# 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-APRIL, 1931 — Vol. 1 — No. 12

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# The Revolt Against Christian Moral Standards

PRESENT-DAY repudiation of Christianity is not confined to a rejection of its creed. It includes a rejection of its ethics, of the mode of behaviour it commends. That was not the case fifty years ago. Our fathers, not to mention our grandfathers, did not have to defend their ethical conceptions. Practically everybody admitted their superiority. In those days, even those who rejected the doctrines of Christianity vied with those who accepted them in extolling the superiority of its ethics. The oft-quoted words of JOHN STUART MILL (written in 1873) express what was then, and for a considerable number of years thereafter, the prevailing view even among those most pronounced in their rejection of the supernaturalism of the Christian creed:

> "The most valuable part of the effect on character which Christianity has produced by holding up in a divine person a standard of excellence and a model of imitation is available even to the absolute unbeliever, and can never more be lost to humanity. . . Whatever else may be taken from us by rational criticism, CHRIST is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than all His followers, even those who had the direct benefit of His personal preaching. . .Religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man as the ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor even yet would it be easy, even for the unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than to so live that CHRIST would approve our life."

It is quite otherwise now, however. Today there is no part of Christianity more openly assailed or more expressly repudiated than its ethics. In apparently ever-widening circles the Christian type of man is no longer regarded as the highest type of man. NIETZSCHE was the first outstanding person to openly attack the Christian ideal of conduct. Moreover he counted it as one of his chief claims to greatness that he had "unmasked Christian morality," which he declared to be "the most malignant form of all falsehood, the actual CIRCE of humanity, that which has corrupted mankind." H. G. WELLS, BERNARD SHAW, BERTRAND RUSSELL, BENJAMIN B. LINDSEY, WALTER LIPPMANN—not to mention others, including even preachers and theological professors—may as a rule express themselves more mildly but it must be obvious to all informed persons that they repudiate Christianity as a way of life as truly as they repudiate it as a system of thought and belief. The decade that has passed since FIGGIS wrote the following words has but served to add to their significance:

> "On all hands we hear preached a revival of Paganism. Christianity as an ethical ideal is contemned. Formerly Christians were charged with hypocrisy because they fell short of their ideal. The charge was false, although the fact was true. We do fail, fail miserably, to come up to our ideal, and always shall, so long as it remains an ideal. Nowadays the Christian is attacked not because he fails, but in as far as he succeeds. Our LORD Himself is scorned, not because He is not the revealer of love, but because He is. Hardly a single specifically Christian value is left as it was."

How shall we explain this change of attitude towards the Christian ideal of character and conduct? What lies at the root of the fact that the present-day attacks on Christianity are aimed at the morals it inculcates as well as the doc-

## IN THIS ISSUE:


Labels for Presbyterians ..... 4
W. V. Watson
Noble Loneliness—Micaiah ..... 5
R. Saillens
Church Union and Doctrinal Purity .... 6
Wm. Carter
Religious Conditions in New Zealand ..... 7
A. A. Murray
Notes on Biblical Exposition ..... 8
J. G. Machen
Books of Religious Significance ..... 10
Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice ..... 11
Current Views and Voices ..... 13
Letters to the Editor ..... 15
Ministerial Changes ..... 16
News of the Church ..... 19
Index to Vol. I ..... 24

trines it proclaims? No doubt a number of considerations must be taken into account to obtain anything like a complete explanation, but we are confident that L. S. THORNTON stressed that which is most central when he wrote:

> "The repudiation of Christian moral standards is a direct and entirely natural result of the earlier rejection of Christian dogma. No doubt far-seeing theologians foresaw all along that this would be the case; but (at first) those who repudiated the Christian creed did not themselves see it. It is indeed safe to say that they had no suspicion of it. There are still, perhaps, a few pedants who declare that the essence of Christianity is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount, and that one can be a good Christian by practising the imitation of CHRIST, without taking any notice of the traditional dogma. Such people are living in a fool's paradise; for all around them at this moment are living proofs of the fallacy of their opinions. If there is one thing that can be said with absolute certainty about the whole movement with which we are dealing, it is that the revolt against the Christian ethic is due to a previous repudiation of the doctrines upon which it is founded. The two things, belief and conduct, are indissolubly bound together; they are parts of one whole, as the roots and the fruit are both alike parts of one tree, organically connected."

Much as we may deplore it, there is no occasion for being surprised over the fact than an outstanding characteristic of "modern" thought is its repudiation of the ethics of Christianity. That is only what was to be expected as a consequence of its previous repudiation of the doctrines of Christianity. It is true that men of the last generation like J. S. MILL, THOMAS HUXLEY and MATTHEW ARNOLD did not regard themselves as enemies of Christian morals because they rejected the supernaturalism of the Christian creed. But that was only because they did not think themselves through, because they attempted the impossible task of remaining up a tree after they had sawed off the limb upon which they had been sitting. NIETZSCHE reasoned more soundly. He perceived that the Christian ethic was organically connected with the Christian creed; and that having rejected the creed there was no halting place short of a rejection also of the ethic. Hence he waged war not only against the Christian creed but against its ideal of life and conduct. In our judgment, the logic is all on the side of NIETZSCHE. Doubtless there will continue to be those like GEORGE ELIOT who commended the Christian ideal of life though she wholly rejected the supernaturalism of its creed; but we may be sure that the number of such will become fewer and fewer. We anticipate no general return to the halfway position of so many of the generation immediately preceding us. Rather we expect that it will become more and more true that those who reject the creed of Christianity will also reject its standards of moral conduct.

Neither the reasonableness nor the practicability of the mode of life that Christianity commends can be vindicated apart from that measure of supernaturalism that it confesses. Whether we direct our attention to the beginning, the course, or the goal of Christianity as a way of life, we come face to face with the supernatural. The Christian life originates in regeneration by the Holy Spirit. When CHRIST said, "Ye must be born again," He enunciated a truth as fundamental to Christianity as a way of life as it is to Christianity as a system of thought. Or do we consider the course of the Christian life, the path along which the Christian walks? Then, we discover that the directions for that life (its principles and precepts) are of supernatural origin, that the main motives and incentives advanced to lead men to live a Christian life are drawn from the supernatural, and even that the power, that enables men to live Christian lives comes from a supernatural source. Apart from the supernatural it may be possible to show that the Christian ideal of conduct is superior to all known ideals, and that this would be a much more desirable world in which to live if it was more generally embraced and practiced; but it is not possible to show that it is reasonable and practicable simply because it requires the supernatural to make it operative. It is because, and only because, we can do all things through Him that strengtheneth us that it is possible to translate the Christian ideal into terms of life and character. Or do we consider the goal of the Christian life? Then, we find that while it is a mistake to suppose that the Christian way of life is exclusively, or even predominantly, a world-shunning and contemplative life, yet that its center of gravity is in another world. The supernatural alone provides its proper setting. If this life is all, or even if the Christian life does not culminate in an immortality of blessedness with GOD, it is idle to attempt to vindicate its reasonableness. PAUL said not without warrant: "If in this life only we have hope in CHRIST, we are of all men most miserable."

If we are right—as we are confident that we are—that the wide-spread repudiation of Christian moral standards, evidence of which abounds on every side, is rooted in a previous repudiation of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity (doctrines which are but interpretations of great supernatural facts), it is obvious that the only way in which Christian moral standards can be restored to honor and acceptance by those who have repudiated them is to persuade them that the doctrines of Christianity are true. If that is not capable of being done, it is futile to suppose that the civilization of the future will be dominated by Christian ideals of character and conduct. We believe that it can be done, and hence that one of the crying needs of the hour is an apologetic that will make clear that the Christian view of things is the only valid view. In the meanwhile, let no one suppose that our zeal for doctrines is a zeal for a sterile intellectualism. Far from it. We can be intelligently indifferent to Christian doctrines only as we are indifferent to Christian standards of conduct. All around us, for those who have eyes to see, there exists living proof of the fact that those who attack the doctrines of Christianity are at the same time attacking its ethics. Nothing is more certain than that in the long run Christian doctrines and Christian morality stand or fall together. We might as well expect a house to stand after its foundation has been undermined or a tree to continue to bear fruit after its roots have been cut as expect men to try to act like Christians when they do not think like Christians. The cry, "Christianity is life not doctrine" is folly and unbelief. In the interest of the Christian life itself the doctrines must be maintained and propagated.

## What and Where is Christ Today?

SOME nineteen hundred years have come and gone since the resurrection and ascension of our LORD. Where is He today? What is He like today?

In answer to the question, What is CHRIST today? instructed Christians reply that in all essentials He is just what He was nineteen hundred years go. In the Gospels we learn not only of what He once was but of what He now is. It is this that divides between the Gospels and all other biographies. Other biographies tell us of what men once were but not of what they are like today. Of CHRIST alone can it be truly said that He is "the same yesterday, today and forever." What CHRIST was, that He continueth to be. Through every change and chance of time His character, thoughts, feelings, sympathies, powers, activities remain essentially the same. Let us never forget the answer which the Shorter Catechism gives to the question, "Who *is* the redeemer of GOD'S elect?" to wit: "The only redeemer of GOD'S elect is the LORD JESUS CHRIST, who, being the eternal Son of GOD, became man, and so was, and *continueth to be* GOD and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, for ever."

Christian faith, however, not only asks, What is CHRIST? it also asks, Where is CHRIST? Obviously, we cannot say that where CHRIST was nineteen hundred years ago, there He is today. In that case we would but need to travel to Palestine to find Him. The resurrection was followed by the ascension. Where did CHRIST go when He ascended? The most compendious statement which the New Testament affords as to His present whereabouts is that He is at the right hand of GOD. The exact meaning of this phrase in as far as it indicates His whereabouts, not merely the dignity and honor that is now His, is not easy to determine. It is the truth but not the whole truth to say that GOD being an omnipresent Spirit this phrase implies the omnipresence of CHRIST. We must not forget that He ascended with His human body, and that it belongs to the very idea of body, even a glorified body, that it occupies a definite point in space. The thought of the ubiquity of CHRIST'S body seems to us an impossible conception and yet the notion in whose interest this thought has been advanced, however we may explain it, is profoundly true and one that is repeatedly taught in the New Testament and constantly confirmed by the experiences of GOD'S people, viz., the continued presence of CHRIST with His people. When CHRIST ascended—an event that is not to be interpreted astronomically—He did not forsake the earth and migrate to a distant heaven. He ceased to manifest Himself as He had done during the forty days, but He continued His presence; neither has He withdrawn it at any time during the centuries that have succeeded. To PAUL alone, as far as we know, has He manifested Himself since that event; and yet CHRIST is still in the midst of His people, and still as really as in Apostolic days does the great promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," find confirmation in the experience of the redeemed.

The very nerve of the Christian religion, the secret of its continuance in this evil world of ours, lies not only in the fact that CHRIST today is essentially what He was in the days of His flesh but equally in the fact that He is constantly accessible to His people—one to whom they can pray, one from whom they can derive strength and comfort, one in whom they can ground their confidence whether for this life or the life to come. What and where is CHRIST as far as we are concerned? "Is CHRIST for us an attractive and impressive figure who lived in Palestine two thousand years ago, and left an ideal of religious and moral conduct, which we intend, if possible, to follow? Or is He an abiding Presence in our hearts and wills, moulding our purposes and controlling our impulses? Is He a mere example or an inspiring influence? Is He for us a dead man, or the living GOD?"

## In Retrospect and Prospect

THIS is the twelfth issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. A year has elapsed since this "venture of faith" was launched in the belief that it would meet an imperative need in the life of the Church. Events, thus far, have justified the faith of its founders. Numerous letters from all parts of the United States and from many foreign lands testify to the large place the paper already occupies in the lives and hopes of GOD'S people. We approach our second year in the confidence that in an increasing measure the great Head of the Church will be pleased to use it for the maintenance and furtherance of His cause.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY is operated by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company—a company incorporated under the laws of Pennsylvania under conditions that preclude its owners from receiving any financial profit therefrom. The price of the paper was fixed at $1.00 per year to put it within reach of all. This was done, moreover, in the knowledge that such a price would cover but a portion of the cost of operation until the paper had a larger subscription list than it could hope to have during its first two or three years; and so with the knowledge that during its early years it would, in all likelihood, be dependent for its continuance on the special contributions of those who share its aims and purposes. CHRISTIANITY TODAY closes its first year without financial indebtedness. Some of those who have contributed most generously to its support, however, have been so affected by the business depression that they will not be able to repeat their gifts. This means that we must look to others to do what these are unable to do. We are going forward in the confidence that the needed support will not be lacking. Fuller information will gladly be given any who may be thinking of including the paper in their benevolence budget.

We solicit the aid and cooperation of our subscribers in extending the influence of the paper. Such success as we have had is largely due to what the rank and file of our subscribers have done for us; and only as this service is continued can we hope for any large measure of success. This is particularly true in view of the fact that we are not in a position to employ subscription agents. The situation being what it is the future of the paper depends even more on what the rank and file of our subscribers do than upon the special gifts of a relatively few individuals, indispensable as these latter are. It will save us much labor and expense if those whose subscriptions expire with this issue will renew without waiting for a special notice through the mails. Along with your renewal please send us the names of those you think would be interested in CHRISTIANITY TODAY or still better of those you have induced to subscribe. Sample copies and subscription blanks will be furnished on request.

*(Continued on page 22)*

# Labels for Presbyterians

By
The Rev. Walter Vail Watson, Th.M.

*"People who go around analyzing*
*Are indeed very tanalyzing."*
*—Ogden Nash.*

HOW many kinds of Presbyterians are there, anyway? What good will it do to find out? Who cares, pray? Well, some of us do because we think that, while analyzing may be "indeed very tanalyzing," it will help us to get to the bottom of our denominational problems just at this time.

Many an attempt has been made to classify the religious animal. One man has divided Christians into "Presbyterians," "Methodists," "Episcopalians," "Catholics"; respectively the *intellectuals*, the emotionalists, the liturgists, the conformists—all found in every local church. He was serious, and has the reputation of possessing sound common sense; inasmuch as he is now a prominent professor in a Presbyterian Seminary!

Some psychologists have also divided us into three large groups,—with sub-compartments. You, for instance, may be the "mental-motive-vital" type because you have a big head (in the physical sense of the word), like to study, care less for exercise than study, and are still less of a he-man! Or if you are the pure "mental" you are like "poor little Paul," going to take Sanskrit next fall,—ostensibly because you like it.

In the hope that some will die laughing I shall venture a grouping of my fellow-Presbyterians surely no more facetious than those referred to. If it were not for the Fundamentalist-Modernist imbroglio—still with us, by the way!—you would be spared this rhetorical effusion. When "all is very peaceful and happy in the main" we don't need to bother with pigeonholing ourselves. You see, they are still saying that we all are one or other of these.

One of the most delightful eventualities of the present religious struggle has been the impulsion to thought or to action. Some have done the one, some the other; some both. It is very interesting to note that we have in this action of people a natural classification of each other, and the beauty of it is that we classify ourselves.

The basis of our self-grouping is seen to be our most evident religious traits. In two of these groups our philosophical and theological thinking dominates us on the one hand; on the other our social outlook dominates three groups. In fact a great deal of lost motion has been incurred within the church lately just because so many of us have not realized that our loyalties are not always theological, but social. We Fundamentalists have made the mistake of supposing that if we simply and directly stated the issues of the present crisis the multitudes would flock to our side. The issues have been drawn as clearly as possible; the multitude has not flocked. Neither has it flocked to anyone else, but continues apathetic. If skeptical, note the down curve in church attendance, in budget giving. Read and weep! Maybe it is just as well that the great mass of people have so far continued indifferent to us. It just gives the group with the will to sacrifice the opportunity to lead.

We present the thesis that there are, have always been, and always will be in our denomination—or in any other group of Protestants—at least five well-defined groups which have to be reckoned with in any successful forward movement in the religious life.

We have first of all two groups: the Fundamentalists and the Modernists, the conservatives and liberals. It is of interest to note that these designations are as unfortunate as they are misleading. What we really mean when we say liberal or Modernist is *rationalist*. It rejoiced the heart of many and discomfited the heart of not a few when last spring at the Northern Baptist Convention in Cleveland Dr. Curtis Lee Laws courteously and capably put this group in its place. He called these gentlemen what they are: rationalists. Not all the Modernists are rationalists; they are just professing rationalists like many Christians are merely professing Christians. Many of us who rejoice in the spirit of liberality in the real sense of the word, and seek to practise it, are in no sense rationalists. But every rationalist is outstandingly a rationalist. The rationalist in the religious sphere is a man whose ultimate basis of judgment on matters of faith and practise is his pure reason. He invariably rejects the miraculous because it is unreasonable. The deity of our Lord Jesus, in the strict sense we have always meant the designation, is unreasonable. His physical resurrection is rejected because it is unreasonable. The Bible can not be the Word of God because it is reasonable to suppose it merely the word and work of men. In like manner all the essential doctrines of Presbyterianism go by the board as a matter of course. The rationalist neither believes in nor has experienced what we call the New Birth. He is the natural man—who uses his brains!—of I Cor. 2:14. To some extent he is in the leadership of the Presbyterian Church, his position often of great influence.

Many of us who are classed as Fundamentalists deplore the looseness of the classification. The designation covers a multitude of us sinners. The real Fundamentalists are better denominated *supernaturalists*. They are those—predominantly thinkers like the rationalists—who, in building a life philosophy, realize the need of more than the reason in determining it. Of necessity they accept the fact of a divine revelation because life is utterly devoid of meaning without it. They accept the Bible uniquely as the Word of God because they know that its truth completes that truth at which they can arrive by process of reason. A great multitude of Fundamentalists belong to a later grouping. You may guess which it is when it is mentioned. The real Fundamentalists are the supernaturalists, and we may be reasonably sure that they are of a number in the Presbyterian Church today which is indeterminate and much to be reckoned with.

