the General Assembly is no longer the Supreme Court, with the right of review and control of any case brought before it, but sinks merely to the level of an administrative board. It may advise the Commission, but it will be powerless either to take the case out of the hands of the Commission, or to give it to a Special Commission, provided the Permanent Judicial Commission still holds the case under consideration. In this way, it is pointed out, a case might languish on from year to year, never being decided or ended. Objectors also say that the provisions permitting the reopening of any case would result in never-ending litigation, to the great annoyance of the Church.

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, at its stated meeting on January 5, 1930, answered overture "A" in the negative by a very decisive vote, rejecting the recommendation of a committee that action be favorable.

At the present writing, forty-eight Presbyteries have voted to answer overture "A" in the affirmative, ten have voted to answer in the negative, and one has reported no action.

Overture "B" of 1930-1931 asks this question of the Presbyteries: "Shall Constitutional Rule Number 1, entitled Local Evangelists, be rescinded?" Constitutional Rule No. 1, which was adopted in 1893, is as follows:

"It shall be lawful for presbytery, after proper examination as to his piety, knowledge of the Scriptures, and ability to teach, to license, as a local evangelist, any male member of the Church, who, in the judgment of presbytery, is qualified to teach the gospel publicly, and who is willing to engage in such service under the direction of presbytery. Such license shall be valid for but one year unless renewed, and such licensed local evangelist shall report to the presbytery at least once each year, and his license may be withdrawn at any time at the pressure of presbytery. The person securing such license shall not be ordained to the gospel ministry, should he desire to enter it, until he shall have served at least four years as a local evangelist, and shall have pursued and been examined upon what would be equivalent to a three years' course of study in theology, homiletics, Church history, Church polity, and the English Bible, under the direction of presbytery."

It is under the authority of this rule that Presbyteries have been able to ordain local evangelists as Ministers after examination and instruction by the Presbyteries without their having pursued a regular theological course.

It is argued, by those who support the overture, that Constitutional Rule No. 1 was passed in a time of emergency, when the West was being opened up. It temporarily suspended, they claim, the historic

Presbyterian principle calling for an educated Ministry, which principle ought now to be restored. Others, who object to the rule, declare that God's choices of messengers are not limited to Seminary-trained men, and that to withdraw the right of a Presbytery to ordain a man it believes fit, and who has been evidently called of God, is for the visible church to assume the perogative of overruling the Spirit of God. Still others profess to see in the move the beginning of an attempt to limit ordinations to graduates of Seminaries that are under ecclesiastical control, and hence satisfactory to the dominant party in the Church. The vote by Presbyteries on overture "B" at this writing is, For, seventy-three; Against, eighteen; No action, one.

## Men's Work Congress

MORE than 600 official delegates (ministers and laymen), from 22 denominations with a communicant membership of 20,000,000, held the first Interdenominational Men's Work Congress ever assembled in the United States, in Hotel Gibson, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 11 and 12, 1930.

The presiding officer of the Congress was Dr. Bert Edward Smith of Chicago, president of the Interdenominational Council on Men's Work, and head of Methodist Episcopal Men's Work. Actively associated with him in perfecting the preparation and conduct of the Congress was Dr. William F. Weir of Chicago, secretary of Men's Work for the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr of Pittsburgh, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, U. S. A., sounded the keynote of the Congress by discussing "The Place of the Church in Modern Life." He held that the three important issues before the Church as it faces the problems of our age are: The Church must capture the intellect of the modern world, must challenge the conscience of the modern world, and must satisfy the spiritual aspirations of the modern world. He suggested that the familiar old hymn, "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name, Let Angels Prostrate Fall," should be re-written with a new and modern significance to the effect: "Let science prostrate fall; let industry prostrate fall; let education prostrate fall; let politics prostrate fall; and let America, Great Britian, Germany, France, China, India, Africa, and all other countries, prostrate fall;" and then, and not until then, would mankind be fully commissioned to sing, "Bring forth the royal diadem and crown him Lord of all!"

Six separate Commissions considered the proceedings of the Congress under the following heads:

"The Place of the Church in Modern Life;" "Religious Movements Among Men;" "Men Facing the Evangelization of the World;" "Men's Work in the Local Church;" "The Meaning of Christ in Personal Life;" "Men Facing the Responsibility of Christian Citizenship."

