# 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-FEBRUARY, 1931
Vol. 1 No. 10

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# The Supernaturalism of Christianity

"THE supernatural," in the words of the late Dr. B. B. WARFIELD, "is the very breath of Christianity's nostrils and an anti-supernaturalistic atmosphere is to it the deadliest miasma."

The fact just alluded to—for fact it certainly is—goes a long way, almost the whole way, in accounting for whatever depression of fortunes Christianity is suffering today. Previous to the rise of Modernism in the eighteenth century there had been numerous individuals who had maintained that all that comes to pass, including religion and morals, could be accounted for without positing any supernatural factor; but the thinking of humanity as a whole had been supernaturalistic to the core. As that erudite Dutch scholar, HERMAN BAVINCK, has observed: "Before the eighteenth century the existence of a supernatural world, and the necessity, possibility, and reality of a special revelation, had never been seriously called in question." The last two hundred years, however, has witnessed the rise and spread of the so-called empirico-scientific life and world view which turns its back on all supernaturalism and professes to give a purely naturalistic explanation and interpretation of all that has been and is. Within the last seventy-five years the acceptance of this anti-supernaturalistic view of things has become so wide-spread, especially in academic circles, that its advocates not unnaturally look upon it as an "assured result" of modern discovery and confidently anticipate the time when culture and civilization will be built on a purely naturalistic basis.

The effect of the rise and spread of this anti-supernaturalistic conception of things on the fortunes of Christianity would not have been so serious were it not for the fact that it found wide-spread acceptance within the Christian Church itself under the name of Modernism. For what Modernism is, in effect, in its consistent forms of expression, is a de-supernaturalized version of Christianity. How far matters have gone in this respect is indicated by the fact that HENRY NELSON WIEMAN of the University of Chicago in a widely advertised book, entitled "Ventures in Belief: Christian Convictions for a Day of Uncertainty," issued under the auspices of the Student Christian Association Movement of America, and which includes among its contributors such well-known "leaders" in Christian thinking as FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, KIRBY PAGE and HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, says that the sense of futility that characterizes modern life is due to the fact that men have lost faith in the supernatural without the courage to commit themselves whole-heartedly to the natural. He writes as follows:

> "This sense of futility, this refusal to believe in any cosmic destiny for man, is chiefly due to the fact that men have found it impossible to believe in the supernatural. Heretofore for several centuries men have envisaged their highest values and vocation in terms of the supernatural. But there is no supernatural and men are fast coming to see that there is not. But they are not willing to commit themselves to the naturalistic process. They stand looking wistfully off into the sky whence has vanished the delusion of the supernatural and think there is no longer anything to make human life magnificent" (p. 101-102).

Just why men holding such views should suppose that they are giving expression to "Christian convictions" we are at a loss to understand, seeing that nothing is more certain than that Christianity de-supernaturalized is Christianity extinct. We wish it could be said that such a view-point is held by only a few. Such, however, is not the case. It is, or at least threatens to become, the dominant view-point of the age in which we live: for what is or at least rapidly becoming, the outstanding characteristic of the age in which we live? Is it not its deeply rooted and wide spread naturalism of thought and sentiment? Even where the reality of the supernatural is not openly

## IN THIS ISSUE:


The Prophetic Urge..... 4
Floyd E. Hamilton

Is Westminster Seminary a Rebel Institution?—Open Letter and Reply 6

Notes on Biblical Exposition..... 10
J. Gresham Machen

Books of Religious Significance..... 12

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

Letters to the Editor..... 16

Current Views and Voices..... 16

Ministerial Changes..... 18

News of the Church..... 19

denied, it is widely doubted; and even where it is affirmed, its affirmation is almost everywhere timid, hesitant and shame-faced. The real question seems to be even among those who recognize the supernatural as an element in Christianity, not what kind and measure of the supernatural does the Christianity of CHRIST and His apostles demand; but, how little of the supernatural may be allowed, and yet a man call himself a Christian.