Out of these groups come many of the zealots for the cause of reform. Without the aid of other church groups they are powerless on the floors of our councils. Too often they eat their hearts out as they see valuable time lost and their fellows selling their birthright for a mess of pottage. Both rationalists and supernaturalists suffer equally here; with the important exception that, wittingly or unwittingly, the dominant leadership of the Church has been training with the rationalistic group of late years. To the rationalist with his hope for "humanizing" the Church today has come but scant satisfaction, because the great number so far who have followed him have not followed him all the way.

The great number of our membership form their religious convictions on a social rather than a philosophical basis. There seem to be three well-defined groups here, for which no names as yet can be entirely satisfactory. A hazard might denominate these: 1. the *individualists*, 2. the *institutionalists*, 3. the *conformists*. By this time it is evident that no one can be absolutely classified in this fashion. Every person differs from every other, but every person wittingly or unwittingly falls into his group because of some evident and prominent religious motive.

The individualists in some cases go about impressing people with their differing views. These love to take the opposite side in any question of doctrine or policy. In such a controversy as the fight between rationalism and supernaturalism through which we are passing they will be found in both camps. If the presbytery is advocating some form of church union these brethren will be against it on general principles. Often they go about smashing our favorite idols or injecting unsettling questions about our creed, and they are a chief cause of discomfort in the Church. We all know and shun them if possible.

Another group of individualists is composed of those persons who play up their own importance. They are found leading many of the so-called Fundamentalist groups, with-

in our denomination and especially outside any of the regular denominations. Their movements always center about themselves. Another group of self-important individuals are often found shepherding flocks who ought to have known better than to hire them. They advertise their speeches in large type, and use spotlights and any quantity of other theatrical effects, to center attention upon themselves in what they have to say. They have found that up to a certain point the public eats this up. It is too bad that they must be even noted in passing. They helped Lewis write *Elmer Gantry*.

The institutionalists are our friends who run things in the Church and whose aid at present must be had if a project is to be put through, no matter what the project may be. They are for the most part good people, well-meaning in the extreme, but evidently no lovers of logic or doctrine! They will be found most heartily singing, "Zion founded on the mountains, God thy Maker loves thee well," at the General Assembly. To such the perpetuation of the Presbyterian Church is a tremendously necessary thing. They "view with alarm" anyone who dares criticise the existing order, the Boards or the machinery of the Church. The spread of the "Kingdom" is the big thing, and by the spread of the Kingdom seems to be meant the growth in effectiveness and size of the denomination. No wonder that they are all for church union, for a whopping big church, efficiency, zoning plans, and what have you? They feel that the mission of the Church is being fulfilled when we make a big "impact" upon the social order. If the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. survives the present strain unchanged she will have her politicians to thank for the deed!

And last, but not least in any sense of the word, come the people. Poor people, will they always continue to come last? Here are the conservatives, if you please, and any pastor of ten years experience knows it! These are the good Protestant people who support the Presbyterian Church, or any other church. The church primarily is to them a spiritual haven. The loyalties of these people are almost entirely dependent upon environment, upon personal like and dislike. These are our conformists. This is the great group of following church members who look up to whoever is in the chair, be it in the pulpit, the presbytery, the synod, or the Assembly. Like Ruth they say, "Whither thou goest I will go . . . thy people shall be my people, and thy god my god." It doesn't make any difference who this leader is; if he be confident, incessant, impressive they are his; they will go where he wants them to go, say what he wants them to say, be what he wants them to be. Some of us have the temerity to believe that this great group can be awakened to learn its power, and to stand for something in its own right. Some of us hope that in time this last class may be the smallest class numerically. It will probably be generations before the conformists cease to be an overwhelming majority.

I am interested in such an analysis because of what it indicates to church leadership. Tremendous power is seen to be vested in the hands of a very few. And tremendous responsibility. It is appalling to think that the Presbyterian Church may be led into any one of three directions, depending entirely upon which group has the vision, courage and consecration to lead it: 1. We are headed toward a banal ecclesiasticism, if indeed we are not there already. We are likely to perish of dry rot which all the church union in the world cannot prevent and must only hasten. 2. We are headed for the awful abyss of social and religious chaos toward which humanism is driving so many men today if we go over to the control of the rationalists. 3. Or we are headed for another Day of Pentecost, if we have the sense to hear the Lord in His Word saying to us: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."

# Noble Loneliness—Micaiah

**Pastor R. Saillens**

**English Translation by the Rev. Paul Woolley**

The author of this paper is well-known not only in France, but throughout the countries where the evangelical faith is known, as the director of the Institut Biblique at Nogent-sur-Marne, near Paris. This Bible Institute has been for years a lighthouse of truth and its students have made their impress not only upon France and Switzerland, but also in more distant mission fields.

Pastor Saillens is a leader of the Union des Chretiens Evangeliques, a member of the directing committee of that organization, and a frequent speaker at its annual conferences, the latest of which was held in the month of March at Mas d'Azil in the Pyrenees.

Pastor Saillens visited this country some years ago and spoke in a number of cities. England has also been blessed by his ministry.

FOUR hundred there were, all "prophets of the Lord"—not of Baal, nor of Astarte, for these had been wiped out by order of Elijah at the brook Kishon. These four hundred were without doubt some of the "sons of the prophets" who are mentioned so frequently in the history of Israel, especially at this period—students of those schools established at Bethel, at Jerusalem and at other places, theological schools where the Mosaic doctrine and precepts were probably mixed with the worship of the golden calf instituted by Jeroboam, a worship which doubtless had kept its roots alive in this "stiff-necked" people ever since the coming up out of Egypt. Oh, the system of compromise in matters of faith does not date from yesterday!

These prophets had been called together by Ahab's order and at the request of his ally Jehoshaphat. Strange alliance! Jehoshaphat was a sincere worshipper of the true God, but he had committed a grave mistake. He had given as wife to his son Jehoram, who should succeed him, a daughter of Ahab. He did not suspect, the over-confident Jehoshaphat, that this woman, Athaliah, who was the daughter of the execrable Jezebel, would almost extinguish his line, the line of David, and that she would set up the worship of Baal at the very heart of Jerusalem! The intentions of Jehoshaphat were good without a doubt. He fondly imagined himself to be working for the reuniting of the two nations which until the death of Solomon had been but one. Did not these two peoples together still constitute the people of God? And would it not be a pious work to unite them again? Was it not worth the trouble, to attain this grand result, to show oneself tolerant even in matters which involved infractions of the Divine law? Such was probably the line of reasoning of Jehoshaphat which explains his willingness to conclude the military alliance with Ahab against Assyria. Fleshly wisdom, contrary to the Divine commands which forbade alliances of this nature.

So here are the two kings speaking the same tongue, descendants of the same great ancestor, Abraham, but as different the one from the other from the religious standpoint as it is possible to be—here they are thrown side by side in the presence of their troops and the four hundred pretending "prophets of the Lord."

The four hundred are agreed. More complete unanimity has never been seen. Not a single dissonant voice in this numerous and noisy council. One of them, armed with iron horns, parades before the two kings and addresses Ahab: "Thus saith the Lord, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until thou have consumed them." The unhappy prophet! He dares to attribute to the Lord words dictated by his court position. It is true that three years before, the king of Israel had vanquished the king of Assyria. If Ahab alone had been able to accomplish a striking victory over Benhadad, why should it be doubted that Judah and Israel together under the leadership of their two kings would this time crush the same adversary? The false prophet believed that he could speak with assurance.

Jehoshaphat and the four hundred prophets with him forgot that the Lord does not work according to the foresight of

men; they did not know that His patience toward Ahab was at an end that the sentence pronounced by Elijah was about to be accomplished: the blood of righteous Naboth was about to be avenged. Ahab would die.

These prophets did not know that. Neither their leader with the horns of iron, nor they themselves, nor, alas, Jehoshaphat had inquired of God concerning His will, and not being in touch with the Lord they had been given over to a lying spirit.

Jehoshaphat, desirous as he was to avoid displeasing his deplorable ally, was nevertheless not without disquietude. This unanimity, this stage-play, this self-sufficiency, inspired within him a lack of confidence. It was not thus that the true men of God spoke and acted! "Is there not here," he asked of Ahab, "a prophet of the Lord besides, that we may enquire of him?"

Jehoshaphat without doubt had heard of Elijah, perhaps also of Elisha. Where were they hiding, why were they not here? Scripture tells us nothing on this subject, but we may suppose that the great prophet and his servant had been forced by the persecution of Jezebel and her cowardly husband to hide in the desert or in the caves of Mount Carmel. Oh, yes, it will be easy to have a united church when the opposition has had its mouth closed by persecution open and secret. But what a church indeed, and what a union!

There remained, however, one man of the stamp of Elijah; this man was Micaiah. Ahab did not disguise the aversion which this prophet inspired in him, but he could not prevent Jehoshaphat from listening. They sent to look for him. Where? Perhaps in prison. In any case, if it was not thither that they went to seek him, thither it is that he will be conducted as soon as the audience is over.

A eunuch or chamberlain is sent to look for Micaiah, and having found him, he addresses him thus: "Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king *with one mouth:* let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them," which means: "Do not be fool enough to draw apart;—follow the current, howl with the wolves, cry with the pack. Your protestations will prevent nothing. You would but expose yourself to useless sufferings and perhaps to death. Are you more pious than the king of Judah, Jehoshaphat, who is also in agreement, even he, with all of us?"

These are indeed the counsels of a courtier.

But the reply of Micaiah is so magnificent, so heroic, so truly inspired that it consoles us for all this foolish cowardice: "As the Lord Liveth, What the Lord Saith Unto Me, That Will I Speak."

Here, indeed, is the motto of the true prophet in every country, in every age! Politics, human subtility, the art of accommodation have no place in the sacred domain of the conscience and of the faith. All honor to thee, Micaiah, standing firm alone in the midst of this tumult—alone, but with God! Thy words will not convert anyone; Ahab will crown his cowardice by disguising himself for the battle, impressed doubtless by thy predictions though he avow it not. But he will not prevent the sentence pronounced upon him by Elijah after the assassination of Naboth from being accomplished today: "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." Jehoshaphat will not break the guilty alliance, none of the false prophets will range themselves on thy side, Micaiah; thou wilt go to prison, perhaps thou wilt die there. But at least thy words will remain in the sacred book until the end of the ages; they will be there to proclaim to all—to those of the New Covenant as to those of the Old,—that God never leaves Himself without witnesses and that in the bosom of the Israel according to the flesh there is always a faithful minority, the spiritual Israel!

And we Christians, disciples of the One who above all has stood alone, we, especially, to whom God has given the duty of seeking the lost, of bringing them to Jesus Christ and *of teaching them all that He has commanded,* shall we not take as a motto the words of Micaiah, "What the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak"? And the word of the Lord for us is the word of Christ, indeed, it is Christ Himself, the Truth infallible, absolute, definite, without variation or shadow of change. Shall we permit this divine authority to be questioned in our presence, in assemblies called Christian, without the revolt and protestation of all that is within us? Shall the fear which an Ahab inspires in us, *or even the respect and the affection which we have for a Jehoshaphat,*—shall they be able to close our mouths? "Love is strong as death." For the love of Christ and His Church we shall not be silent; no majority, even though it be "crushing," will stop our protest.

*Give us the grace, O God, to be members of the faithful minority, without hatred and without fear, without shame and without pride.*

# Church Union—and Doctrinal Purity

## By the Rev. Wm. Carter, D.D.

THE earnest desire of evangelical Christians that the Church of Christ may be one is the reflex of the prayer of our Saviour on the night of His betrayal. The damage of divisiveness is fully apparent to the reflective; competition where should be cooperation, friction where should be fellowship, regions over-churched or under-churched.

There were centuries when the Western Church was one. Variation from the creed of that Church was branded as heresy, and was punished by imprisonment and death. Thus criticism of the Church was sternly repressed, and errors crept in to be continued. The rise of the Reformation became possible only because the prophets of reform were protected by the civil power.

The reformers appealed from the paramount Pope to the infallible Word of God. Some supreme authority is essential to stability. Failing of such authority, man is left to the imaginations of his own heart, and the Church is adrift without an anchor. Protestantism accepted the Bible as the paramount authority; and, as a consequence, we have agreement on all except two doctrines, that of Baptism and that of the Divine Decree, belief in neither being essential to salvation.

It might seem that union should be easily and safely effected, in view of such agreement. Indeed such might be the case, were it not that there have crept into the ranks of our ministry not a few who regard fundamental doctrines of the Church with indifference or even with disbelief; and a large contingent of our clergy regard the entrance of such persons into the ministerial ranks as quite permissible. This is an unfortunate lack of discernment, which presents a menance to the doctrinal purity of the Church. There is a well-known economic law that a debased currency tends to drive out of circulation the full-weight coins. That a similar ecclesiastical law exists, has been evidenced in New England Congregationalism, in which the upspringing of a Unitarian element in the ministry drove out the evangelicals, so that the Unitarians obtained possession of the property of the Church.

The peril to the Presbyterian Church in the proposed plan of union does not seem to be generally recognized. It is stated that the plan of union to be laid before the coming General Assembly demands no more of the candidates for ordination to the ministry than that they be required to "believe and acknowledge the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith professed by the United Church and contained in its standards."

Now it is beyond dispute that for some years the Presbyterian Church in the

U. S. A. has not been able to establish as fundamental certain outstanding doctrines of our Confession. The General Assembly has affirmed and reaffirmed that five specified doctrines are essential to ordination. In relation to the Virgin Birth this was further emphasized by the decision of the Permanent Judicial Commission in 1925. But in regard to the other four points no positive decision can be quoted; and the right of the General Assembly to pronounce on the doctrines has been challenged in the so-called Auburn Affirmation.

Manifestly, in order to avoid misunderstandings and even suspicion of breaches of faith, it is of the highest importance to determine the question of what are the essential or fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith professed by the United Church and contained in its standards.

There are Ministers of the Presbyterian Church, who hold that the doctrine of the resurrection of our Lord's crucified body is not an essential doctrine of the Church. Some do not believe in the resurrection of "the body in which He suffered," to use the language of our Confession; and some speak of a spiritual resurrection. The spirit of our Lord, according to the Scriptures, was committed into the possession of the Father, and was not interred with His body. The claim of a spiritual resurrection is therefore manifestly unscriptural. However, this fact does not establish the doctrine as one of the fundamental doctrines of our Church.

Such being the existing facts connected with the matter of the deliverances of the Assembly and the determination of what are the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, is it not of prime importance that a clear and authoritative statement should be contained in the compact by which the organizations are merged? The claims of the Auburn Affirmation have not been rebuked by the Assembly, and the questions there raised, may be regarded by the uniting denominations as established in favor of the Auburn contentions. Should that be the case, decisions based on the five points as essential doctrines might be denounced as breaches of faith; and endless controversy and even disruption would be likely to follow.

The serious nature of such an unstable condition in matters of doctrine is not easily estimated. To a large part of our ministry every one of the five points and many other doctrines are precious. It is more than probable that a large majority in the Church is loyal to our Confession. Unless the doorway to the ministry is well guarded, the conservative portion of the Church may be conscientiously constrained to withdraw from the United Church, to safeguard their children from erroneous teaching, which would be a lamentable outcome of hasty and ill-guarded consolidation.

The wisdom which operates beforehand is the true wisdom. Francis Bacon wrote: "When Time is not called in as a counselor neither does it ratify the decision." We have the memory of a union in Scotland which gave birth to bitter controversy and long and expensive law-suits. We have the recent history of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Such warnings should make us cautious in our advance toward consolidations. Consulting with Time, consulting with Prudence, may save untold distress, unnecessary conflict, wide-spread scandal, deplorable loss in missionary and church work, grief to the Holy Spirit, wandering of the little ones who might have been rescued, had the Church conducted its advances with wisdom and consideration of the great issues at stake. May the great Head of the Church lead our beloved Communion in self-restraint and vision and deliberation, to the glory of His Holy Name.

# Religious Conditions in New Zealand

## By the Rev. Alexander A. Murray

As one born in New Zealand and having spent twenty-three years of my life in the ministry, and of that thirteen in the Presbyterian Church in Auckland, the chief city of the Dominion, I am in a position to state with some degree of accuracy the trend of things in the churches today compared with thirty years ago.

We owe America a great debt of gratitude. Thirty years ago one of your stalwarts, Dr. R. A. Torrey, accompanied by Charles Alexander, visited us for the purpose of conducting a Dominion-wide gospel campaign. For many months prior to their arrival ministers of almost every denomination backed by their congregations made preparation for a great spiritual quickening and reviving. Prayer meetings were held in churches and in private homes all over the land. Never before had there been such preparation. Everybody expected God to visit us and He did. The Missioners arrived in Dunedin the Scottish city and were accorded a hearty and enthusiastic welcome. The largest hall available was packed to the doors. Ministers of every persuasion were on the platform and in harmony with the movement.

Dr. Torrey exceeded all expectations and Charles Alexander by his geniality, sincerity and simplicity won the hearts of all. Conversions could be counted by fifties and hundreds. Young people's services were held and vast numbers professed faith in Christ. Afternoon Bible readings were as well attended as the evening meetings. It was a moving sight to see any afternoon over a thousand people assembled in the largest Presbyterian church to hear Dr. Torrey's addresses on the Holy Spirit.

A leading Jew is reported to have said that if Dr. Torrey could be prevailed upon to remain in the Dominion twelve months the effect of his work would sweep the drink traffic from the land. There was much truth in this. One reason it is so difficult to effect moral reforms today is because the pulpits have gone down doctrinally. The denial of the authority of Scripture is the cutting of the tap root of all moral reform. But to continue, interest in spiritual things was so great that on the train route from city to city hundreds of people gathered at the stations to see and hear the Missioners. As soon as the train stopped Dr. Torrey would alight and mounting a small platform address the crowd. The newspapers were liberal in their space and devoted columns to reports of the campaign. There was opposition but it came mostly from the man on the street. Thousands in New Zealand date their conversion to the Torrey-Alexander Mission.

