Covenant Theological Seminary Library


# 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-DECEMBER, 1930 — Vol. 1 — No. 8

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# The Central Significance of Christmas

CHRISTMAS commemorates the birth of a great man who spent His life doing good. It commemorates that but at the same time it commemorates so much more that we need to be on our guard lest we forget that it really does do that. This greater thing that it commemorates is the advent, the entering into the sphere of human life of the SON of GOD.

Those who deny that the BABE of BETHLEHEM was born of a Virgin and who maintain that the possibilities that slumbered in MARY'S SON were the result of a favorable heredity, in fact all but the few misguided individuals who think of JESUS as a legendary being, speak of the birth of CHRIST and with few exceptions regard Him as the greatest and best of those born of women. There are an increasing number today, however, who cannot bring themselves to speak of an advent of CHRIST; and that because such a mode of speech implies that He had existed previous to His birth in Bethlehem of Judea and that for the accomplishment of a definite purpose He had left that glory that He had had with the Father before the world was and entered into the conditions of earth. Unless we see in JESUS not only a man but the GOD-MAN it is hardly likely that we will think of Christmas as commemorating His advent.

No doubt it is possible to be so taken up with the divine in JESUS as to lead us to forget His humanity, the fact that He became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. There is little danger of our falling into that error today, however. The danger is rather that enamored of His humanity we will be forgetful of His divinity. Be this as it may those of us who regard Him as infinitely more than a man yield to others in no respect in our confession of His humanity. There is no hesitation at all on our part when we say that in all that goes to make a man, whether as regards his body or his soul, JESUS was and is a man. None the less Christmas commemorates not so much the birth of the best and most beloved of the sons of men as a "momentous event in the eternal life of GOD: a manifestation, a forth-coming, a mission, a redemptive movement, a visitation, a great descent."

The presence of a GOD-MAN in this world calls loudly and insistently for explanation—and that whether we consider this more than extraordinary, this supernatural being from an intellectual or from an ethical viewpoint.

From an intellectual viewpoint a difficulty is raised by the fact that the presence of the GOD-MAN in this world involved a break in the order of nature, a miracle in the strict sense of the word. We live in an ordered world, a casually connected world; and yet on the assumption that JESUS was a GOD-MAN it is certain that the causes ordinarily operating in this world cannot account for Him. From a more ethical viewpoint, a difficulty is raised by the presence of one who was holy, harmless and undefiled in a world filled with sin and shame, in a world reeking with iniquity and blasphemy—and that as a result of His own choice. The ethical problem raised is similar to that which would be raised by the discovery of one distinguished for purity and good works in a night-club of the fastest sort. But whether we be concerned over the intellectual or the ethical difficulty, or both, that is raised by the presence of the GOD-MAN in this world of ours, the needed explanation for all those who have eyes to see is given in that "Faithful Saying" by which the early Christian community expressed its practical belief in the Advent of our LORD: "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation that CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners." If sin had not entered this world, JESUS would never have come; but sin being here as an awful reality, His coming was necessary if men were to be saved, if a fallen race was to be restored to its GOD. JESUS did not come into this world because He was attracted by the ways of sinful men. Far from it. Sin was the one thing that He hated with perfect hatred. He was here on an errand of mercy. It was His love

## IN THIS ISSUE:


What Shall We Do With Christianity? — William Bittle Wells — 4

The Eternal Child — Clarence Edward Macartney — 6

Three Tributes to Dr. Wilson — 8

Books of Religious Significance — 10

Letters to the Editor — 13

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice — 14

Current Views and Voices — 15

News of the Church — 17

not of sin but of sinners that brought Him here and that kept Him here until He had accomplished His task.

To say that it was specifically to save sinners that CHRIST came into this world is not to say that that was the only end He had in view; and yet if we are to preserve the emphasis of Scripture and of the Church of the ages we must say, without hesitation, that it was the central end He had in view. It is true that He came to reveal GOD, to be the light of the world in things moral and spiritual. It is true that He came to reorganize human society, to establish a kingdom in which justice should prevail and in which love should be the law. But important as are these, and other ends, they are subordinate to the great central purpose of His coming. To regard them as primary is to misunderstand His life-task; it is to exalt a corollary above the main proposition; it is to value the by-product above the principal product. What is even more important to note is that only as CHRIST saves from sin does His work as revealer and social reorganizer become effective. It is sin that lies at the root of our moral and spiritual ignorance as well as of our social maladjustments; hence only as sin is eliminated from our lives do we profit by the knowledge He brought or adjust our social activities to the requirements of that kingdom of love and righteousness He came to establish.

We are constantly told that there is an overwhelming presumption against the belief, held by the whole Christian world, that so tremendous an event as the coming of the SON of GOD into this world ever happened. That, however, is because men persist in trying to ignore the fact of sin in this world. That such is the case is evidenced by the fact that whether or not men think there is an overwhelming presumption against such an event having occurred is found to almost invariably turn on what they think about the moral and spiritual condition of mankind. When they think that men, on the whole, are in a normal condition, as good morally and spiritually as could reasonably be expected at this stage of the evolutionary process, we find them thinking that the presumption is overwhelmingly against the thought that GOD'S own SON assumed flesh and dwelt among us—because they feel that there was no real need of such an act on His part. But when they hold that men are in an abnormal condition, morally and spiritually; that they have gone wrong, so wrong that they constitute a lost and condemned race, a race that left to itself will fester in its corruption from eternity to eternity; then by as much as they believe in the existence of a good GOD who is interested in the welfare of His creatures they are disposed to think that He will intervene, that He will put forth His hands to save and redeem.

If Christmas is to mean to us all that it ought to mean and may mean; if it is to speak to us not merely of transient joys, given and received, but also of abiding joys and unfailing hopes, it must be because it brings to us the vision of Him who became incarnate for us men and our salvation. All well-grounded hope, whether for ourselves or for humanity, is bound up with the conviction that one who was on an equality with GOD entered into the conditions of humanity some nineteen hundred years ago. Education and legislation and such like, important as they are, have no power to transform the heart, to develop the spirit of good-will among men. JESUS alone has the ability to do this; and yet only as this is done, and in proportion as it is done, can we intelligently hope for a society in which justice shall prevail, in which love shall be the law, and happiness the universal condition. We, however, are not merely the children of time, we are also the children of eternity; hence our deepest joy on Christmas Day ought to have its source in the fact that it speaks to us of One who is able to bestow upon us the forgiveness of our sins and to make us meet not only for the work of this life but for the inheritance of the saints in light.

## The Factual Basis of Christianity

AN outstanding characteristic of modern-religious liberalism—and one that places it in sharp antagonism to historic Christianity—is its open or implied denial of the facts upon which the Christian religion rests.

No criticism of that Manifesto of liberalism in the Presbyterian Church known as the "Auburn Affirmation" goes deeper than that which points out its denial or indifference to the factual basis of Christianity as shown by its attitude toward the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of our LORD and especially its attitude toward His death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to GOD. We do not indeed agree with those who tell us that Christianity consists of facts not doctrines—facts without doctrines are merely facts that are not understood —but certainly doctrines which are not the explication of facts are something other than doctrines as they have been understood in Christian circles. At the best they are myths and at the worst lies.

A mighty series of facts that find their culmination in the incarnation, atonement and heavenly priesthood of JESUS CHRIST supply the foundation of the Christian religion. It cannot be stated too strongly or too frequently that Christianity is grounded in facts, in events that happened. Whoever rejects these facts or denies their eternal value and significance, whether or no he realizes it, is an enemy of the Christian religion. The famous declaration of Lessing "accidental truths of history can never be the proof of necessary truths of reason," consistently applied, tears up Christianity at its very roots, inasmuch as Christianity derives its distinctive content not from "necessary truths of reason" but from what Lessing calls "accidental truths of history." We would not admit of course that there was anything "accidental" about these "truths of history" but truths of history they certainly were and are. No doubt this exposes Christianity to the peril of historical investigation. A religion independent of historic facts need not concern itself about the historicity or unhistoricity of any alleged events. Not so, however, Christianity. It stands or falls with the question whether certain events actually happened. Apart from these events, it has, could have no gospel. For "gospel" means "good news," information about something that has happened. This is not to suggest that it is at all doubtful whether these events actually happened, but it is to say that apart from these events, there is and could be no such thing as Christianity as it is set forth in the New Testament and in the historic creeds of the Christian church.

It is in the light of this tendency to maintain that the value of Christianity is independent of the historic truthfulness of the Bible that we should evaluate the wide-spread denial of the virgin birth of our LORD as an essential doctrine of the Christian faith. No doubt there are many exceptions but as far as those who are at all consistent in their thinking are concerned it will ordinarily be found that back of their skepticism as to the story of the virgin birth is the notion that no historical events are essential to Christianity. As a matter of fact the story of the virgin birth is so well supported that it is hardly supposable that any informed persons would regard it as unhistorical did they not have the notion that no miraculous events are historical. Readers of Dr. MACHEN'S "The Virgin Birth of Christ" will hardly contradict us at this point. If those who maintain that the value of Christianity is independent of historic truthfulness of the Bible most frequently cast suspicion on such events as the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of our LORD that is only because such statements are less fitted to arouse the dissent of the rank and file of Christians than would similar statements concerning the deity of CHRIST or His existence today as our ever-present LORD and SAVIOUR. Be that as it may, it should be remembered that we have to do with a movement of thought that concerns itself not merely with this or that single occurrence as essential to Christianity but with the question whether any historic facts are essential to Christianity. What is more, it should not be forgotten that the more important of the facts recorded in the Bible as historic are so bound together that there is no good reason to reject some without rejecting all. Really they stand or fall together. We hold that they stand together.

To perceive the sense in which Christianity rests on a factual basis is to perceive that a non-miraculous Christianity is just no Christianity at all; and that because the facts upon which Christianity rests are through and through miraculous. Our choice, therefore, is not between a miraculous and a non-miraculous Christianity; it is between a miraculous Christianity and no Christianity at all. How true this is appears most clearly perhaps when it is perceived that we cannot eliminate the miraculous without eliminating CHRIST Himself as He is pictured in the New Testament and yet it is this CHRIST who stands at the center of Christianity and makes it what it is.

Again, to perceive the sense in which Christianity rests on a factual basis is to perceive that there can be no such thing as a non-doctrinal Christianity. A religion based on facts is necessarily a doctrinal religion; because these facts have meaning only as they are interpreted. It is not the bare facts recorded in the New Testament, it is those facts interpreted as the New Testament interprets them that gives us Christianity. Give the facts no interpretation and they would not yield us Christianity; give them an interpretation other than that given in the New Testament and they will yield us something other than Christianity; it is only when we accept both the facts recorded in the New Testament and the interpretation of those facts found in the New Testament that we have what can honestly and intelligently be called Christianity. There is but one *Christian* interpretation of these facts and that is the one given by CHRIST and His apostles. Hence the falsity of the antithesis expressed in the saying "Christianity consists of facts not doctrines." A non-doctrinal Christianity just as truly as a non-miraculous Christianity is just no Christianity at all.

Yet again, to perceive the sense in which Christianity rests on a factual basis is to perceive that Christianity is a redemptive religion, not in the vague sense characteristic of other religions, but in the particular sense that it offers salvation from sin, conceived as guilt and power and pollution, through the expiatory death of JESUS CHRIST. Christianity is a redemptive religion not in the sense that it tells men what they must do to save themselves but rather in the sense that it tells them what CHRIST has done, and does to save them. At the heart of the Christian religion is the conviction that CHRIST bore our sins in His own body on the tree. Apart from that fact—a fact as truly historic as any fact that can be mentioned—there is and could be no redemption in the Christian sense of the word. Warfield rightly says: "Expiation, in its very nature, is not a principle but a fact, an event which takes place, if at all, in the conditions of time and space. A valid religion for sinful men includes in it, accordingly, of necessity an actual historical element, an actually wrought expiation for its sin. It is the very nerve of Christianity and the essence of its appeal to men—by virtue of which it has won its way in the world—that it provides this historical element and proclaims an actual expiation of human sin" ("Christology and Criticism," p. 340).

Finally, not to mention more, to perceive the place that facts occupy in the Christian religion is to perceive that the chief value of the Bible lies in the facts that it records. Men often write and speak as though the main value of the Bible lay in its moral and spiritual lessons and that as long as these are retained we need not be greatly concerned about the historical facts with which they are associated in the Bible—as though the Bible was like a great parable whose value is independent of the truthfulness of the story upon which it is based. There could be no greater mistake. Valuable as are the moral and spiritual lessons inculcated in the Bible, its chief value lies in the fact that it records those great acts of redemptoin that GOD has wrought for the salvation of His people—acts that have their culmination in the birth, life, death and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST.

## Tributes To Dr. Wilson

WE should like to call our readers' attention to several tributes to the late Dr. ROBERT DICK WILSON which appear on other pages of this issue. Many notices of the life and work of Dr. WILSON have been published during the last month in the religious press. We have not space to publish other fine remembrances of this great man of GOD which have come unsolicited to us. All these notices bear witness to the love in which Dr. WILSON was held by so many, and to the secure place he will undoubtedly occupy as one of the great scholars of the Church universal. It was a cause of rejoicing to Dr. WILSON to the end of his days, as it is to so many now, that GOD spared him long enough so that he could make his witness in no uncertain way when the clear call came to establish Westminster Seminary.

# What Shall We Do With Christianity?

By William Bittle Wells

[We are glad to be able to publish this month the first half of an article by a well-known Western Business man. Mr. Wells is a graduate of Stanford University, Palo Alto, California. For eight years he was Editor and Manager of "The Pacific Monthly," and for five years Northwest Editor and Manager of the "Sunset Magazine." He is now Northwest special agent for a large life insurance Company, with offices in Portland, Oregon.]

THE present situation in the religious world is at once so anomalous and contradictory that any attempt to analyze it fairly and truthfully is fraught with great difficulty. This is so because we find men high in religious councils who hold diametrically opposed views as to what constitutes a Christian, and as to the meaning and significance of Christianity itself.

The breach in the Church, whether due primarily to the Fundamentalists or to the Modernists, furnishes the secular world a peculiar, and, in some respects at least, a fascinating intellectual problem, that, at first glance, it would seem a school-boy could solve, so simple are the principles that are involved. When we ask, What is Truth? we get, and are entitled to get, a variety of answers. But when it comes to a question as to whether a thing is, or is not, it would seem that so simple a question could and would get an immediate and conclusive answer. That it does not get it, nor, in fact, an answer that is even commonly acceptable, is one of the anomalies of the present religious situation that puzzles those on the outside, and is causing dissatisfaction and disintegration within the Church.

Is this difference of opinion a fundamental and irreconcilable difference, worthy of justifiable separation, or is it a question that can and should be settled by deprecating the "divisive spirit," and striving for peace and unity?

The last meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, judging by press reports, evidently took the ground that more good than harm will come from a *laissez faire* attitude. The impression was made that this Church could not handle the question frankly and fearlessly; that, if it attempted to do so, there might ensue a schism in its ranks more deleterious and fateful than the present underground rumblings of discontent and possible division. Some other Protestant organizations were able to take a firmer stand for the Fundamentalist cause.

All this discussion of Fundamentalism and Modernism seems to the secular press to be a "much ado about nothing," and the onlooker does not understand why there should be any controversy at all, since both factions are preaching *about* Christ, both emphasize many of the same things, and both seemingly are striving for the "kingdom of God."

We do not have to go far to seek the reason for this attitude on the part of those outside the Church. When the Modernist says that "Christianity is a life," he makes Christianity broad enough to take in the Jew, the Unitarian, and all others who are *en rapport* with such a definition. It is apparent, of course, that any man—even an agnostic or an atheist—could and would be a Christian, under such a definition, if he squared his life to the highest ethical concepts. In fact, this very claim is made by the Modernist theory of Christianity, when carried to its logical conclusion, because it teaches that Christianity is an evolution, and that the old beliefs are now *passe*. That is, we have gone beyond the simple things of early Christianity, since all life is an evolutionary process, and religion must progress with it, or die. Therefore, beliefs, essential possibly at one time, are non-essentials in our highly enlightened age.

Accordingly, based upon the teachings of Jesus, Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, and others, the world can come to a common religious understanding, and as a result there can arise a newer, broader, higher, and better religion: one of kindness, right living, and broad brotherhood, freed from childish dogma and outworn creeds, impossible and chimerical miracles, myths, and mysteries. Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian can accept such a religion, and under such auspices it can progress in its development until man's selfishness is dissolved into thin air, his sins sunk in the evolutionary process, and life at last a heaven upon earth!

This outline of the newer religion, or, if you prefer, this broadening of Christianity in accordance with the spirit of the times and religious progress, has possibly something to commend it along purely altruistic and ethical lines. To call it Christianity, however, is a shocking perversion of the truth and a traversty upon real Christianity. It is in no sense a rational development of Christianity, nor is it in keeping in the slightest degree with that most indispensable of Christian ideals—the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of the living God.