Each Commission presented to the Congress written findings, and all findings were adopted by the entire Congress without a dissenting vote. They committed the manhood of the Christian Church to renewed pledges of love, loyalty and devotion; to proclamation of the gospel of Christ through the Church as the only hope of the world; to brotherhood throughout the race of mankind dominated by the love of God; to a definite service in the work of his local church for each particular man; to fidelity to Constitutional government in the United States; to the promotion of peace among the nations and good will throughout the world; to undivided support of President Hoover against repeal of the 18th Amendment or modification of the Volstead Act; to perfection of organization and program of Men's Work in particular denominations and interdenominationally; to recognition of the world as the full field of the Church and to world evangelization as the mission of the Church; to loyalty in spirit, activity in service, and generosity in support, in the local church.

## Death of Dr. Geo. Alexander

THE Rev. Geo. Alexander, D.D., for many years Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, New York, died on December 12th, at the age of eighty-seven years. Dr. Alexander had long been a noted figure in the Presbyterian Church. A man of great personal abilities and undoubted charm, he wielded a wide influence. He graduated from Union College in 1866 and from Princeton Seminary in 1870. He was ordained and installed as pastor of the East Avenue Church, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1870 and remained there until 1883. He was Minister of University Place Church, New York City, from 1884 to 1918, and of the First Presbyterian Church from 1919 until the time of his death. He was President of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. from 1903 to 1924. He was for many years a Director of Princeton Seminary previous to the reorganization, and a member of the Board of Trustees since that event. It was always a source of sorrow to many that Dr. Alexander, while personally conservative in his theology, chose to throw the weight of his great influence steadily on the side of the "Liberal" party in the Church. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick preached his famous sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" while the Special Weekly Preacher of the First Presbyterian Church of New York under Dr. Alexander's Pastorate, and Dr. Alexander steadily and vigorously defended Dr. Fosdick in Presbytery, Synod and the General Assembly.

The funeral services were held in the First Presbyterian Church of New York, on Dec. 15th, 1930. Among those who took part were, Dr. J. V. Moldenhawer, the Rev. P. P. Elliott, Dr. Howard Duffield, Dr. Henry Van Dyke, Dr. Thos. Guthrie Speers, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick and Dr. Robert E. Speer.

## Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students

THE League of Evangelical Students, with chapters in thirty seminaries and colleges, will hold its annual convention in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 13th, 14th, and 15th. All the meetings of the convention will be open to the public, who are cordially invited to attend. One of the outstanding features will be a missionary rally on Sunday, February 15th, to be addressed by Dr. Robert Glover, F.R.G.S., of the China Inland Mission. Dr. James M. Gray, Dean of Moody Bible Institute, will be the principal speaker at another meeting to be held in one of the large downtown churches. About fifty delegates from leading seminaries and colleges are expected to attend. The meetings of the Convention will be held in a centrally located and easily accessible place, but the exact location has not yet been determined.

The League was organized by Christian students with a two-fold purpose in mind. First, to confirm in the faith and hold fast those who enter colleges and seminaries with a living trust in the tenets of historic Christianity but who are in danger of losing that faith through the teachings of pseudo-science. Secondly, to rally students who desire actively to propagate faith in the Virgin Birth of Christ, His redeeming sacrifice, His resurrection, His second advent, and the inerrancy of Scripture. Philadelphia chapters of the League are active in Westminster Theological Seminary, Eastern Baptist Seminary, Reformed Episcopal Seminary, and the University of Pennsylvania.