Matters have gone so far that it is almost an occasion for rejoicing when we find a man confessing any measure of Christian supernaturalism—so difficult is it for men immersed in an anti-supernaturalistic atmosphere to confess the full measure of the supernaturalism that Christianity demands. None the less, if we are to face the future with any well-grounded confidence that the Christian life and world view will re-assert itself and again become dominant in the culture and civilization of mankind, we cannot be supernaturalistic only here and there in our thinking and naturalistic in its substance. Only a consistent supernaturalism—by which is not meant an exclusive supernaturalism: the *super*natural implies the reality of the natural—can successfully contend with a consistent naturalism. Here as elsewhere defeat lies along the path of half-hearted, compromising constructions. It is far easier to confess the full measure of that supernaturalism that Christianity recognizes and requires than it is to confess it only in part. We weaken, not strenghten our position when we seek to defend a pared-down supernaturalism rather than that thorough-going supernaturalism that is the very breath of the nostrils of a sturdy Christianity.

It has seemed to us, therefore, that we might render some of our readers a useful service if we indicate the kind and measure of that supernaturalism that Christianity recognizes and demands. We shall not attempt to consider all the ways in which a frank recognition of the supernatural enters into the very substance of Christianity: that would require a lengthy article, perhaps a number of articles. In the limitations of an editorial we can do little more than mention some of the more important of the points at which we must frankly recognize the supernatural in our conception of things, if, as Christian men and women, we are to witness a good confession in the midst of an age so hostile to the supernatural.

It is beyond our purpose to attempt to vindicate the reality of that kind and measure of the supernatural that Christianity recognizes and demands, except as this may be involved in reminding our readers that the whole mass of that evidence that gives us Christianity is available to establish the reality of such supernaturalism. It will be obvious to all that the reality of such supernaturalism is given in the truth of Christianity provided such supernaturalism belongs to the substance of Christianity to such a degree that without it real Christianity simply cannot exist. Some of the considerations that indicate the place that the supernatural occupies in Christianity follow:

(1) It is fundamental to the supernaturalism of Christianity that GOD is a supernatural GOD. The GOD of Christianity is indeed the GOD of nature and the GOD in nature; but at the same time He is the GOD above nature. This means that while the GOD of Christianity is an immanent GOD, yet that He is above all else the transcendent GOD. It is to misconceive and profane His name to identify Him with nature or to think of Him as merely another name for the sum-total of the forces and energies of the universe. No matter how vast we conceive the universe to be, it is to belittle GOD beyond recognition to suppose that any doctrine of immanence can even remotely express the fulness of His being. As Dr. WARFIELD has put it:

> "When the Christian says 'GOD' he means, and if he is to remain Christian must mean, a *super*natural GOD—a GOD who is not entangled in nature, is not only another name for nature in its coordinated activities, or for that mystery which lies beneath and throbs through to All; but who is above nature and beyond, who existed, the Living GOD, before nature was, and should nature cease to be would still exist, the Everlasting GOD, and so long as this universal frame endures exists above and outside of nature as its LORD, its Lawgiver and its Almighty King.
>
> "No Christian man may allow that the universe, material and spiritual combined, call it infinite if you will, in all its operations, be they as myriad as you choose, sums up the being or the activities of GOD. Before this universe was, GOD was, the one eternal One, rich in infinite activities: and while this universe persists, outside and beyond it GOD is, the one infinite One, ineffably rich in innumerable activities inconceivable, it may be, to the whole universe of derived being. He is not imprisoned within His works: the laws which He has ordained for them express indeed His character, but do not compass the possibilities of His action. The Apostle PAUL has no doubt told us that 'in Him we live and move and have our being,' but no accredited voice has declared that in the universe He lives and moves and has His being. No, the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him; and what He has made is to what He is only as the smallest moisture-particle of the most attenuated vapor to the mighty expanse of the immeasurable sea."

(2) It is fundamental to the supernaturalism of Christianity that GOD has frequently *acted* in a supernatural manner: for instance (a) in the creation of nature (b) in the work of redemption and (c) in the production of the Bible.

Belief in nature as a product of GOD's creative activity is involved in what has been said of GOD as the supernatural GOD. If GOD existed before what we call nature, it must be that it owes its existence to His creative act. Many voices today oppose the notion that nature owes its existence to an act of creation, in the strict sense of the word; but it is fundamental to the Christian conception of things that "in the beginning GOD created the heavens and the earth." Christian thinkers may differ as to how the universe became as it is; but our thinking is not Christian unless we look upon the universe as a product of GOD's power and as such an utterly dependent thing.

We come nearer the heart of a Christian's conviction when we make mention of the fact that GOD has acted in a supernatural manner in the redemption of sinners. It lies at the very heart of the Christian confession that the SON of GOD, the second person in the Trinity, became incarnate for us men and our salvation.

"Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation that CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners." When the anti-supernaturalism of the age seeks to eliminate the supernatural from the redemption that Christianity offers a lost world, it strikes it at its very heart.

Again it is fundamental to Christian conviction that GOD acted in a supernatural manner in the production of the Bible in order that men might know what He would have them believe concerning Himself and the duty which He requires of them. It was not enough that GOD should have intervened in the processes of this world for the salvation of sinners, there was also need that GOD should make known to men the meaning of His mighty acts of redemption. Hence GOD has given us a two-fold revelation—a revelation by deed and a revelation by word. The revelation by word came through His supernatural activity as truly as did the revelation by deed—a fact that should be unhesitatingly acknowledged by the Christian man. The Bible is not merely one of the world's religious masterpieces, it is at the same time "the Word of GOD, the only infallible rule of faith and practice" in a sense that would have been impossible apart from both a revelation and an inspiration of a supernatural sort. In a word it is fundamental to Christian conviction that the Bible is a supernatural book.

(3) It is fundamental to the supernaturalism of Christianity that GOD *acts* in a supernatural manner, especially in what we call regeneration and sanctification. It would profit us nothing that GOD acted supernaturally in the past were it not also true that He acts supernaturally in the present. Here too we cannot do better than avail ourselves of Dr. WARFIELD'S eloquent words:

> "It is not enough to believe that GOD has intervened in this natural world of ours and wrought a supernatural redemption: and that He has Himself made known to men His mighty acts and unveiled to them the significance of His working. It is upon the field of the dead that the Sun of righteousness has risen, and the shouts that announce His advent fall on deaf ears: yea, even though the morning stars should again sing for joy and the air be palpitant with the echo of the great proclamation, their voice could not penetrate the ears of the dead. As we sweep our eyes over the world lying in wickedness, it is the prophet's vision which we see before us: a valley that is filled with bones, and lo! they are very dry. What benefit is there in proclaiming to dry bones even the greatest of redemptions? How shall we stand and cry, 'O ye dry bones, hear ye the word of the LORD!' In vain the redemption, in vain its proclamation, unless there come a breath from heaven to breathe upon these slain that they live. The redemption of CHRIST is therefore no more central to the Christian hope than the creative operations of the Holy Spirit upon the heart: and the supernatural redemption itself would remain a mere name outside and beyond our reach, were it not realized in the subjective life by an equally supernatural application."

(4) It is fundamental to the supernaturalism of Christianity that GOD will act in an extraordinarily supernatural manner in the future previous to the ushering in of the eternal state. We do not think that either the A-millennial or the Pre-millennial or the Post-millennial view of the second coming of JESUS CHRIST is fundamental to the supernaturalism of Christianity; but that He will return in as distinctly a supernatural manner as He came some two thousand years ago is a belief that is clearly included in that measure of supernaturalism that Christianity requires. Things are not always to continue as they now are. A great catastrophe, a mighty cataclysm awaits this earth. Whatever may be the precise order of events, there is to be a return of CHRIST, a resurrection of the dead, a judgment based on the deeds done in the body, and an eternal separation between the good and the evil.

We do not pretend to have indicated anything like the full measure of that supernaturalism that enters into the very substance of Christianity. All we have done is to indicate some of the principal points at which there must be a frank recognition of the supernatural as a factor having significance for human life if as Christian men and women we are to witness a good confession in the age in which our lot has been cast. It is not surprising, in view of the wide-spread extent to which the supernatural as a factor in human life is denied or even scouted, that there should be many attempts to give us a non-supernatural Christianity on the assumption that we can yield the supernatural and yet retain the main values of Christianity. Let us, however, not be deceived thereby. Christianity denuded of the supernatural is just no Christianity at all, to such an extent does the supernatural enter into the very essence of the Christian religion. The universal adoption of a non-supernatural Christianity would mean the death not the triumph of real Christianity. Moreover it is the supernatural element in Christianity, and that element alone, that enables us to speak of it as a redemptive religion in the New Testament meaning of the word. Eliminate the supernatural and we have no message for sinners. Recognize that kind and measure of the supernatural that historic Christianity recognizes and we have a message that can be proclaimed joyfully and confidently even to the worst of sinners. We repeat that our choice is not between a supernatural and a non-supernatural Christianity but between a supernatural Christianity and no Christianity at all.