About ten years later we were favoured with a visit from Dr. Wilbur Chapman and Chas. Alexander. They had a wonderful time, especially in Australia. In New Zealand the co-operation was not so hearty as when Dr. Torrey was with us. This falling off in interest was not due to want of scholarship or ability on the part of Dr. Chapman, but on account of the growth of Modernism.

Eight years ago another of your stalwarts in the person of Dr. French E. Oliver came to our land at the invitation of The United Evangelical Church, a church largely Presbyterian in doctrine and polity. Dr. Oliver's ministry was scholarly, masterly and convincing but he received no co-operation from other denominations. It has now come to this that any preacher who takes a decided stand against evolution and Modernism will not be invited to New Zealand by any Ministerial Association. The Presbyterian Church has its own Evangelist but only the smaller churches avail themselves of his services. Aggressive evangelism is on the wane and it is entirely due to Modernism. The younger ministers are to a very large degree modernistic. Modernism is given to the people in Homeopathic doses. It is given so skilfully that the unwary are

*(Continued on page 17)*

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

## IV. THE FREEDOM OF THE CHRISTIAN MAN

*"Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins, in order that He might deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of Him who is God and our Father, to whom be the glory for ever and ever, Amen.*

*"I marvel that you are so soon turning, from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to another gospel, which is not another—only, there are some who are disturbing you and wishing to subvert the gospel of Christ." (Gal. 1:3-7, in a literal translation.)*

### Grace and Peace

IN the last three numbers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we have discussed two of the three parts into which the opening of this Epistle is divided: we have discussed the nominative part, which indicates the person or persons from whom the Epistle comes; and we have discussed the dative part, which indicates the persons to whom the Epistle is addressed.

The remaining part is the greeting. It begins with the words: "Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." So far there is nothing peculiar about it at all. Exactly these same words occur in the greetings in Romans, I and II Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, II Thessalonians; and very similar words occur in all the other Epistles of Paul.

In this Pauline greeting, "grace" designates the undeserved favor of God, and "peace" the profound well-being of the soul which is the result of it.

### "God Our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"

This grace and this peace come not only from "God our Father" but also from "the Lord Jesus Christ;" these two divine Persons are placed in the closest possible conjunction. Thus the greeting involves the most stupendous ascription of deity to our Lord. Yet that ascription of deity appears not at all as something new, but altogether as a matter of course. So deeply rooted in the life of the apostolic Church is the belief in the deity of Christ that it has determined the very form with which practically every one of the Pauline Epistles begins. Neither Paul nor his readers detected anything strange in this amazing separation of Jesus Christ from all created beings and this amazing inclusion of Him with God the Father as the source of all grace and all peace.*

So much appears in almost every one of the Epistles of Paul. The greeting is the most constant part among the three parts into which the openings of the Epistles are divided. But here in Galatians this constant formula of greeting has joined with it an addition which is entirely unique. "Grace be to you and peace," says Paul to the Galatians, "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"—so much appears in the other Epistles—but then he adds here alone, "who gave Himself for our sins in order that He might deliver us from the present evil age according to the will of Him who is God and our Father, to whom be the glory for ever and ever, Amen."

What is the reason for this addition just here, this addition which is entirely without parallel in the other Epistles? The answer is perfectly clear. Paul is adding these words in reply to the propaganda of the Judaizing teachers who were making the cross of Christ of none effect. "Christ died to set you free," says Paul in substance; "yet now you are returning into bondage; by your effort to earn a part of your salvation by your own good works you are returning into that very bondage from which you were released at such enormous cost; you are trying to undo the effects of Christ's unspeakable gift." That is the central thought of the Epistle to the Galatians. It is set forth in epitome in this remarkable addition which the Apostle makes to the regular form of greeting that appears in the other Epistles.

### "Who Gave Himself for Our Sins"

"The Lord Jesus Christ," says Paul, "who gave Himself for our sins." When Paul says "gave Himself," he is referring very specifically not to the incarnation, but to the cross; not to the life of Christ, but to His death. Certainly the incarnation and the life of Christ on earth were necessary to the saving work of Christ; without them the redemption which He accomplished on Calvary would have been impossible. But here it is unquestionably the death that Paul has in mind. There might conceivably be a doubt about that if this language appeared in some other writer, but in Pauline usage the matter is not open to doubt.

The word "for" in the English translation of the phrase "for our sins" represents either of two Greek prepositions, of which some manuscripts have one and some the other.

One of these two prepositions, *peri*, means simply "concerning" or "in the matter of." If that preposition was what Paul wrote, then the phrase simply indicates that Christ's death was connected in some way with our sins, without any indication of what the connection was. Of course, the connection is made perfectly plain by other passages in Paul; the Apostle clearly believed that when Christ died on the cross He died in our stead, bearing the just punishment of our sins. That wonderful thought was always in the background of his mind when he spoke of the connection between our sins and Christ's death. But it is not designated specifically by the preposition *peri*.

The other preposition, *hyper*, means "in behalf of," "for the benefit of;" it has the idea not merely of a connection between what precedes it and what follows after it, but of an active interest of the former in the latter. But how can Paul possibly have said that Christ died "for the benefit of" *sins?* The thought seems at first sight to be blasphemous.

In reply, it may be said, in the first place, that Paul does say just that in I Cor. 15:3. Whichever reading is correct at Gal. 1:4, the preposition *hyper* is certainly used in the clause, "Christ died for (*hyper*) our sins," in the precious summary that Paul gives in I Cor. 15:3 ff. of the tradition of the early Jerusalem Church. It is important, therefore, to determine what the preposition means in this connection. What does Paul mean when he says that Christ died "in behalf of our sins?"

The answer can be made clear by the example of a modern English colloquial usage. We sometimes say to a sick person, "How is your cold this morning?"; and he sometimes replies: "It is very much better; I took some medicine for it last night, and the medicine helped it very much." Now that sick person does not mean, strictly speaking, that he took the medicine *for* ("for the benefit of") the cold, or that the medicine *helped* the cold, or that the cold is now *better*. On the contrary, he means that he took the medicine *against* the cold and that the cold was *hindered* by the medicine and that the cold is *less flourishing* than it was before. Yet the colloquial usage in question is very common and very natural. When we say that a cold is better, we really mean that the person is better because the cold is not so flourishing as it was before; and when we say that we give a sick person some medicine for his cold, we really mean that we

* See the fine article by B. B. Warfield, "God Our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," now published in the second volume, *Biblical Doctrines*, in his selected works, pp. 213-231.

give the medicine for him and against his cold.

So here, when it is said that Christ died for the benefit of our sins—supposing that to be the correct reading—that really means that Christ died for the benefit of us, laden with our sins as we were; or, in other words, that He died for the benefit of us and for the destruction, or counteraction in some way, of our sins.

The manuscript evidence is rather evenly divided in Gal. 1:4 between *peri*, "concerning" or "in the matter of," and *hyper*, "for the sake of" or "for the benefit of." But fortunately it does not make very much difference which of these two readings is correct: for if *peri* (the more general word) is the correct reading here, we have the more precise word used in exactly the same connection in I Cor. 15:3; and in any case the phrase is of course to be understood in the light of the full, rich teaching of Paul in other passages as to the meaning of Christ's death.

### The Two Ages

Christ "gave Himself for our sins," Paul says, "in order that He might deliver us from the present evil age." "The present age" is clearly to be regarded as contrasted with a future age. In Eph. 1:21, in the phrase "not only in this age but also in that which is to come," the contrast becomes explicit; and it is implied in all the passages in Paul's Epistles where "the present age," or "this age," is mentioned. By "the present age" Paul means the whole period from the fall of man to the second coming of Christ; by "the age which is to come" he means the glorious time which is to be ushered in by this latter event.

This doctrine of the two ages was not originated by the Apostle Paul, but had a considerable history before his time. It appears with the utmost clearness, for example, in the teaching of Jesus, as when He speaks of the sin that shall be forgiven "neither in this age nor in that which is to come" (Matt. 12:32). But Jesus does not speak of it as though it were a new thing. On the contrary, He seems to assume that it is already well known to his hearers.

It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that the doctrine of the two ages was a well-known Jewish doctrine at the time of our Lord and of His apostles. Ultimately the doctrine had an Old Testament basis in such passages as the prophecy in Isaiah 65: 17-25 regarding the new heavens and the new earth. The later Jews were quite in accordance with Old Testament teaching when they looked forward to a new and glorious age which was to take the place of the present age of misery and sin.

Thus far we have found nothing peculiar in the teaching of the New Testament and of the Apostle Paul upon this subject. In holding that the age in which we are living is to be followed by a glorious age which is to be ushered in by an act of God, Paul is teaching what his Jewish contemporaries already taught.

### Already Free

But at this point an important difference enters in. The difference is that according to the Jews a man must be either in one age or in the other, whereas according to Paul (and really also according to Jesus) a man, through Christ, can already, here and now, be free from the present age and a citizen of the future kingdom. In one sense we look to the future for our salvation, but in another sense we have it here and now. Outwardly we are still in the present evil age, but inwardly we are already free from its bondage.

This double aspect of salvation—in one sense, future; in another sense, present—runs all through apostolic teaching, and is quite basic in true Christian life of all ages. Here in Galatians it is especially the present aspect of salvation that is in view. "You have already been made free from the present evil age," Paul says to the Galatians; "what folly then it is to return into bondage! Christ died to set you free; will you then do despite to His love by becoming again slaves?"

### Bondage Versus Freedom

Certainly a man is a slave if, as the Judaizers desired, he seeks to earn even a part of his salvation by his obedience to God's law, if he seeks to enter into an account with God. We are already hopelessly in debt; we are under the awful curse which the law pronounces against sin. If we try to pay the debt by our own miserable works, the debt is not really paid but is heaped up yet more and more. There is one way of escape and one way only. It is open because Christ has paid the debt and set us free.

Have the men of our time really known that freedom? Will they ever really be able to atone for sin by "making Christ Master" in their lives, by trying, unredeemed and unregenerate, to live as Christ once lived? The whole Word of God answers, "No." Freedom is found only when a man, like Christian in Bunyan's allegory, comes to a place somewhat ascending where he sees a cross and the figure of Him that did hang thereon, and where, at that sight, the burden of sin, which none in the village of Morality could remove, falls of itself from the back. That is a freedom that is freedom indeed. Right with God, fear removed, the slate wiped clean, all lightness and joy!

It is a freedom, first of all, from sin—freedom from its guilt and freedom from its power. But the freedom from sin brings also a freedom from this whole evil world. What cares the true Christian what the world may do; what cares he what ill fortune, as the world looks upon it, may bring? These things hold the unredeemed in bondage, but over the redeemed man they have no power.

### The Meaning of Freedom

The Christian does indeed live still in this world. It is a travesty on this Pauline doctrine when it is held to mean that when he escapes, inwardly, from the present evil world by the redeeming work of Christ the Christian can calmly leave the world to its fate. On the contrary, Christian men, even after they have been redeemed, are left in this world, and in this world they have an important duty to perform.

In the first place, they do not stand alone, but are united in the great brotherhood of the Christian Church. Into that brotherhood it is their duty to invite other men by the preaching of the gospel; and they should pray that that preaching, through the supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit in the new birth, may be efficacious, and that the great brotherhood may expand yet more and more.

In the second place, Christians should by no means adopt a negative attitude toward art, government, science, literature, and the other achievements of mankind, but should consecrate these things to the service of God. The separateness of the Christian from the world is not to be manifested, as so many seem to think that it should be manifested, by the presentation to God of only an impoverished man; but it is to be manifested by the presentation to God of all man's God-given powers developed to the full. That is the higher Christian humanism, a humanism based not upon human pride but upon the solid foundation of the grace of God.

But these considerations do not make any less radical the step of which Paul speaks. It remains true that the Christian has escaped from this present age—from this present world with all its sin and all its pride. The Christian continues to live in the world, but he lives in it as its master and not as its slave. He can move the world because at last he has a place to stand.

### The Author of Freedom

This freedom which Paul attributes to the Christian is not a freedom that the Christian has arrogated to himself; it is not a freedom that has been attained by rebellion against God's holy law. So the Judaizers represented it, but in representing it so they were wrong. "No," says Paul; "we are not free by rebellion against God, but by His own gracious will. Christ gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from the present evil age *according to the will of Him who is God and our Father;* and to Him, our supreme Liberator, we can ascribe all the glory and all the praise." So the address of this Epistle ends with a triumphant doxology: "To whom be the glory for ever and ever, Amen."

It is a wonderful passage—this "address" or opening of the Epistle to the Galatians. In it is contained a summary of the whole rich content of the glorious Epistle that

*(Continued on page 18)*

# Books of Religious Significance

*THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. A Handbook of Christian Ethics. By Joseph Stump, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., President of Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary. New York, The Macmillian Company, 1930. $2.50.*

BY presenting Christianity as an ideal way of life and Jesus as the most perfect man while neglecting to show the supernatural foundation of these facts Modernism gains many an easy convert. The "natural man" does not object to having a beautiful ideal of life placed before him any more than he objects to visiting an art gallery. As long as you recognize his as essentially sound in heart and mind you may say anything to the "natural man." As soon, however, as you place the cross of Christ with its implication of man's complete corruption in heart and mind before the eyes of men they will turn away in disgust. Modernism's popularity is due to the fact that it is based upon the evolution hypothesis which holds to man's essential and inherent goodness. Thus the "offence of the cross" is removed and anybody whether truly regenerated or not can call himself a Christian. It follows that the term "Christian" has thus lost or changed its meaning. Modernism loves to speak of regeneration, but by regeneration it does no longer signify the implanting of new life into the heart of the sinner by the Holy Spirit but a new resolve on the part of man to live better. And thus one might mention other terms to show that Modernism continues to use all the old terms so dear to the heart of Christians but changes their meaning completely. Now add to this the fact that most churches have sadly neglected the thorough catechetical instruction of its young people and it is no marvel that Modernism makes so many converts. When people have lost their power of discrimination between the true and false the mere use of the old terms will make a modernist preacher acceptable to an orthodox congregation.

For these reasons we are happy to welcome the book of President Stump. He does not hesitate to make it plain that a truly Christian life must spring from a regenerated heart in the old sense of the term. There is no true purity of motive unless man truly loves God and man cannot truly love God unless he be regenerated. Accordingly we are not to think of the Christian life and of the Christian virtues as a superstructure based upon the foundation laid by the Greeks. This is the way Modernism construes the matter. We are to realize however with respect to paganism that, "While in form this teaching approaches that of Christianity, in content it is different" (P. 21). The conclusion is inevitable that the "Christian life" of the Modernist only outwardly resembles the "Christian life" of the Christian while in content the two are radically different.

In consonance with the author's insistence upon the need of regeneration is his discussion of man's original state. He has not been frightened by the scarecrow of evolution. He does not menially apologize for believing that, "The original state of man was one of harmony and fellowship with God; but through sin it was replaced with one of enmity and alienation from God by wicked works (Col. 1:21)." (P. 41.) We rejoice in this bold uncompromising stand. That man lived originally in a state of perfection has not been and cannot be disproved by evolution and the various sciences based upon it. That man was created perfect is a doctrine which stands or falls with theism and Christianity. On the other hand Christianity and theism stand or fall with the doctrine of man's original goodness. If God is God he created a world that was "good."

In the second place our author makes clear that the standard by which we are to measure the Christian life is the will of God as expressed in the Scripture. Also on this point President Stump has taken sides against the Modernist. The Modernist's standard of life is his own feeling of right and wrong. Newman Smyth, for instance, in his book on "Christian Ethics," attempts to place the Bible and the "Christian Consciousness" on the same level but does not succeed in doing so. The Christian consciousness always has the determining vote. The Russellite tells us that because "you would not send a dog to hell," the Scripture teaching of eternal punishment must be wrong. All this teaching of Modernism is based once more upon the assumed truth of the evolution hypothesis which says that all law, human and divine, has somehow evolved from sheer emptiness. Laws are, upon this basis, useful expedients for a complicated society and it was a happy idea of our pious forefathers to call those laws divine in order to gain more respect for them. Even now Modernism speaks of the "sacredness" of law though it believes in no God that could make law sacred. Do we wonder at the amount of disrespect for law in our day even among church people? We ought to marvel that there is not more disrespect for law since Modernism has robbed law of its genuine "sacredness."

We do not agree with the author's Arminianism. His free will doctrine we believe to be inconsistent with his emphasis upon the need of regeneration. Moreover Arminianism affords a back-door entrance to Modernism in as much as it gives man an independence of God that is flatly contradictory to the doctrine of creation. Still further we are convinced that Reformed Ethics are more fortunate than Lutheran ethics in as much as with the Reformed doctrine of common grace we can appreciate as good for this life the deeds of men that are not regenerate without saying that they are qualitatively the same as the deeds of regenerate men. We have no desire to cover up these differences. But this enables us the better to appreciate the value of books on the Christian life such as we have before us. As orthodox believers we stand side by side against a common foe.

C. VAN TIL.

*THE MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE by Sir James Jeans. The Macmillan Company. pp. 160. $2.25.*

THIS much discussed book will appeal to the more scholarly of our readers who are interested in the latest teachings in the sphere of physical science (especially astronomy) in their bearing on our outlook on the universe as a whole and our estimate of the significance of human life. In the first four chapters its distinguished author treats of some of the more striking modern developments in the sphere of physical science. In the fifth and final chapter he indicates his view of the bearing of these developments on the philosophy of the universe.