## Overture Regarding Suspensions

THE Presbytery of Geneva has overtured the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., regarding the 75,580 suspensions of last year. The text of the overture, for which the Presbytery of Geneva is asking the concurrence of sister Presbyteries, is as follows:

"Inasmuch as there were 75,580 members suspended by our denomination last year with this number, as it seems, definitely on the increase, and

"Inasmuch as this relatively large number of suspensions indicates several evils to

which the denomination has not as yet given adequate attention, to wit:

1. Present inexact and ineffective systems of keeping church membership rolls.
2. Present chaotic, contradictory, and irregular practises upon the part of the presbyteries and the individual churches in regard to the whole matter of suspending members.
3. The plan, at present practically inoperative, instituted by the church in setting up presbyterial committees on members changing residence.
4. Failure of the sessions and church leaders in general to solve the problem of establishing the new member in the life of the church.
5. The present failure of the pastoral office to a wide degree as a contributing cause to the whole problem.
6. Apparent laxness of preparation for reception into church membership.
7. Insufficient indication of the exact limits of members in good standing which may be made known to each member upon uniting with the church as the official standard of the denomination.

"Therefore, we the members of..... Presbytery, in session at..... do earnestly concur with the Presbytery of Geneva in praying the One Hundred and Forty Third General Assembly, in session at Pittsburgh, Penn., to instruct the General Council to take immediate steps to, (1) Acquaint the denomination with the seriousness of continued difference to the problem of member suspensions and all that this implies, (2) Appoint a commission to study the whole problem of member suspensions, having the end in view of correcting existing evils insofar as humanly possible, (3) Instruct the commission to make definite report to the Assembly in 1932.

## The "Barnhouse Case"

SINCE the last report in the columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, developments in the Barnhouse Case have been little short of sensational. The Presbytery of Philadelphia held a *pro re nata* meeting on November 24, at which time the only business accomplished was the formal transmission of the case to the Judicial Commission. This meeting was short but volcanic, and ended in adjournment before Presbytery could vote on the matter of allowing Drs. Robert B. Whyte and Edward B. Shaw to be members of the Prosecuting Committee along with Dr. Edward M. Freeman.

The next day Drs. Whyte and Shaw accompanied Dr. Freeman to the meeting place of the Commission. The Commission, having already ruled that Drs. Whyte and Shaw were not members of the Prosecuting Committee, held to the same position, whereupon the gentlemen concerned, together with Dr. Freeman, arose and after a few remarks, withdrew, an act which it was said was viewed as disrespect to the Commission. Another *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery was thereupon called by those opposing Mr. Barnhouse. It was held on December 8th. Described by observers as a "packed meeting," a majority of those present voted to take the case away from the Judicial Commission, an act unparalleled in Presbyterian history, and to refer the matter to the Synod of Pennsylvania. The Moderator, the Rev. James Ramsay Swain, D.D., ruled that while the matter of the purported "reference" was out of order "de jure," that is, according to the law of the church, he would rule it in order "de facto,"—as a matter of fact. He was sustained in this ruling by a narrow majority, and amid great excitement, the vote was carried to refer the Barnhouse Case to the Synod "for hearing and decision." Then a vote was passed to discharge the Judicial Commission with thanks. The Rev. M. T. MacPherson, Minister of Central-North Broad Street Presbyterian Church thereupon served notice of Complaint to Synod. Within the time allowed by the Constitution, he, together with the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, the Rev. W. P. Fulton, D.D., and thirty-six other members of Presbytery present when the decision was taken to "refer" the case to the Synod, filed his Complaint. This document complains to Synod against the obvious illegalities of the meeting on December 8th, and asks that the matter be dealt with according to the law of the Church.

The Complaint, having been signed by more than one-third of those present at the time the action complained of was taken, according to section eighty-seven of the Book of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., automatically stays all action.

The present status of the case is, therefore as follows: The Presbytery of Philadelphia, has purported to have taken the matter out of the hands of its special Commission, an act which those familiar with Presbyterian law are practically unanimous in pronouncing to be beyond the power of the Presbytery, once the case had been given to the Commission. The Presbytery also has purported to have discharged the Commission and to have referred the case to Synod. Since the Complaint complained of all these actions as illegal, and since it is a stay under the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the Barnhouse Case is in exactly the same place as it was before the meeting of December 8th. Even without the staying effect of a complaint signed by the requisite number all illegal actions of a Presbytery are void, but with the added fact of the stay, the Judicial Commission of the Presbytery is still competent to proceed to the speedy hearing and decision of the case in accord with the law of the Church. Whether it will so continue is not known at this writing.