In order, however, to attain its ends, the Modernist movement seeks to minimize the great, essential facts of Christianity, and eventually to have them entirely discarded. The puzzling and the alarming thing about the whole situation is the indifference of the laity to the nature of the calamity which threatens them. The plea is made for peace, when there is no peace. The plea is made for unity, when a man who really has convictions that are, or should be, as deep-rooted as nature itself should scorn to compromise when there is, there can be, no common ground for conciliation and peace. But the plea is made to pussyfoot, and the whole Church is pussyfooting. From a purely intellectual point of view the present situation is astounding.

Those who hold to Christianity as a "*faith* which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3), have no quarrel with those who would formulate a new religion, although they would deprecate such a departure from the true faith. But to call the Modernist movement Christianity, and to preach it in Christian churches, is nothing short of blasphemy, if the Scriptures tell the truth and do not tell lies. It is as if a Bolshevik of the worst type were to come to America, preaching revolution, sedition, and ruin, and people should say, "Well, he is a fine talker. Let us not have trouble." What would we think of our vaunted patriotism in such an instance? Yet there is something now at stake greater, far greater, than your mere patriotism and mine. It is the essence and truth of the Christian religion; and if we can pussyfoot upon that question, then we are indeed a race of mollycoddles, and deserve that stigma that is ours.

This unwillingness of men today to face facts squarely is one of the unfortunate and significant signs of the times. It is true of many lines of endeavor, and of many of the bad social conditions, but nowhere else is it as true as it is of religion. There is not only an indifference, but a sort of stupor pervading the intellectual world, an unwillingness to exert the mind, a lazy acceptance of diametrically opposed things rather than disturb the *status quo*. So, rather than protest, as it is their duty in honor to do, men are allowing a movement in religion to undermine the very warp and woof of Christianity; and, instead of having a real religion, to substitute for it an ethical con-

cept that is as far from the Christian ideal as the East is from the West.

Let us see whether this is true or not.

In the first place, we are dealing with the facts of the Gospels, and not with their interpretation, upon which there might properly be a variety of opinions. The New Testament, then, is the acknowledged authority as to what constitutes a Christian. It is to that source, and to no other, that we must go to find out about Christianity, however much we may differ as to what a Christian actually is. But even that point can be simplified, if we depend upon the Scriptures and not upon what men today may say or think.

A Christian is one who *believes in Christ.* "To believe in," according to Webster, "is to believe that the subject of the thought *exists;* to believe that the character, abilities, and purposes of the person are worthy of entire confidence—especially that his promises are entirely trustworthy." "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me." (John, 16:1). A believer in Christ, Webster says further, is "One who receives Christ as his Savior, and *accepts the way of salvation unfolded in the gospel.*"

We submit that that is a fair and honest definition of a Christian; that it has been the definition that has been accepted since the foundation of Christianity, and that any other definition is a fraud upon real Christianity. It is absolutely vital to sound reasoning that we keep this point in mind in connection with this entire controversy. Therefore, Christianity could not be a "life," unless there is a certain, clear-cut, definite belief before life. If we emasculate the meaning of the word Christianity to meet our own particular ideas, we cast ourselves into the mire of unsound reasoning. Why should men call themselves Christians if they discard the Christian concept?

Now, what is the Christian concept?

Primarily, it is that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God; that He was crucified, dead, and buried; that the third day He arose from the dead in the same body, according to Jesus Christ, in which He was crucified, and that, accordingly, His resurrection was actual and not spiritual; that Jesus now sits upon the right hand of God, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; that salvation comes through this acceptance of the divinity of Jesus.

The extreme Modernist takes the ground that Jesus was no more divine than you or I, but that we are all "Sons of God" in the same sense that Jesus was. Modernism, even at its best, is inclined to emphasize the divinity that there is in each of us, and to minimize any particular idea of divinity in Jesus. Yet, Christ was divine in a far different sense than all humanity is divine, or else He was the greatest liar and the greatest imposter since time began. In view of the fact that "goodness" is not compatible with lying, it is absurd to say that Jesus was a "good man," when He claimed to be the actual, divine Son of God. There is no other alternative: either He *was* the Son of God, or else He was the very devil incarnate.

Jesus made a profoundly significant claim for Himself. "Which of you," said Jesus, "convinceth me of sin?" No other man in all history ever made such a claim for himself, and no mere man, good or bad, in his senses, could or would make such a claim. Only a God can be free from sin.

Again Jesus said: "Before Abraham was, I AM." (John 8:58.) Such a statement must give any man pause. The Jews did not misunderstand it. They took stones to stone Him, because, as they said, being a man, Jesus made Himself out God. Did Jesus lie, or did He tell the truth when He said that He existed before Abraham?

Again Jesus said: *"If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins."* (John 8:24.) These are strong words; no uncertainty about them. According to Jesus, Himself, then, the unbeliever is to be punished for not believing that Jesus is the Son of God. Therefore, it is worse than idle to speak of Jesus as a "good man," when He denied that He was a man, and set Himself up as God, Himself. "I and the Father are one." (John 10:30.)

"Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" said Jesus.

"He answered and said, 'Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?' "

"And Jesus said unto him, 'Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee.'

"And he said, 'Lord, I believe.' And he worshipped Him." (John 9:35-38.)

We submit, then, that the man who does not accept the divinity of Jesus is not a Christian, and if the Church tolerates a man-made, and not a divine Christ—the very *sine qua non* of Christianity—the New Testament and Christianity itself must, without question, be thrown into the discard. It is absolutely vital to the life of Christianity that it uphold the purity of its beliefs. Therefore, the minister who pussyfoots upon this most vital and fundamental point should not only not be tolerated, as unfortunately he is being tolerated in the Christian pulpit, but he should be driven from it as Christ drove the moneychangers from the temple. Such a man has only one honorable thing to do: get out of the Christian pulpit, and, if necessary, swab the streets, thereby retaining his own self-respect as well as the respect of men. Hypocrisy is a damnable thing under any circumstances, but it is doubly damnable in a minister who attempts to undermine that faith which, to say the very least, he is paid to uphold. Yet there are ministers in many, if not all, the Protestant denominations who hang thus dishonorably onto their jobs, when they, of all men, should have stamina enough to starve rather than to stand before men as liars and hypocrites.

The strange part about all this is that, at this late date, it has become necessary to define Christianity in *terms of Christ,* and upon the rocks upon which it was founded and upon which it has rested down through the ages. When once the Christian Church parts company with the Divine Christ, it is on the road to destruction, and most certainly deserves to be destroyed. This is true because the rejection of the divinity of Jesus, according to true Christian principles, does not let the matter rest there. It brings into question the very existence of any God, and the authority of the whole Bible, as well as its truth or falsity upon all the subjects with which it deals. The divinity of Jesus is inextricably involved in all these matters, and in the entire scheme of the Christian religion. If it falls, the whole structure falls. And, if it does fall, no honest and intelligent man, who has been a Christian, could then consistently have anything to do with any religion, which to him must then be a sham and a mockery, a delusion and a snare. There would be left nothing to do but to eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die.

Therefore, it is futile to speak of the Christian religion as an evolutionary process. The foundations of Christianity were laid by Christ Himself, once for all, and its faith, if the Bible is any authority whatever, was given once for all. Jesus delivered practically but one message: the acceptance of Him as the Son of Almighty God, and salvation through that acceptance. No process, evolutionary or otherwise, could improve upon a perfect message. It could only distort it or misrepresent it.

There are two other phases of this Modernist movement which we wish to discuss because of the intellectual problems involved. One has to do with miracles, and the other, the resurrection of Jesus. In view of the complaint of the Modernists that those who believe in the Bible are prone to take the teachings *about* Jesus, rather than what Jesus Himself actually said and did, we will consider the miracles and the resurrection from that point of view, as recorded in the Gospels.

In the first place, however, attention is called to that peculiar quality of mind which accepts it as a fact that there is a God, and immediately limits that God to finite powers. For example, there are those in apparently increasing numbers who accept, or, say they accept, the divinity of Jesus,

but who do not believe in miracles. The idea that even a God could do anything contrary to what they understand as "Nature's Laws" is abhorrent to them. But what kind of a God would it be who would be unable to suspend a law that He had created?

What is a God?

Webster says that a God is a "Being conceived as of possessing *supernatural* power . . . the Supreme Being; the Eternal and Infinite Spirit." Therefore, to say that we believe in God, but we do not believe in miracles is a contradiction of terms. It is impossible to hold to the one, and not to hold to the other. Therefore, again, the rejection of the miracles in the New Testament means not only the rejection of the authenticity of the record, but, what is more vital, if possible, the rejection of the divinity of Jesus, and throwing overboard the whole idea of Christianity. This must be the inevitable conclusion because Christ's entire ministry, and consequently, Christianity, were founded upon miracles.

"Behold, there came a leper and worshipped Him, saying, 'Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.'

"And Jesus put forth His hand, and touched him, saying, 'I will; be thou clean.' And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." (Matthew 8:2-3.)

"Jesus said unto the Centurion, 'Go thy way; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee.' And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour." (Matthew viii; 13.)

"Behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped Him, saying, 'My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay Thy hand upon her, and she shall live.' Jesus rose and followed him, and so did His disciples, and behold, a woman which was diseased with an issue of blood for twelve years, came behind Him, and touched the hem of His garment; for she said within herself, 'If I may touch the hem of His garment, I shall be whole;' and when He saw her, He said, 'Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole.' And the woman was made whole from that hour.

"And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels and the people making a noise, He said unto them, 'Give place; for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth.' And they laughed Him to scorn. But when the people were put forth, He went in and took her by the hand, and the maid arose. And the fame hereof went abroad into all the land." (Matthew 19:18-26.)

"And great multitudes came unto Him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and He healed them: Insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be made whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see; and they glorified the God of Israel." (Matthew 15:30-31.)

"And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship, so that it was full. And He was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow; and they awake Him, and say unto Him, 'Master, carest Thou not that we perish?' And He arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, 'Peace, be still.' And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm." (Mark 4:37-39.)

"About the fourth watch of the night, He cometh upon them, *walking upon the sea*, and would have passed by them. But when they saw Him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out. For they all saw Him, and were troubled. And immediately He talked with them, and saith unto them, 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.' And He went unto them into the ship; and the wind ceased; and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered. For they considered not the miracles of the loaves; for their heart was hardened." (Mark 6:48-52.)

The four gospels are thus replete with miracles which Jesus performed. We cannot question the genuineness of these miracles without questioning the validity of the Scriptures in every respect. It is again a question of fact: do the Scriptures lie in this respect, or do they tell the truth? If they do not lie, granting that the writers were honest and sincere, were the men deceived and was Jesus deceived? The answer to this is that no man can read the account of the miracles without being impressed that the truth is being told. It seems to be inherent in these statements about Jesus. They have the ring of absolute sincerity. No fact in history is better attested than are the miracles of Jesus.

Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, came to Jesus by night, and said, "Rabbi, we *know* that Thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." (John 3:1-2.) Peter emphasized the same point: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him, in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know." (Acts 2:22.)

(*Concluded in our next issue*)

# The Eternal Child

A Christmas Sermon by

The Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D.,

Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

*"Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against; . . . That the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."*—Luke 2:34, 35.

I HAVE never read any comment on it, but I take it for granted that Raphael's great painting of Jesus and His mother in the Dresden gallery is an attempt to describe the thoughts and emotions of the mother and her child at the presentation in the temple. Mary, listening to the words of Simeon, presents and yet holds back her child, and her unfocused eye seems to be filled with wonder and awe as she sees far in the distance the strange destiny of the child who rests in her arms.

Simeon, a just man and devout and who waited for the consolation of Israel, and to whom it had been revealed by the Holy Ghost that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ, had come by the Spirit into the temple when Joseph and Mary brought Jesus up to present Him. By a revelation he knew that this child was the Lord's Christ, and taking Him up in his arms, he blessed Him. If we had the gift of Simeon, and when mothers and fathers bring their child here to the church to be baptized, we could cast the horoscope of the child and speak its destiny, the mother's face would be filled with wonder and awe, perhaps also with dread. As she contemplated the path of hardship, of sorrow, and of pain which her child was to tread; or the career of honor and of fame which he was to accomplish; the days of loneliness, the hours of anguish, perhaps also deeds of dishonor and of shame—no doubt, it is just as well that the future is veiled and that no Simeon can stand in our midst and sketch the future of the child as he did the future

of the divine child who lay in Mary's arms. Yet every life is full of wonder, of mystery, of awe, and what the people said when they were amazed at the circumstances of the birth of John the Baptist, we can all say when we look into the face of a child, what manner of child shall this be?

When he took the child in his arms, the devout Simeon blessed Joseph and His mother, and spoke unto Mary His mother. If a little before, St. Luke says that the parents brought in the child Jesus, as if Joseph were just as much a parent of the child as Mary, let it be noted how carefully he is to say here that it was to Mary His mother that Simeon addressed himself when he declared the destiny of the child. "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against; Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." In this statement of the destiny of Jesus, there are three things said of Him—all of them strikingly illustrated and fulfilled in the life of Jesus, in the history of His Church ever since, and in the lives and hearts of men today. First, that Christ is to men either a blessing or a condemnation. Second, that His presence, His truth, His Church, will ever create opposition. And third, that Christ Himself is the revealer of the thoughts of the heart, the supreme touchstone of human nature.

I. Christ is either a Blessing or a Condemnation; He is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel. Christ either condemns men or justifies them and saves them. In Him, men are saved or lost. He is a stone of stumbling upon which men fall, or a rock by which they rise unto life eternal.

When Simeon, inspired by the Holy Ghost, said that Christ is set or appointed, established for the falling and rising again of many in Israel, what he means is not that Christ is sent by God to make men stumble and fall, but that stumbling and rising again will ever be the effect of His person and His truth as men encounter Him upon the pathway of life. In Christ there is no neutrality. Men are either for Him or against Him. They rise through Him, or because of Him they fall.

We know how true this was during Christ's life upon earth. There were many who were offended in Him; many who stumbled and fell—the scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, Herod, Pilate, Caiaphas, Judas—all of these men fell, whereas others rose. Many who stood high fell; many who were poor and humble were exalted. To some His person and His doctrines present insuperable difficulty and make demands which only serve to arouse the bitter antagonism of the heart, and the very righteousness of these demands, the reasonableness of them only the more arouses the antagonism of human nature.

This is why it is a solemn and searching thing to be confronted with Christ, in the Scriptures, in the proclamation of the Church, in the lives of His followers. To have a duty presented to us and then refuse it; to have a higher path opened for us and decline it; to have a sin revealed to us, and refuse to leave it or mourn over it—this is to stumble, and to fall. But to obey, to change our life, to repent, to believe—this is to rise to new levels of character.

It has become sort of a fashion today to eulogize doubt, and praise doubters as superior minds, and presumably superior characters. It is worthwhile remembering, therefore, that we have nothing of this in Christ, or in the Scriptures, and that Christ makes it clear that the different attitudes of men towards Him is to be accounted for by a difference in their hearts. He told them plainly that the reason they did not believe in Him and love Him was because the love of the Father was not in their hearts. They were not of the truth, therefore, they would not come unto Him. In the great doctrines of the Christian faith, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the present intercession of the Son of God and His Second Coming to judge men and angels—in these doctrines some find only an occasion for scorn and angry rejection, and others treat them as impossible and old-wives tales; while others again rise upon these granite foundations of faith to holiness of life and fellowship with God. They find them to be not a stumbling block as some do, or foolishness as others do, but the power of God and the wisdom of God. How shall we account for this difference, this contrasting reaction to Christ and His Gospel? Not in environment; not in training; not in education, or heredity—for those who have had the same training, environment, heredity and education immediately part company in the presence of Christ. Some stumbling upon Him and falling, others rising through faith and obedience to nobility and beauty of life. "The reason," Christ says, "is a difference in life."

The last scene in the earthly life of Christ is a tragic demonstration of the way in which Christ divides among men. It was a prefiguration, too, of His influence upon human nature through all the ages. There He hung between the two thieves, one of whom reviled Him and cursed Him and mocked, while the other said, "Remember me when Thou comest into Thy Kingdom." So Christ is set for the falling and rising again of many souls, so He divides between men. He is the savor of death unto death, or to others the savor of life unto life. It is this fact which gives an immense earnestness and solemnity to the preaching of Christ and His Gospel. No one can hear it without being made thereby either better or worse. It is the proclamation of life eternal to them that believe; the proclamation of death to them that reject Him.

II. Christ will always be opposed in the World. "Behold this child is set for a sign which shall be spoken against." The angels when they announced the birth of Christ had foretold only His glory and His triumph. It remained for the devout Simeon to tell the plain truth that Christ who had come in the beauty of holiness and innocence, the incarnation of divine love and pity and compassion would be encompassed by hatred and enemies at every step in His earthly career until at length the storm of human passion and anger broke over His head upon the cross.

There are many scenes in the history ot the human race which are of a nature to undeceive those who will know nothing of human nature but its original goodness and excellence. But the one chapter in the history of humanity which forever refutes such a definition of human nature is that chapter which relates for us the life and the death of Jesus Christ. In that chapter we learn what human nature is and to what length it will go. This child is set for a sign which shall be spoken against. When I recall that some said He had a devil, others that He was mad—that men took up stones to stone Him, that they tried to throw Him over a precipice, that they betrayed Him and mocked Him and spat upon Him and crowned Him with thorns, crucified Him, and reflect that I share the same nature as those men, then I come to understand how far the heart can go in its rebellion against God.