The most outstanding characteristic of these developments seems to be their rejection of the mechanistic theory of the universe and their advocacy of a "principle of indeterminicy" that allows some play for free will in the production of events. Sir James Jeans advocates a "mathematical" rather than a "mechanical" theory of the universe, but whether there is any fundamental difference between his view and the view he sets aside is not altogether clear. He invokes the theory of probability but apparently only when the knowledge of the conditions involved is not sufficient to allow of a mechanical explanation. Be this as it may, it does not seem to us that there is anything in his theory of the universe to bring much comfort to the evangelical Christian. No doubt the Christian has cause to rejoice at the blows that are being dealt to the mechanistic theory of the universe, but to supplant it by a theory into which what is distinctive of Christianity will fit as little as in a mechanistic theory does not help matters much. At the same time it is well to know that Sir James Jeans says that "the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds."

One can hardly read this book without being struck with the highly speculative character of much that goes under the name of physical science. In fact if our solar system is relatively so insignificant—the

total number of stars, we are told, is probably something like the total number of grains of sand on all the sea-shores of the world—and if our only source of knowledge of the universe is human observation and reasoning, the likelihood of our arriving at sound conclusions as to its nature and purpose would seem to be exceedingly small. Suppose we had a magnifying glass sufficiently powerful to apprise us of the fact that a race of human beings had their home on a grain of sand. What would be the likelihood of their arriving, by the use of such minds as we possess, at sound conclusions as to the nature of our solar system? Small wonder that Sir James Jeans says that it is generally recognized that "science is not yet in touch with ultimate reality" (p. 135). The facts being what they are it seems to us that all statements about the origin and purpose and destiny of the universe and of the human race are valueless unless we have a source of knowledge other than human observation and reasoning. This means that here too we are dependent on revelation for any assured knowledge (other than details) on such matters. One is also impressed with the credulity of many scientists. Apparently they are willing to believe anything rather than believe that this universe owes its existence to the creative activity of God. Sir James Jeans quotes with apparent approval the statement that "six monkeys, set to strum unintelligently on typewriters for millions of millions of years, would be bound in time to write all the books in the British Museum." And yet he would probably judge it incredible that God should raise the dead!

In reading this book we should not fail to remind ourselves that the voice of Science is not to be identified with the voice of any particular scientist. At the most a particular scientist expresses only half-truths. Hence the folly of supposing Christianity false because it does not agree with the utterance of any scientist or even group of scientists. Christianity has a definite content of its own, obtained independently of science and independently evidenced as true, and when scientists speak not half-truths but whole-truths we are confident that it will be obvious to all that there is no conflict between Science and Christianity. S. G. C.

*THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF CALVINISM. By H. Henry. Meeter, Th.D. Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company. Pp. 116. $1.00.*

THIS book is small in compass but rich in content. Its author is Professor of Calvinism (a unique professorship as far as we know) at Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich., an institution of the Christian Reformed Church of America. It contains an amplification of a lecture delivered before the combined Faculties of Calvin College and Seminary and has been published in the hope that "Ministers, teachers, and intelligent laymen may find in it an aid to a better understanding and appreciation of Calvinism."

It would be difficult to conceive a book better adapted to further the purpose in view. It is admirably fitted not only to remove misunderstandings—of which there are many—but to apprise the reader of just what Calvinism is in the estimation of its leading exponents. In this respect it ranks with Dr. B. B. Warfield's article on Calvinism in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, and, withal, is better fitted to meet the needs of the general reader.

Dr. Meeter employs the term, as is customary with Calvinists, in its broad sense as indicative not of an ecclesiastical group but of a world- and life-view. This means that he thinks of Calvinism as "a logical system, an organic whole, and not a mere aggregate of opinions" moreover that "the system is not a narrowly religious one, having soteriological significance only, but one which relates to the whole of life in all its departments, political, social, educational and scientific, no less than the religious or soteriological sphere." The thing Dr. Meeter is particularily concerned to do is to point out the fundamental or ur-principle of Calvinism. This he finds not in predestination (as so many erroneously think), or in the "glory of God," or in the "absolute causality of God," but in the "absolute sovereignty of God in the natural and moral spheres." "This basic thought of the sovereignty of God is the formative principle of the system. It is the germinal idea, the seed-thought of Calvinism. The system was not first in order, with the fundamental idea its logical conclusion. Just the reverse! The formative principle gave rise to the system. As Herman Bavinck states it: 'From this root principle everything that is specifically Reformed may be derived and explained.'"

In conclusion Dr. Meeter contends that "this fundamental principle of Calvinism, the sovereignty of God, may never be, and by true Calvinists never was, construed as a mere abstract dogma, but as a living, vital principle aglow with life. Calvinism always was something more than the mere intellectual adherence to dogmas which so many of its foes and would-be friends would have us believe. Not the sovereignty of God as a speculative thought, but the sovereignty of God as a conviction that controlled every nerve and fibre of his being, was the fundamental principle of the Calvinist and the mainspring of his action."

While Calvinism is represented as a world- and life-view by Dr. Meeter, and not merely as a theological system, yet this does not of course mean that he minimizes its religious significance. Rather it means that he stresses its religious significance. "The Calvinist is the man," he writes, "who has caught a vision of God in His majesty, one who sees the controlling and guiding hand of God everywhere, who firmly believes that nothing can so much as move without His will, that 'in Him we live and move and have our being.'" Calvinism in the sphere of religion he regards as the precise antithesis of Modernism. "Calvinism is pure supernaturalism and pure evangelicalism in the sphere of religion," he writes, and so "the very antithesis of modernism which in its consistent form is pure naturalism and autosoteric."

This book must be read to be adequately appreciated. We heartily commend it to the attention of our readers. Whether they be Calvinists of non-Calvinists they will agree, we believe, with Dr. Leander S. Keyser (a Lutheran) that "Dr. Meeter has given us a very capable, and, withal, a kindly presentation of the claims of the Calvinistic system." S. G. C.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Our Lord's Return

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In reading* CHRISTIANITY TODAY *I find references to the "A-millennial" view of our Lord's return. It is a term with which I am unfamiliar and which I have not run across elsewhere. Just what do you mean by the term? Wherein does the A-millennial view differ from the Pre-millennial and the Post-millennial views? I was of the opinion that one had to be either a Pre-millennialist or a Post-Millennialist. . . .*

*Sincerely yours,*
*H. M. G.*

IN our judgment no conception of the future has the right to call itself Christian that does not attach epochal significance to the return of our Lord. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the Christian must choose between what is known as the Pre-millennial view and the Post millennial view, true as it is that much of the literature on the subject is fitted to convey that impression. As a matter of fact there is a third view, viz., the A-millennial that has been widely held and that is widely held today. The late Dr. B. B. Warfield (a Post-millennialist), whose knowledge of the history of Christian doctrine was perhaps unsurpassed, once told the writer that this view has the best right to be called the historic Protestant view. It is the view held by that erudite student of eschatology, Dr. Geerhardus Vos, as may be learned from his volume "The Pauline Eschatology" and

from his article "Eschatology of the New Testament" in the "International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia." It has been ably set forth in a more popular way by Dr. William Masselink in the book entitled "Why Thousand Years? or Will the Second Coming be Pre-millennial?" We mention these things merely to indicate that the A-millennial view is not a new or strange doctrine (as some seem to think) but rather one of the three generic views of the Second Coming held by intelligent Christians.

As the name implies, the A-millennial view rejects the thought of a millennium either preceding or following the return of our Lord (its advocates hold that Revelation 20:6, rightly interpreted, does not teach the idea of an earthly millennium). Rejecting the thought of a millennium preceding our Lord's return it holds with the Pre-millennialists that His return may be imminent; but because it equally rejects the thought of a millennium following our Lord's return it agrees with the Post-millennialists that His return will be immediately followed by the general resurrection and the general judgment and so with the final consummation. According to the A-millennial view the future course of events is indicated, broadly speaking, in the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13:24-30 and 36-43). It is held that the good and the evil will grow together until the end. It is obvious that this view occupies a mid-position between the pre-millennial and the post-millennial views. Its advocates, of course, claim that it embraces the truth taught by both the others. Our object is to define not to defend this view. CHRISTIANITY TODAY looks upon the differences between the three views mentioned as a difference between brethren. Its editors have their own convictions in regard to them but editorially the paper seeks to take a neutral position.

## Was Herod Descended From Judah?

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Would you please tell me how Herod the King was connected with Judah? Genesis 49:10.*

*Sincerely,*

*A. A. P.*

THIS question is evidently predicated on the assumption that Genesis 49:10 has not been fulfilled unless Herod who was King of Judea when Jesus was born was a descendant of Judah. In our judgment that assumption is a mistaken one. Certainly there would seem to be no warrant for supposing that Herod was even of Jewish descent. Both his father and his mother belonged to the Idumaean race—such at least seems to be the consensus of opinion among scholars of all shades of belief. Just what the right interpretation of Genesis 49:10 is, however, is by no means clear. Few passages in Scripture have been more in dispute as to their meaning than the familiar one which reads: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." There are three main interpretations: (1) Shiloh is taken as the name of a person and designates the Messiah; (2) Shiloh is taken as the name of a place and made to read "until he come to Shiloh" instead of "until Shiloh come" and its initial fulfillment found in Joshua 18:1; (3) Shiloh is taken as a compound word that means "whose it is" and the phrase is translated somewhat after the meaning of the phrase in Ezekial 21:27, "until he comes whose right it is"—a meaning of the word with a messianic reference that is very old, having been entertained by the translators of some of the ancient versions including the Septuagint.

Our questioner has evidently adopted the first interpretation and is concerned about the ancestry of Herod because he thinks that it is not a true prophecy unless descendants of Judah reigned until the coming of Christ. That interpretation, as we have indicated, is not a necessary one, but even if it be the right one we hardly think it right to say that it proved a false prophecy unless Herod was a descendant of Judah. Marcus Dods is not always a safe guide but he not only accepts this interpretation along with many more orthodox scholars, but writes wisely concerning it: "It was not accomplished in the letter, any more than the promise to David was; the tribe of Judah cannot in any intelligible sense be said to have had rulers of her own up to the coming of Christ, or for some centuries previous to that date. For those who would quickly judge God and His promise by what they could see in their own day, there was enough to provoke them to challenge God for forgetting His promise. But in due time *the* King of men, He to whom all nations have gathered, did spring from this tribe; and need it be said that the very fact of His appearance proved that the supremacy had not departed from Judah? This prediction, then, partook of the character of very many of the Old Testament prophecies; there was sufficient fulfillment in the letter to seal, as it were, the promise, and give men a token that it was being accomplished, and yet so mysterious a falling short, as to cause men to look beyond the literal fulfillment, on which alone their hopes had at first rested, to some far higher and more perfect spiritual fulfillment."

But whether or not Dr. Dods was commenting on the true interpretation of this passage, the general thought to which he gives expression should not be forgotten when we are considering prophecies still unfulfilled as well as when considering those already fulfilled. It is misleading to define prophecy as history written beforehand. In history we have a right to expect details but in prophecy we have the right to expect only large outlooks and these only as they minister to right living. Prophecy does indeed impart information concerning the future but in it the imparting of information is subordinate to ethical impression. If we keep this in mind not only will we not be surprised, for instance, that so little detail has been revealed concerning the return of our Lord, we will realize that it ever becomes us to approach the study of this subject not so much as those who desire to satisfy their intellectual curiosity as those who desire to know their duty, the sort of lives they ought to live, in view of the fact that at some unknown time in the future JESUS CHRIST is to return to raise the dead, to sit in judgment, and solemnly to conclude the history of humanity.

## The Last Verses of Mark

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*A number of times during college days I have met the contention that the last twelve verses of the 16th chapter of the Gospel according to Mark are not an integral part of the gospel. Aside from the note given by Dr. Scofield, and the fact that most manuscripts, except the two oldest, contain the verses, I have been at a loss to add further evidence. I would appreciate any substantiation you may give to show why these verses have been incorporated in the Word.*

*Sincerely,*

*M. D. L., Jr.*

THERE seems to be a general agreement among scholars that these verses are spurious. It is true that some learned men have defended their genuineness (Dean Burgon and Abbe Martin) but both the external and the internal evidence seem to indicate that these verses were not a part of Mark's original gospel. Dr. B. B. Warfield has stated the evidence for their spuriousness in "An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," pp. 199 ff. as has F. J. A. Hort in "The New Testament in the Original Greek," Introduction, Appendix pp. 28 ff. As our questioner indicates these verses are lacking in the oldest manuscripts. Who wrote them or how they came to be incorporated in Mark's gospel, however, are questions that await a satisfactory answer. It is often supposed that the last page of the original manuscript was lost and that these verses were written to take its place, but no convincing evidence has apparently been offered in behalf of this or any other of the explanations that have been offered. Verses 17 and 18 are often cited by faith healers, "Christian Scientists" and such like. It is well for us to know, therefore, that these verses are spurious. "These signs" we read, "shall accompany them that believe." The gifts there mentioned are promised to all believers, not merely to eminent saints. It would go hard with us if the genuiness of our faith were dependent upon our ability to speak with new tongues, to drink poison without hurt, and to heal the sick with a touch.

# Current Views and Voices

## When the Preacher is Hated

*From "The Banner," Grand Rapids, Mich.*

THE preacher of the gospel brings an unwelcome message. "Gospel" means good tidings, but the fact that it is a message of joy does not imply that it awakens a joyful response in the hearts of all who hear it. The old Greek sculptor who covered the face of Truth with a veil, intimating that no one cares to look into her face, had a much deeper insight into human nature than the superficial modern who thinks that man naturally gropes for the truth.

The gospel is unpopular not merely because it proclaims truths about God and man which are humiliating to the sinner's self-conceit, but especially because it condemns the kind of a life he is leading: a life of self-will, self-indulgence and disobedience to the law of God. The *doctrine* of the gospel but especially its practical *precepts* are distasteful and odious to him. It would be more correct to use Paul's terminology and include under "sound doctrine" the ethical as well as the dogmatic aspect of the gospel. This doctrine or teaching includes our beliefs, our convictions, as they pertain to conduct as well as those which touch our intellectual convictions. Everywhere in the New Testament do we find that emphasis on the practical aspect of belief. Sometimes doctrine and precepts are practically identified. Not only does Paul speak of the sound doctrine as being "according to godliness," but those moral precepts which are based on the Law are sometimes spoken of as "doctrine." Jesus rebukes the Pharisees for teaching as their *doctrines* the *precepts* of men. Elsewhere He represents the unregenerate as hating the light (the truth) because by coming to the light their evil works are reproved. They hate the gospel because it condemns their ungodly and immoral way of living And Paul predicts that in the last days men shall heap up "teachers after their own lusts"—which means that their lusts or evil desires determine the kind of teaching to which they are willing to listen, the plain inference being that it is the kind of teaching which condones their sinful mode of living.

Men would not hate the gospel so vehemently as they do if it were merely a system of abstract teachings or metaphysical speculations. Experience proves that a onesided presentation of the gospel, whether as mere doctrine or as an emotional evangelistic appeal, does not bring to light that secret animosity against the truth of God which is present in every unenlightened soul. In either case the arrow fails to find the sore spot in the sinner's life. But let the preacher present the claims of Christ in their fullness, let him present the precepts of Christ, let him proclaim the full Christian life as pictured in the Scriptures—and the pent-up floods of prejudice and hatred will break forth at once.

The preacher who dares to rebuke the members of his church for their worldly pleasures or for their unscrupulous methods in financial matters must reckon on opposition. Human beings, even if they are Christians, are more sensitive in their pocketbooks and in their favorite diversions than in anything else. It is no wonder that the American pulpit has been as good as silenced on the moral side of amusements and that in spite of all our emphasis today on "the social gospel" little is said about the proper acquisition and employment of wealth. If Jesus were on earth today among this money-loving and pleasure-mad generation, He would undoubtedly hurl holy invectives at those who bow before these two most popular idols. How bitterly men would hate Him! How many church members would turn away from Him!

## In Times of Strain and Stress

*From "The Christian Advocate," New York.*

FAITH is the anchor that holds in the strain and stress of life. It may be merely an item of interest to the philosopher and theologian as an intellectual abstraction to be dissected and discussed; but it is valuable beyond estimate as a vital spiritual experience and possession to the Christian believer!

It is a pitiful thing that there are so many in this day of high pressure who hold their physical lives at so small a price that they do not hesitate to snap the golden threads of life, hoping to find surcease from the strain and stress through the medium of self-destruction. Everywhere there are care-encumbered men and women, but it is not empty rhetoric to say that they know by experience that there is a profound truth in the declaration of Him who said, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Turn where you will and you find men and women bent of back, furrowed of brow, carrying crushing burdens—but there is a song in their hearts, for they believe and know that there is spiritual significance in the promise, "Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee." There are on every hand men and women whose hearts are heavy with grief, but in their eyes is the light of a great hope and in their souls the glow of an unwavering faith, for they believe in the promise of divine comfort vouchsafed in the Scriptures. "I can bear it," said a grief-stricken soul, "for there is that great promise, 'What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter.' But what can a man do in the presence of sorrow and loss like mine who has no such positive assurance?"

"Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress
trees."

"Fine! I knew you would take it standing," said one man to his friend who had received a terrific blow that had seriously dislocated his plan of life, but who had refused to sit in the seat of the scornful, or to repudiate his Christian profession by discarding his faith, or to let bitterness fill his heart or cynicism scarify the serenity of his spirit.

Take it standing—like a Christian! Maintain the integrity of your faith—like a Christian! Receive the insidious arrows of the enemy on your strong shield—like a Christian! Keep your heart closed to every evil and open to every good—like a Christian! Grip with tightening tenacity every assurance of God's presence, power, love, grace—like a Christian! Believe unfalteringly in His pledged promises, fulfilled as they have been and are in the daily experience of His Children—like a Christian! And it will be a glad song of Christian confidence and triumphing faith, like unto this, that will swell in your heart day by day:

Fear not, for I have redeemed thee.
When thou passeth through the waters, I
will be with thee;
And through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee:
When thou walkest through the fire, thou
shalt not be burned;
Neither shall the flame kindle upon thee.
For I am the Lord thy God,
The Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.