## The Proposed Union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches

OUR December issue contained the "partial report" adopted by the representatives appointed by the Presbyterian Church (North), the Presbyterian Church (South), the United Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Church in America, and the Reformed Church in the United States to prepare a plan for the organic union of these churches. Though put forth as a "partial report" it indicates, we suppose, the substance of the plan for organic union that will be submitted to the next General Assemblies of said churches, and, if approved by these bodies, transmitted to the presbyteries for action during the year following. It would seem, therefore, that this report is deserving of much more discussion than it has yet received. Doubtless this finds explanation in large part to a general disposition to withhold judgment

*(Continued on page 17)*

# The Prophetic Urge

By the Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton
Professor in Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea

IF there is any one characteristic more than another that seems to be conspicuously lacking in the Presbyterian Church as a whole, today, it is the prophetic urge. I do not mean the urge to prophesy in the sense of foretelling future events, but the urge to proclaim the truth of God in all its phases, omitting nothing because we fear it will make us unpopular or because we know it will be unpalatable, but proclaiming the vital burning truth of God, simply because it *is* the truth of God, and because we know it is the message needed by the Church in a given situation. It is the urge to tell the teaching which we find in the Word of God because we know it is *God's* message, that is lacking generally throughout the Church today. How often do we see the spirit shown by the prophet Amos when he spoke the words: "The Lord Jehovah hath spoken; who can but prophesy?"

In the past centuries the times of quickening and revival have always been the times when there have been one or two or more burning souls who did not hesitate to speak God's truth as they saw it, because they felt that God had given the church *that particular* message for their need at *that* time. Such souls set on fire the whole church of the time, so that thousands became bold to proclaim the needed message from God's Word. It is just that thing that is needed in the church today, and it is just that thing that is so conspicuously missing from the messages spoken from the pulpits and in the councils of our church. There are therefore certain things that ought to be said boldly in the councils of our church by those who feel that their message is from God.

One of the things that ought to be proclaimed is the teaching of the Word of God on the subject of *unity* in relation to *Church Union*. It seems almost impossible today to speak in the councils of the church against Church Union. The power of the ecclesiastical machine is so overwhelming that it is practically impossible to get a fair discussion of a subject like Church Union in General Assembly. The spirit of the times is in favor of Church Union, and woe to the rash commissioner who dares to oppose it on the floor of General Assembly! Yet certainly the teaching of the Word of God is opposed to promiscuous Church Union with denominations holding a radically different view of the teaching of the Word of God. Unquestionably the Bible teaches that there *should* be unity among all Christians both in outward form and in inner spirit, and certainly where there is such unity of spirit, there should be unity in outward form as well, but no passage in Scripture is more grossly misinterpreted than the passage on unity in our Lord's prayer in the seventeenth chapter of John, verse eleven, "that they may be one, even as we." Those who use it as an argument for Church Union, constantly forget that it refers not only to outward form, but to inner spirit, "even as we," i.e. the same kind of unity that exists between God the Father and God the Son. If that unity of spirit is lacking, Church Union is not only undesirable but impossible. For example, if we believe that the Old and New Testaments are both true as to the recorded facts and doctrines (allowing, of course, for minor and unimportant errors of transmission or translation), how can we have Church Union or unity with those who believe that the Old Testament is composed largely of unreliable folklore or myths manufactured for the purpose of teaching a religious message? If we believe that Jesus Christ is very God of very God, how can we have union or unity with those who believe that He was only a man, though He was the highest pinnacle of the evolution of the human race? If we believe that the only way of salvation is through trust in Christ as our substitute who bore the penalty for our sin and who kept the law of God perfectly in our place, how can we have unity or union with those who believe that the way of salvation is through living Christ-like lives? If we really believe that the Westminster Standards contain the system of doctrines taught in the Bible, how can we have Church Union with a church which officially denies it? In other words, Church Union should only be with denominations which hold substantially the same beliefs which we ourselves hold. Any other union would simply sow the seeds of discord and result in a battle within the church itself. Truths such as these ought to be boldly proclaimed at a time like the present when they are so vitally needed to prevent the church from making an irremediable mistake.