In how striking a manner, the prediction of Simeon has been fulfilled. Wherever Christ, His cause, His Church, His Gospel, His doctrines, His true disciples are, there Christ will be spoken against. Wherever He is not spoken against, wherever His Gospel is not rejected and scorned, but received with polite courtesy or dismissed with cool indifference, there you can be sure that it is not Christ who is preached, and that what appears to be the Gospel is another Gospel which is not another. The real Christ, the real Gospel will always be a sign to be spoken against.

It is possible so to preach Christ that He shall not be spoken against. You can leave out His awful claims to pre-existence, deity, world dominion and judgment, you can omit His stern demands upon believers; you can be silent as to the solitary and exclusive way of righteousness and salvation, by faith in Him alone—all these things which are repugnant to the natural mind and heart of man—you can leave out, but only to discover that Christ so preached is not a sign to be spoken against. St. Paul tells us in his letter to the Galatians how men urged him to tone down a little the terms

of redemption, to persuade him to say that although men were saved by Christ, it was also necessary for them to observe certain Jewish laws and rites. But, he said, that if he should do that, then would the offense of the Gospel cease. But what he declared to be the offense of the Gospel, that the sinner is saved only by his faith in Christ that to Paul was the power of the Gospel, the Gospel of which he was not ashamed, the Gospel in which he gloried—nothing less than this seems now to be the question before the Church of Christ. Shall the Gospel, a stone of stumbling or a rock of rising, a sign to be spoken against or a truth to be embraced with rapture, love and joy, shall it cease to be the Gospel, good news, and become merely good advice, meditation, observation, warning?

III. Christ is the touchstone of human hearts. Behold this Child that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. The one great purpose of our earthly probation is that God might know our hearts. Not that in His omniscience, He cannot know and see what is in the heart now, or what the heart will do in the years to come, but rather that by the experiences of life, by the use or abuse of its opportunities and its dispensations, every man should write a description of his character. This, we are told was His purpose in His dealings with Israel. Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God hath led thee. These forty years in the wilderness that He might humble thee to prove thee, to know what is thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep His commandments or not. The life of the heart is the critical thing. Out of the heart are the issues of life, not what goes into a man, but what comes out of his heart defileth him. If men do not love Christ it is because the love of God is not in their hearts. With the heart, man believeth unto life. It is therefore in harmony with this great fact of life that Christ is declared to be the One who above all others tests the heart and reveals its secrets and its thoughts.

We can see how true this was during the life of Christ upon earth. There was something in Him and in His truth which awakened latent evil and latent good. The scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, Herod, Pilate, Caiaphas, Judas, brought before Christ, revealed themselves, their anger, hypocrisy, blasphemy, bitterness, enmity to good, their hatred and their treason. While others brought before Christ had discovered in themselves the things which God delights to find. Mary, her gratitude; the publican, his penitence; the Magdalene, her love; the centurion, his great faith; the thief, the penitent and his hope. So Christ has ever been revealing, uncovering, discovering what is in the heart. The same sun which shines upon the earth today ripens the good seed, the wheat, and also the tares. The same sun which scatters the darkness, dissipates the clouds, also draws out of the earth its noxious mists and vapors. So Christ acts upon the hearts of men.

In Christ, the one great decisive, searching thing is His remedy for sin. Forgiveness through faith; cleansing through His blood. How that test at once reveals, searches a man's heart. When we say that He searches the heart of man, reveals its secrets thoughts, we do not mean that in one man He discovers only that which is unworthy, and in another only that which is worthy. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. But that in one, He discovers a refusal of God's will and plan, and in the other a humble and grateful acceptance of it. In one, self-righteousness; in the other, the publican's cry—"God be merciful to me, a sinner." Let the cross be plunged down today into your heart—what is the reaction to it? Men speak of salvation by character. Yes, if by that you mean the Gospel standards of character, the Gospel's method of ascertaining the true character of a man's heart. For the supreme test of character is the offer of Christ crucified, the acceptance or the rejection of that shows the moral drift of a man's nature and nothing that he can say or do, good or bad, is of the least significance as compared with that acceptance or that rejection.

When Sir Walter Raleigh was led to the block his executioner asked him if his head lay right. Raleigh answered, "It matters little, my friend, how the head lies, provided the heart is right." Here in the presence of God, here before Him to whom are revealed the secrets of all hearts, here before the cross of mercy and of love, what does your heart speak, how does your heart lie?

# Three Tributes to Dr. Wilson

AMONG the many tributes to the life and work of the late Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, the three following are typical. Two are selected from Church Bulletins. The first is from the pen of the Rev. H. H. McQuilkin, D.D., minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Orange, N. J. The second is from the bulletin of the Benedict Memorial Presbyterian Church of New Haven, Conn., and was written by the Rev. L. Craig Long, the minister of that Church. The third is from a leaflet recently issued by Westminster Seminary.

## "A Wise Masterbuilder"

"WESTMINSTER Theological Seminary in Philadelphia has sustained an irreparable loss in the death of this great scholar, inspiring teacher, stalwart defender of the faith. He was master of more than 30 languages and always carried on his investigations in the original tongues—a thing that scholars like even Prof. Driver of Oxford could not do.

"For fifty years he had ferretted out every fact that has any bearing on the Old Testament Scriptures. Toilfully, open-mindedly, eagerly he ransacked the treasures of knowledge. The results of his search brought assurance that the Christian has a sure foundation for his faith in the Sacred Word.

"He taught first in the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh, where the writer was one of his 'boys,' as he always called his former students. Then for thirty years he shed the light of his brilliant attainments on Princeton Theological Seminary. When the control of Princeton was shifted, he, knowing intimately all the inside workings of the matter, was constrained by his conscience and convictions, and at great sacrifice materially, to withdraw and take the lead in founding Westminster. His family testify that his year in the new institution was the happiest of his life. Here as a wise masterbuilder, he laid the foundation of a theological school that is destined to strengthen and enrich the entire Protestant body with its positive, emphatic, triumphant testimony to the faith of the Reformers.

"His name will forever remain entwined with Westminster's. From her portals he went home to God. The splendor of his fame and faith will linger with the faculty and students of Westminster like some superb sunset against the sky, and will surely raise up men and women of faith throughout the Church to aid in maintaining and expanding the work he loved so well."

## One Who Fought the Good Fight

"MANY hearts have been filled with sorrow during the past week because God has called Home, one of His faithful servants. Those who shall miss him are those who have loved him, and who have looked to him for more than fifty years, as one who has been able to build up intelligent faith in those who studied in his classes, in the accuracy and infallibility of the Old Testament. Dr. Wilson began his theological study more than fifty years ago, and has held professorships in three Seminaries: Western, Princeton, and finally Westminster. As a student, he realized the great need for a type of Biblical scholarship which would be objective and thorough in dealing with facts that could be known only by

exhaustive research over the whole range of the ancient languages related to the Bible. He faced the need, and answered the call. In his preparation, he mastered some twenty-six languages; to these he added many others in his later study. Babylonian, Ethiopic, Phoenician, all the Aramaic dialects, and Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, and Armenian, Arabic, Syriac and Hebrew, were just some of those which he learned in order that he might read for his own study the original manuscripts, versions and copies, from which our translations have come. When asked, on one occasion by Mr. Philip E. Howard, Publisher of the Sunday School Times,—'Professor, what do you try to do for your students?' He instantly replied, 'I try to give them such an intelligent faith in the Old Testament Scriptures that they will never doubt them as long as they live. I try to give them evidence. I try to show them that there is a reasonable ground for belief in the history of the Old Testament. Whenever there is sufficient documentary evidence to make an investigation, the statements of the Bible, in the original texts, have stood the test.' The writer of this brief tribute is but one of thousands of Ministers who owes much to Dr. Wilson for the part that he had in the establishment of his faith in the Bible. One of his greatest contributions was made, when after Princeton Seminary had been reorganized by the General Assembly, he became an inspiration and a leader, with Dr. Machen and Dr. Allis, in the establishment of Westminster Theological Seminary. The Hymn printed on the front-page of this Bulletin ('When I survey the wondrous Cross'), is one which holds great meaning for many who have known and loved him. It was sung on two occasions as a favorite. The one time was on the first commencement day of the New Seminary, when thirteen young men were receiving their diplomas. It was after Dr. Wilson, a veteran soldier of the cross, had given final charge to these, his last students, that the hymn was sung. In closing he said, 'Fight the good fight of faith' . . . 'Until we meet at Jesus feet' . . . A summer past, the second year of the Seminary opened, Dr. Wilson met one class, and then 'went Home.' Not much wonder that many who attended his final service in Westminster on Tuesday, October fourteenth, had a new meaning placed upon the old hymn 'When I survey the wondrous Cross,' when it was again sung that day by the Seminary quartet. Only a man like Dr. Wilson could so perfectly prove by example that the words of this hymn were the feelings of his heart. A few of us who knew him intimately, and who received new Christian courage at each hand-clasp, shall miss his living faith, as we thank God that He spared him for such a long life of service for Presbyterianism. Let us pray that his students and followers may follow in his footsteps of faith, singing, with sincere meaning the words—'When I survey the wondrous Cross.'"

## The Power of a Noble Example

ON Saturday, October 11, 1930, the Rev. Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism in Westminster Theological Seminary, entered into his heavenly reward.

Dr. Wilson was a notable scholar. Where others were content to take the results of philological investigation at second hand, he had recourse to the sources. His linguistic attainments were broad and deep. He was at home not only in Hebrew and Aramaic, and of course in Latin, Greek and modern languages, but also in Babylonian, Arabic, Syriac, and other tongues. His knowledge of the Old Testament was profound.

He devoted all of this vast learning to the defence of Holy Scripture. He believed with all his mind and heart that the Bible is true, and he supported his belief with a wealth of scientific material which even his opponents could not neglect. Only a short time before his death he was engaged in an answer to a notable monograph, published at Oxford, which had recently devoted itself to a consideration of his views.

He was greatly beloved as a teacher and as a friend. With the simplicity of a true scholar, he was always ready to cast reserve aside and receive his students into his heart. He called them his "boys," and they responded with affection as well as with respect.

But great as were Dr. Wilson's achievements throughout a long and fruitful life, his greatest achievement was his last. It was the achievement by which, putting selfish considerations and unworthy compromise of principle aside, he left his home at Princeton and entered the Faculty of a new institution devoted unreservedly to the Word of God.

Many arguments might have been adduced to lead Dr. Wilson to remain at Princeton Seminary after the reorganization of that institution in 1929. He was at that time in his seventy-fourth year. An honorable and advantageous retirement awaited him whenever he desired. He had a good salary and a comfortable home. He had the friends that he had made at Princeton during a residence there of nearly thirty years. Might he not retain these advantages without being unfaithful to the cause to which he had devoted his life? Would not the new Board of Princeton Seminary keep in the background, for a time at least, the real character of the revolution that had been wrought? Would not the doctrinal change be gradual only, as at so many other institutions, formerly evangelical, which have conformed to the drift of the times? Could he not, meanwhile, serve God by teaching the truth in his own class-room, no matter what the rest of the institution did? Could he not round out his life in peace? Could he not leave to younger men the battle for the Faith?

Those considerations and many like them were no doubt presented to Dr. Wilson in very persuasive form. But he would have none of them. His Christian conscience, trained by a lifetime of devotion to God's Word, cut through such arguments with the keenness of a Damascus blade. He penetrated to the real essence of the question. He saw that for him to remain at Princeton would be to commend as trustworthy what he knew to be untrustworthy, that it would be to lead Christ's little ones astray. He knew that a man cannot have God's richest blessing, even in teaching the truth, when the opportunity to teach the truth is gained by compromise of principle. He saw clearly that it was not a time for him to think of his own ease or comfort, but to bear testimony to the Saviour who had bought him with His own precious blood.

He did bear that testimony. He left his home at Princeton, and all the emoluments and honors that awaited him there. He cast in his lot with a new institution that had not a dollar of endowment and was dependent for the support of its professors upon nothing but faith in God.

Dr. Wilson was supremely happy in that decision. He never regretted it for a moment. He entered joyfully into the life of the new seminary, and God richly blessed him there. Then, having rounded out more than the allotted period of three-score years and ten, a Christian soldier without tarnish of compromise upon his shield, he entered into the joy of his Lord.

His example is a precious possession for those whom he has left behind. He is, indeed, no longer with us in bodily presence. His great learning is with us only in his writings and in the knowledge of the Bible that he has imparted to his host of students throughout the world. But the power of his example will not be lost. Westminster Seminary, by God's grace, will ever be true to the Lord Jesus, as this beloved teacher was true. Trustees, Faculty and students will be moved always to sacrifice themselves for an institution to which Dr. Wilson gave so much.

His example will touch also the hearts of those throughout the Church who love the gospel that he loved, and who know that that gospel cannot well be preached unless there be a school of the prophets to train men to preach it in all its purity and all its power. The Seminary that was so dear to Dr. Wilson's heart, and in whose founding he had so large a share, will not, we think, be allowed to call now in vain; but gifts will pour in from those who, like Dr. Wilson, have hearts full of gratitude to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

# Books of Religious Significance

## Book Notes

ONE of the most unusual books we have seen in recent months is entitled "The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews *Fairbairn vs. Fairbairn*" by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, edited by Prof. Albertus Pieters, D.D., of the Western Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, at Grand Rapids. (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.) The volume is arresting and unusual in that it represents the contradictory views of an unusually keen mind at different periods in his life. As a young Minister of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Fairbairn delivered a lecture on "The Future Prospects of the Jews," taking strong ground favoring a literal fulfillment of prophecies relating to their return to Palestine. About twenty-five years later, as a famous professor of the Free Church, he published a book usually referred to as "Fairbairn on Prophecy" in which occurred a chapter on "The Prophetical Future of the Jewish People." He then championed the opposite position—namely, that everything promised to Israel was promised to God's people, and that Christians being now that people, all Old Testament prophecies and promises are typical of spiritual blessings to be received in Christ. Dr. Pieters takes no sides, but leaves the reader to make his own decision between two great arguments by the same man. . . . Presbyterian Scotland is justly famed for its great pulpit tradition—as is the Reformed family of Churches over the world. But too often our knowledge is confined to men who preached in cities, and who were much in the public eye. Recently two delightful volumes have reached our desk, volumes brimful of human interest, instruction and inspiration. They are *Some Noted Ministers of the Northern Highlands*, and *Sermons by Noted Ministers of the Northern Highlands*, and both books are from the pen of the Rev. D. Beaton, of Wick, Scotland,—the first as written and the second as edited by him. Sketches are given of the lives of thirty-three men who labored in the period from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, sketches which recapture the very atmosphere in which people and Ministers lived, struggled and believed for the sake of the covenanted faith. Of the sermons, the author says, "It is with wistful feelings we read these noble pulpit utterances from lips that were touched with a live coal from off the altar, and which ring so true to the Scriptures. Gone are the noble messengers that proclaimed the message—gone are the gracious men and women who drank it in, and in doing so forgot all their sorrows. We believe there are still some who value the Gospel as set forth in these sermons, and trust all such will give a welcome to this book and make it known to their friends." Moving upon a high and spiritual plane these sermons are emphatically out of the ordinary, yet never pedantic, always breathing with life. Both books are 5 shillings net ($1.25) and may be ordered from the Rev. D. Beaton, Wick, Caithness, Scotland. . . . The Rev. J. D. Leslie, D.D., LL.D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., has recently issued a volume on *Presbyterian Law and Procedure* in that Church. (Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.) It is a work of almost four hundred pages, compact and succinct. It should be invaluable to all Ministers and office bearers of the Southern Church, and deserves circulation among those in all Presbyterian and Reformed bodies who desire to be kept informed of the law of a great sister Church. . . . Professor William Bancroft Hill, of Vassar College is the author of a volume entitled *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, $1.25.) Dr. Hill approaches the evidence for the Resurrection from a novel point of view. "The Starting Point," says the author, "is the need of the disciples. In their state of mind,—their fear, dismay, ignorance and hopelessness—could anything other than what the Gospels relate have transformed them into the men we see on the Day of Pentecost? In other words, was there a need of the post-resurrection appearances; and if there was, can we doubt that it was supplied, unless we doubt all that the Gospels tell of our Lord?" The Book affirms the resurrection as historic fact. It deserves a wide reading . . . *Christianity or Religion?* by the Rev. A. C. Gaebelein, D.D., ("Our Hope," 456 Fourth Ave., New York City, $1.50 postpaid), has recently been issued in a third edition. It is a "study of the origin and growth of religion and the supernaturalism of Christianity" from a strongly conservative point of view. It is an instructive and inspiring work, breathing devotion and scholarship on every page. This is a book to put into the hands of any who may have dipped superficially into the well of "comparative religions." On one point only do we venture to disagree with Dr. Gaebelein. He distinguishes between Christianity and all religion, feeling that to call Christianity a religion would be to blur the line of distinction between the Gospel and the false hopes of lost humanity. It seems to us, however, that it is no concession to call Christianity a religion. It *is* a religion. But it is the only *true* religion, —the only way by which man may be reconciled to God. . . . *Eyes in the Dark* is the name of a new book from the pen of Zenobia Bird, who will be remembered by many for her delightful story "Under Whose Wings" of several years ago. Miss Bird's stories are not, so far as we know, duplicated in any way by those of any other writer. She writes of Christian young men and women who find the grace of God more than sufficient for every need and problem. It is a story that will appeal to teen age boys and girls, interesting them with a fine, bracing tale, and leading them closer to Christ. (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, $1.50.) . . . W. Bell Dawson, M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.C., widely known author on scientific and religious subjects has written a booklet small in size, but mighty in theme, entitled, *The Hope of the Future.* This hope Dr. Dawson finds in the pages of the Bible to be nothing less than that "blessed hope" of the return of our Lord to earth. He believes that that coming will be preceded by apostasy, and that the coming of our Lord is now imminent. Dr. Dawson occupies the pre-millennial position. While in general agreement with him, the writer of these lines feels sure that this distinguished man of God would not wish to have differences regarding the manner of Christ's coming divide those who are contending for the Faith once for all delivered to the saints. This is a booklet that will repay serious reflection and study. (Published by Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London and Edinburgh. May be ordered from the author, 7 Grove Park, Westmount, Montreal, Canada.)