## The Synod of South Dakota and National Missions

THE Synod of South Dakota at its late meeting, in response to a concurrent overture from three of its five presbyteries, adopted changes in the organization for National Missions. In accordance with the principle announced by the General Assembly when ordering Synodical organizations, in the phrase "to which each Presbytery shall be related," the Synod directed that its Committee shall be composed of an equal number of ministers and elders, elected for the purpose by the several presbyteries and certified to the Synod—one minister and one elder from each, except that there shall be one additional member chosen by the Synod, who shall be the chairman. As to the chairmanship it was stipulated that the same individual, or a member of the same presbytery, shall be ineligible at the end of two full terms, until the lapse of one term. The relation of the presbyteries to the organization was further emphasized and clarified in order that they shall exercise their proper authority in the performance by their own action of all presbyterial functions that are related in any manner to National Missions, rather than, permissively, by proxy. On the other hand, provision was made to safeguard presbyterial authority, and thus stimulate the sense of responsibility, a prominent feature of which requires complete information to each presbytery of proposed programs in all the presbyteries, and detailed accounting, at the end of the year, to each, of the work accomplished in all. The Synod also decided after mature deliberation, to dispense with the Synodical Executive office after April 1, 1932, subject to agreement with the Board of National Missions. At the same time it voted without a dissenting voice in favor of presbyterial field men, to be chosen by the presbyteries concerned, with the advice of the Board, and of the Synodical committee, in the matter of salaries. A feature adopted respecting field men provides for temporary interchange, or concentration, when found desirable. Full inauguration of these changes must await the next Synod's choice of a chairman of the committee.

## The Presbyterian Church in Canada

THE Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr. Frank Baird of Pictou, Nova Scotia, has completed an extensive itinerary in the West. He has been most heartily welcomed everywhere and has exerted a wide influence. His messages have brought stimulus and encouragement to those doing the hard work

of the Church. Upon his return to Toronto, he spent one day in conference with the committee appointed to advise the Moderator with respect to his subsequent movements. On the evening of December 18th in the largest Presbyterian Church in Toronto, Riverdale Church, with a seating capacity of over 2000, he addressed a large audience, giving a review of the Church's life and work throughout Canada. He then proceeded to his home in Nova Scotia to spend Christmas and New Year's with his family and congregation. Preceding his western trip he visited a great section of the Church in the Maritime Provinces, including Newfoundland. Thus, in the short period of six months he has visited the Church from its remotest eastern to its furthest western bounds. Some noteworthy receptions were accorded him. In First Presbyterian Church, Regina, the capital of Saskatchewan, a large gathering assembled on a week-night evening, presided over by Hon. Mr. Justice Martin, a member of that congregation and one who did yeoman service during the period of conflict. There were present also the Premier of the Province, Dr. Anderson, and the former Premier, now leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gardiner, both of whom spoke in welcome to the distinguished visitor and in expressing good wishes for the Church. The city was represented by an alderman who spoke in behalf of the Mayor. Dr. Henry Nobles, of the Baptist Church, a staunch friend of First Presbyterian Church, and the Bishop of Qu'Appelle, conveyed greetings. The minister of First Presbyterian Church is Rev. S. Farley. In Victoria, the capital of the most westerly province, British Columbia, another splendid reception was tendered him in St. Andrew's Church, of which Rev. H. P. S. Lutterell is the minister. On behalf of the congregation, Col. Jas. Scroggie, a member of the Session, conveyed greetings. Mr. Thos. Humphries spoke on behalf of the Presbytery. His Honor Lieut.-Governor Bruce, in addressing the Moderator, said that whilst he had the pleasure of welcoming many visitors of distinction to the province none gave him greater pleasure than those who were leaders in the great work of the Church. In the person of Dr. Schofield, the Bishop of British Columbia, of the Anglican Church, Dr. Baird found a former friend with whom he had had association in the Maritime Provinces. Dr. Baird on the Sunday following preached in St. Andrew's, Erskine, and St. Paul's Churches. From Victoria he proceeded to Nanaimo, where he delivered an address in celebration of the Sixty-fourth Anniversary of that congregation.