Another truth that ought to be boldly proclaimed is the teaching of the Word of God as to our attitude, as Christians, towards false teaching in the church. Modernism is probably believed by only a relatively small portion of the church today, though there are many indications that it is far more widely accepted than is generally supposed. It is, however, a gnawing cancer at work in the vitals of the church, and unless it is removed, sooner or later the church will be in danger of succumbing to it. But though Modernists may be relatively few in number, the vast majority of Ministers and elders in the Presbyterian Church refuse either to preach or to vote against Modernism in the councils of the church. They apparently believe that Modernism is either unimportant or not dangerous, and that Modernists have as much right in the Church as they have. At any rate, whatever may be their motives, they deplore "controversy," and refuse to support any attempts to defend the church from Modernism. The so-called "ultra" conservatives in the church are ridiculed, scorned and ostracized simply because they are uncompromising in their opposition to Modernism in the Presbyterian ministry, and because they insist that vows to accept the Westminster Standards as the summary of Biblical doctrines, should be lived up to by those who take them.

Now if there is any teaching in the Word of God that is plain, it is the Bible teaching in regard to the Christian's attitude toward false doctrine. Paul was tolerant of other methods or motives in proclaiming the gospel, but when it came to errors in teaching the gospel itself, hear him thunder forth: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preach unto you, let him be anathema!!" (Gal. 1:8). John was the apostle of love, tolerant of others to the last degree, yet hear his advice to the elect lady about her attitude toward false teachers: "If any one cometh unto you and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house and give him no greeting!" (II John 10). There isn't much toleration of false teaching in those words! We might expect thundering against false doctrine from the impetuous Peter, so we are not surprised when we find him denouncing the end of false teachers: "as among you also there shall be false teachers who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction." (II Pet. 2:1). There isn't much counsel of toleration for false doctrine in those words! Jesus Himself never hesitated to denounce the false teachings of the members of the visible church of His day, the teachers and

preachers among the Jews. "If God were your Father, ye would love Me, for I came forth and am come from God. . . . Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." (John 8:42-44).

In view of the teaching of the Bible about our attitude toward the teachers of false doctrine, certainly we need prophets in the church today who will unhesitatingly face abuse and ostracism in order to condemn false teaching in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. We are told that we should bring charges against those who teach and preach false doctrine, and probably that is the logical next step to be taken, in spite of its obvious hopelessness. The difficulty with this method of dealing with the teachers of false doctrine is that in most cases it would be practically useless as far as driving the offenders out of the church is concerned, and would accomplish untold harm to the influence of the church in society. It would probably be useless as far as accomplishing its purpose goes, for Modernists who are teaching false doctrine in the church are so skillful in verbal evasion and distortion that it would be extremely difficult to present evidence sufficient to convict them of false teaching. They are determined to remain in the church until it is wholly won to their point of view, and they regard any methods as justified which will keep them in the church. Then it is a well known fact that the presbyteries where Modernists are boldest are under the control of Modernists, and no conviction could be obtained no matter what the evidence might show. However in spite of this hopeless prospect of obtaining convictions, probably the best course for Conservatives to pursue is to prefer charges against Modernists and force the presbyteries to go on record in the matter. Then as soon as the times comes, if it does come, when it is evident that the church is hoplessly under the control of Modernists, we will be able to withdraw from the denomination with the knowledge that we have done all possible to preserve the purity of the church before leaving it. It will take many John Knoxes, however, who will be willing to suffer for the truth, to take such a course so obviously unpopular. May God give us men at a time like this!

A third thing that ought to be boldly proclaimed is the truth of the system of doctrine commonly called "Calvinism," but more properly called "The Reformed Faith." The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church sets this forth in its clearest form, and every Minister and elder has sworn to uphold it and accept it as the system of doctrine taught in the Word of God, yet matters have come to such a state today that those high in the councils of the church say in effect that the differences which formerly divided the different denominations in the way of doctrine, are no longer bars to church union! It is difficult to see by what line of reasoning they arrive at this conclusion. Either they are ignorant of the essential features of the beliefs of the other denominations, or they had come to the conclusion that these beliefs are no longer held in the denominations themselves, for nothing could be plainer, for instance, to one who knows than the fact that the Arminianism of the Methodists and the Calvinism of the Presbyterians, are diametrically opposed in their interpretation of the teachings of the Word of God, on fundamental points of doctrine. It is only by ignoring these vital points that any union could be effected between these denominations. That is apparently exactly what is contemplated by many, but if so, certainly there are many thousands of Presbyterians, both in the pulpit and in the pew, who will never be content to give up or ignore these precious truths of Calvinism, which as Dr. Warfield used to say, are the Gospel in its purest form.