H. McA. G.

*THE DOCTRINE OF GOD. By Albert C. Knudson, Dean of Boston University School of Theology, and Professor of Systematic Theology. Pp. 434. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.*

THE book before us presents "the first of two independent volumes that together will cover the field of Christian theology." There are reasons for thinking of this book as of more than usual importance. The doctrine of God is of perennial significance. Yet many recent writers have so completely changed the idea of God that the term as used by them means nothing at all. One can scarcely enter a bookstore without noticing that some new deity is born. Usually these gods are born into the pragmatic family. As the space-time continuum advances in age she becomes the fruitful mother of gods. The immanence-idea is so overworked that it has turned into identity. Any "value" or "ideal," that strikes some one's fancy is promptly impersonated and deified. If the author of such a deity is a prominent scientist it becomes forthwith a sure token of bigotry to say that

such an author is not a Christian or a theist.

In the book of Professor Knudson we meet on the contrary with a serious attempt to take God seriously. Knudson would have transcendence be more than a word. He does not sympathize with the extreme pragmatic tendency of the day. Moreover, he does not wish to build up his theology on just one aspect of human experience. He stresses the equal or perhaps superior value of the volitional as compared to the intellectual aspect of personality but by no means wishes to set the intellectual categories aside in order to find room for faith. His is to be a theology based upon the "logic of the whole personality." In connection with this it should be said that the author does not fear metaphysics. All of us have some metaphysics or other. The only question is what kind of metaphysics we have. We cannot base our religion on an "as if." Thus we see that Knudson seeks to give us a well-rounded and metaphysically grounded doctrine of God. As such it is worthy of our serious consideration.

In consonance with the philosophical seriousness of the author is the high religious tone that pervades the book. When one turns, for example, from Bruce Barton or Roy Wood Sellars to Knudson one emerges from a stifling secularism to the mountain air of religion. Such things as these we value highly.

Moreover, the author is a leading representative and exponent of a movement in theology and philosophy that has considerable influence on the Christian church in America. An unpublished doctor's thesis in the University of Chicago Divinity library by Bernhardt on *Borden Parker Bowne and the Methodist Episcopal Church*, proves that the philosophy of Bowne has a controlling influence on the Seminaries of the the denomination referred to. The writer of this thesis sees a great difference between the old method of instruction and the new method of instruction in these seminaries. The chief difference he finds to be the fact that the new method begins from human experience while the old method began with an assumed authoritarianism of the Scripture. We cannot but agree with Bernhardt that if this difference exists between the old method and the new, it is not a matter of detail or of emphasis. It becomes a question of which method is proper and which is improper for the subject of theology. More than that it becomes a question of which is true and which is false. Knudson maintains that his position in theology, based as it admittedly is upon Bowne's, philosophy, is the logical development of true Christian thought. "Personalism is *par excellence* the Christian philosophy of our day." (Doctrine of God, p. 80.) It is this claim of Knudson that we would call in question. Or if it be granted that personalism is "the most prevalent Christian philosophy of our day" our interest will be to show that this prevalent philosophy is not identical with nor a logical development of Biblical Christianity or, more broadly, traditional theism. And secondly, our criticism may suggest some reasons why traditional theism and the "overcome position" of orthodox Christianity may still be the more defensible philosophy or theology of the two.

In developing our claim that Knudson's position is a radical departure from instead of a logical development of Christian theism, we are in a very fortunate position for two reasons. In the first place, Knudson himself offers us a definite and to us an entirely acceptable criterion by which to judge a genuine theism. This gives us the advantage of judging the author by his own standard. In the second place, we have the good fortune of being able to refer to the author's book on "The Philosophy of Personalism," for a more definite statement of Knudson's theory of reality and theory of knowledge than could well be given in the book now under discussion. This is especially valuable since we believe that the chief weakness of the book is an antitheistic theory of knowledge.

Beginning with the first point we find that in the chapter our author devotes to the Absoluteness of God, he is very insistent on the necessity of an absolute God. The fundamental demand for unity that marks human thought can be satisfied with nothing less. More than that, the unity that we seek must be a concrete unity. If God is not to be a "'spectral woof of impalpable abstractions or an unearthly ballet of bloodless categories,'" He must be personal. An absolute, personal God is the most urgent requirement of rational thought. Of such pivotal significance does Knudson consider this point that he considers belief in such a God the only alternative to skepticism. "Either a theistic Absolute or completely philosophical skepticism would seem to be the alternatives that confront us; and as between the two a healthy reason ought to have no difficulty in making its choice." (p. 250.)

We are quite ready to subscribe to Knudson's alternative. The only alternative to a theory of reality of which God as absolute personality forms the controlling concept is a metaphysical relativism. Of course it is easy to find intellectual difficulties in traditional theism. It is quite customary to reject Biblical theism for no better reason than that we cannot fathom how an absolute God could create the universe or become actually incarnate. To purchase relief from intellectual difficulties in this fashion is too expensive a procedure. Where is the system that has no intellectual difficulties? We do not hold to Christian theism because it has no, or even in the first place because it has less of intellectual difficulty in it than other systems but because we hold that on the basis of a metaphysical relativism no knowledge whatsoever is possible. Parmenides was quite right when he said of Heraclitus's flux that if opposites do change into one another completely, there is no abiding subject about which we can say anything. For the Christian theist God is the ultimate subject of all predication. It is not as though we could sacrifice God and retain ourselves. If we sacrifice God we also sacrifice ourselves.

Corresponding to and involved in this theory of reality is an equally theistic theory of knowledge. If God is absolute personality He is completely selfconscious. God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. There are no hidden depths of troubled possibility within or beyond Him. He knoweth the end from the beginning. It is this absolute selfconsciousness of God that forms the basis of certainty for our knowledge. Possibility for us is deeper than the deepest sea. If it were so also for God the whole of our coherent experience would be adrift on a shoreless, bottomless void. Our thought would be operating in a vacuum. If there is to be any rationality or coherence anywhere there must be absolute rationality somewhere. Our rationality rests upon God's rationality.

It is this that Christian theism has expressed in its conception of authority. Its view of authority has never been that of mere tradition. If prophets or apostles, if Christ or the Scriptures are said to speak with absolute authority this is said because it is believed that an absolute God speaks in them. If the Scriptures are claimed to be inspired in a unique sense, this doctrine of inspiration is logically connected with the claim of an absolute God. How seldom does one meet with a critic of Christian theism who will even attempt to state fairly the various implications of the conception of an absolute God, as they appear for example in the doctrines of Christ and of the Scriptures and thereupon assume manfully the epistemological consequences of rejecting all. It is much easier to isolate, for example, the inspiration theory, present it as something mechanical and cast it aside as of no religious significance.

According to the theistic theory of knowledge then, God is the one who interprets the meaning of reality to man. Man's mind must be receptive to this interpretation if he is to have any knowledge at all. Man cannot begin his speculation upon facts and thereupon ask whether God exists. If the facts do not exist apart from God, they are the product of His plan. That is it is then God's interpretation that is prior to the facts. How then could man separate the facts from that interpretation of God? As well could you separate a drop of ink from the ocean. Professor Hocking has given expression to this thought by saying that our God-consciousness must be basic to our ex-

perience. If the God consciousness does not enter at the level of our lowest sensations, says he, it will never enter at all.

If these considerations are true it is an error to suppose that the chief contribution of Christianity to the advancement of speculative thought is the concept of personality as such. Christianity reintroduced the conception of God as Absolute personality primarily and therefore the concept of finite personality; secondarily, Christianity is restorative and supplementative of an original theism; Christianity and theism stand or fall together.

With this brief explanation of the theory of reality and the theory of knowledge of Christian theism we may now ask to what extent Knudson's contention that his theology is a genuine development of traditional theism can receive our assent. To do this we inquire not about details but only about his theory of reality and his theory of knowledge.

Knudson is keenly aware of the fact that not every type of personalism can furnish the basis of a Christian theistic theology. In order to make it as clear as possible that his personalism is genuinely theistic, he distinguishes it from several other types of personalism. There is first of all the atheistic personalism of men like J. M. E. McTaggart. Then there is the pantheistic personalism of Wm. Stern. These two are clearly antitheistic. But even of the theistic personalisms there are some varieties that are contrary to a true typical theistic personalism. Of these he mentions the absolutistic personalism of the Hegelian school, the relativistic personalism of Charles Renouvier and the purely ethical or teleological personalism of George H. Howison. The absolutistic personalism does injustice to the reality of human personality. Relativistic personalism might better be called finitism because it will have no absolute at all. Purely ethical or teleological personalism denies the creation of man by God.

These exclusions on the part of Knudson would seem to bring him very near to Biblical theism. He rejects finitism and absolutism because they fail to distinguish between the personality of God and the personality of man. Thus Knudson very clearly means business with the conception of personality. Moreover he rejects any view that wipes out the creation idea. Thus Knudson wants God to be a higher personality than man. But does our author really take seriously the conception of an absolute personality? We are persuaded that he does not.

The author writes a good deal about the prolegomena to theology. Naturally in such a discussion the question of method is important. As to this he tells us that "authoritarianism" is an "overcome standpoint." The infallible inspiration of the Scripture is, he thinks, easily shown untenable by evident errors in the Scripture. Here we could have wished that an eminent systematic theologian should at least not have descended to this easy method. As suggested above we have a right to expect that such doctrines as inspiration shall first be shown in their correlation to the central doctrine of an absolute God before they are lightly cast aside. But let that pass. The main point is that Knudson resolutely sets himself to an empirical investigation of the facts of the religious consciousness of man in order to determine what religion is before he goes to God. The assumption of this method is that the religious consciousness exists and functions or at least can function normally even if no absolute God exists. It is taken as a matter of course that this is the only scientific procedure. But what then of Hocking's demand that the God consciousness must come in at the very beginning of our experience lest it do not come in at all? A true theist must make God the highest interpretative category of experience and he cannot do so unless God interprets at the beginning as well as at the end of experience. To say this is not a way "of completely escaping subjectivity," (p. 104) as Knudson would have us believe. To have a truly empirical theology it is not necessary first to study religious experience apart from God. The truly theistic position is also the truly empirical position. We may say that Knudson has untheistically isolated human experience from God.

The so-called experiential method is definitely based upon "the autonomous validity of our religious nature." (p. 225.) Criticising the view of theology that teaches it as a "*doctrine de deo et rebus divinis*, he tells us that, "It fails to see that in our day theology must be anthropocentric in its startingpoint." (p. 192.) So also when the question of the origin of religion is discussed the author finds it a matter of total indifference what the origin of religion may have been. "One might, like the sage of whom Van Hugel tells us, trace the origin of religion back to 'the scratching by a cow of an itch on her back,' and yet not undermine the religious belief of the day; or, on the other hand, one might find the ultimate source of religion in a primitive revelation and yet leave it with as little rational justification as ever." (p. 217.) But surely this is most too strange for words. Only upon the assumption of a complete metaphysical relativism could one make such a statement consistently. If the universe has been created by God, man's religion is dependent upon and even defined by that fact, while if religion might have originated in independence of God its definition cannot, even eventually, be formed by a reference to God.

We would not be understood as saying that for Knudson religion needs no objective reference at all. On the contrary, he tells us that religion "involves a personal attitude toward an objective realm of values." (p. 48.) Again he says, "A submissive, trustful, conciliatory feeling toward the powers that be in the universe is primary in religion." (p. 40.) And once more, "Religion in its essential nature means faith in the rationality and purposiveness of the world." (p. 42.) The point of importance is that for Knudson the "realm of values" need not necessarily be personal. Religion "is unequivocal in attributing supreme worth to the spiritual realm, but whether the transcendent Reality is to be conceived as personal or not is left undecided." (p. 51.) Very definitely then the conception of an absolute God is not a *sine qua non* of true religion for Knudson. It is desirable but not indispensible.

We have now seen that the root of the antitheistic tendency in Knudson's book is his uncritical assumption of the ultimacy of finite personality. When in his work on "The Philosophy of Personalism," he seeks to tell us what the distinguishing characteristics of a true "typical theistic personalism" are, he defines personality in general and *afterwards* makes his distinctions between human and divine personality. It follows that this method precludes the possibility of ever deriving at the conception of an absolute God. God is then a species of a genus. If there are limitations in the genus they will also be in the species.

It is this fact that God's personality can be no more than a species of the genus of personality that comes most definitely to the foreground when God's relation to time is discussed. About this our author says little and we wish he had said much. Yet he says something directly and more indirectly which enables us to conclude that for Knudson, as for all other non-theists, the Universe is a more inclusive conception than God. We have already seen that for Knudson religion consists of an attitude toward an ideal realm which is an aspect of the Universe. We may now note that for Knudson man partakes of the essential nature of eternity and on the other hand God partakes of the essential nature of time. As to the former it is involved in the contention that in personality as such, therefore human as well as divine, is contained the final unity that our experience needs. (Philosophy of Personalism, p. 83.) In the last analysis the finite personality does not need God for knowledge. "The reality of the soul or self or 'I' is the fundamental presupposition of personalism; it is even a more characteristic doctrine than the existence of a personal God." (Philosophy of Personalism, p. 67.)

But more important, if possible, is the second point that God partakes of the essential nature of time. That this is the case can best be realized if we study Knudson's conceptions of creation and of incarnation.

As to creation he makes no very definite statement. He realizes that an eternally necessary creation would lead readily to pantheism. But he thinks that perhaps all the purposes of religion may be served by conceiving of creation as "eternal, yet free and actuated by love." (Doctrine of God, p. 369.) What this may mean I cannot fathom. More definitely, however, does he tell us that just as it was true that in man as well as in God, one can find the final principle of unity so it is equally true that in God's being as well as in man the rationale of change must be found. "If God be thought of as a changeless substance, there would be no way of accounting for the advancing cosmic movement. Changes in the world must be due to changes in its underlying cause. An unchanging cause could produce only an unchanging effect." (Doctrine of God, p. 316.) It is difficult to distinguish such a view from an outspoken metaphysical relativism. Time is made an ingredient element in God as well as in man; the absoluteness of God has disappeared.

In more direct connection with Christianity, the same inherent temporalism appears in the author's view of the incarnation. He tells us that no religious purpose is served by the Chalcedonian creed which endeavored to keep from intermixture the temporal and the eternal. The "impersonal manhood" of Christ by which the Church sought to safeguard the transfusion of God and man has for Knudson no significance. "We find it simpler and more satisfactory to think of him as 'a human personality completely and abidingly interpenetrated by God's indwelling.'" (Doctrine of God, p. 421.) If now in this connection it be realized that Christ is considered to be no less divine for His being a "human personality," it becomes still more difficult to call Knudson's position Christian or theistic, and to distinguish it from metaphysical finitism.

It is upon the basis of this metaphysical relativism that Christianity is regarded as standing in no more than a climactic relation to other religions. (p. 109.) Christ is no longer the incarnate Son of God suffering in His assumed human nature for the sins of man, but God Himself in the human person of Christ is the "chief of burdenbearers." (p. 413.) If this is not to mean that God is responsible for evil it must mean that evil is at least as original as God in which case one has a finite god. And this accords with the author's statement that the "unsurpassability," of Christianity has no more religious significance for us. (p. 114.) This is true if God as well as we are brethren fighting side by side against an evil that exists independently of both in a Universe that is greater than both.

Finally in the last chapter, on the Trinity, the author once more reveals to us that, to him, God is brought down into the temporal flux. He says, and we believe rightly so, that the Christian church has in its doctrine of the Trinity not a useless superadditum, but that it forms the foundation of philosophy and theology. In the Trinity unity and plurality live in eternal harmony. But now note that according to Knudson one of the members of the Trinity is or may be a "human personality." Thus the diversity factor consists of a temporal element. The unity is no more than a unity within a Universe that is inclusive of both time and eternity, of both God and man. Knudson has thought to make the Trinity do genuine philosophic service by bringing it very close to us, but he has brought it so close to us that it does us no service at all. Worse than that, Knudson has brought the Trinity into the flux with the result that no unity of any sort can ever be obtained.