Progress in the city of Toronto has been marked by the erection of another fine church edifice, Rogers Memorial Church. This is a beautiful Gothic structure, attractive both outside and in and with seating accommodation for 600. The attendance at the Sabbath School is large, being about 550. The completion of this building is a great tribute to the minister, Rev. W. Scott Galbraith, who has not yet completed the first year of his ministry. The cost of the building was $6000.00. The congregation presented the minister with a Geneva gown. This congregation had its beginning not quite twenty years ago in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Finlay, when a Sunday School was organized by Rev. T. H. Rogers, now retired.

Central Presbyterian Church, Brantford, which is not a new building, having been purchased from the Congregationalists in 1927, is a beautiful edifice, having been entirely remodelled and redecorated. The congregation was organized in February 1925, with a handful of members from three minority groups. That small company of members has now grown to 841 and the growth of the Sunday School has been so great that accommodation is quite inadequate, it being necessary to find additional room in the Y. W. C. A., across the street. This church is entirly free of debt and the congregation has regularly met its budget allocation. The minister is Rev. A. T. Barr.

A great occasion, according to the report of the minister of the congregation, Rev. W. L. Newton, was the visit of Dr. A. F. Scott Pearson of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, to the Church of St. John and St. Stephen, Saint John, N. B. The event was the One Hundred and Thirty-first Anniversary of St. Andrew's Society. Among those present were the Premier of the Province, Hon. J. B. M. Baxter, and the Lieut.-Governor, Hon. H. H. Maclean. In addition to preaching twice on Sunday, Dr. Pearson gave an address on the "Causes of Scotland's Greatness" at a banquet on Monday evening; on Tuesday he visited the Presbytery and addressed the Canadian Club on "The Business Man Analyzed." Mr. Newton thus refers to the visit of this distinguished leader:

> Our people were charmed with this delightful personality and we were all amazed by his remarkable versatility, scholarship, humor and the ease with which he meets all types of people.

In the West, in the province of Saskatchewan, two new churches have been opened recently, one at Indian Head and the other at Moosomin. The congregation in the latter place vainly sought to obtain the former Presbyterian Church. The original sum asked for this building was $8000. It was reported that it was offered to another body for $1000. The Presbyterians offered $1100 for it but it was alleged to have been sold to another gentleman for $1200. Br. Baird refers to this case as "a scandal upon religion." Nevertheless the congregation erected its own building.

Another church is in progress of erection at Tillsonburg, Ontario, the cornerstone of which was laid with due ceremony recently. Services were under the direction of the Minister, Rev. Arthur Bruce, while the dedication service was conducted by Rev. Dr. A. L. Howard of Simcoe, Moderator of the Presbytery. The trowel presented to Mr. Agur, who laid the stone, was first presented to the late Mrs. Tillson, who laid the cornerstone of the first Presbyterian Church in Tillsonburg in 1867. This trowel will bear the additional engraving of The Burning Bush, the symbol of the Presbyterian Church, and the date of the latest ceremony. In 1849 Mr. Harvey Tillson presented a site for the first church and thus Presbyterianism began its course there.

## Doctrinal Investigation in the South

IT is reported that the views of the Rev. Chas. E. Diehl, D.D., a Minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and President of Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn., were questioned on December 23rd, by eleven Pastors of Presbyterian Churches in Memphis, in a petition to the Board of Directors of the College. The board, it is said, was asked to investigate "for the good of the college" and not as punishment for Dr. Diehl, his views concerning the "Divine inspiration of the Bible," his supervision of finances and student dances on the campus of the college.

E. B. Lemaster, Chairman of the College Board, is reported to have said that he is "perfectly satisfied with Dr. Diehl" and to have predicted that the board will uphold him, considering his theology to be sound.

## Are All Those Dying in Infancy Saved?—Concl.

the Arminian has no right to believe in the salvation of all dying in infancy; in fact it is not clear that he has any right to believe in the salvation of any dying in infancy. For according to the Arminians, even the evangelical Arminians, God in His grace has merely provided men with an opportunity for salvation. It does not appear, however, how a mere opportunity for salvation can be of any avail for those dying in infancy. It has been well said: "If only a single infant dying in irresponsible infancy be saved, the whole Arminian principle is traversed. If all infants dying such are saved, not only the majority of the saved, but doubtless the majority of the human race hitherto, have entered into life by a non-Arminian pathway."