## "The Offence of the Cross"

**By Brig.-General H. Biddulph.**

*From The Bible League Quarterly, London, England.*

IT is a melancholy fact that vast territories in North Africa and in Asia, which once enjoyed the preaching of the Gospel, relapsed into utter darkness; the churches perished either entirely or in large measure, and darkness reigned for hundreds of years until the revival of missionary zeal in the last century.

Of recent years much attention has been given to the scanty historical remains of early Christian missionary enterprise in Mongolia and China . . .

From a study of the famous Nestorian inscription a translation of which has recently been published by Prof. Saeki of Tokyo, with comments, we can see clearly the reason why the candlestick of the Church in

China was removed, and the message and warning is one worthy of special attention at the present day.

The inscription bears the title "A Monument commemorating the propagation of the Ta-ch'in (Syrian) Luminous Religion in the Middle Kingdom," i. e., China.

The body of the inscription commences with a brief statement concerning the doctrine of God, of Man, and of the Gospel. Then follows an account of the arrival of the first Nestorian Mission in China, in 635 A.D., the favourable reception of it by the Emperor, and its fortunes and progress under successive reigns, during which it increased mightily both in extent and in power until the year 781 A.D., when the monument was erected. The inscription closes with some scores of names, in Chinese and in Syriac, of individuals ranking from bishop downwards.

The important part of this inscription lies in its statement concerning the Gospel, in so far as our present purpose is concerned. It runs thus:—

"The original nature of Man was pure and void of all selfishness, unstained and unostentatious, his mind was free from inordinate lust and passion. When, however, Satan employed his evil devices on him, man's pure and stainless (nature) was deteriorated; the perfect attainment of goodness on the one hand, and the entire exemption from wickedness on the other, became alike impossible for him. . . .

"Whereupon one Person of our Trinity, the Messiah, who is the Luminous Lord of the Universe, veiling His true Majesty, appeared upon earth as a man. Angels proclaimed the glad tidings. A virgin gave birth to the Holy One in Ta-ch'in. A bright star announced the blessed event. Persians saw the splendour and came forth with their tribute.

"Fulfilling the old Law as it was declared by the twenty-four sages" (i. e., the O. T.), "He taught how to rule both families and kingdoms according to His own great plan. Establishing His New Teaching of Nonassertion, which operates silently through the Holy Spirit, another Person of the Trinity, He formed in man the capacity for well-doing through the Right Faith.

"Setting up the standard of the eight cardinal virtues, He purged away the dust from human nature and perfected a true character. Widely opening the Three Constant Gates, He brought Life to light and abolished Death. Hanging up the bright sun, He swept away the abodes of darkness. All the evil devices of the devil were thereupon defeated and destroyed. He then took an oar in the Vessel of Mercy, and ascended to the Palace of Light. Thereby all rational beings were conveyed across the Gulf. His mighty work being thus completed, He returned at noon to His original position (in Heaven). The twenty-seven standard works of His Sutras" (i. e., the N. T.) "were preserved. The great means of conversion (or leavening, i. e., transformation) were widely extended, and the sealed Gate of the Blessed Life was unlocked. His Law is to bathe with water and with the Spirit, and thus to cleanse from all vain delusions and to purify men until they regain the whiteness of their nature."

Apart from the Buddhistic flavouring of the inscription (a fact which is brought out very prominently in Professor Saeki's notes), and from various doctrinal errors and misrepresentations, it will strike at once even the most casual reader that there is a complete absence of any reference to our Lord's humiliation, passion, crucifixion, burial, and resurrection: a fatal omission, vitiating entirely the Christian testimony of the inscription. . . .

The marks of the preaching of the true Gospel are absent from the inscription, viz.: "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." As now, so then, the preaching of Christ crucified is to some a stumbling-block, and to others foolishness. Instead of proclaiming the unchanging verities of God's Word to changeable and sinful man, the Nestorian missionaries seem to have adopted ideas, so much in vogue at present, and tried to present the Gospel in a manner considered suitable for the times, and in accordance with the taste of the age. In this "New Teaching of Non-assertion which operates silently through the Holy Spirit" and without the Cross of Christ, we seem to be reading about those errors of the "Modern Oxford Movement," exposed so forcibly by the Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, in the Columns of the Church of England Newspaper, last December. He wrote, "their theology seems to be a leap from surrender to God the Father to communion with God, the Holy Spirit," and again, "according to their practices communion between God and man is not mediated through our Lord Jesus Christ alone," and again, "their Quiet Time consists in relaxing and filling their minds with God."

If we turn to another popular type of preaching the Gospel, of which we may take that widely praised book, "The Christ of the Indian Road" as an example, how forcibly are we reminded of the same error exemplified in the inscription. Professor Nemai Chunder Das has criticised this book very keenly and effectively in this periodical, and it will suffice to make a few apposite quotations. The Professor writes: "There is a constant endeavour to let the Hindu interpret Christ in his own way. . . . One looks in vain for a clearer and fuller statement of the mission of our Lord on earth. Mr. Jones practically ignores the more fundamental point that, viz., that God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. . . . A sinner must first and foremost be saved from his sins by accepting Christ as his Saviour. Yet hardly anything is said on this vital point."

It is unnecessary to labour the subject, we see clearly that the same errors in preaching the Gospel which characterised the Nestorian mission to China, some twelve or thirteen hundred years ago, are to be found in active Christian work now, both at home and abroad; and apparently the underlying reasons are much the same. No permanence can attach to such work; as Lord William Gascoyne Cecil has written in his preface to Saeki's book, "The Christianity which has conquered has been that which is urged with distinctness, even amounting to harshness." A Christianity in which the Cross of Christ does not take the first, and foremost place, must perish in dishonour; and the missionary who preaches any other Gospel than that of Jesus Christ and *Him crucified* is building his house upon the sands.

## Salvation and Education

From the *Sunday School Times*

EDUCATION should never become a religion. In the minds of many it is. A popular newspaper writer recently said, when discussing education as the great benefactor: "For the school bell is as sacred as the church bell, and every pupil is a child of God." Education is indeed *a* great benefactor, but not *the* great benefactor: Christ as Saviour is the only benefactor who can meet men's deepest and eternal needs. Education trains powers that the pupil already has; regeneration gives men powers that they never before had. For regeneration, or the new birth, gives life to the dead, and education never can do that. Nor is every pupil a child of God. The Word tells us, concerning Christ, that "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name" (John 1:12). Education has an important place in God's plans for human life—but not the most important place. Salvation first, then education. Not to men in general, but only to the born-again children of God, who are saved by faith in Christ as Saviour, is the word spoken: "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

## Tolerance

WILLIAM FEATHER in

*The Philadelphia Public Ledger*

A MAN was making a strong speech for tolerance. He condemned intolerance.

"Why aren't you more tolerant toward intolerance?" he was asked.

That question stopped him.

Prof. Thomas N. Carver digs into this question in his book, "Human Relations."

"We may as well be honest about it, and

admit," he says, "that no one ever is and no one ever can be tolerant on any subject for which he cares intensely. The scholar who cars intensely for scholarship is intolerant not only toward a student who cheats, but also toward one who does inaccurate and slovenly work, and the artist is equally intolerant toward bad art, though both the scholar and the artist may be very tolerant on every subject except his own."

Prof. Carver does not consider tolerance as noble a virtue as some people have tried to make it.

If certain practices are known to endanger civilization, he wonders why we should show tolerance for them? Should we show tolerance for drunken locomotive engineers, reckless taxicab drivers, irresponsible radicals and unscrupulous physicians?

## Sensationalism

*From "The Watchman-Examiner," New York.*

Sensationalism in the pulpit is often condemned without any very exact notion of what the term means. Elijah would have been sensational in the modern sense if he had poured petroleum over the altar, leading the people to believe that it was water, and then had secretly ignited it. We, however, want preaching that will produce a sensation as Elijah did that day at Carmel.

The Bible is full of the most soul-moving facts. If these are presented with any sort of sympathy they tend to produce mighty effects in arousing and stirring men. And the great preachers have been men who produced the most astounding results. They were sincere and did not act a part. They were honest with themselves and in their methods. If they were dramatic they were not stagy. If they were profoundly moved, it was genuine emotion and not simulated. If they aimed at moving men, they aimed to move them by the truth, and not by misrepresentations or by arguments they knew were unsound.

Ministers of the gospel should thus aim to produce a sensation, to arouse and move their hearers profoundly. Preaching of that kind will be sensational, but sensational in the right sense of the term. The judgment that the Lord must pass on much of our preaching is that it is dull and lifeless; that it is timid about offending certain conventional standards; that it has not about it the earnestness and directness that the call to the ministry demands.

The preacher who interlards his discourse with the coarse or vulgar anecdote or epithet; the one who pretends to an emotion that he does not feel; and the one who makes appeals that are unworthy of real men—this man is a sensationalist in the worst sense of the word. There is no reasonable objection to a man's carrying into the pulpit the power with which God has endowed him. He ought to do so, and must do so if he is to realize his largest effectiveness. A man is to carry his personality and his peculiar power into the pulpit. The more striking these are the better. That is sensational preaching of the noblest order.

Broadus, Moody, Lorimer, Beecher created sensations. We cannot have too much of this. But the sensationalism that resorts to tricks of speech or rhetoric; that is not absolutely sincere; that cares more for the effect than for the morality of the means by which it is produced; that will defend anarchy to make a point, or stoop to irreverence to inspire ribald applause—we cannot have too little of it.

# Letters to the Editor

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

## What One Affirmationist Thinks of Us

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am in receipt of a copy of your publication entitled, CHRISTIANITY TODAY followed by a letter soliciting my subscription.

If this publication represents your idea of what Christianity is, or should be today, then, I would rather be an unregenerate Hottentot than a follower of your particular brand of teaching.

I have received several copies of your publication in the past. In all of them you present the same sensorious, critical, faultfinding, un-Christian soreheadedness common among those who want to boss everyone and dictate their thinking and speaking. You represent an inferior type of rule or ruin pessimist, who imagines the possible right of sending everyone to a burning hell of fire who does not accept their peculiarly misshapen brand of Theology.

The outstanding purpose of your publication seems to be a persistently acrimonious misleading, sneering attack upon the "Auburn Affirmation" and a deliberate attempt to condemn and crucify every Minister who signed it. . . . I signed the "Affirmation" and see no reason why I should feel that I have been guilty of an offense against God and the Church. . . . I know many of the Ministers of our Church whom you are persistently lampooning. They have always presented the marks of true Christian gentlemen.

Your publication in its attacks upon the theological beliefs of these men is anything but Christian.

I have never heard them express anything more than amusement at your scurrilous attacks, your publication is constantly pouring out the vials of wrath, hatred and misrepresentation upon them.

Either you are hopelessly bound by an ego-complex of your own infallibility, or you are dishonest.

Again, may I reaffirm, I do not want your brand of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Sincerely,

---

[EDITOR'S NOTE: While the writer of this letter appended his signature, yet we feel it best not to publish it. The letter, somewhat abridged, indicates an attitude toward us and the cause for which we stand that we are glad to say is not the dominant reaction of our readers.]

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have just read your article "The Supernaturalism of Christianity." This is to thank you very cordially for the same, for I find myself in utter agreement with every position you take.

You mention several great names, every name of whom, is a mystery to me. They say, and do so many courageous Christian things, deal with men and situations, in such a lovely spirit, and straightway either deny, or invalidate, opinions, convictions, traditions, and teachings, to which I cling tenaciously.

Sometimes, I yield the palm to them, then chide myself, for doing so. God knows, we desire to live in charity with our brethren, then we come across some such quotations, as you set forth in your article, and my soul says "I cannot away with it." It is "Nehushton" to me. We sometimes wonder whether they are entitled to be classified among those in every nation that fear God, and word righteousness, and so are acceptable to Him. For ourselves we leave it there, as between men. Having said that however, we still feel there is an issue—a vast, vital issue, between a supernatural Christianity, as expressed by our Lord Jesus and Paul and the hosts of saved, believing, redeemed, saints, past and present, and the emasculated, naturalistic views of those who deny our position. Can it be here? "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father, which is in Heaven." Or, here, "when it pleased God, to reveal His Son in me"? To both Peter and Paul, the Revelation given was from heaven, supernatural, surely subjective and objective, alike.

Christianity, as a way of life, and as an experience is a thing of the spirit. His Spirit and our spirit. At least this is our

traditional (Methodist) witness. To me it is God given, a definite, positive assurance, that the Eternal, Holy, Infinite, Omnipresent, Omniscient, and Omnipotent God, the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ has revealed Himself, in a person, His only begotten Son.

This involves the miracle of the Incarnation, the life, the death and Resurrection of the same eternal Son. Includes the miracles, words, deeds, miraculous and supernatural of Almighty God, through that same Jesus.

All men may fear such a God, with even a reverential fear, but to love Him, with the love that casts out fear is a supernatural experience that confirms everything else that may be postulate of the Divine Being.

Yous very truly,

H. M. HANCOCK.

Wakefield Grace M. E. Church,
New York, N. Y.

## How Church Union Works in Western Canada

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Recently it has come to my attention that, in the Canadian West, large numbers of churches have been closed by the United Church of Canada owing to lack of funds. Specifically, in one area in Southern Saskatchewan, if one were to draw a line from Moosejaw south to the international boundary, west to the border between the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta at the town of Empress, and again south to the boundary, no less than fifty-three points have no services where service was held formerly. What does analysis of the situation reveal?

First, it explodes the economic argument for church union. At one time, two Ministers, one Methodist, the other Presbyterian, served in these small towns. Usually, each had one or two points outside as well. When "union" came, one Minister served in the town where the churches were united. But union left the three or four points outside unserved, unless another pastor was placed there. No saving was really effected.

Then, after five years, a period of economic stress arrives. What happens? Well, if the town is large enough, the place is served, but if not, then it is joined up with two other towns usually along the line of railroad. What does that mean? Surely that, the urban centres are served, while the farmers can do without. Taking three railroad towns so served, from eight to twelve points on either side of the railroad formerly served are left desolate of spiritual offices.

Why is the United Church so able to act? Because, being like the monopolist in trade, the people have to take just exactly the treatment handed out to them, without murmuring. And, mark you, at the time when the unfortunate agriculturists of Western Canada, destitute materially, and almost broken in spirit because of the difficulty of making ends meet, need the comfort and sustaining power of the gospel, then services are closed down!

Thus union works in our Canadian West on a basis of no distribution without production, which is measured by the ability of the machine to rake in the shekels, recognized as the most important matter affecting a church's existence. No wonder God looks on in derision! And the devil is intensely amused!

Yours, etc.,

Brantford, Ont. ALFRED T. BARR.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am just a "nobody"—as far as influence goes—and alas I have no money to contribute to your paper or to Westminster Seminary, but, I must express my admiration for all of these so called *"rebels"* who are so boldly standing for the old time "faith" and for the *absolute* and *final* authority of God's inspired Word.

I have just finished reading the February number of your magazine, and the *kindly* but *positive* stand that is taken in regard to the Westminister situation delights my heart. It seems so good to know that there are men of this type left in the Presbyterian Church—sometimes it *almost* seems as if the liberal element were having their own way and that those of sound faith were too timid or too cowardly to protest. A *protester* is never *"popular."* But, I believe there comes a great joy and peace into the heart of that man or woman who *protests* against the mutilation of God's Word and the subtile and dangerous teachings of "modernism." This joy and peace comes from knowing that to please *God* is better than to be "popular" with men. I have already subscribed for CHRISTIANITY TODAY and also am already sending it to several people, but, am now adding to your list one new subscriber for whose paper I will also pay. Please find $1.00 inclosed.

Can you start this new subscription with the February number?

MRS. MARY ROWLEY.

202 E. 10th St., Santa Ana, Calif.

## "Sharing" or Saving?

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: At present an investigating committee headed by Mr. Galen Fisher who some years ago was connected with the Y. M. C. A. work in Japan but now is chief of the Religious Research Institute of New York, a subsidiary piece of machinery fathered by John R. Mott, and Dr. Harvey H. Guy who some twenty-five years ago spent a few months in Japan as a missionary of the Christian denomination with a couple of others is in Japan. Just who appointed them is not very clear to me. Perhaps they are a self-appointed body.

They have come to find out just what the missionaries have accomplished thus far and to ascertain whether more missionaries are needed and the kind needed. They are to gather the facts and then submit them to another body in the States who will draw up the "Findings."

This committee came to Osaka some days ago. They had a big banquet with many of the Japanese Christians. The Osaka *Mainichi* one of the largest newspapers in the East reports them as follows:

"The party of Dr. Harvey H. Guy and several other well-known religious enthusiasts, after completing their work in Tokyo, has begun operations in this part of the country now, inquiring into the actual results, according to vernacular reports, of the religious work done by Americans among the Japanese. The precise object of his party, if I am correctly informed, is to ascertain the possibility of making the work more *'Passive,'* teaching where such teaching is deemed of benefit to the Japanese and *'learning'* if there is anything to be learnt from them. It will be more on an *'exchange'* basis.

"This sounds more sensible. In a country where the influence of a centuries old civilization holds sway, it will be an unwise move to *'impose'* something new, as though grafting upon it; it will be a waste of effort. This new method will, for one thing, appeal more to the so-called intellectual class, by widening the scope of the movement, and under judicial leadership, it may eventually enlist the best elements in the country."

This Committee is to report through others to the Christian people of America. What this Committee reports will have a far reaching effect on gifts for the missionary cause. I think it would be well to *investigate* the Committee as to their own faith in the basic teachings of Christianity. It also may be well for the rank and file of the church membership to know something about this forth-coming report.