In conclusion, let us note again that the author's doctrines about the Incarnation and the Trinity followed necessarily from his experiential startingpoint. If you begin your investigation of religion by assuming that finite personality has within itself sufficent unifying power so that it need make no reference to an absolute God at the outset, the reference made at the conclusion will be no more than a polite bow to a name. For Knudson, man is the standard of truth while for Christian theism, God is the standard of truth.

CORNELIUS VAN TIL

# Letters to the Editor

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

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am sending you my check for a year's subscription to your paper. I have been preaching the kind of Christianity its columns express for over sixty years. During the last nearly fifty years I have been preaching it as the pastor of one of the oldest and most historic churches of America, The First Baptist Church, New York City. I feel I should like the monthly tonic which the paper gives. May God bless you in meeting and antidoting, the brilliant and superficial cynicism and square infidelity which operates under the false pretense of "Scholarship."

Sincerely yours,

I. M. HALDEMAN.

New York, N. Y.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have been reading each issue of your paper with increasing interest, and finding in it the complement of my own thinking I am herewith enclosing my subscription for one year. CHRISTIANITY TODAY has surely been born at a time of crisis and if we in Canada prior to 1925 had such a periodical perhaps the debacle called Church Union might have been different. However, we got a sifting which perhaps has done us much good and many of those who would likely have been a "thorn in the flesh" are with us no more. My own observation is that Modernism and Church Unionism are bedfellows, since only by a process of mental reservation can one remain even luke warm to the historic and biblical standards of the Presbyterian Church. . . . The Presbyterian Church has always had her "thin red line" and perhaps through your paper you are mustering yours. It is at least evident that God has called you to a task, and my prayer is that He may strengthen you for your labors, crown your efforts with victory, and may your cry ever be "I am doing a great work therefore I cannot come down."

Sincerely yours,

F. MCAVOY.

Geneva Presbyterian Church,
Chesley, Ontario.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Those who are loyal to the Westminster Standards in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., may awake to a more threatening, though obscure danger than anything that has occurred for a generation. It is in connection with negotiations for union of Presbyterian denominations. There is the possibility that the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church may be proposed as a substitute for the Westminster Standards, for the doctrinal basis of union of the two denominations, United Presbyterian, and Presbyterian U. S. A. This appeared sufficiently clear, in a joint meeting of United Presbyterian and Presbyterian ministers in Pittsburgh, Nov. 24. The chief speaker disparaged the Westminster Confession, slighted its statement of the doctrine of reprobation, and emphasized the Confessional Statement of the U. P. Church, as a basis of the union of these two denominations.

Be it observed that this brief Confessional Statement omits the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation or preterition. Here might come into play almost the whole series of masterly articles by that famous former New School theologian, Dr. Shedd, republished in his "Calvinism Pure and Mixed," a "Defence of the Westminster Standards," particularly those unanswerable discussions

about preterition. Passing strange it is that the present danger occurs, since ever increasing millions are singing hymns of preterition, in English and other languages, hymns having exactly the same Scriptural basis as the statement of preterition in our Confession. Many United Presbyterians in our day have learned to sing them. For instance, "Pass me not, O God my Father!" —preterition!

In the past five years the United Presbyterians have circulated perhaps less than fifty copies of the Confession of Faith, but thousands of their brief Confessional Statement. How long, then, before that denomination consigns the Westminster Standards to oblivion? Are we to be maneuvered or misled into the same situation? Let the conservatives of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. promptly organize their protests. Let them record their conviction that the proposed union of U. P. and Presbyterians U. S. A. should be on the same basis only, as that of the Old and New School, the Westminster Standards, pure and simple.

CHAS. E. EDWARDS.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

## A Memorial to ROBERT DICK WILSON

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Not often do men see courage such as that of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson. The Minute adopted by the Faculty of Westminster Seminary on the occasion of his Home-going made mention of his willingness, in leaving Princeton for Westminster, to be counted a fool for Christ's sake. The cost of his decision was greater, probably, than most men apprehend. For, far beyond the loss of worldly prestige, or of money, was the pain of tearing up roots that had sunk deep into the soil of Princeton. Let us not forget that.

But there is another item of cost to be figured. For some years Dr. Wilson and my father discussed the possibility of securing funds for the publication of some of Dr. Wilson's most important manuscripts. What those manuscripts contain,—save that one is a most necessary and valuable study on Daniel,—I do not know; that information is in the hands of certain members of the Westminster Faculty who have the manuscripts in their keeping. But I do know that my father held the same opinion of them that is held by these professors,—that they would be invaluable in the defense of the Scriptures and ought to be published at once. Since my father's death Dr. Wilson has, I understand, added greatly to the value of his manuscripts by his recent studies and conclusions.

But Dr. Wilson is not the only member of the Faculty whose manuscripts ought soon to see the light of day. There is a lamentable shortage of new literature on the conservative side, with which to answer liberal and radical argument. For instance, conservative Christian colleges are in need of textbooks on Bible study, in modern pedagogical form. And there are able scholars on Westminster's Faculty nobly equipped to produce such works—if they have not already written them.

The publication of technical works such as these, particularly when it involves the use of the various ancient languages, is expensive. Seldom or never is there any pecuniary profit derived from it. The whole matter is a labor of love.

It happens that just at this time Westminster Seminary is seeking the $500,000 endowment which is necessary, under Pennsylvania law, to secure the privilege of granting degrees. A small part of the necessary sum has already been given by friends of the Seminary. It would seem peculiarly appropriate that just at this moment an effort should be made to secure a considerable sum whose income would be applied to the publication, first, of manuscripts by the members of Westminster's Faculty, and second, by other scholars friendly to the theological position of that Seminary. The very first book published should be by the hand of Dr. Wilson; and this particular fund should be called the Robert Dick Wilson Publication Fund.

I am confident that there is somewhere someone who, loving and revering Dr. Wilson, and at the same time discerning the importance of the project here mentioned, will be able and eager to furnish such a sum as will guarantee that, though Dr. Wilson is gone from us, his works shall live after him, and that the cause for which he lived and died shall be maintained in the realm of religious literature.

DAVID DEFOREST BURRELL.

Williamsport, Pa.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Westminster Seminary was brought to the Kingdom for such a time as this. The great need of the Church in this hour is for expository preaching; not only men equipped to defend the faith, but to proclaim it as well. The Church cannot stand with a compromising, halting ministry.

Men of conviction and passion to proclaim our divinely revealed message is the need.

Westminster has been called of God to the ministry of providing such men.

The Session of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, unanimously and enthusiastically endorse the program of Westminster Seminary.

God's blessing be upon it!

STEWART P. MACLENNAN.

Hollywood, Calif.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Our Relation to Christ

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Why do you in your definition of "What is a Christian?" use the expression "religious" as you do? You say "a Christian is one who stands in a* religious *relation to Christ and receives and rests upon Christ alone for salvation from the guilt and power of sin." Why introduce the ambiguous term "religious relation" in such a fundamental unfolding of saving fact? . . . Do you subsume "the pollution" of sin under the "power" of sin?*

*Appreciating your noble work, sincerely*

*C. E. A.*

REFERRING to the last question first, we would say that while we would be disposed to subsume the "pollution" of sin under the "power" of sin rather than under the "guilt" of sin, yet that we think it would perhaps have been better if we had spoken of the Christian as receiving and resting on Christ alone for salvation from sin conceived as guilt, pollution and power. Apart from the sinner's inability (apart from Christ), to do what is spiritually good he is guilty and polluted—guilt expressing his relation to the justice of God while pollution expresses his relation to the holiness of God.

We agree with our correspondent—who obviously approves our definition as far as it defines a Christian as one who receives and rests in Christ alone for salvation—that the word "religious" as used today is often an ambiguous term; and yet we know of no better term to express the thought we had in mind, viz., that a Christian stands in a relation to Christ such as he stands in relation to God. The need of stressing this thought in any definition of a Christian today is occasioned by the fact that for Modernists in general a "Christian" is one for whom Jesus is an example for faith but not the object of faith. In other words the Modernist professes to believe *like* Jesus but he does not pretend to believe *in* Jesus. Back of this attitude of the Modernist to-

ward Jesus is, of course, his belief that Jesus was a God-filled man rather than the God-man who as such is a proper object of worship. Hence the need of stressing over against the Modernist the thought that Jesus was and is God as well as man; and hence that His genuine disciples necessarily stand in a religious relation to Him, i.e., in such a relation as they stand to God and not merely in such a relation as they might stand to one who is a man and only a man.

## The Old Testament Canon

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*Is the statement true (which I have read recently) that "the Old Testament canon was not finally settled (even in the form we have it, omitting the apocrypha) until about 90 A.D."?*

*If true, is anyone justified in asserting that Christ gave His seal of approval to "everything in the Old Testament"? Did the Apocrypha have a place in the Bible as He knew it? I do not know, but if it did, does not consistency require the believer in an "Infallible Bible" to think that the Apocryphal books, too, were endorsed by Christ?*

*I heard a deeply religious and earnest young college senior say that the extreme claims of Fundamentalism merely drove some of his classmates farther away from religious faith. He himself, specializing in a scientific branch, seems to have found firmer ground under his feet because of the temperate attitudes and strong faith held by many whom you would probably consider dangerously modernistic.*

*Yours sincerely,*

*A. B.*

IN our judgment it is not true that the Old Testament canon was not closed until 90 A.D. or thereabout. Rather we think that the evidence is conclusive that the Old Testament canon was closed, "finally settled," before Christ lived and taught. Were this not the case, it would of course be true that no one is justified in saying that Christ has set the seal of His approval on the Old Testament in the precise form in which we possess it. It is true also that if the Old Testament as Christ used it included the Apocryphal books, consistency would require those who accept the Old Testament as part of God's holy Word on His authority to also believe that the Apocryphal books are just as authoritative as the books ordinarily spoken of as Old Testament books. We think, however, that here too the evidence is conclusive that the Apocryphal books had no place in the Old Testament as Christ knew it; and hence that while the testimony of Jesus is to the effect that the Old Testament books, but the Old Testament books only, are a part of that divine Word that "cannot be broken."

It is quite certain, it seems to us, not only that Jesus regarded the Old Testament as altogether trustworthy but that when He did so He had in mind precisely those books that are included in the Old Testament as ordinarily printed. Among the Jews of Christ's day there were three things that were esteemed peculiarly sacred: the Temple, the Sabbath, and the Scriptures. They found fault with the attitude of Jesus toward the Temple and the Sabbath; but there is nothing to indicate that they took any exception to His attitude toward the Scriptures. Had He said a single word against the Old Testament which they held in utter reverence we may be sure that the reaction of the ever-hostile Jews would have been as hostile as swift. The only possible inference is that Jesus, like the Jews themselves, taught that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are completely trustworthy.

In the absence of specifications it is difficult, if not impossible, to deal, except in a broad way, with the allegation that the "extreme claims of Fundamentalism" drive intelligent people away from religious faith. Doubtless "Fundamentalism" like every other movement has its "lunatic fringe" and suffers from the fact that many confuse the views of this fringe with the views of its representative exponents. If our inquirer had specified the "extreme claims" he had in view we could have expressed our opinion as to their tendency to promote or hinder the progress of true religion; but in the absence of such specifications we are not in a position to pronounce any judgment. It is quite possible that what he calls "extreme claims" we would look upon as claims that must be maintained if Christianity is to be preserved; on the other hand it is quite possible that we would fully share his view as to their harmful char-

(*Concluded on page 23*)

# Current Views and Voices

## The Last General Assembly

**(As seen by the Rev. H. Clare Welker, Th.M., of Brighton, Colorado, in his report to the Presbytery of Box Butte)**

FATHERS AND BRETHREN:

Prompted fully as much by my feelings of warm personal affection for the members of this body as by my sense of responsibility to it, I beg leave to submit the following report on my attendance at the last General Assembly as the ministerial commissioner of Box Butte Presbytery.

I am sorry to have to say that, as a whole, the General Assembly of 1930 was a sad disappointment to me. In the first place, the auditorium in which the sessions were held was almost entirely unsuited to the purposes of such a gathering. The building was so compactly seated it was exceedingly difficult for any except those on the ends of the long rows to get in and out. This is of special significance due to the fact that no commissioner could make himself heard from the floor so that if he were to say anything at all it was necessary for him to get out of his crowded quarters, make his way to the platform and speak before a microphone. One can readily guess how few commissioners would attempt this and how completely any general discussion was forestalled as a consequence. In addition to this, fully one-third of the commissioners were seated under a very low balcony where the light was so dim one could read a printed page only with difficulty. One of the commissioners had the temerity to request more light but was rather shortly advised by the moderator that all the light available was turned on.

In the second place, the assembly had absolutely nothing of the character of a deliberative body. I think one is safe in saying that almost as much time was consumed in the friendly but rather meaningless gesture of presenting and receiving gavels—four of them to one moderator!—as was occupied by all the commissioners on the floor in presenting their views during the whole course of the assembly. This was not due to the fact that the commissioners had no convictions to express but simply to the conditions under which the assembly was held and, more especially, to the way in which things were engineered from the platform. Certain speakers on the platform were heard almost ad nauseam if not ad infinitum. Over and over again the members of a little group, scarcely a score in number, made reports and spoke to them or were accorded the privilege of the platform for the purpose of promulgating their special views, but if a duly elected commissioner on the floor had a word to offer, he had first to get the attention of the moderator,—a thing not always easy to do. Then he had to climb out over anywhere from one to a dozen fellow commissioners, make his way to the platform, be introduced in due form and make his remarks through a microphone and that with a timekeeper at his elbow because the mere common or garden variety of commissioner was ordinarily allotted only five minutes to speak on any one subject.

In the third place, whenever matters touching upon doctrine were acted upon at all, which was not frequently, the matter was always so handled by those in charge of affairs that the assembly invariably went on record as favoring an unabashed modernism if not an openly-avowed rationalism.

This was due not so much to the fact that the majority of the commissioners favored such views as it was to the fact that the presentation was always so graciously subtle and the chance for discussion so limited that few of the commissioners had the opportunity to grasp the significance of what was being done. And yet the effect was the same as if they had given hearty approval. This was especially the case in the matter of Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin's report on the union of the churches of Scotland. In this report he paid high tribute to the creedal basis of union and, sad to say, his report was warmly applauded. A single item of that report in so far as doctrine is concerned is sufficient to indicate with crystal clearness what is in the offing. On the matter of the authority of the Scriptures the following, according to Dr. Coffin, is the basis on which the union was effected.

"We believe the Word of God *contained in* (italics the writer's) the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the sole rule of faith and practice."

One has but to contrast this statement with that of our own statement, "We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice," to see that in effect these two articles are as far apart as the poles,—as according to the former it rests with each subscriber to determine for himself just what amount or portion of the Word of God is *contained in* the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

On the above report by Dr. Coffin, the General Assembly *Daily News* for Monday, June 2, 1930, comments as follows:—

"It was a ringing report and was given enthusiastic applause. Moderator Kerr commented that Dr. Coffin's inspiring and impassioned address was one of the most glowing features of a great occasion."

The thing that is so sadly significant about the whole matter is that by such means our own Church is being prepared for union on a like basis with other denominations in our own country.

A second action which was significant as regards the matter of doctrine was that taken with reference to confirming the appointment of Dr. Wm. T. Hanzsche as editor of the *Presbyterian Magazine*, in view of the fact that he was a subscriber to the Auburn Affirmation which denied the necessity of belief on the part of Presbyterian Ministers in the infallibility of the Scriptures, the virgin birth, the sacrificial atonement, the bodily resurrection of Christ and in the reality of the miracles. An objection to the confirmation of Dr. Hanzsche's appointment was raised by Dr. Craig but the latter was dealt with in rather summary and certainly unparliamentary fashion. The appointment of Dr. Hanzsche was confirmed and some thousands of dollars were voted to make up the deficit in the budget of our "official" magazine as edited by a man who denies the necessity on the part of our Ministers of belief in these fundamental doctrines,—doctrines, the importance of which has been so repeatedly affirmed by our General Assembly.

A fourth thing which was a cause for sadness of heart was the almost total silence of the assembly on the great essentials of the Christian faith,—confession, humility, sacrifice, and dependence upon God rather than upon ourselves. True, there were repeated references to Pentecost and the work of the Holy Spirit but most of them were merely incidental to something else.

By way of conclusion, permit me to make a few statements regarding the matter of Princeton Seminary.

By action of the 1929 General Assembly a new Board of Trustees consisting of thirty-three members was elected to serve in the future as the sole governing body in place of the two boards previously in control of the affairs of the seminary as soon as the necessary amendments to the charter of the seminary had been secured from the civil authorities in a valid way. In the meantime, the same group of men was elected to serve as a temporary Board of Directors.