Lack of space forbids our developing this matter further. Those interested should consult Dr. B. B. Warfield's "Two Studies in the History of Doctrine" (pages 143-239). Dr. Warfield concludes his study of "The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation" by pointing out that the thinking of the Christian world, logically or illogically,

has been more and more coming to the conviction that all those dying in infancy are saved, but adds: "If this answer stand, it must be clearly understood that it can stand on no other theological basis than that of the Reformed Theology. If all infants dying in infancy are saved, it is certain that they are not saved by or through the ordinances of the visible Church; for they have not received them. It is equally certain that they have not been saved through their own improvement of a grace common to all men; for, just because they die in infancy, they are incapable of personal activity. It is equally certain that they are not saved through the granting to them of a bare opportunity of salvation in the next world; for a bare opportunity indubitably falls short of salvation. If all that die in infancy are saved, it can only be through the almighty operation of the Holy Spirit, who works when, and where, and how He pleases, through whose ineffable grace the Father gathers these little ones to the home He had prepared for them. If, then, the salvation of all who die in infancy be held to be a certain or probable fact, this fact will powerfully react on the whole complex of our theological conceptions, and no system of theological thought can live in which it cannot find a natural and logical place. It can find such a place in the Reformed theology. It can find such a place in no other system of theological thought."

In considering the question of infant salvation, it is well to remember that what men have believed, or believe, concerning the fate of those dying in infancy has no bearing on the number of those who actually have been, or will be, saved. We are sure that all Christians would like to believe that all those dying in infancy are saved and sincerely regret the fact, if fact it be, that their conception of the plan of salvation does not allow them to so believe. It seems to us that the fact that such a belief finds a natural and logical place in the Calvinistic conception of the plan of salvation, and in that conception alone is an incidental but potent consideration that indicates that it best expresses the gospel of the grace of God.

## "The Bible in Spain"

THE 29th Assembly of the Spanish Evangelical Church recently passed a resolution expressing its sincere gratitude for the "constant and unselfish work" which the British and Foreign Bible Society has done in Spain. "In our opinion," says the resolution, "the result of the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society during past years can be seen not only in isolated cases and within the modest congregations of the Evangelical Church, but also in the change that is being realized in the spiritual life of Spain far outside the limits of the organized and constituted Churches."

## League of Good-Will

GENERAL HIGGINS, head of the Salvation Army, has created a new organization called, "The League of Good Will." The League purposes to be open for membership to all those that are sympathetic with the work of the Salvation Army in so far as it pertains to relief from suffering and distress. General Higgens expects in this way to extend the usefulness of the Salvation Army in as much as those not members of it and perhaps do not share its beliefs may nevertheless co-operate with it.

## Defections from Rome in Austria

IN a period of eleven years since the war 73,770 adults have transferred their membership from the Church of Rome to the Evangelical Church of Austria and the Protestant Churches of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. Before the war there were 75,222 converts to these and other churches over a period of seventeen years. From these figures it is evident that there is materially increasing movement away from Rome in these countries.

In the territory now called Austria there were 4045 Old Catholics before the war. Since the war this number has increased to 34,049. These figures indicate a still greater deflection from Rome to the Old Catholics than to the Evangelicals. The Old Catholics, it will be remembered, separated from Rome following the Vatican Council of 1870 which announced the dogma of the "Infallibility" of the Pope.

## The Lord's Day in England

THE Council of Christian Ministers on Social Questions has issued a manifesto on the subject of Sunday Observance, signed by sixteen Bishops and other Church dignitaries, together with several Non-conformist leaders. The signatories base their plea for Sunday Observance on "a genuinely Christian alternative" to "the rigour of Sabbatarianism." They go on to declare that "while we abandon the mistaken ground of the claim for Sunday observance based upon the Fourth Commandment, as if that were still binding on Christians in the letter, we none the less press upon the Christian conscience the legitimate claim for its observance," the nature of which claim they proceed to explain. They hold that there is a four-fold obligation as regards Sunday:

1. To participate in public worship and renew the habit of private devotion even at considerable personal cost. The current neglect of this primary spiritual obligation and high privilege must be manifest to everyone.