Today, to offset these tendencies we need a new teaching of the truths of Calvinism from the pulpits of our Church. A generation has grown up in ignorance of these precious doctrines, and we need today boldly to proclaim them in all their power. Let us remember that all the great Reformers from Huss to Calvin and Knox, believed and taught these doctrines, and that their proclamation was the key to the rapid spread of the Protestant Reformation. Let us remember that the great Puritan revival in England and Scotland was based on the teaching of Calvinism to the people in the pews. Let us remember that the great American revival of the time of Whitefield, when weeping audiences of ten and twenty thousand people were convicted of sin under the preaching of Whitefield, was based on the proclamation of the truths of Calvinism. I believe that we can look for no great revival in America or elsewhere until we return to the public teaching and proclamation of the great truths of Calvinism which embody the pure truths of the gospel. Today, more than ever before we need to proclaim the truth that man is dead in sin, and can do absolutely nothing to save himself; that God alone can regenerate the sinner, and He will save those whom He has intended to save in His own time; that all those for whom Christ died will be redeemed; that when the Holy Spirit applies the purchased redemption to the heart of the sinner, it will completely regenerate that heart, regardless of any desire for regeneration or lack of such desire, and that this regeneration can not be resisted; and that those who are once the children of God can never fall permanently away from the faith, but will be preserved until the end. These doctrines are at the very centre of the gospel message, and unless they are proclaimed boldly, we need expect no permanent revival of religion. The churches are filled with nominal Christians who have never been regenerated, and such "Christians" are just no Christians at all. May God grant a revival which shall sweep away all our self-complacency with our big buildings, with our great gifts to the work of the church, with our large numbers of new members who add nothing to the spiritual life of the church and with our numbers of organizations which occupy the time of our workers without saving a soul! May God grant that our pulpits may once more ring with the bold proclamation of the Sovereign Grace of God, till sinners are converted and doubt and Modernism are swept into Hell from whence they came!

These are a few of the truths that need to be proclaimed today. May there be a host of Ministers and laymen raised up who shall not hesitate to proclaim the whole counsel of God!

## A Missionary Crisis in Venezuela

A SITUATION which threatens to seriously cripple and interrupt all missionary agencies has arisen in Venezuela. Some months ago the Romanist Bishop of Valentia wrote an article in his parochial paper, in which he is said to have declared that civil marriage was only recognized concubinage. The government became greatly incensed, and demanded that the Bishop write a second article, retracting the first, and taking oath that he would uphold the Venezuelan Constitution. He refused, and was promptly deported from the country. The Archbishops and remaining Bishops brought pressure upon the government asking that he be allowed to return, but with no success.

The next phase was the passing of a law forbidding all foreign priests to come into the country. This broadened the matter, for the Roman Church, quick to make profit of its adversities, protested that if the law was to be put into effect against its priests, it should also apply to Protestant Missionaries. In an effort, it is said, to be fair, the government acceded to this request. The law now is that any one connected with a religious society which has as its business to evangelize or pastor the people in Venezuela cannot enter the land. When Protestant Missionaries entering the land made inquiry as to the enforcement of the law, they were informed that there would be no exceptions.

It is generally regarded as unfortunate for the Church that consecrated Missionaries who have neither engaged in, nor even considered political matters, should be thus debarred from a great country, merely because of fear of the activities of the Roman Clergy.

# Is Westminster Seminary a Rebel Institution?

## An Open Letter and an Editorial Reply

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: CHRISTIANITY TODAY, I understand, is not officially sponsored by Westminster Seminary nor vice versa. However you would probably admit without argument that the journal substantially represents the views of the party, composed mostly of ministers and laymen within the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., that founded and now maintains Westminster Theological Seminary.

As a Presbyterian minister I have received letters asking my moral and financial support of Westminster Seminary. In writing this letter to you I am answering these appeals, provided you care to publish it, as more or less representative of a rather widespread viewpoint within our denomination that has not been particularly articulate in our religious journals to date.

I consider Westminster Theological Seminary a rebel institution. As Protestants and Americans we have no reason to shy at the term "rebel." Luther, Calvin, Washington and Lee were rebels. Life involves many loyalties. The highest is to God and there are lesser loyalties to home, to school, to church, to religious denomination, to nation. If any of the lesser loyalties conflict with the higher, and, above all, with the highest, it is our right and duty to sacrifice the lesser to the greater. The supreme rule is to obey God rather than man.