At the 1930 General Assembly this temporary Board of Directors reported that the proposed amendments had been secured and that the new Board of Trustees was now functioning as the sole governing body of the seminary.

It chances, however, that there is grave question as to the legality of these amendments to the charter of the seminary and in view of the fact that Princeton Seminary has assets in excess of five millions of dollars, this constitutes an exceedingly important consideration. Manifestly, if the new Board of Trustees has the power legally to amend its charter once in the manner in which these amendments have been secured, it has power to do it any number of times. If this be true, the General Assembly has no effective control over the seminary and it can readily be seen that at some future time such amendments might be secured to the seminary's charter as would permit its assets to be diverted to uses diametrically opposed to the wishes of the donors and even to the wishes of the Presbyterian Church itself.

This possibility was called to the attention of the Assembly by Dr. Craig, a member of the former Board of Directors, with an urgent appeal that the new Board of Trustees be instructed by the Assembly to institute a friendly suit in the civil courts to determine if the charter of the seminary had been legally amended. In view of the showing by Dr. Craig that some of the most able attorneys of the State of New Jersey hold the amendments to the charter are not legal, it would seem this is the only logical thing to do. Yet for reasons difficult, for some at least, to understand this action was strongly opposed by the new Board of Trustees and its wishes prevailed with the Assembly.

## The Pastor and Detail Work

From the *American Lutheran*

RECENTLY we came upon a pastor of a fairly large city church folding form letters, putting them into envelopes and affixing stamps. His labors were in connection with a campaign conducted by his church. The man was busy, but we claim that he was misdirecting his time and energy and was occupied in work which should have been delegated to some of his church members. Every Minister should, of course, be humble enough to do any kind of work, but he has no business doing any kind of work in the church that others can do just as well. The spiritual duties of his office are so manifold and complex that they should engage all of his time and attention.

A Minister cannot do justice to his pulpit and to his pastoral service if he spends many hours of his valuable time in mechanical details which others could do. His time is so valuable that any unnecessary dissipation of it must be burdensome to his conscience. And while he is performing these detail jobs members of his church are becoming indifferent because they are assigned no place in the activities of the church. Many of our good people want to help and stand ready to place time and energy at the disposal of the church. We admonish them to work in the kingdom and fail to provide the opportunity to do any work. In the meanwhile the pastor flits about feverishly, wearing himself to a frazzle with detail jobs, devoting a minimum of his time to his sermons and the other spiritual duties of his office. His people soon take his performance of these detail tasks as a matter of course. They fail to realize that for the sake of general congregational welfare and efficiency the pastor should not be permitted to perform any tasks that someone else in the church can do. Every arrangement which will release his time for the performance of his actual pastoral duties is bound to redound to the welfare of the church.

In a well-organized church there are usually plenty of jobs that might profitably be assigned to the laity. Often most of the jobs are loaded on to a few willing workers and the rest of the tasks the pastor assumes. Ordinarily the pastor himself is to blame. But his willingness to undertake every odd job that offers itself is not contributing to the efficiency of the church nor to the effectiveness of his ministry. He is making himself a detail slave to the neglect of his real office and is training a set of congregational drones.

# News of the Church

## Interesting Facts of Churches and Ministers

### Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

#### Churches Organized

First Church, Minneapolis, Kans.

#### Churches Disbanded

Salt Creek, Colo.

#### Calls

Rev. John Murdock, Ojai, Cal. to First Church, Bakersfield, Cal.;
Rev. Harold B. Cook to St. James Church, Orosi, Cal. (declines);
Rev. Roger F. Cressey, Corry, Pa. to Henry, Ill.

#### Calls Accepted

Rev. Daniel S. McCorkle, Bearcreek, Mont. to Conrad, Mont.;
Rev. Ralph Orr, Belgrade, Mont. to Libby, Mont.;
Rev. John Pate, Libby, Mont., stated supply at Hot Springs, Mont.;
Rev. D. D. Mitchell, LeRoy, Minn. to Hastings, Minn.;
Rev. Hugh K. Fulton, stated supply, Rawlins-Parco, Wyo.;
Rev. E. W. Perry, Goldendale, Wash. to Kirkpatrick Memorial Community Church, Parma, Idaho;
Rev. Jasper R. Lamp, Emmett, Idaho;
Rev. Stewart C. Potter, to First Church, Gustine, Cal.;
Rev. Walter M. Sutherland, Lemon Cove, Cal. to Chowchilla, Cal.;
Rev. V. Butler, Mackinaw City, Mich. to Mt. Hope Church, Lansing, Mich.

#### Ordinations

Rev. W. Clyde Wolfe, Ellsworth, Kans.
Rev. Donald J. Henry, stated supply, Myton, Utah.

#### Installations

Rev. Wm. Pfantz, Kipp, Kans. to First Church, Beloit, Kans.;
Rev. Homer Greene, Idana, Kans. to Culver, Kans.;
Rev. Jay C. Everett, Larned, Kans. to First Church, Minneapolis, Kans.;
Rev. F. E. Piper, Rifle, Colo. Oct. 3;
Rev. R. O. Gorden, Huntingdon, Tenn.;
Rev. C. Levy Shelby, D.D., Greenfield, Tenn.;
Rev. Daniel J. Kerr, St. Paul, Minn. to Grant's Pass, Ore.;
Rev. Claude B. Protler, Portland Unity, to Medford, Ore.;
Rev. D. T. Robertson, D.D., Fargo, N. D. to Marshfield, Ore.;
Rev. John Burns, Brighton, Colo. to Corvallis, Ore.;
Rev. M. S. Weber, Chicago, Ill. to Eugene, Ore.;
Rev. Grover C. Birtchet, D.D., Colombia, S. A. to Salem, Ore.;
Rev. A. G. Pearson, D.D., Idaho Falls, Idaho to Pendleton, Ore.;
Rev. Herman S. Reichard, D.D., Walla Walla to Central Church, Portland, Ore.;
Rev. M. G. Montgomery, Parma, Idaho to Moreland Church, Portland;
Rev. Wm. L. Killian, D.D., Davenport, Wash. to Mizpah, Portland, Ore.;
Rev. J. Sidney Gould, New York to Tillamook, Ore.;
Rev. C. P. Carlson, Hayfield, Minn.;
Rev. W. M. Forsyth, Cedar City, Utah, Nov. 5;
Rev. A. T. Smith, Portland, Ore., stated supply at Klamath Falls, Ore.;
Rev. A. G. Miller, San Francisco, Cal. to stated supply, Lakeview, Ore.;
Rev. Lane C. Findley, Spencer Memorial Church, Lemmon, S. D., Nov. 13;
Rev. S. C. Poter, Gustine, Cal., Nov. 13;
Rev. Chas. E. Evans, J. A. Henry Memorial Church, Phila., Pa., Nov. 14.

#### Changed Addresses

Rev. L. V. Schermerhorn, 4231 Jenifer, N.W., Washington, D. C.
Rev. C. H. Reyburn, Mountain View, Cal.

#### Resignations

Rev. Geo. M. Cummings, from Garden Memorial Church, Washington, D. C.;
Rev. Llewelyn Jones, from Moriah Church, Utica, N. Y. to take effect May 31, 1931;
Rev. C. F. Geiger, Raymond, S. D. on or before April 1, 1930;
Rev. Wm. T. Paden, First Church, McIntosh, S. D. on Dec. 15, 1930.
Rev. Lewis B. Hart, D.D. from Newman, Cal.

#### Deaths

Rev. Robert Shemeld, Washington, D. C., Oct. 24.

#### Retirements

Rev. J. E. Blair, Winton, Cal.

### Presbyterian Church U. S.

#### Churches Organized

First Church of Dickenson Co., Birchleaf, Va.

#### Calls

Rev. J. W. Hassell to Sequin, Texas;
Rev. J. H. Pollard to Falfurrias, Tex.

#### Calls Accepted

Rev. Geo. M. Matthews, Clinton, N. C. to Durham, N. C.;
Rev. J. Irwin Knight, Holsten Valley, Tenn. to Mt. Olive and Calypso, N. C.;
Rev. R. A. Lapsley, Jr., D.D., Columbia, S. C. to 1st Church, Roanoke, Va.;
Rev. R. D. Bedinger, D.D., missionary to Africa, to Jackson, Miss.;
Rev. Geo. F. Swetnam, to Uniontown, Ala.;
Rev. W. T. Pearman, Sparta, Ga. to Dawson, Ga.;
Rev. John H. Grey, Jr., Bedford, Va. to be college pastor, Lexington, Va.;
Rev. J. S. Smylie, Evergreen Church, Memphis, Tenn. to Central Church, St. Louis, Mo.;
Rev. Wm. C. Colby, 1st Church, St. Charles, Mo. to Rumson, N. J. Church.

#### Ordinations

Rev. C. W. Solomon, Karnes City, Tex. Oct. 26;
Rev. Charles W. Kernan, as evangelist in Cooke Co., Tenn.

#### Installations

Rev. M. J. Murray, Faison, N. C.;
Rev. P. C. Adams, Immanuel Church, Wilmington, N. C.;
Rev. L. I. Hill, Whiteville and Chadburn, N. C.;
Rev. H. H. Thompson, 1st Church, Bristol, Tenn., Nov. 16;
Rev. Reginald Lowe, Moorhead, Miss., Oct. 13;
Rev. Paul M. Watson, Griffin, Ga., Oct. 26;
Rev. Jas. L. McGirt, Carrollton, Ga., Oct. 26;
Rev. W. G. Harry, Warm Springs, Ga., Nov. 2;
Rev. W. E. Crane, Porterdale, Ga. to Ormewood Church, Atlanta Ga., Nov. 2;
Rev. W. M. Crofton, Rose Hill, Columbus, Ga.

#### Resignations

Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, 1st Church, Covington, Va.;
Rev. J. C. B. McLaughlin, New Providence, Tenn.

### Presbyterian Church in Canada

#### Calls Accepted

Rev. James A. Grant, Presbytery of Mankato, U. S. A. to Erin and Ospringe, Canada;
Rev. John V. Mills, Dundalk and Ventry, Canada.

#### Inductions

Rev. H. S. Lee, St. Andrews, St. Lambert, Quebec.

#### Changed Addresses

Rev. Edmund Barnes, Rupert St. Church, Edmonton, Alberta.

#### Deaths

Rev. D. G. McQueen, D.D., LL.D., Edmonton, Alberta, Oct. 22.

### Reformed Church in the U. S.

#### Calls Accepted

Rev. F. K. Stucki, La Crosse, Wis. to Waukow, Ia.;
Rev. L. A. Moser, Harvard, Nebr. to Merengo, Ia.;
Rev. P. J. Kohler, Alleman, Ia. to Harbine, Neb.

#### Installations

Rev. Ernest Gauder, Zion Church, Dawson, Neb., Oct. 5.

### Reformed Church in America

#### Churches Organized

First, Wynantskill, N. Y.

### Calls Accepted

Rev. C. Dolfin, Firth, Neb. to Hingham, Wis.

### Changed Addresses

Rev. John Black, Hagaman, N. Y.

### Deaths

Rev. J. M. Lumkes, Holland, Mich., Oct. 20.

## Christian Reformed Church

### Calls

Rev. W. Van Peursen, Hope Christian Reformed Church, Los Angeles, Cal. to 1st Reformed Church, Zeeland, Mich.;
Rev. C. Groot, Brooten, Minn. to Hamshire, Tex.;
Rev. Wm. Van Peursen, Zutphen, Mich. to Lagrave Ave. Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

### Calls Accepted

Rev. J. M. Voortman, Randolph, Wis. to Wright, Ia.;
Rev. Candidate B. Vanden Brink to Oostburg, Wis.;
Rev. M. Arnoys, Dutton, Mich. to E. Leonard St. Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.;
Candidate K. E. N. J. DeWaal Malefyt, Leighton, Ia. to Edmonton, Alta., Canada;
Candidate N. DeVries, Grand Rapids, Mich. to Zillah and Sunnyside, Wash.

### Installations

Rev. R. J. Frens, Hanford, Cal., Oct. 1.

### Changed Addresses

Rev. J. DeJonge, 1362 Quincy St., Long Beach, Cal.

## United Presbyterian Church

### Churches Organized

Manhattan, Kans.

### Calls

Rev. C. Spoelhof, Lodi, N. J. to Grand Haven, Mich.;
Rev. J. L. Van Tielen, W. Sayville, N. Y. to Hoboken, N. J.

### Changed Addresses

Rev. W. L. Kennedy, Santa Anna, Cal.

## Church Union

OFFICIAL representatives of five bodies of the Presbyterian and Reformed Church family met in the First United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., on November 12 and 13, and adopted a partial report planning organic union of The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., The Presbyterian Church in the U. S., The United Presbyterian Church of North America, The Reformed Church in the U. S., and The Reformed Church in America. As a basis of the proposed union, the existing standards of the five bodies were approved, as follows: The Westminster Confession, The Larger and Shorter Catechisms, The Doctrinal Statement of the United Presbyterian Church, The Heidelberg Catechism, The Canons of the Synod of Dort, and The Belgic Confession.

The Six Committees which had been appointed submitted then reports to the conference as a whole. After considerable discussion, and in some instances, modifications, the mind of the conferees was expressed as follows:

*From the Report of Committee on Doctrinal Standards and Terms of Subscription.*

### Questions to Be Put to Ministers Before Their Ordination or Admission to a Charge

"1. Do you believe in one God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and do you confess anew the Lord Jesus Christ as your Saviour and Lord?

"2. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of the Living God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

"3. Do you believe and acknowledge the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith professed by the united Church and contained in its Standards, as agreeable to, and founded on the Word of God, revealed in the Holy Scriptures? And do you engage to adhere to, maintain and proclaim them?

"4. Do you acknowledge and agree to the government and discipline of the united Church?

"5. Do you promise to give dutiful attendance upon the courts of this Church, to submit yourself in the spirit of meekness to the authority of this presbytery and the superior courts, and to follow no divisive courses, but to maintain according to your ability the unity, purity and peace of the Church?

"6. Have you been led so far as you know your own heart to seek the office of the holy ministry by zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

"7. Do you promise to be diligent in the cultivation of personal piety, endeavoring to adorn your profession by a course of life becoming the gospel and the ministry of Christ?

"8. Are you now willing to take the charge of this congregation agreeably to your declaration at accepting their call? And do you promise to discharge the duties of a pastor to them, as God shall give you strength?"

### Committee on the Spirituality of the Church

"We declare the union of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system to be based on the teachings of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in those portions of their Standards which define the spirituality of the Church.

"The Church of Christ, under the guidance and through the power of the Holy Spirit, is entrusted with a distinctively spiritual mission. It has to do with the salvation of souls from the guilt and power of sin, the growth of Christ-like qualities of character and the development of those powers which make for devoted and efficient service. The establishment of the Kingdom of God in all the earth is the goal to be attained.

"In pursuit of its task to establish the reign of truth and righteousness on earth, the Church shuns all political alliances and entanglements, and all other associations that would tend to lower its spiritual tone and to subtract from its spiritual power. The Church seeks to Christianize human life in all its phases and to bear faithful and fearless testimony, through its individual members, against every form of sin and evil, and all that opposes the Kingdom of God. In the maintenance of the non-political and non-secular character of the Church, moral questions only, apart from their distinctive political implications, are proper subjects for its corporate action. The Church carries on its great work in behalf of all righteousness and equity, praying daily in the words of the Master, 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.'"

### Committee on Polity of the Church

In view of the subjects committed to the various sub-committees, the Committee on Church Polity defined polity, as referring to the governmental organization of the Church.

"As it is unreasonable to expect interpretation and elaboration of the Presbyterian form of church government that will be wholly acceptable to the constituencies of the negotiating Churches, we believe that there must be a real spirit of faith in one another. Believing in the sincere desire of all our brethren in this union effort to promote the Kingdom of God, we present the following basic principles, and recommend that they be recognized and transmitted to all the negotiating Churches as a declaration of the fundamentals of Church polity:

"1. That the Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme and sole Head of the Church.

"2. That the Word of God is the ultimate source and authority in Church government.

"3. That the Church's nature, relation and function are spiritual, and spiritual only.

"4. That witnessing for Christ is the continuous business of the Church.

"5. That the evangelization and Christianization of the world is the aim of the Church.

"6. We accept and practice the Presbyterian system as the method or form of Church organization and government, believing it to be in harmony with the Scriptures.

"We believe the books of government of the negotiating Churches to be in harmony with these principles.

"In creating a book of government for the united Church, we recommend that the following provisions be made:

"1. Congregations holding the consistorial form of organization as practiced by the Reformed Church in the U. S. and Reformed Church in America, shall have the right to retain their present form of organization, and new congregations organized thereafter may at their own choice adopt the consistorial form of organization or that practiced by the Presbyterian Churches.

"2. Presbyteries or classes as existing at the time of union shall not be merged or their boundaries or membership altered without their consent."

#### Committee on Boards and Agencies

"Your committee would respectfully report as follows:

"1. After hearing detailed statements from the representatives of the different denominations, your committee has discovered a remarkable similarity in the Boards and Agencies that have been set up by our Presbyterian and Reformed bodies for carrying on the Church's work.