S. M. ERICKSON.

Takamatsu, Kagawa Ken, Japan.

# Ministerial Changes

## Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

### Calls

H. McAllister Griffiths to Hollond Memorial Church, Phila., Pa.

### Calls Accepted

M. S. Benjamin, Plymouth, Ind. to Bethany Church, Milwaukee, Wis.;

William J. Spire, Fentress, Texas to First Church, Electra, Texas;

R. Harlan McCartney, D.D., First United Church, Sharon, Pa. to First Church, McKeesport, Pa.;
Frank W. Gregg, Cody, Wyo. to First Church, Lincoln, Kans.;
Lewis S. Hall to Littleton, Colo.;
Francis P. Morrison, Morrill, Neb. to Wray, Colo.;
Cranston E. Goddard, Ph.D., First Church, Independence, Mo. to Sherman, Texas;
Henry J. Noding, Zion Church, Ellsworth, Minn. to Federated Church, Lansing, Ia.;
J. W. Oglivie, Mt. Pleasant, Ark. to Jamestown, Anderson, Mt. Carmel and Pine Grove, Ark.;
W. Rothwell, Lake City, Ia. to Plover, Ia.;
Roderick C. Jackson, First Church, Trinidad, Colo. to Winfield, Kans.;
Joel B. Hayden, D.D., Fairmount Church, Cleveland, Ohio to Head Mastership Western Reserve Academy;
John Paul Cotton to First Church, Bethlehem, Pa.;
David L. Miller, Caldwell, Kans. to Westminster Church, Wichita, Kans.

#### Ordinations

R. David Bender, March 14.

#### Installations

George P. Horst, D.D., First Church, Wichita Falls, Texas;
Richard C. McCarroll, Fourth Church, Boston, Mass., March 11;
Fred. W. Mathews, Ann Carmichael Church, Phila., Pa., March 20;
Walter L. Turney, Union Church, Ft. Madison, Ia., March 15;
Roy W. Zimmer, First Church, Independence, Mo., March 29;
C. M. Stewart, Clarion, Pa., March 20.

#### Resignations

Ward K. Klopp, Immanuel Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.;
Frank Ferguson Ogle, Urich and Creighton, Mo.;
Edgar Mitchell, Parish and Hastings, N. Y.;
Charles A. Hunter, First Church, Shadyside, O.;
Frederick L. Provan, New London, Ia.;
E. D. Byrd, First Church, Cynthiana, Ind.;
John T. Howarth, Slickville, Pa.;
R. A. Buchanan, Grace Church, Albany, Ore.;
Crayton K. Powell, Ivywild Church, Colorado Springs, Colo.

#### Deaths

Harvey E. Kilmer, Ph.D., Grand Rapids, Mich., Feb. 21;
C. M. Whetzel, Cleveland, O., Feb. 23;
Lewis A. Kerr, D.D., Chase, Kansas, March 16;
William V. TeWinkel, Canastota, N. Y., March 11;
David T. Smythe, Stroudsburg, Pa., March 13;
James Greenslade, Walla Walla, Wash., March 14;
Rollin Grant Shafer, Thayer, Ind., March 9;
Bela K. Basho, Richmond, Va.;
Percy Y. Schelly, D.D., Phila., Pa., March 28;
Hubert S. Lyle, Washington College, Pa.;
Ralph A. Armstrong, Ecorse, Mich.;
Charles B. Bullard, East Orange, N. J., March 24.

## Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

#### Calls

B. A. McIlhany to Hartsville, S. C.;
T. B. Hay, Westminster Church, Memphis, Tenn. to Port Gibson, Miss.

#### Calls Accepted

H. W. Darden, Stamps, Ark. to Camden, Ark.;
F. R. Dudley, D.D. to Central Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.

#### Installations

R. J. Hunter, Jr., First Church, Union City, Tenn.

#### Changed Addresses

F. B. Estes, Orangeburg, S. C.;
B. H. Smallwood, Carthage, Ark.

#### Resignations

Charles Cureton, Inman and Clifton, S. C.;
T. J. Ray, Jr., Garyville, La.;
M. R. Vender, Director of Religious Education, Central Church, Kansas City, Mo.

#### Deaths

A. Douglas Wauchope, D.D., Gainesville, Ga.;
Sam E. Hodges, D.D.. Anniston, Alabama.

## United Presbyterian Church

#### Calls

Fred C. Patterson to Buffalo and Worthington, Pa.

#### Calls Accepted

C. M. Stewart, Oil City, Pa. to Presbyterian U. S. A. Church, Clarion, Pa.;
Newton Smith, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., The Hollow, Va. to Amoret, Mo.;
William M. Nichol, Jr., First Church, Kansas City, Mo. to Sparta, Ill.;
J. A. Harper, Stafford, Kans. to Pinckneyville, Ill.;
E. G. Forrester, Fairmount Ave. Church, Canton, O. to Sixth Church, Cleveland, O.;
Craig G. Whitsett (Pres. U. S. A.), Stated Supply, Pullman, Wash.;
Peter McCormack (Pres. U. S. A.), Stated Supply, Third Church, Spokane, Wash.

#### Installations

W. P. Aikin, Central Church, Omaha, Neb., Feb 25;
A. Theodore Smith, Klamath Falls, Ore., March 24.

#### Resignations

William M. Alwynse, Mt. Perry, O.

## Reformed Church in America

#### Calls

G. DeMotts, Hope Church, Sheboygan, Wis. to Lynden, Wash.;
John C. VanWyk, Bethel Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. to Fifth Church, Muskegon, Mich.;
Cornelius Dykhinsen to Schoharie, N. Y.

#### Calls Accepted

E. Kampmann, Cromwell Center Church, Everly, Ia. to Meservey, Ia.;
Harke Frieling, Lafayette, Ind. to Union Church, Paterson, N. J.;
William Gouloose, Prairie City, Ia. to Eighth Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.;
William R. Everts, Bethel Church, Davis, S. D. to Immanuel Church, Willowlakes, S. D.

#### Installations

Cornelius B. Muste, First Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., March 3.

#### Resignations

Ferdinand S. Wilson, Church of the Covenant, Paterson, N. J.

#### Deaths

H. M. Bruins, D.D., Feb. 18.

## Reformed Church in the United States

#### Calls Accepted

J. Reagle, Trinity Church, Tiffin, O. to Mt. Bethel, Pa.;
J. V. George, Reading, Pa. to St. Paul's Church, Adamstown, Pa.;
F. P. Franke, Marengo, Ia. to Porterfield, Wis.

#### Installations

G. Gaiser, Medina, N. D.;
Ira Wilson Frantz, St. John's Church, Fullerton, Pa.

#### Changed Addresses

F. Friedrichsmeier, 502 W. Thayer, Bismarck, N. D.

#### Resignations

A. Haller Lenz, Upham, N. D.;
A. S. Glessner, D.D., Community Church, Austintown, O.;
W. C. Lyerly, Newton, N. C.

#### Deaths

B. Ruf, Berne, Ind.

## Christian Reformed Church

#### Calls

J. J. Hiemenga, Third Church, Paterson, N. J. to La Grove Ave. Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. (declines);
William Van Peursem, Zutphen, Mich. to West Sayville, N. Y.

#### Calls Accepted

William Hendriksen, Zeeland, Mich. to Allen Ave. Church, Muskegon, Mich.

#### Changed Addresses

J. A. Westervelt, 69 Ferndale Ave., Glen Rock, N. J.

## Religious Conditions in New Zealand —Concluded

deceived. The rising generation do not know what constitutes the Evangelical Faith.

Many of the older people are uneasy over the state of doctrine in the churches, but they are too timid to make a protest. There are Ministers in the various denominations who also are concerned, but they lack the courage to protest in Presbytery or Assembly or Conference. I am persuaded that if the sound Ministers and office bearers would only organize and take the field and do battle for the Historic Faith they would be surprised at the support they would receive from the members.

Why should the modernistic fraternity be allowed to hold the reins of power in the Church? It is they who should move out and not those who are true to the faith of their fathers. If these timid men had more concern for the truth and less for their reputation there would be a conflict in the Church of such a character as would arrest

the leaven of evolution and Modernism. Unless immediate action is taken in New Zealand to stem the tide I fear that Modernism will capture the entire field.

There is scarcely a University Professor in our midst that does not hold and teach evolution. For the first time in the history of the Otago University a series of public lectures on this was arranged a year ago. To my knowledge the only Presbyterian Minister who protested and used his pen to some purpose was the editor of *The Biblical Recorder*, the Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A. It is impossible for our High School young people as well as our University undergraduates to escape the teaching of evolution. The sad part is that these young people do not get both sides placed before them. Their teachers take an unfair advantage of them. Either these teachers do not know there is another side to evolution or they know it, yet deliberately suppress it in their teaching. There was a time when the Theological Seminary with its sound teaching was an antidote to the infidelity of the University, but alas the Seminary is now a bed-fellow with the University. There was a time when the Pulpit was an antidote to the false teaching of the Colleges but that time has gone.

The Denominational Church Papers keep their readers in ignorance concerning the battle that is being waged in your country for the truth. I am persuaded that if CHRISTIANITY TODAY could be placed in the homes of the people it would prepare an army to wage a victorious conflict for Bible Christianity.

The latest move to capture the churches for Modernism is Church Union. Tentative negotiations are now on foot to bring about Union between the Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists. The leaders of this "unionarian stunt" are modernistic to a man. They see the churches losing ground. They are finding it increasingly hard to pay their way. Support to Foreign Missions is waning, yet these short sighted politicians think that the only way out of defeat is Union. They refuse to be told that if they would see the hand of God upon them in power they must return to Apostolic doctrine and preaching.

While Modernism is growing something is being done to resist it. The United Evangelical Church takes its stand on the Bible and is uncompromising in its attitude to all that calls in question the absolute authority of the Bible. But this church is in its infancy. In this young country where the population is small independent churches are difficult to maintain. The people cling to their churches as cats to soft cushions. Few are prepared to put their hands in their pockets and generously help on a sound movement. There is also a Bible League. It too is in its infancy. What is needed in New Zealand is leadership: Men bold enough for the truth to take the field as did Luther, Calvin and Knox and fight until a new day dawns.

Your break with Princeton is heartening. When all is said and done it is impossible to salvage an institution when its Board of Control is modernistic or "Tolerant" of Modernism. The only hope is separation and a new beginning. The truth cannot be saved by compromise or union but by separation. This has been the history of the church.

Westminster Seminary has before it a great future if it remains loyal to the faith. I would urge all who love the faith of our fathers—the faith that made heroes, saints and martyrs—to withdraw their financial support from any institution that has in it the seeds of Modernism and get back of sound institutions such as Westminster Seminary. Only as the source of the stream is pure can the stream be pure.

If the Seminary is sound the ministry will be sound. Let us keep the flag of truth nailed to the mast and with one heart and mind go forward to preach and teach "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

## Notes on Biblical Exposition—Concluded

follows. In the unique addition to the nominative part ("not from men nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead"), we have a summary of the first main division of the Epistle (Gal. 1:10-2:21) in which Paul defends his independent apostolic authority against the Judaizers' contention that he was an apostle only in a secondary sense; in the unique curtness and brevity of the dative part ("to the churches of Galatia"), we have an indication of the deadly seriousness of the crisis in which the Epistle was written; in the unique addition to the greeting part ("who gave Himself for our sins, in order that He might deliver us from the present evil age according to the will of Him who is God and our Father, to whom be the glory for ever and ever, Amen"), we have a summary of Paul's defence of his gospel in the great central part of the Epistle. Paul was not like some modern preachers, who are inclined to mention the blessed doctrine of the cross only when they are taken to task for neglecting it. Paul regarded it as the very foundation of Christian life; and when it was belittled, as in Galatia, he put his whole heart into its defence.

### Thanksgiving True and False

Immediately after the address we find in nearly all of the other Epistles of Paul an expression of thanksgiving for the Christian state of the readers. That appears in Romans, I Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians, II Timothy, Philemon; and II Corinthians and Ephesians are only apparent, rather than real, exceptions. But in Galatians there is nothing whatever of the kind. The first word of the Epistle, after the address is over, is not "I give thanks" but "I am surprised;" Paul plunges at once into the matter that caused the Epistle to be written. "You are turning away from the gospel," he says in effect, "and I am writing this Epistle to stop you."

What is the reason for this absence, in the Epistle to the Galatians, of the usual thanksgiving? The answer is really very simple. Paul omitted giving thanks, for the simple reason that there was nothing to be thankful for.

No doubt he did give thanks to God on the very same day when he wrote this Epistle. He gave thanks for the gospel of Christ; he gave thanks for news that he had received from other churches. But the news that he had received from Galatia was bad and only bad, and Paul had not the slightest intention of telling God that it was good.

Many persons seem to think that it is eminently pious to give thanks to God whether or not there is anything to be thankful for. They seem to think that loyalty to the Church means blind loyalty to a human organization or to agencies and boards; they seem to think that sin in individual or ecclesiastical life can be removed by saying that it is not there; they cover up the serious issues of the day, in the councils of the Church, by a sad misuse of the sacred exercise of prayer.

Paul's way was very different. A sterling honesty ran all through his devotional life. He thanked God for what was good; he prayed to God, sometimes with tears, for the removal of what was bad. But always he was honest with God. When he got down upon his knees he did not try to conceal the real facts either from God or from himself. He made God a sharer in his joys, but also he made Him a sharer in his sorrows. Like Hezekiah, he spread the threatening letters of the adversaries unreservedly before the throne of grace. So here, with regard to the Galatian churches, he faced the facts. The Galatians were turning away from the faith. There was no honorable possibility of concealment or palliation. The facts were too plain. Paul had not the slightest intention of concealing them. Thanksgiving at such a moment would have been blasphemy; praise of the Galatians would have been cruelty. Paul engaged neither in thanksgiving nor in praise. Instead, he wrote this mighty Epistle, with its solemn warning, with its flaming appeal.

There is one advantage about a man like that. He may not always give you praise when you desire praise; but when he does give you praise you know that it comes from the heart.

# News of the Church

## The Overtures

LATEST advices from the office of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., show that Presbyteries have voted upon the overtures as follows: Overture A (On the Permanent Judicial Commission) Yes, seventy-eight, No, sixteen, No Action, two. Overture B. (On the rescinding of Constitutional Rule No. 1, respecting Local Evangelists) Yes, ninety-two, No, twenty-five, No Action, one. Since an affirmative vote of one hundred and forty-seven Presbyteries is necessary for adoption, it will be seen that neither of these overtures has yet been adopted by the Church.

## Westminster Seminary News

NEARING the end of its second year, Westminster Theological Seminary is rejoicing in the successful completion of its academic work. The new building recently added to the temporary quarters, thus doubling the working space, has been in constant and profitable use.

Of six licentiates taken under care of the Presbytery of Philadelphia at its meeting on April 6, five were Westminster seniors. They were Messrs. C. Wayne Julier, Henry W. Coray, Henry G. Welbon, Alex. K. Davison and Tod B. Sperling.

The Presbytery of Philadelphia is generally recognized as the most exacting Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in its examinations for licensure. The Westminster men all passed their trials with flying colors. Each also preached a sermon and was examined in theology before the whole Presbytery. The vote to license was unanimous, and the opinion was expressed by numerous members of Presbytery that a finer group had rarely, if ever, been licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. The above-average quality of these Westminster men and their thorough and solid education was strikingly noticeable, and the subject of considerable comment.

### Commencement Day

The exercises of Commencement Day, May 12th, will be begun by a stated meeting of the Board of Trustees, at 11 A. M. in the Seminary building. At 3:30 P. M. there will be held in Witherspoon Hall a memorial service for the late beloved Professor R. Dick Wilson, full announcement of which will be found in another item of this issue. At 4:45 P. M. tea will be served in the seminary buildings, at 1528 Pine St., to which all friends are cordially invited by the Trustees, Faculty and Students. At 8 P. M. the commencement exercises will be held in Witherspoon Hall, which is located in the Witherspoon Building, Walnut, Juniper and Sansom Sts., Philadelphia. The speaker of the evening will be the Rev. Stewart P. MacLennan, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, California. Dr. MacLennan, under whose ministry the Hollywood Church has become outstanding on the Pacific Coast, is a notable preacher. A large attendance is expected, and the seminary has extended a welcome to its friends to attend this service of thanksgiving to God for His blessings on the Seminary.

## Assemblies—1931

**Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.**
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 28th

**Presbyterian Church in the U. S.**
Montreat, N. C., May 28th

**United Presbyterian Church**
Youngstown, Ohio, May 27th

**Reformed Church in America**
Asbury Park, N. J., June 4th

**Christian Reformed Church**
Grand Rapids, Mich., June 11th

**Cumberland Presbyterian Church**
Evansville, Ind., May 21st

**Presbyterian Church in Canada**
Toronto, Ont., June 3rd

## Lutheran Pastor Withholds Confession from Court

PASTOR EMIL SWENSON, of Bethlehem Lutheran Church of Minneapolis (Augustana Synod) recently refused to repeat in court things told him in confidence as confession on the ground that information thus given him by a member of his church was a religious confession which he was not bound to divulge, but which he was, in fact, bound to keep secret. Judge Paul W. Guilford of the County District Court held him in contempt of court, sentenced him to pay a fine of $100 or serve 30 days in the county jail. The case has been referred to the State Supreme Court with the Minneapolis Federation of Churches backing the Lutheran pastor, it being a test case.

In nearly every state of the union the law rigidly protects the sanctity of the confessional in terminology of which the following is an example: "A clergyman or other minister of any religion shall not be allowed to disclose a confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practice of a religious body to which he belongs." Judge Guilford, citing the Minnesota law which is a verbatim copy of the above statement with the added phrase: "without the consent of the party making the confession", declared that no precedent was needed since the man who confessed was not obligated by any rule of the Lutheran Church to undertake any sort of confession and declared that circumstances were different from those under which a member of the Roman Church is obligated to make confessions to a priest.