From personal knowledge of such Christian scholars as Doctors Wilson, Machen and Allis I believe they felt in conscience bound to leave Princeton Seminary and to assist in founding a new institution that, in their opinion, would be truer to traditional Presbyterian doctrine and thus to essential Christian truth, they being of the belief existing seminaries were not fully trustworthy exponents of sound Presbyterianism or even of true Christianity. In so far as they sacrificed financial gain and associations undoubtedly dear to them they deserve honor and I am sure receive it from many who, because they do not accept their premises, do not follow them in their actions.

It seems to me three loyalties are involved. I give them in the ascending order of obligation. First, to the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. of which denomination the majority of Westminster supporters are officers or at least members. Second, to Presbyterianism, a heritage of doctrine and historical tradition. Third, to Christ. I grant without argument that Westminster men judge themselves bound by the last two loyalties mentioned to found a new seminary which is most certainly not officially sanctioned by the denomination and whose very existence, even if there were not explicit written statements to the same effect, constitutes an indictment of the soundness of existing seminaries, notably Princeton, which are sanctioned, supported and recommended by the denomination as our official training schools for the ministry of our denomination.

I frankly think honor demands that ministers, elders and members of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. resign and withdraw from the denomination if they believe our denomination that by overwhelming vote in our highest court, the General Assembly, has sustained the present heads of Princeton Seminary is untrue to Presbyterianism and sound Christian faith by so upholding unsound seminaries. I think for a minister to continue as a member of one of our presbyteries, to gain whatever influence membership in our old and powerful denomination gives, is as absurb as it would have been for Robert E. Lee to have attempted to retain his commission in the U. S. Army while serving the Confederate States of America.

I do not think the Westminster movement is the legitimate activity of a minority party essentially loyal to the denomination but differing with others on church policies. It is not akin to the Republican, Democratic or Socialist parties in our nation. It is essentially akin to such rebellion against constituted authority as that of Washington or Lee. I am not arguing the loyalty of Westminster men to Presbyterianism or to Christ. I grant both as they see their duty. I likewise claim they have no right to constitute themselves judge of the Presbyterianism and Christianity of the majority of us who support our General Assembly in its attitude toward Princeton. I have often wondered why these men so keen in other ethical questions, so sensitive to claims of loyalty, have never to my knowledge, publicly justified their continuance in a church against the constituted authority of which they have rebelled.

I frankly think our presbyteries ought to consider whether or not they ought to discipline their members who back Westminster, asking these men to either loyally support their denomination and its institutions or withdraw from our fellowship. Failing that I believe our presbyteries would have unquestioned legal grounds under our constitution for bringing these members to trial and dismissing them from their offices.

One can conceive many reasons why presbyteries do not so act. Many ministers and elders prefer the way of peace and avoidance of conflict. Some dread a church split. Others out of friendship and love for the particular brethren would hate to hurt them. Perhaps it is not inconceivable not a few believe it their duty to Christ to suffer this rebellion without resorting to discipline merited though they might believe it. Whatever the motives, wordly or Christian, I do think presbyteries are side-stepping a duty. They might well proclaim to the world that Westminster Seminary is not an official institution of our denomination, that its chief justification for existence is the distrust of Westminster men of our traditional and official institutions, that it has no claim on the support of members of our church and that its graduates and students have no right as such to calls to pulpits in our denomination.

I believe Princeton and the other official seminaries of our church are thoroughly loyal to our denomination, to our Presbyterian heritage and to Christ. As such I commend them to my congregation. Until our denomination so acts as to make Westminster an official seminary I cannot support it in any way. I will continue to believe the honorable course for the Westminster group to follow is to form a new denomination to be true to historic Presbyterianism and Christianity as they conceive both. If in so doing they abandon property and other privileges it may be regrettable but rebels have always paid that price of endangering their participation in what they and their fathers have helped to build when they refuse to abide by the rule and discipline of a governing body exercised according to the constitution of the institution. They may be right and the majority wrong in the sight of God but so far as we fallible human beings can we must maintain order and discipline through constituted agencies.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERTS WILLIAMS.

First Presbyterian Church,
Bordentown, N. J.