"2. Should these denominations decide to unite organically, it is our opinion that there is nothing in the present organization of their Boards and Agencies that would present any real obstacle to their consolidation.

"3. In the event of the organic union of these bodies, it is our opinion that these agencies can be so united as to preserve the individual interests of each, increase their efficiency, and reduce the cost of their administration.

"4. Should the committee decide to go forward in this endeavor, we recommend that representatives of their different Boards and Agencies be called together to work out the details for their consolidation.

"5. As a concrete illustration of how they can be combined, we submit for your consideration:

"'A proposal to create a central board to administer the foreign missionary work of the Reformed and Presbyterian family of Churches in the U. S., June, 1919,' substituting in the plan the new Church as organically united for the Alliance of Reformed and Presbyterian Churches."

#### Committee on Educational Institutions

"The committee of the joint conference of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches meeting in Pittsburgh on November 12, 1930, appointed to consider the bearing of the educational institutions of the constituent bodies on Church Union, reports as follows:

"1. That we discover nothing as far as these educational institutions are concerned to act as an insuperable or even serious obstacle to the union of the Churches.

"2. That for the strengthening and more effective service of these institutions a union of the Churches will be advantageous.

"3. That a comprehensive unified program of Christian education can be more easily and naturally carried out following a union of the Churches.

"4. That meanwhile the Committee on Education of the Western Section of the Alliance, in line with authority already given, be urged to undertake at once a complete survey of the whole field of Christian education as it relates to our Presbyterian and Reformed Churches and propose recommendations based thereon."

#### Committee on Property Rights

"Your Committee on Property Rights respectfully reports as follows:

"At this time, without having before it the recommendations of the other committees with respect to the basis of a union of the several Churches concerned, it is impossible for your Committee on Property Rights to make a report in any detail, for the reason that it does not have before it the specific questions involved. We accordingly confine this report to a statement of general principles underlying such a union.

"When a basis of union has once been agreed upon and such a basis of union has been approved by the governing bodies of the respective Churches, in accordance with the procedure established by their respective constitutions, then the several Churches involved in the union may be merged and united into one Church, under such name as may be agreed upon, and such united Church will succeed to and become vested with all of the property rights and powers of the constituent Churches. It must be understood, of course, that if any of the Churches hold property subject to a specific trust, such a trust must be respected and its terms complied with.

"In working out the details of the union, many problems on property rights may arise, but your committee are of the opinion that there are no legal barriers in the way of consummating any union that may be agreed upon."

## The Heroic Stand of the Bible Union of China Against Modernism

FOR twenty years the China Sunday School Union has been one of the cooperating units of the World's Sunday School Association. Annually it has received a grant of $4,000 per year from the latter body as a partial aid in the carrying out of its work. Recently the World's Association has severed this relationship and cancelled its appropriation. Despite denials to the contrary it is asserted by the China Sunday School Union that this drastic step was taken in order to silence its witness to the great doctrines of the Christian faith in the interests of Modernism, and this assertion is backed up by abundant material from the files of the China Union.

The Union was created by the act of the Centenary Missionary Conference, held in Shanghai in 1907. Three years later, by the aid of the World's Association, it was able to secure a full time secretary in the person of the Rev. Elwood G. Tewksbury, who had previously served about seventeen years as a missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Although other organizations, notably the Stewart Evangelistic Funds, have contributed liberally to the Union, the uninterrupted help of the World's Association has been no small factor in enabling the Union to render increasingly large service. Mr. Tewksbury has proven himself an able and wise administrator, and has done a great work.

Doctrinally the China Union has always adhered to what is known as the "common zone" policy. The fact that the China Committee had upon it representatives of different denominations made it necessary to define the doctrinal limits within which it should move. Accordingly it was early resolved that "The C.S.S.U. Committee is *representative* as *regards its literature*, which emphasizes those aspects of Biblical truth which are *held in common* by the churches of the larger denominations and are contained in their Standards and Declarations." Notwithstanding the clear realization that many in the cooperating churches did not believe the doctrinal standards of their own organizations, the Union consistently maintained a strong witness to the truth of the Gospel. Its literature was all of an evangelical, conservative nature. But this, naturally, did not satisfy the Modernist element. Therefore, at the Jerusalem Missionary Conference in 1928, Drs. Weigle and Diffendorfer of the World's Sunday School Association Committee called Dr. Lyon of the China Committee into consultation regarding the matter. Later, Dr. Lyon issued a statement in which it was clearly implied that if the China Union did not change its "common zone" doctrinal policy so as to issue literature favored by Modernists as well as conservative literature, there might be established another union organization which would pursue the desired policy. Notwithstanding this threat, for such it was clearly seen to be, the China Committee later in the same year passed the following resolution: "that the Executive Committee of the China Sunday School Union reaffirms the present policy of the Union."

At the last Quadrennial Convention of the World's Sunday School Association, the

Rev. R. M. Hopkins, D.D., was elected General Secretary of the American Section. After his election, Dr. Hopkins proceeded to China that he might study the Sunday School situation. After many interviews with individuals and groups, he presented certain suggestions to the China Committee: regarding literature, revision of the constitution, and retirement of the General Secretary. These suggestions were carefully considered. It was obvious that they were made with the idea of making the Union representative of all shades of doctrinal thought. At an executive meeting of the Committee called to decide the matter, it was voted "that this meeting recommend . . . that, when considering any proposed changes in the Constitution of the China Sunday School Union, it be understood, that the China Sunday School Union adheres to the policy and present practice, known as the 'common zone policy.'" At a later meeting, the revision of the constitution desired by Dr. Hopkins, in that it was understood to leave the doctrinal policy an "open question" to be determined from time to time by a changing committee, did not secure sufficient support for adoption. At this time it was announced that the China Inland Mission, the largest mission body in China, would withdraw if the doctrinal policy were made an "open question." In spite of the intimation of Dr. Hopkins that he would find it difficult to recommend the continued cooperation of the World's Association unless the church and mission groups were given full power to determine the doctrinal policy from time to time, it was voted "that the China Sunday School Union go forward under its present Constitution and policy which is well known both to its constituency and supporters."

Dr. Hopkins returned to New York, and at the meeting of the Board of Managers of the World's Sunday School Association, American Section, Dr. Tewksbury was discontinued as Secretary as of April 30, 1930, with a few scanty words of polite appreciation, transportation to America being offered him within six months, but no pension being allowed him after his long years of distinguished service. His dismissal was docketed as beng due to his "expressed inability . . . to fully represent the World's Sunday School Association . . ." and the committee expressed "its deep regret that he has found himself out of accord with the fundamental policies involved in the work of the World's Sunday School Association." At the same meeting, further financial support was conditioned upon the reorganization of the Union in accordance with the desires of the Association.

On receipt of the news of the Action of the American Section of the World's Association, the China Sunday School Union met and passed a number of resolutions, in part as follows:

"RESOLVED: that in reply . . . we point out:

"1. That the present Constitution of the China Sunday School Union requires that two-thirds of its membership shall be 'electively representative of the Evangelical denominations or churches, the remaining one-third to be co-opted annually by the Committee itself.' . . . The mission and church representatives on this Committee repudiate . . . implications that their appointing bodies were not free agents in this matter.

"2. That the China Sunday School Union has voted to go forward under a general Committee elected as per its Constitution provided it is stipulated and clearly understood that it will continue, as in the past, to conserve and 'emphasize those aspects of Biblical truth which are held in common by the churches of the larger denominations and are contained in their standards and declarations.'

"The China Sunday School Union sees clearly that the maintenance of this policy is the only way in which a Union Sunday School organization can be 'the servant of the churches in China,' if the greatest number of the church and mission bodies are to be included. The China Sunday School Association therefore insists that this doctrinal policy be considered as a *closed question.* If it should be left open, some of the largest bodies in China would cease to cooperate. In spite of Dr. Hopkins' assertion in his Report that 'the issue before us therefore is not one of doctrine,' we definitely state this is the *only* unresolvable issue.

"Inasmuch as the doctrinal issues involved were made clear to Dr. Hopkins on his recent visit to China, the conditions which the World's Association have made regarding the continuance of its grant, can only be interpreted as a demand that the China Sunday School Union hold its historic and unifying doctrinal policy as an open question. This, the Committee is not prepared to do.

"It must be distinctly understood, however, that the China Sunday School Union approached the problem of reorganization with an open mind, and in fact in Committee-of-the-whole while Dr. Hopkins was present, considered favorably most of the suggestions made by him, but failed finally to adopt them because it became evident that the changes suggested would leave the Union's doctrinal policy an open question and possibly place a group in control not in sympathy with that policy.

"3. That as regards future grants from the World's Sunday School Association, we fail to understand why a world's association that is understood to represent the churches of Evangelical Christendom, can refuse to co-operate with an organization in mission lands, whose operations in the future as in the past twenty years, are based upon the Standards of these very churches.

"RESOLVED: that the China Sunday School Union hereby reaffirm the vote taken at its meeting November 27, 1929, which read as follows:

"'That the China Sunday School Union go forward under its present Constitution and the Policy which is well-known both to its constituency and its supporters.'

"The Committee understand that this action refers to the intention of the China Sunday School Union to serve the churches of China under its present Name and with the Aim and Functions, viz., Literature, Education, Evangelism and Extension, etc., as specified in Articles I and II of its Constitution and that the Union continues to welcome the co-operation of mission and church bodies interested in carrying out its well-known policy of emphasizing those aspects of Biblical truth which are held in common by the churches of the larger denominations and are contained in their Standards and Declarations.

"RESOLVED: that the Rev. E. G. Tewksbury be heartily invited to continue as the General Secretary of the China Sunday School Union.

"RESOLVED: that the China Sunday School Union hereby records its appreciation of the distinguished and efficient service to the cause of Christ in China, rendered by the Rev. E. G. Tewksbury. He came to China under the American Board in 1890 and for the last twenty years has served as the China representative of the World's Sunday School Association.

"We of course recognize the abstract right of the World's Sunday School Association to discontinue Mr. Tewksbury's relation to the American Unit of the World's Sunday School Association. We would, however, call attention to the fact that he was jointly called to the China work by the World's Sunday School Association and the China Sunday School Committee, and moreover instructed by the World's Sunday School Association to serve under the direction of the China Committee. This he has faithfully done and until the present Action of the American Section of the World's Sunday School Association, no cause of complaint had been brought against him before this Committee by any co-operating church or mission body. The decision of the American Unit to discontinue him as their representative, without retirement allowance, with only three and a half months' notice, and even making return travel to the U. S. A. available only on condition that he leaves China before July—this seems strangely inconsistent with what we understand to be the policy of the World's Sunday School Association in dealing with their Field Secretaries on a 'missionary' basis. We know of no large Mission Board that would thus drastically treat a missionary who is in good and regular standing.

"It is to be noted, moreover, that the action taken by the World's Committee not only affects Mr. Tewksbury personally, but can only be interpreted as directly intended to weaken the only union Sunday School organization in China, not only financially but as regards its secretarial staff, and that

almost immediately, and at the very time when the cause of Christian Religious Education in China demands the most urgent assistance."

It will be noted that it is the contention of the World's Association that no doctrinal issue is involved, while the China Union claims that the changes in policy demanded as a condition of further support would be such as to completely alter the doctrinal stand of the Union, and allow the production of literature acceptable to Modernists as well as literature of an orthodox and positive character. In this connection it will interest the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY to know that the *Christian Century*, High Priest of Modernism among the religious press, views the issue as frankly one of doctrine. In an editorial published in the issue of March 12, 1930, and entitled "Can Christian Missions be Saved?" it says in part: (Italics ours)

"To make concrete the situation as it actually is, we invite attention to the present condition of the missionary enterprise in China. We speak now, bear in mind, of that enterprise considered a whole. There are missionaries, there are missions, there are Chinese Christians who are trying desperately to make Christianity an appreciable influence in revolutionary China. But when Christianity is considered as the Chinese see it, it must be remembered that it consists far more largely of such elements as are placed in China by *the Roman Catholic Church, the China Inland Mission, the various 'faith' missions, the ultra-conservative Lutheran and southern fundamentalist denominations, than of anything else. . . .*

"The situation is strikingly epitomized in a single recent issue of the *Chinese Recorder. . . .*

"And in another part of the same paper there is a discreet, but revealing account of the ineffectual attempt to rescue the work of the China Sunday School Union from the fundamentalism which has controlled it.

"This latter situation merits more than passing consideration. It is another example of what happens when a reputedly united effort reduces itself to the lowest common denominator basis. Up to the present moment, the attempt to instruct the youth of China in Christian ideas, as carried on in the Christian Sunday schools, is in terms of a dogmatic that is completely opposed to every principle of knowledge that young China is absorbing in that nation's new schools. Because of the effort to have no single word in any Sunday School literature that might offend the most determined heresy hunter among the fundamentalist missionaries—and China has a good many of them—the Sunday schools, which should be equipping new Christians for a new day, have been living in a bygone age. *Some of the mission boards have at last awakened to this situation, under the prodding of the World's Sunday School Association, and are now planning to leave the Sunday school organization in China in the hands of the dogmatists while they organize a new body of their own.* But the point is, that this decision has only come now, after the revolution in China has been under way for years; it is a belated attempt to catch up with a procession that is already far down the road.

"The organization of a new Sunday School movement in China is a beginning of an attempt to win back a battle almost lost. But it is only a beginning. If this battle is not to be thrown away, some grim facts must be faced, and some daring decisions must be made. The fact must be faced *that more than half the missionary force in China and on other fields is a handicap to the Christian cause.* Not because of any slightest shortcoming in purity and devotion of life, but in identifying Christianity with a day already departed, these consecrated people are doing what they can to make Christianity's triumph impossible. They stand for the status quo—theologically, politically, socially—some more than others, but all sufficiently to link their whole service with the cause of reaction. . . ."

Latest advices from China are to the effect that the attack anticipated by the *Christian Century* is developing. The first of the World's Sunday School deputation, the Rev. J. L. Corley, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has arrived on the scene to study the situation, with a view, it is said, to the formation of an all inclusive Religious Education Council. This council is expected to do the work that the China Sunday School Union would not do except on a definite doctrinal basis. This, however, cannot be fully "representative" as desired so ardently by the World's Association, as it will lack representatives from the conservative elements. The net result of the agitation will be to divide the Sunday School forces of China into two groups, each avowedly standing for a different kind of teaching than the other. It will be a matter of congratulation to conservatives generally to know that evangelical men and women in China and throughout the whole world are rallying to the aid of those who count the reproach of Christ as of more value than the praise of men, and that the China Sunday School Union will continue unabated its noble witness to the truth.

## Rome as Viewed by the Primate of All England

THE prospect of a great union of Christian churches "maybe in our own time" was discussed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on Nov. 13, in addressing the lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury at Westminster.

"The prospect is opening up before our eyes," he said, "of groups of churches in all parts of the world, Angelican, Orthodox, Old Catholic, national churches like that of Sweden and new churches which will be self-governing and able to develop their own character and mission in their visible communion by their acceptance of a common bond of faith and order.

"After it is achieved," he added, "we shall see, maybe in our own time, a return to that form of visible unity which marked the undivided church before Christendom was scattered into its various fragments. There is only one cloud. There is no place at present for the largest and greatest Christian community, the Church of Rome.

"The door which was opened in 1920 (by the Lambeth conference of that year) is the door which leads along a definite road toward a definite ideal."

The Archbishop of York declared that the task of the Lambeth conference was "no longer one of issuing a general call to unity," but has reached a stage of "definite negotiations."

The fact that the Archbishop of the established Church of Protestant England could speak of the Church of Rome as "the largest and greatest Christian community" has caused many comments and severe condemnation by those who insist upon the maintenance of the Protestant character of the Church of England.

## Rome Versus the Jews

SINCE the announcement on the part of the British government of its changed policy with regard to Jewish colonization in Palestine, the belief has been expressed in certain well-informed quarters that the Church of Rome, having designs on Palestine as a possible mandate under the League of Nations to be administered by the Papal state, was indirectly responsible for the British change of front. *The Christian* of London, says:

"In a certain degree the strained situation in Palestine has been eased, but it cannot be said that any change of policy has been announced on the part of the Government. Nevertheless, it is something to the good that last week the Colonial Office empowered the Palestine Government to issue fifteen hundred permits under the Labour Schedule for Jewish immigrants to enter Palestine during the next six months. Last May a number of certificates issued under this schedule were cancelled, to the extreme perturbation of the Jewish people. As indicating the unrelenting spirit of the Arab leaders, it is announced that they have urged the British Government to stand by the position (obviously hostile to the Jews) promulgated in the recent White Paper. Another element causing anxiety finds expression in a letter just to hand from a well-informed Palestine correspondent. Writing to us, that correspondent says:——

"'We are passing through a period of excitement, in virtue of the White Paper issued concerning the Jewish and Arab question. It seems to me that this is a sop to

the Cerberus of Rome, designed to ease the Malta question for politicians. While the Jew is to be restricted from the purchase of land, the Latins, Greeks, and Armenians may buy with all facility. The question is, Rome *versus* the Jew; all else is a cloak.'