Doctor Samuel Trexler, president of the United Lutheran Synod of New York says: "We cannot but regard the Minnesota case with the warmest personal interest. I have no doubt that the Judge's ruling will be reversed upon appeal. It is not merely an attack upon the Church but upon the rights of the individual to receive comfort and peace when oppressed by a sense of guilt. Any attempt to spread this legal doctrine to New York, of course, would meet the most active and universal opposition."

Readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will watch the outcome with keen interest.

## Birth Control Indorsed by the "Federal Council"

INDORSEMENT of "Birth Control" has been given in a majority report submitted after several years of study by the Committee on Marriage and Home of the "Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America." It was issued with the approval of the council's Administrative Committee, as was also a dissenting minority report.

Twenty-two of the twenty-eight members of the committee signed the majority report, three signed the minority report and three expressed no judgment either way. The committee comprises ministers, a number of influential laymen, including George W. Wickersham; also Mrs. John D. Rockefeller and other prominent women.

### The Majority Report

The majority report opens with the statement that "the majority of the committee holds that the careful and restrained use of contraceptives by married people is valid and moral."

"They take this position," the majority report continues, "because they believe that it is important to provide for the proper spacing of children, the control of the size of the family and the protection of mothers and children, and because they are of the opinion that abstinence within marriage

under ordinary conditions is not desirable in itself.

"But they cannot leave this statement without further comment. They feel obliged to point out that present knowledge of birth control is incomplete, and an element of uncertainty, although small, still remains. More serious is the fact that all methods are as yet more or less subject to personal factors for their effectiveness. Married couples should keep these facts in mind and welcome children, should they come."

The majority report warns the public against "advertised nostrums," which are beginning to appear in thinly disguised forms in reputable periodicals, and against "so-called 'bootlegged' devices at drug stores."

"It is essential," it states, "to consult the family physician or to go to established clinics or health centers for information or assistance."

### The Minority Report

The minority report refused to sanction the use of contraceptive measures and called upon the church, "when control of conception is necessary, to uphold the standard of abstinence as the ideal.

"The method of abstinence is to be used to meet conditions and situations in which, otherwise, contraceptives would be necessary," it says. "This does not mean that sex relations between married people as an expression of mutual affection are wrong, but that they are to be denied when child-bearing is hazardous to the well-being of mother or child or household."

Preceding the majority and minority reports is a statement on which the entire committee agreed.

The committee agreed unanimously that because of economic considerations and, in many cases, the welfare of the mother, "there can be no question as to the necessity for some sort of effective control of the size of the family and the spacing of children."

The committee also agreed that, whatever the final decision of the Church may be, "the Church should not seek to impose its point of view as to the use of contraceptives upon the public by legislation or any other form of coercion, and especially should not seek to prohibit physicians from imparting such information to those who in the judgment of the medical profession are entitled to receive it. It should be expected, that guidance will find expression through the researches and experience of physicians and men of science as well as through the corporate conscience of the Church."

It dwells at some length on the economic considerations, noting that "very large families tend to produce poverty, to endanger the health and stability of the family, limit the educational opportunities of the children."

The problems of overpopulation, it points out, are also involved in consideration of birth control.

"As to the necessity, therefore, for some form of effective control of the size of the family and the spacing of children, and consequently of control of conception, there can be no question," it concludes. "It is recognized by all churches and all physicians."

The committee's chairman, the Rev. Dr. Howard Chandler Robbins, professor at The Episcopal General Theological Seminary in New York City, and for many years dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, signed the minority report, together with Mrs. Robert E. Speer, president of the national board of the Y. W. C. A., and Mrs. Orin R. Judd, president of the Council of Women for Home Missions.

The three who signed neither report were: Dr. Ben R. Lacy, president of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. W. A. Newell of Greensboro, N. C., chairman of the Bureau of Social Service of the Women's Missional Council of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, Suffragan Bishop of New York.

The supporters of the majority report were the Rev. Albert W. Beaven, Rochester; the Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Buffalo; the Rev. Ralph Marshall Davis, Erie; the Rev. John W. Elliott, Philadelphia; Mrs. Jeannette V. Emrich, New York; Mrs. John Ferguson, New York; Dr. G. Walter Fiske, Oberlin, O.; Mr. and Mrs. Abel J. Gregg, New York; Dr. Ernest R. Groves, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Dr. Percy G. Kammerer, Avon, Conn.; the Rev. John W. Langdale, New York; the Rev. John A. Marquis, New York; the Rev. William S. Mitchell, Worcester, Mass.; Mrs. I. H. O'Harra, Philadelphia; Mrs. J. Scott Parish, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., New York; the Rev. Alva W. Taylor, Nashville; the Rev. Worth M. Tippy, New York; George W. Wickersham, New York; the Rev. B. S. Winchester, New York, and Miss Amelia Wyckoff, New York.

Drs. Davis and Marquis are Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

### Lutheran Council Disapproves

Declaring that "no Lutheran appears among the signers of the statement nor among the members of the Committee on Marriage and the Home," the National Lutheran Council made public a comment on the report by the Rev. F. H. Knubel, president of the United Lutheran Church in America.

"It is of prime significance," Dr. Knubel said, "that the present agitation for birth control occurs at a period which is notorious for looseness in sexual morality. This fact creates suspicion as to the motives for the agitation and should warn true-minded men and women against the surrender of themselves as tools for unholy purposes.

"The duty of the Church is now possibly more than ever to proclaim the holiness of the sexual relation, as well as temperance in the use thereof. There will then be no need for birth control.

"Even if the state should ever discover facts and conditions which could conceivably render necessary the exercise of birth control, only such an arrangement for it should be devised as would, because of its stringency, give no comfort to those who consciously or unconsciously are promoting loose morals. Anything else would serve to weaken the foundations of the home, and therefore of the state itself. There is little evidence, however, that the advocates of birth control would be satisfied with such a stringent provision."

### Roman Catholic Comment

"Father" Charles E. Coughlin, of the "Shrine of the Little Flower" near Detroit, attacked the report in a radio sermon a few days after the report was issued. He said, in part, "This question of birth control is nothing new in the annals of sociology or of civilization. It is hundreds of years older than the Federal Council of Churches in America. It was born not because of a great moral issue but because of a matter of dollars and cents. Originally, it was an economic issue. Its whole history has been tied up with the so-called science of political economy. And today it still is an economic issue."

Speaking for the Church of Rome, he said further, "we adhere to the principle that the sacrament of matrimony was not instituted by man, but by God; that the laws made to strengthen and to confirm and to elevate it are not of man's devisal, and that the nature of matrimony is entirely independent of the free will of man as much as is the law of sunrise and of sunset. On this question we may not be silent."

He said that one local paper has gone on record as stating that those signers of this report speak for 23,000,000 persons. "Those figures are grossly erroneous, but the fact of the great surrender and the greater betrayal cannot be disputed if yesterday's news item is correct," he added.

"The great surrender consists in handing over the fundamentals of the natural law to the ideals of Paganism. The greater betrayal coincides with the fact that once more the people of this country whom the Federal Council of Churches is supposed to represent have been traded and bartered to the god of political economy.

"One is not surprised that such a thing at last have eventuated. Those of us who are acquainted with the activities of Communistic doctrines in this country have long since breathed rather nervously at the activities of certain officials of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America in abetting the doctrines of Lenin and of advocating the ideals of Bolshevism."

## Memorial Service for Dr. Wilson

ANNOUNCEMENT has already been made of the service in memory of Professor Robert Dick Wilson to be held on the afternoon of May 12th at 3.30 o'clock in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia. At this service brief addresses will be made by Rev. H. H. McQuilkin, D.D. of the First Presbyterian Church, Orange, N. J., Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D., of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., and Mr. Philip E. Howard, President of the Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia.

## Auburn Affirmation to the Fore

AFTER having passed comparatively unnoticed for a considerable time, the so-called "Auburn Affirmation" has again begun to attract great attention in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America. The occasion for this renewal of interest in the Modernist manifesto of 1924 is the agitation in favor of the organic union of most of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in the United States. The conservative elements in the churches other than the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. are looking with apprehension upon the Modernist ascendency in the larger body. Those who favor the proposed Union have lately begun a vigorous campaign to minimize the doctrinal significance of the "Affirmation," and to represent it as merely a plea for liberty within limits historically recognized by the Presbyterian Church. Articles for and against the "Affirmation" have appeared in all the Southern Presbyterian weeklies, and the *Presbyterian Standard* has even gone to the length of publishing the full text of the document. From reports coming to the Editorial offices of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is becoming evident that opposition to the proposed union will be very strong in the South, in the United Presbyterian Church and in the Reformed Churches. On all sides it is freely predicted that should the officialdom of the Churches concerned force them into "Union" that a "Continuing Church" will arise, as in Canada, perhaps joining conservatives in the various bodies in one great orthodox church, truly Reformed and Presbyterian in faith and practice.

## The Fundamentalist Convention

THE World's Christian Fundamentals Association is returning to Philadelphia, its birthplace, for its Fourteenth Annual Convention, which will be held in Bethany Presbyterian Church May 17-24. The decision to hold this Convention in Philadelphia was made at the convention last June in Los Angeles. Charles L. Huston of Coatesville, Pa.; was elected Chairman of the Philadelphia Executive Committee. Peter Stam, Jr., is Secretary of this committee, Mr. John L. Steele is Treasurer, and Charles G. Trumbull, Editor of *The Sunday School Times*, is chairman of the Program Committee, which is co-operating with the President of the Association in choosing speakers and building up the program of the convention.

The theme this year will be "The Personal Return of Christ." A prophetic conference was held in Philadelphia in 1918, which led the way to the first convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association the following year. Various emphases have been made from year to year. It has been twelve years since the Lord's Return has been stressed. The Rev. Paul Rood, President of the Association, writes in *The Sunday School Times*, "We have tried to be sensitive to the Holy Spirit in choosing our theme, and then of necessity we had to be sensitive to the needs of the Church and the world at this present time. These are days of stress and uncertainty, and men are hungering for the certainties of the Word of God. The outstanding need of the hour is a Heaven-sent revival and the speedy evangelization of the world. We know of no better way to bring this about than to emphasize the Lord's return and related themes. We owe this great truth to the world and to the Church if we are to fulfill our stewardship of the Scripture. No subject could be more timely and pertinent. People are thinking of it as never before, and our convention theme will arouse nation-wide and worldwide interest. The presentation of the theme must be loving and constructive, not combative. The practical effect of this truth upon life and service must be emphasized. Our convention must above all else be spiritual, and therefore we shall major in the deepening of the spiritual life, evangelism, and missions. We pray and hope that a revival will come to Philadelphia through our convention which shall strengthen the hand of every evangelical pastor and church and shall belt the globe in its influence."

The following will be among the convention speakers: Dr. Harry I. Ironside, Moody Memorial Church, Chicago; Dr. Arno C. Gaebelein, author and Bible teacher, New York City; Dr. W. B. Riley, First Baptist Church, Minneapolis; Dr. Will H. Houghton, Calvary Baptist Church, New York City; Dr. W. H. Rogers, Hinson Memorial Church, Portland, Ore.; Dr. Stewart P. MacLennan, First Presbyterian Church, Hollywood, Cal.; Dr. M. R. De Haan, Calvary Undenominational Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Paul W. Rood, Beulah Tabernacle, Turlock, Cal.; Arthur H. Carter, Editor of Bible Witness, London, Eng.; David L. Cooper, President of Biblical Research Society, Los Angeles, Cal., and Miss Elizabeth L. Knauss, author and lecturer, Davenport, Ia.

Among subjects to be discussed will be the following: Prophecy the Proof of Inspiration; The Biblical Logic of the Second Advent; The Two Aspects of our Lord's Return; Looking Backward Over a Third of a Century of Prophetic Fulfillment; The Menace of Bolshevism; The Shadows of the Great Tribulation; The Present Sanhedrin Movement and Its Great Possibilities; Why Evangelize Israel in This Generation?; The Day of the Lord and Its Unspeakable Glories; The Eternal Issues.

A large attendance is expected, and Christian people are asked to pray that the convention may be blessed of God in the bringing of a revival.

Peter Stam, Jr., care of The Religious Press Association, 325 North Thirteenth Street, Philadelphia, is Secretary of the Philadelphia Executive Committee and all letters sent him will be referred to the proper committee or individual.

## The Vatican and Palestine

A RECENT news item from "Vatican City," the new name of the Pope's dominions declared that "It was said unofficially today that the Vatican would not oppose the proposed visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cosmo Gordon Lang, to the Holy Land if he made the visit privately as one of the many pilgrims of every Christian faith who go to the Holy Land at Easter or other seasons. It was repeated, however, that an official visit by the Archbishop would create a difficult situation, since it would establish a precedent which would permit its repetition indefinitely."

The "Living Church," representative of American High Church Episcopalianism indignantly comments as follows:

"As substantially the same cablegram went the rounds of the press last year, so this is a mere repetition of what nobody challenged then, it seems time now to characterize the item.

"It is frankly none of the business of 'the Vatican' whether the Archbishop of Canterbury travels to the Holy Land; whether he goes as a pilgrim or officially as a Catholic metropolitan of a friendly Church which has officially received Greek bishops as its guests in Lambeth.

"When 'the Vatican' secured any control over the movements of the Archbishop of Canterbury we cannot imagine. If the Pope and Mr. Mussolini wish to designate a certain portion of what had been Italian territory as an independent state, with a former Italian subject as its ruler, that is their affair and none of us has sought to interfere. We do suggest, however, that a ruler thus created has no control over an English archbishop or a British peer. As American bishops sit with English bishops under the presidency of the same archbishop, we do maintain that this is the affair

of all of us. So far as we know, we have no Pope-controlled archbishop and we desire none. We cannot say whether the Archbishop of Canterbury has any wish to travel to the Holy Land. But we do hope that a nation that once declared that 'the Bishop of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop' will sturdily maintain that ground. If such a visit will create 'a difficult situation' and a 'precedent,' the sooner they are created the better, and without knowing, we shall hope that the English Church has a Primate strong enough to create them, and shall hope for the speedy report that the Archbishop is on his way."

## In Retrospect and Prospect—Concluded

We hope to make the paper increasingly useful as an instrument for the exposition and defense of the Bible and the Gospel it proclaims. With this end in view its editors welcome suggestions and criticisms from its readers. Some have expressed the opinion that the paper is too "high-brow" but they have been few in number as compared with those who have flattered us by telling us that they valued CHRISTIANITY TODAY above other religious papers because of the "high intelligence" by which it is informed as well as because of its loyalty to the "faith once for all delivered." A number have expressed the wish that we deal with the Sunday School lessons but we do not see how this could be done in any adequate way without increasing the size of the paper. If we could increase the paper to thirty-two pages—an increase that would necessitate an increase in the price of the paper—we would be glad to arrange for an exposition of the Sunday School lessons along with other suggested additions, but we hesitate to take this step under the existing circumstances. We expect to introduce new features during the coming year, including a religious story dealing with the situation in the Church today. There is nothing sacrosanct about the present make-up of the paper: it will be altered in form or content whenever it appears that such alterations are likely to make the paper a better instrument in the service of the great cause that it exists to further. Free from all ecclesiastical control but loyal to the Bible as the Word of God we continue our task of stating, defending and furthering the Gospel in the modern world. This paper is a success in the eyes of its sponsors only as it proves helpful in maintaining the Christian heritage in the face of encroaching Modernism and in transmitting it undiminished to those who shall come after us. The testimonies we have received from many quarters embolden us to believe that a sufficient measure of success has attended our efforts as to warrant us in appealing to all those who value the Christian heritage to lend us their aid in extending the influence of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

## The Pope Protests Against Protestantism in Italy

WHEN, under the Lateran Treaty and Concordat, the Pope was given a new authority, with sovereign rights, it was generally anticipated that trouble awaited the people gathered within the limits of Vatican City. For years past, in the kingdom of Italy, there has been a growing sense of religious freedom. A recent message from Rome throws light upon the actual circumstances, giving details of a remarkable pronouncement on the part of the Pope, upon Protestant propaganda as at present pursued under the very shadow of St. Peter's at Rome. As head of the Roman Catholic Church—to follow the message—"His Holiness views with regret the increasing activity of Protestants, in Rome and throughout Italy. Often, he declares, the propaganda is open, at other times underground; but, while allowing freedom of religion to non-Catholics, *the Lateran Treaty did not grant the right of carrying on propaganda against the Catholic religion.*" He also remarked upon the "injurious" nature of the propaganda, as ignoring, not to say contemning, the person of the Sovereign Pontiff and the "sacred character" of the Eternal City!

Commenting upon this pronouncement, *"The Christian" (London)* says: "Of course, no one ever dreamed of seeking from the Pope a right to carry on propaganda against Romanism; while the right to proclaim the Gospel and testify against error is the fundamental privilege (not to say duty) of every servant of Christ. To ask the Pope to grant facilities to spread light among the benighted people of his city were an utterly mistaken course of procedure. Accordingly, whatever word may yet be issued from the Holy See—possibly fulminated—nothing will deter those who, as desciples of Christ, proclaim the right of the soul to go direct to God, in confession and prayer, neither will anything hinder the witness of those who, by all and every means, preach among men a full and perfect salvation, authenticated from the Throne of God, whatever may be the will of popes, cardinals, bishops, or priests in Rome, or in any other place where the anti-Christian spirit may rule."

Protestants generally will regard this protest of the Pope as evidencing the desire of the Church of Rome for religious freedom when it is in the minority, and for religious monopoly whenever it is in the majority.

Recent decrees concerning religious freedom in Italy have been summarized as follows by the Secretary of the World's Evangelical Alliance:

1. All kinds of religious beliefs and forms of worship are permissible throughout the kingdom, provided they do not run contrary to public order and decent custom.