2. To engage, according to opportunity, in Christian service.

3. To learn or relearn the secret of really recreative rest.

4. To strive by all means to secure that his own or his family's "rest" shall not be secured at the cost of needless work being imposed on others, whether public or private servants.

They point out that "no objection is taken to recreation in the usual sense, if this fourfold obligation is first observed."

Of late there has been considerable agitation both in England and Scotland, regarding an "open Sunday." This manifesto is regarded by many as an effort to lay the basis for a possible compromise.

## A Travelling Theological Seminary

AT a recent meeting of the Council of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, England, it was decided that arrangements should be made for the Summer Vacation Term, 1931, to be spent in Egypt and Palestine, and that the return journey should be by the northern Mediterranean route, including visits to Messina, Smyrna, Constantinople, Athens, and Naples. Wycliffe Hall, which is one of the three Anglican Theological Halls for graduates at Oxford, represents the Evangelical wing of the Church of England. It has visited Palestine twice during the last four years, and has carried out there its usual program of lectures and tutorials. During the last visit, in August of last year, these studies were interrupted by the disturbances in Palestine, and the members of the Hall were enrolled as special constables to help to maintain peace.

## Nobel Peace Prize Awarded to Archbishop Söderblom

THE Nobel Peace prize for 1930 has been awarded by a committee of the Norwegian Parliament to the Rev. Dr. Nathan Soderblom, primate of the Lutheran Church in Sweden, and pro-chancellor of the University of Upsala, who has distinguished himself in the cause of international peace. The award carries with it the sum of $46,000. The Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, former secretary of state of the United States and one of the authors of the Kellogg Peace Pact, received the 1929 Nobel peace prize.

Archbishop Soderblom was born at Helsingfors, Sweden, in 1866 and was educated at the University of Upsala, Sweden. He traveled in many countries, including America, where he studied the Bible under Dwight L. Moody. From 1894 to 1901 he was pastor of the Swedish Lutheran Church in Paris. From 1912 to 1914 he was professor of theology in the University of Leipzig. For a number of years he was professor in his alma mater, the University of Upsala, and became a member of the Swedish Acad-

emy. He is a master of ten languages and it is said that his interests are as broad and varied as his wide knowledge of world affairs.

He was awarded the Nobel peace prize because of his vast work in the churches of Europe and America in the interest of more righteous and peaceable relations among the nations. In 1923 he visited the United States, delivering a series of lectures at leading universities under the auspices of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. At the same time he visited many Lutheran centers in America. In 1926, at Geneva, he warned the League of Nations that the governments represented in the league must be less imperialistic. If the league was to live and be useful, he said, it should strive to promote international friendship and justice.

## Dunfermline

MUCH indignation has been aroused throughout Scotland by what has been called the "audacious action" of a gathering of three thousand Roman Catholics who, on Sunday, November 16th, marched in religious procession through the streets of Dunfermline and congregated in the "Nave" of historic Dunfermline Abbey, where they prayed for the "conversion" of Scotland to Rome. Dunfermline Abbey is considered a great Protestant sanctuary. The "Nave" is the portion in which, after it had survived the first troubled years of the Reformation, Protestant Scotsmen first worshipped God. For over two hundred years it has been regarded as the stronghold of Protestantism. The Nave is now in the hands of the Government, which has been carrying out an extensive scheme of restoration. It is said, however, that no permission was given for this use of the remains of the historic edifice.

At a great public meeting held in Edinburgh early in December, the following resolutions were passed:

"This public meeting of Edinburgh Protestant citizens protests against the audacious action of a large party of Romanists in holding, without permission, a religious service in the Nave of Dunfermline Abbey, which is the property of the nation, on November 16th, and thereby giving offence to the religious to the sensibilities of faithful adherents of the Protestant Reformed faith.

"And, further, while recognising the evident endeavour of H. M. Board of Works in their subsequent decision, to treat all parties on equal terms in future, this meeting desires most respectfully to remind the Board that this is a constitutionally Protestant nation, and that therefore the just rights of loyal Protestants should not be made to suffer unnecessary restrictions because of the improper conduct of the adherents of an alien faith, and that a copy of the resolution be sent to His Majesty's First Commissioner of Works, and to the Secretary of State for Scotland."