"This point of view is not wholly new. For some years past it has been clear that Rome has been exerting a malevolent influence, in the hope of defeating Jewish aspirations and furthering other designs. That the politics of Malta have played a part in the White Paper business is, however, a new element in the Palestine problem."

## Wheaton College

WHEATON College, Wheaton, Illinois, interdenominational, has attracted an increasing number of students during the past few years, the enrollment having doubled in five years' time. For three consecutive years it has not been possible to accept all of the students that have applied for admission, due to the limitation of enrollment. Six hundred and twenty-three students were registered in September, coming from approximately forty states and fifteen foreign countries. One hundred and fifty-two of this number are members of the senior class, and candidates for the bachelor's degree. Of the new students admitted, sixty came with advanced credits from other colleges and universities. This is especially significant, since the majority of these came from state universities and secular colleges where little or no attention is given the spiritual development of the students.

Two hundred and five students make up the freshman class. A vocational survey made among the members of this group revealed the fact that fifty-four are looking forward to entering the teaching profession, and fifty-two are planning to devote their lives to the Christian ministry and to missionary activities.

The departments of science, as well as the other departments of the college, are headed by men with the highest type of scholastic training, holding degrees from the country's strongest universities. These men find no conflict between true science and Christianity.

A survey of twenty-one Illinois liberal arts colleges revealed the fact that ten of this number experienced a decrease in enrollment during the past year. Of those experiencing an increase, Wheaton College ranked the highest, with a gain of one hundred and eleven students, or twenty per cent over the preceding year. It is apparent from this fact that conservative Christian education still makes a strong appeal to a great many people throughout the country.

Wheaton College Academy, the preparatory department of the College, also has a record enrollment this year, with a total of one hundred and ten students. Many parents are anxious to place their children under Christian auspices during their preparatory course, and thus Wheaton Academy is attracting an increasing number of young people. Many individuals of mature years who are unable to complete their work in the public high schools find that the Academy provides a congenial atmosphere where this may be done.

That true Christian education is still popular among thousands of people throughout the country, is evidenced by the enrollment of conservative colleges and Bible institutes.

## Evangelical Theological College

THE Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas, opened its seventh annual session September 27 with dormitory space for both single and married students taxed, with a number of students quartered outside the College buildings. Dr. Alexander B. Winchester, "Minister Extra Muros" of Knox Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Canada, preached the opening sermon. Since the beginning Dr. Winchester, who was one of the originators of the movement which eventuated in the founding of the College, has been a member of its faculty as associate professor of English Bible Exposition. After an absence of two years due to ill health this scholarly and faithful man of God was welcomed warmly by students and faculty as he resumed his October schedule of class room lectures. He is succeeded in the seriatim Bible courses for November and December by Dr. George E. Guille, President of Bryan Memorial University, who, like Dr. Winchester, has been an associate professor of English Bible Exposition since the establishment of the College. When Dr. Guille accepted the presidency of the Bryan University he made provision to remain on the faculty of the Evangelical College also.

Two new members of the resident faculty began work this fall. Rev. Ellwood M. Schofield, A.M., Th.B., heads the department of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. An alumnus of New York University, Princeton Seminary and the Graduate College of Princeton University, Professor Schofield continued his studies at the University of Berlin and finished the residence work for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the graduate department of the Louisville Baptist Seminary. Rev. Wick Broomall, A.M., Th.M., of Birmingham, Alabama, accepted the call to the departments of Biblical Introduction and Semitic Languages and Old Testament Exegesis. Professor Broomall is an alumnus of Maryville College and Princeton Seminary. He won his graduate degrees at Princeton Seminary and Princeton University.

The faculty and student body have just experienced a great spiritual uplift through the presence and addresses of Mr. D. E. Hoste of London, General Director of the China Inland Mission, who spent a week stopping on his way east from China. Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor were also guests of the College at the same time and contributed much profit and blessing. The week was begun with a day of fasting and prayer.

Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, President of the College, spent the summer vacation in the British Isles and Belgium, delivering 130 conferences addresses during his visit. At the opening of the fall semester announcement was made of the gift from an eastern donor of a $23,000.00 property which completes an entire block frontage for the campus. The advance enrollment for 1931 is heavy.

# CANADA

### Conference With the United Church

BY authority of a resolution of the General Assembly, a meeting of representatives of Evangelical Churches was called for October 14th in Knox College Board Room. The Assembly's resolution recorded its "readiness, consistent with its practice, to meet in conference with representatives of other evangelical bodies, upon matters of common interest to them in their prosecution of the work of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ." The only response to this appeal was a delegation from the United Church of Canada. The committee appointed by the Assembly consisted of: The Moderator, Dr. Baird, Dr. A. S. Grant, Dr. D. R. Drummond, Dr. George E. Ross, Dr. Robert Johnston, Dr. James Wilson, Dr. L. B. Gibson, Dr. S. Banks Nelson, Rev. W. Barclay, Rev. W. F. McConnell, and Mr. Jas. Rodger.

Upon Dr. Baird intimating that the committee was ready to hear from the United Church, Dr. Oliver, Moderator of the United Church, called upon Dr. Cochrane, Home Mission Secretary, who raised the question of overlapping, and Dr. Laird who introduced the matter of distribution of estates and legacies in dispute between the two Churches and suggested the appointment of a committee of each Church to deal with such. Upon hearing these gentlemen, and no other person from the United Church intimating the desire to be heard, Dr. Baird stated the hearing was over and if further conference were necessary the United Church would be advised. The committee having deliberated, announcement was made, by special delivery letter, to the United Church as follows: "That having heard a deputation from the United Church of Canada, this committee resolves that a communication be sent to the United Church of Canada, stating that, owing to the action of the last General Assembly, they are not in a position to discuss overlapping; and that the Church also be advised that, as the settlement of legal matters is now attended to by a committee, the appointment of another committee is not, in their opinion, necessary."

This deliverance covered the only matters presented by the United Church. It

was very remarkable that, notwithstanding their oft expressed desire for conference, the question of the name, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada*, was not raised, nor the *Census* to which such extended reference was made in the 1929 Year Book of the United Church. In speaking about overlapping Dr. Cochrane did not refer to the many instances of intrusion by the United Church into territory previously occupied wholly by The Presbyterian Church in Canada, nor to the competition within the United Church of which complaint has been made to its last General Council, and from which union was expected to provide a complete deliverance.

Concerning the attempt of the United Church to have all those who record themselves as Presbyterians listed as belonging to the United Church of Canada, *The Presbyterian Record*, Toronto, remarks:

"However praiseworthy the purpose of a religious denomination to seek accurate registration for its own people, it should be content with that. Not so the United Church, for it is moving far beyond that limit.

"Taking advantage of mere words it will have others registered as members and adherents of the United Church who are not connected with it. Should one say to the census enumerator that he is a member or adherent of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, even though he is of those who did not go into the Union, and therefore does not belong to the United Church, the census commissioner is to be informed by the United Church that such an one is to be recorded as belonging to the United Church of Canada. This intention is specifically set forth in page 46, Section D of the United Church Year Book, 1929, already cited.

"Nothing could be plainer than the intent here expressed to gather into the fold of the United Church, so far as census enumeration is concerned, all those Presbyterians who did not enter the United Church. *That church knows full well that these Presbyterians will report themselves in no other way, nor can they justly report themselves in any other way than as members and adherents of The Presbyterian Church in Canada.*

"To the end therefore that her people may be accurately registered let the United Church employ all proper agencies and methods. They have a right to be credited with all who are their own, even though they can hardly expect it because of their instructions with respect to identity. However, it is not accurate registration the United Church seeks but improper and dishonest registration, and to accomplish its purpose pleads an Act of Parliament. Neither in fact nor justice can they support the claim that those who declare they belong to The Presbyterian Church in Canada should be reported by the census as belonging to the United Church."

**The Editors of Christianity Today desire to take this opportunity of wishing a blessed Christmastide and a happy New Year to their many friends and well wishers throughout the world.**

## The Old Testament Canon

*(Concluded from Page 15)*

acter. It is possible, for instance, that our inquirer has in mind the claim of Fundamentalism that the Bible is infallible. We believe that this claim, when properly understood, is well-grounded and so cannot suppose that its proclamation, any more than the proclamation of any other truth, can prove harmful. On the other hand, it may be that our inquirer has in mind the notion that Christianity stands or falls with the question whether the Bible is infallible or the "dictation theory" of the inspiration of the Bible (of which we have heard much without ever coming into contact with anybody who held it). In the latter case we would agree because we not only regard the "dictation theory" as untenable but are far from supposing that we could have no Christianity if we did not have an infallible Bible, important as we regard the doctrine of Biblical infallibility. Or it may be that our inquirer has in mind the claim of Fundamentalism that Christianity is through and through a supernatural religion and that a non-miraculous Christianity is just no Christianity at all. In that case we would not regard the claim as "extreme" but rather as one so moderate that it must be maintained if we are to be Christians at all in any defensible sense of the word. If miracles never happened we could not have, for instance, a divine Lord and Saviour; and yet unless we do Christianity is indeed the great delusion.

It may be added that it is not enough that men have a strong *religious* faith. Fundamentalism is perfectly right, we believe, in maintaining that only a *Christian* faith has saving value. No doubt it is much easier to hold to the faith of "Modernism" with its rejection of the supernatural but it is by no means obvious that what is left of Christian faith after the supernatural is eliminated is worth believing. If we must eliminate from Christianity everything that makes it worth believing before it will be accepted by the modern man, why bother about the question of whether or no he accepts it? This is not to say that all men who are "modernistic" in their thinking are non-Christians; but it is to say that "Modernism" in all its consistent forms of expression is something other than Christianity in any proper sense of the word. We rejoice when men reject "the extreme claims" of Fundamentalism provided this leads them to get "firmer ground" under their feet; but let us not forget that the only really firm ground upon which any man can stand, religiously speaking, was pointed out by Paul when he said: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ." The Athenians were "deeply religious" but that fact brought no satisfaction to the soul of Paul.

## Mrs. Kennedy's Generous Gift

THE recent bequest of Mrs. John S. Kennedy, of New York, to Union Theological Seminary of Richmond, has reminded friends of the seminary that during her lifetime Mrs. Kennedy was liberal in her contributions to the same institution. In 1917, in her notable generosity, Mrs. Kennedy gave $160,000 for the erection and equipment of "Schauffler Hall" as a modern Sunday School building for the use of the Department of Religious Education. This building was given in memory of her brother, the late Rev. A. F. Schauffler, D.D.

The will of Mrs. Kennedy, who died at the advanced aged of ninety-seven years, is said to reach in valuation to ten million or more dollars. Her husband, who died about twenty-one years ago, willed fully ten millions to various Presbyterian institutions.

Certain specific designations are made, after which it is provided that of the remaining three-fourths of the residuary estate, Union Theological Seminary of Richmond, Va., is to receive one-fortieth. The amount has been estimated as being approximately $200,000.

## "REVELATION"

AT the time that this issue goes to press, copies of Volume one Number one of the new periodical *Revelation* have begun to appear. It is published in Philadelphia by the "American Bible Conference Association, Inc." Its editor is the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Minister of the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. The paper has grown out of the Radio Ministry of Mr. Barnhouse over the Columbia chain of stations, in order that the printed page might extend his work. It is a finely put together magazine. Some of the contributors to the first issue are, The Rev. I. M. Haldeman, D.D., H. A. Ironside, and Mr. Barnhouse.

## Presbyterian Ministers' Fund

THE Rev. Perry S. Allen, D.D., President of the Presbyterian Ministers' Fund was called Home on Saturday, November 8. Funeral services were held at the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, on November 11, and interment was made at Woodlands Cemetery. Dr. Allen had been President of the Fund for over thirty-five years, and was recognized by insurance experts the world over as a great administrator. During his incumbency the Fund was built up from a somewhat minor position so far as total insurance is concerned until it became recognized as a large and important institution. Dr. Allen was credited with having brought about this almost phenomenal growth.

The Fund was organized by the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1717 as "The Fund for Pious Uses." For many years it continued to report to the Synod and later to the General Assembly. It was a direct effort on the part of the Church to care for its needy Ministers and their families. In 1759 the Fund was incorporated by Thomas Penn and Richard Penn. Since that time it has operated as a life insurance company. It is the oldest life insurance company in the United States.

Shortly after the death of Dr. Allen, the Board of Directors of the Fund (by requirement of law composed of a majority of laymen) elected Mr. J. H. Radey Acker, a Philadelphia attorney as acting President. The selection of a layman as President of the Board has aroused considerable resentment on the part of many Ministers, who feel that the Fund should be exclusively under the direction of a clergyman. They argue that a Minister has usually been at the head of the fund, and that the chairmen of all its important committees have been Ministers. The corporators of the Fund are made up of Ministers and laymen in the proportion of about two to one, respectively. Among these corporators are the heads of Theological Seminaries, educational institutions and administrative heads of the Boards of Churches in the Presbyterian Family. Those Ministers who wish a Minister at the head of the Fund believe that, the Fund being exclusively for Ministers, should not be under lay control lest possibly the Fund might be at a future time opened to unordained men. On the other hand it is observed on behalf of the position taken by the Board, that while it is true that the Fund has been under Ministerial superintendence since the beginning, it was a small enterprise until the genius of Dr. Allen transformed it as few men, whether Ministers or laymen, would have been able to do. Mr. Acker, Acting President of the Fund, has been long and intimately connected with the organization. He has been a corporator for twenty-two years, a Director for twelve years, and General Counsel for the fund for six years. He is President of the Board of Trustees of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia.

It is not yet too late to send Christianity Today as a Christmas present, and to have a card sent to announce your gift. Our low subscription price —only a dollar a year everywhere, may help you to solve your gift problem. A blank is enclosed for your use. Should you not yet be a subscriber you may use the blank for sending in your own enrollment.

## Westminster Seminary News

THE initial half of the first term of Westminster Seminary's second academic year has just passed, and the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will doubtless be looking for news from the various realms of the Seminary's life.

Through the generous invitation of two friends of the Seminary, who acted as hostesses upon the occasion, a Thanksgiving dinner, to which the members of the student body, the members of the Faculty and a number of other members of the Seminary community were invited, was held in the Seminary on Monday evening, November 24th. Some seventy-five were present. Dr. Samuel G. Craig, the editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, presided as toastmaster, and though it might appear that such a banquet would minister primarily to the physical man, the intellectual and spiritual were amply provided for by the proceedings during the latter part of the evening. Especially outstanding were the short addresses of Mr. Murray of the Seminary Faculty on "The Reformed Faith in Scotland and Westminster Seminary," and of Dr. Allis, likewise of the Faculty, on "Occasions for Present Thanksgiving."

Such bountiful feasts are not to be thought of however, as interfering with athletic exercise, as the basket ball team, which promises fine sport for the winter session, already indicates. A number of games have been scheduled and the convenient gymnasium arrangements provided by the Seminary make frequent practice possible.

To turn to the more direct intellectual and spiritual activities of the Seminary, one of the most important actions of recent months has been the step taken by the Board of Trustees in uniting the Department of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism and the Department of Old Testament History and Exegesis to form one enlarged department, the Department of Old Testament. The head of this department is the Rev. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament, and Dr. Allis is assisted by the Rev. Allan A. MacRae, M.A., Assistant Professor of Old Testament.

There are no two men anywhere better equipped to carry on the work of the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson than these two. Dr. Allis was for many years Dr. Wilson's assistant on the Princeton Faculty, and following upon his graduate study in the University of Berlin he has devoted his entire life to teaching the Old Testament. In this connection he was also for many years editor of the recently discontinued *Princeton Theological Review*. Mr. MacRae was selected by Dr. Wilson to be his own assistant, and for the past year he has been intimately in touch with Dr. Wilson's work and activity in every line, living within a few doors of his home and spending many hours with him in study and research.

The Seminary has had the privilege of hearing several special speakers within recent weeks. The latest have been Mr. D. E. Hoste, of Shanghai, China, General Director of the China Inland Mission, the Rev. John H. De Vries, D.D., of Saybrook, Connecticut, translator into English of many of the works of the great Reformed theologian of the Netherlands, Dr. Abraham Kuyper, and Dr. Thomas Lambie of Abyssinia, medical missionary under the Sudan Interior Mission.

The students carry on weekly prayer meetings under the auspices of the Students' Association and, in addition to these, class prayer meetings and a regular missionary prayer meeting are also under the direction of the student body.

In recent weeks a group of the students has been holding open-air services on Saturday evenings in North Philadelphia, thus providing the people of a crowded district with the opportunity of hearing the gospel that alone is able to save.

Another student group, which is preaching and singing the gospel, is the Seminary Quartet. These four young men have sung the good news and presented the message of the gospel within recent weeks at a number of services, among them the Sunday evening service at the First Church of Orange, New Jersey. Other engagements have been scheduled for the future.

The Christmas vacation will commence on Friday, December 19th, at one o'clock. During the vacation, one group of students are taking part in a series of meetings in Southern California. Others will be preaching and working elsewhere.

BENJ. F. EMERY CO., PHILA