2. Churches and other buildings necessary for the work of these different religions may be acquired or erected, subject to a royal decree, obtainable through the Home Secretary, or the Minister of Justice.

3. The names of the ministers of these different churches ought to be notified to the Minister of Justice for his approbation, and to render legal acts done by them that require to be civilly registered (such as baptism and marriage).

4. A difference of religion forms no impediment to the enjoyment of all civil and political rights, nor to the acquirement and holding of any civil or military office.

5. Full liberty is granted for the propagation and discussion of religious subjects.

6. Parents and guardians can have their children exempted from attending the religious instruction given in the Public National Schools.

7-12. These decrees concern the marriage ceremony. Their gist is that all the ministers of religion referred to in the preceding decrees are at liberty to unite in matrimony men and women of any religious persuasion and of any nationality, provided their papers are in order, according to the laws of Italy, and of those of their respective countries. All such marriages have the legal validity of those performed by a civil magistrate.

Dr. Alexander Robertson in his recent book, "Mussolini and the New Italy" says:—"There is a law in Italy prohibiting voluntary military organisations which might become forces of rebellion in the land. Accordingly, when the generals, colonels, and other officers of the Salvation Army sent in their names to the Minister of Justice for his approval, he could not grant it. However, he referred them to Mussolini, who in effect said: 'A military organisation like the Salvation Army was not contemplated by the law, but the weapons of your warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, directed not against men and nations, but against the powers of darkness; go on with your warfare, and I will see you are protected.'"

## A "Josephus" that Caricatures Jesus

INTENSE interest throughout the Christian world, both among scholars and the great body of believers has been aroused by the recent appearance of what purports to be a new version of the works of Jesephus. This version, it is claimed, is descended from a copy of his works which Josephus is supposed to have written in Aramaic, for Jewish readers who could not understand his Greek version prepared for the Imperial authorities at Rome. (It is

the latter version that has been made familiar to the English-reading public through the famous version of William Whiston.) This Aramaic copy is said to have been translated into Greek again, and then into Old Slavonic. Two years ago, a German translation was completed, but this Spring the work is released for English readers. The translation into German is by Dr. Robert Eisler, and the English translation is by Dr. A. H. Krappe, both German scholars.

The new text includes a description of Jesus' physical appearance, and represents the events of Passion Week as a minor rebellion "nipped in the bud," though even Josephus (or Pilate) seemed certain that the danger of violence and revolution lay not in Jesus but in His followers.

As for his appearance, Jesus is said to have been extremely small, his figure bent or crooked (the result of hard toil in boyhood). It is held that this may explain references in the Gospels (Luke 4:23, 19:3, Matthew 6:27, 11:11) that it is in line with Jesus' thought of Himself as the "Servant of the Lord"; also it is observed that Dr. Rendel Harris has pointed out in Syriac literature allusions perhaps indicative that Christ was short of stature. Dr. Eisler calls the passage "this mercilessly cold, detached, unsympathetic, pen-portrait of the man Jesus." The words of the "reconstructed" text are as follows:

"There appeared a certain man of magical power, if it is permissible to call him a man, whom certain Greeks call a son of (a) God, but his disciples the true prophet, said to have raised the dead and to have cured all diseases. Both his nature and his form were human, for he was a man of simple appearance, mature age, dark skin, short growth, three cubits tall (i.e. 4 ft. 6 in.), hunchbacked, with a long face, a long nose, eyebrows meeting above the nose, with scanty hair, but having a line in the middle of the head after the fashion of the Naziraeans, and with an undeveloped beard. . . .

"Many of the multitude followed after Him and hearkened to His teaching; and many souls were in commotion, thinking that thereby the Jewish tribes might free themselves from Roman hands. . . . When more people again assembled round Him, He glorified Himself through His actions more than all. The teachers of the Law were overcome with envy, and gave thirty talents to Pilate, in order that he should put Him to death. And he took (it) and gave them liberty to execute their will themselves. And they laid hands on Him, and crucified Him contrary to the laws of (their) fathers."

Josephus was a man who, after being a leader of the Jews against the Romans, gained the favour of Vespasian and became an agent of the Roman Government. The Encyclopædia Britannica says of him: "Some allowance must be made for a tendency to exaggeration or false accentuation wherever his vanity judged such a thing to be desirable." Again, as to his *Antiquities*, "He frequently omits or modifies points which seemed to him likely to give offence." Again, of his Autobiography, "His narrative of these events cannot be regarded as an impartial one; and that in some points at least he was led to sacrifice truth to self-interest can be conclusively shown by his own earlier work, *The History of the Jewish War*."

At first sight any delineation of Christ by Josephus the Jew would be expected to have a hostile intent; and then, if a statement from his pen should pass through the hands of Jewish copyists in order to circulate among such as "hated Christ without a cause," and clamoured for His death, there could not but adhere to the resultant record features which would shock the feelings of those who had accepted Jesus as Christ the Lord, the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. From the work just published it would appear that this is what actually came to pass. Hence the physical features of Christ were described in the phraseology of contempt, and His death and resurrection invested with the elements of deceitful fiction.

Calling the "portrait" a "caricature," *The Christian* (London) remarks indignantly: "The Slavonic version is hailed as coming under the designation of 'researches,' with the insinuation that it 'breaks up new ground' in historical investigation, and much beside. All the time, however, those who remember that, in the past Christ and His people have been held up to scorn and contempt, will be prepared to learn that the delineation which was last week found to be 'good copy' in the daily papers, is *not a portrait but a caricature*, and therefore can furnish nothing for edification. What is more, though the misrepresentation cannot hurt the Lord Jesus, it is hardly likely at the present time to be acceptable in another direction. During recent years, as is well known, it has pleased the more thoughtful among the Jewish people, to claim Christ as of their race, to boast of Him as 'one of themselves.' Though disallowing His higher claims, have they not gloried in His moral majesty, and much beside? Can it be other than unfortunate, then, that, at such a time, there should have been raked up a blasphemous defamation of Christ, even though given forth in the name of the eminent Josephus? For one thing, the defamation shows how sadly the Jewish mind has misunderstood Christ, and has failed to estimate aright His work 'for us men and for our salvation.'"

Writing in the *British Weekly* (London), the Rev. Prof. W. A. L. Elmslie, D.D., of Westminster College, Cambridge, takes the view that even if Josephus *did* describe Christ's appearance in unflattering terms, yet it need not trouble true believers. Says Dr. Elmslie:

"Even if it be authentic 'Josephus,' what proof is there that he is not merely handing on the careless exaggerations, or caricaturist adjectives, used by contemptuous foes of Jesus? Dr. Eisler, however, deals wisely and feelingly with the shock to sentiment should this be true. How often the physically weak or unbeautiful . . . have been the giants of man's spiritual life. We hold that the glory of God is here manifest in man. Perhaps we should also learn to see that the perfection of man's spiritual being may best be shown, not apart from physical suffering or handicap, but by its presence and overcoming. And if Jesus' bodily appearance were as here portrayed, think, too, of the increased proof of some amazing force in his Personality which caused the people to expect to see in Him the Messiah-King of Israel.

"Dr. Eisler's development . . . is lamentable. He seems to forget how precarious, in whole and in part, is his reconstituted text of Josephus. He acknowledges the admittedly unscrupulous character of Josephus, and knows that both he and Pilate, for that matter, would suit their own convenience in representing the affair of the Crucifixion as an insurrection merely. Yet he uses this material, seemingly without a qualm, as an assured basis for an elaborate, novel interpretation of the history of John the Baptist and of Jesus, battering and distorting the Gospel traditions into whatsoever shape may support the Josephus text. His treatment of the tradition of the appearance of Jesus after the Crucifixion is rash and unscientific to the last degree.

"It is a great misfortune that so erudite and earnest a scholar should display such recklessness as a historian, but the phenomenon is by no means without precedent.

"The book is emphatically not for the general reader, unskilled in problems of literary criticism. Scholars of the New Testament will discriminate between the MSS. problem and Dr. Eisler's ingenious, interesting but over-confident construction of history. On the MSS. problem we have already Mr. Nock's weighty opinion that they contain only late and unreliable material; and unless other competent authorities take a different view we need not consider that any invaluable text for the study of Jewish history and Christian origins has come to light."

## New Council for Palestine

PALESTINE is to have new features in its form of government under the British mandate. A Council, composed of the High Commissioner and twenty-two members will form a legislative body. Half of the members will be appointed by the British Government and half chosen by election in Palestine, the members elected are to include both Jews and Mohammedans.

# Index to Vol. I. May 1930 to April 1931


## EDITORIALS

By Way of Preface ... May 1930 ... Page 1
Christianity as It Was and Is ... May 1930 ... " 3
A Statement and an Appeal ... May 1930 ... " 4
A Word of Explanation ... May 1930 ... " 4
The Managing Editor ... May 1930 ... " 4
What Is Christianity? ... June 1930 ... " 1
"Speaking the Truth in Love" ... June 1930 ... " 3
The Passing of Professor Harnack ... June 1930 ... " 4
The Moderator of the 142nd Assembly ... June 1930 ... " 4
An Explanatory Statement ... June 1930 ... " 4
Is Christianity True? ... July 1930 ... " 1
Roman Catholic Comment on Assembly Action ... July 1930 ... " 3
"The Gospel of Jesus" ... July 1930 ... " 3
Rights Vs. Duties ... July 1930 ... " 4
Relative to the Value of Christianity ... August 1930 ... " 1
"Who Are the Heretics?" ... August 1930 ... " 3
The Deepest Quietive ... August 1930 ... " 4
"Books of Religious Significance" ... August 1930 ... " 5
Christ and Christianity ... September 1930 ... " 1
War, Birth Control and Science ... September 1930 ... " 3
Westminster Theological Seminary ... September 1930 ... " 4
What Is a Christian? ... October 1930 ... " 1
Prayer and the Weather ... October 1930 ... " 3
The Present Age ... November 1930 ... " 1
Princeton Seminary's New Champion ... November 1930 ... " 2
The Central Significance of Christmas ... December 1930 ... " 1
The Factual Basis of Christianity ... December 1930 ... " 2
Tributes to Dr. Wilson ... December 1930 ... " 3
The Paramount Duty of the Christian Church ... January 1931 ... " 1
Preaching in the Language of Today ... January 1931 ... " 2
The Joy of Salvation ... January 1931 ... " 3
A Notable Series of Bible Expositions ... January 1931 ... " 3
The Supernaturalism of Christianity ... February 1931 ... " 1
The Proposed Union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches ... February 1931 ... " 3
The Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord: Its Importance ... March 1931 ... " 1
"Is the Northern Church Theologically Sound?" ... March 1931 ... " 3
The Revolt Against Christian Moral Standards ... April 1931 ... " 1
What and Where Is Christ Today? ... April 1931 ... " 3
In Retrospect and Prospect ... April 1931 ... " 3

## CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES

Present Situation in the Presbyterian Church ... May 1930 ... Page 5
*J. G. Machen*
Protestantism's Tomorrow ... May 1930 ... " 8
*C. E. Macartney*
The Study and Defence of the Bible in Westminster Seminary ... June 1930 ... " 5
*R. Dick Wilson*
If One Resorts to Ordinary Logic ... June 1930 ... " 9
*Gertrude Smith*
The Office of Ruling Elder: Its Obligations and Responsibilities ... July 1930 ... " 5
*F. P. Ramsay*
"The Gospel of Jesus" ... July 1930 ... " 7
*Wm. Childs Robinson*
Christianity Today in the Near East ... August 1930 ... " 5
*S. W. Beach*
The "Yes and No" Attitude in the Presbyterian Church ... September 1930 ... " 5
*F. H. Stevenson*
The Reformation Gospel in the Modern World ... October 1930 ... " 4
*W. A. Maier*
The Present Position in the Presbyterian Church of England ... October 1930 ... " 6
*A. H. Fraser*
Robert Dick Wilson—Defender of God's Word ... November 1930 ... " 4
*O. T. Allis*
The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Free University of Amsterdam ... November 1930 ... " 9
What Shall We Do With Christianity? (Part 1) ... December 1930 ... " 4
*W. B. Wells*
75,580 ... January 1931 ... " 4
*W. V. Watson*
What Shall We Do With Christianity? (Part 2) ... January 1931 ... " 5
*W. B. Wells*
The Prophetic Urge ... February 1931 ... " 4
*F. E. Hamilton*
Let the Orthodox in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Unite! ... March 1931 ... " 6
*J. C. Monsma*
Labels for Presbyterians ... April 1931 ... " 4
*W. V. Watson*
Noble Loneliness—Micaiah ... April 1931 ... " 5
*R. Saillens*
Church Union and Doctrinal Purity ... April 1931 ... " 6
*Wm. Carter*
Religious Conditions in New Zealand ... April 1931 ... " 7
*A. A. Murray*

## SERMONS

The Saving Christ ... May 1930 ... Page 11
*B. B. Warfield*
The Concentrated Life ... June 1930 ... " 6
*H. H. McQuilkin*
"A Man . . Whom God Had Hedged In" ... July 1930 ... " 6
*D. Def. Burrell*
The Passing of a Peerless Personality ... August 1930 ... " 7
*A. Z. Conrad*
Joy in Service ... September 1930 ... " 8
*G. T. Purves*
The Modern Crucifixion ... November 1930 ... " 6
*F. Paul McConkey*
The Eternal Child ... December 1930 ... " 6
*C. E. Macartney*
The Sources of National Decay ... January 1931 ... " 7
*J. Keir Fraser*
What Is Truth? ... March 1931 ... " 8
*R. B. Kuiper*

## BOOK REVIEWS

Machen—The Virgin Birth of Christ ... May 1930 ... Page 13
Brunner—The Theology of Crisis ... May 1930 ... " 14
Chrisman—The Message of the American Pulpit ... May 1930 ... " 15
Inge—What is Hell? ... June 1930 ... " 11
Potter—Humanism ... June 1930 ... " 12
Jones—The Christ of Every Road ... July 1930 ... " 9
Andrews—Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas ... July 1930 ... " 10
Mencken—Treatise on the Gods ... August 1930 ... " 9
Lowe—"Rashi" on the Pentateuch—Genesis ... August 1930 ... " 10
Kirk—The Spirit of Protestantism ... August 1930 ... " 11
Nixon—An Emerging Christian Faith ... September 1930 ... " 11
Papini—Saint Augustine ... September 1930 ... " 12
Vergilius Ferm—What Is Lutheranism? ... September 1930 ... " 13
Speer—Some Living Issues ... October 1930 ... " 9
Van Dusen—Ventures in Belief ... November 1930 ... " 11
Mathews—The Atonement and the Social Process ... November 1930 ... " 11
Burggraaff—The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America ... November 1930 ... " 12
Fairbairn—"The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews"
*Fairbairn vs. Fairbairn* ... December 1930 ... " 10
Knudson—The Doctrine of God ... December 1930 ... " 10
Hepp—Calvinism and the Philosophy of Nature ... January 1931 ... " 11
Masselink—Why Thousand Years? Or Will the Second Coming be Pre-Millennial? ... January 1931 ... " 12
Squires—Educational Movements of Today ... February 1931 ... " 12
Spaulding—Twenty-Four Views of Marriage ... February 1931 ... " 12
Zerbe—The Karl Barth Theology or the New Transcendentalism ... February 1931 ... " 13
Sockman—Morals of Tomorrow ... March 1931 ... " 14
Campbell—Freedom and Restraint ... March 1931 ... " 14
Stump—The Christian Life ... April 1931 ... " 10
Jeans—The Mysterious Universe ... April 1931 ... " 10
Meeter—Fundamental Principles of Calvinism ... April 1931 ... " 11

## NEWS OF THE CHURCH

May 1930 ... Page 20
June 1930 ... " 22
July 1930 ... " 16
August 1930 ... " 18
September 1930 ... " 18
October 1930 ... " 18
November 1930 ... " 19
December 1930 ... " 17
Jan. 1931 ... Pages 6 and 19
Feb. 1931 ... Pages 5 and 19
March 1931 ... Page 17
April 1931 ... " 19

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

May 1930 ... Page 16
July 1930 ... " 14
August 1930 ... " 15
September 1930 ... " 16
October 1930 ... " 14
November 1930 ... " 13
December 1930 ... " 13
January 1931 ... " 17
February 1931 ... " 16
March 1931 ... " 10
April 1931 ... " 15

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

July 1930 ... Page 11
August 1930 ... " 12
September 1930 ... " 14
October 1930 ... " 12
November 1930 ... " 14
December 1930 ... " 14
January 1931 ... " 13
February 1931 ... " 14
April 1931 ... " 11

## VOICES FROM MANY QUARTERS

May 1930 ... Page 17
June 1930 ... " 14

## NOTES ON BIBLICAL EXPOSITION

I. A Man Who Could Say "No" ... January 1931 ... Page 9
*J. G. Machen*
II. The Witness of Paul ... February 1931 ... " 10
*J. G. Machen*
III. Plain Speaking in a Time of Peril ... March 1931 ... " 12
*J. G. Machen*
IV. The Freedom of the Christian Man ... April 1931 ... " 8
*J. G. Machen*

## CURRENT VIEWS AND VOICES

October 1930 ... Page 16
November 1930 ... " 17
December 1930 ... " 15
January 1931 ... " 15
February 1931 ... " 16
April 1931 ... " 13

## INTERESTING FACTS CONCERNING CHURCHES AND MINISTERS

November 1930 ... Page 19
December 1930 ... " 17
January 1931 ... " 17
February 1931 ... " 16
March 1931 ... " 16
April 1931 ... " 16

## OPEN LETTERS

February 1931 ... Page 6

## MISCELLANEOUS

June 1930 ... Page 17
December 1930 ... " 8
January 1930 ... " 8


BENJ. F. EMERY CO., PHILA.