## Gains and Losses in the Church of England

ACCORDING to the "Official Year Book of the Church of England," just issued by the Church Assembly, there are 34,000 fewer communicants in that Church than there were a year ago. The number of Sunday School scholars has decreased by the number of 22,000. Confirmations have declined by 9,000. The number of ordination, however, and Bible Classes shows a slight increase. While the Church of England does not depend entirely upon voluntary contributions, offerings are large in amount. The total is 9,873,164 (approximately $47,983,577) consisting of 4,120,078 (approximately $20,013,589) for General Purposes, and 5,753,086 (approximately $26,809,998) for Parochial Purposes. Commenting upon these figures, the *English Churchman*, a Protestant Family Journal circulating in the Anglican body, remarks: "The total gives cause for thankfulness when regarded by itself, but when it is compared with the enormous sums annually spent on luxuries it suffers badly by the comparison. We do not know the total value of the tobacco consumed in the British Isles in one year, but the customs receipts on tobacco and snuff alone amounted last year to £62,909,202. It is a fact which demands the prayerful attention of Christian people, that such a large proportion of their Lord's money is spent on their own selfish gratification and such a very small proportion is given in support of the work of Him Who gave us His all. It is required of a steward that a man be found faithful, and we are all stewards of the money which God sees fit to entrust to us. What will the account of the stewardship be when it is demanded from us?"

## Westminster Seminary Notes

### By the President of the Board of Trustees

WESTMINSTER Seminary has been blessed by the prayers and unfaltering interest of a growing company of orthodox Presbyterians. During the past month this has been especially noticeable. The Board of Trustees begs to acknowledge herewith the generosity of hundreds of contributors to the Seminary's funds. Most of them are unknown friends, and in many cases they are living in remote places. They are trusting to the integrity and faithfulness of a group of men, known to them only by reputation, to economically and wisely expend their gifts. Every official in the Seminary is aware of this trust. To fulfill its obligations to the utmost is their steadfast purpose, their constant prayer, and their principal satisfaction in the administration of Westminster Theological Seminary.

A news bulletin containing pictures of the enlarged library, the students in all the classes, and the dormitory accommodations, will soon be published. Copies will be mailed to every sustainer of Westminster whose name is on record. Inquirers will be sent copies upon request to the office, 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia. Pioneer scenes will be valuable in the coming years.

Special lecturers in the department of Pastoral Theology in January and February are Dr. Samuel G. Craig, Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, who will give a course in Church Government; and Dr. A. L. Lathem, Minister of the Third Presbyterian Church of Chester, Pa., who will explain methods of Bible instruction to children as they have been used with remarkable success under his direction. Neighboring ministers with large churches and wide experience in preaching have been assisting in the department of Homiletics by hearing and criticising student sermons. The first term has been divided among Dr. Aquilla Webb of the First and Central Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, Delaware, Dr. Charles Schall of the First Church of Wayne, Pennsylvania and the Rev. W. Edward Jordan of the Calvin Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. Dr. Robert R. Littell of the Tioga Church in Philadelphia will continue this fine service in the second term.

The Seminary Faculty has elected Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., now its senior member, as its Chairman in succession to the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Dr. Machen is as well known in Europe as in America, and his books are generally held as an authoritative expression of that portion of the Protestant Church which adheres to the sturdy Calvinism that made the various Presbyterian communions honored and powerful throughout the world. Westminster's faculty is made up of young men. Dr. Machen is forty-nine years old. The average age of his colleagues cannot be more than thirty-five. Many years of vigorous life awaits this brilliant group of scholars, and by God's grace and the prayers and help of God's people, they will tell for the glory of Christ, and the proclaiming of the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

The Commencement speaker at the exercises in May will be the Rev. Stewart P. MacLennan, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Hollywood, California. Dr. MacLennan and his congregation are whole-heartedly behind Westminster Seminary. Mr. Joseph P. Holbrook, a son of one of the elders in the Hollywood church, is a member of the Junior Class. Further announcement of the Commencement program will be made at a later date.

FRANK H. STEVENSON.

BENJ. F. EMERY CO., PHILA.