## Editorial Reply

WE are glad to give publicity to the letter printed above. Strongly as we dissent from its main assertions, it gives the best and the most obviously sincere expression we have seen of a viewpoint that it seems is being somewhat widely circulated throughout the churches. As a result of its dissemination—to what extent in sincerity and to what extent in pretence we do not presume to say—many look with disfavor on Westminster Seminary who otherwise would be its friends and supporters.

Our reaction to Mr. Williams' letter is not

indeed one wholly of dissent. We believe, or at least would like to believe, that what he says about CHRISTIANITY TODAY is essentially correct. We share his admiration for those Christian scholars—the late Robert Dick Wilson in the van—who rather than sacrifice their convictions or stifle their consciences left Princeton Seminary and cast in their lot with a new and unpopular institution that wholly lacked endowments, and so with no assured future. We rejoice at his insistence on the fact that we ought to obey God rather than man; also upon his insistence that subject to this supreme obligation we should render whatever obedience is due the constituted authorities under which we may live. We also approve when he asserts that those in rebellion against such constituted authority ought to be disciplined and if necessary expelled from office or even from membership in the organization.

Moreover, we admit that Mr. Williams is substantially right in saying that the very existence of Westminster Seminary constitutes an indictment of the seminaries under the control of the General Assembly. We say "substantially right" though it necessarily involves an indictment only of Princeton Seminary. Westminster Seminary, as is stated in its constitution, was established "to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary, as it existed prior to the reorganization thereof in the year 1929, in respect to scholarship and militant defense of the Reformed Faith." Even if it could be shown, therefore, that the instruction given in connection with the official seminaries of the Church is all within the area tolerated by the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, it would not follow that there was no need of a seminary like Westminster. Whatever may be said as to the present situation at Princeton Seminary it will hardly be denied that Princeton Seminary has forsaken those policies and traditions in respect to scholarship and the militant defense of the Reformed Faith that characterized it previous to 1929. Moreover, whatever may be alleged as to the soundness of seminaries of the Church other than Princeton, it will not be maintained that any of them are committed to those traditions and policies with respect to scholarship and the militant defense of the Reformed Faith that characterized old Princeton. Hence it must be obvious to all that, if the policies and traditions of Princeton Seminary as it existed prior to 1929 were to be perpetuated, it was absolutely necessary that there be those who would take up the torch that Princeton Seminary had thrown down and hold it high for the enlightenment and encouragement of those who believe in the full trustworthiness of the Bible and that the system of doctrine taught in the Bible has found its best expression in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Sins of omission are just as fatal for a seminary as for an individual. In the picture of the last judgment, drawn by Christ Himself it is for the undones and not for the dones that men are condemned. Seminaries are needed that have positive, not merely negative virtues, seminaries that not only teach no heresies but earnestly, vigorously and in a scholarly manner seek to set forth the whole truth of God in the face of whatever opposition manifests itself, whether within or without the Church —and one such seminary at least Westminster seeks to be.

We do not indeed mean to imply that the existing seminaries of the Presbyterian Church are guilty only of sins of omission. For the most part they are doing things which ought not to be done as well as leaving undone the things that should be done. With the *possible* exception of Princeton, Louisville and two or three of the small and relatively unimportant seminaries it is all but certain that positively unsound teaching is being given, the Standards of the Presbyterian Church being judge. Auburn, Western, Chicago, San Francisco all have signers of the Auburn Affirmation as members of their faculties. Princeton's Board of Control—the thing which in the long run determines the character of an institution—not only has two Auburn Affirmationists among its members but in an official statement has commended these Auburn Affirmationists to the confidence of the Church; and so it is not surprising that Auburn Affirmationists are being invited to address the Princeton students and preach in the Princeton chapel. Mr. Williams expresses the belief that all the official seminaries of the Church are "thoroughly loyal to our denomination, to our Presbyterian heritage and to Christ;" but that means, if we mistake not, that his judgment as to the present orthodoxy of Princeton is valueless. Mr. Williams being judge, Princeton will have to depart from orthodoxy somewhat further than any of the existing seminaries of the Church have done before he will regard it as an unsound institution. It would seem that Mr. Williams holds that a man can be a "fully trustworthy exponent of sound Presbyterianism" and at the same time approve the Auburn Affirmation. Apparently in Mr. Williams' logic there is nothing corresponding to the law of contradiction according to which things opposed to each other cannot both be true. The similarity between his position and that of the Princeton Board of Control is obvious.

We come now to Mr. Williams' main contention, namely, that Westminster Seminary is a "rebel institution," that its founders and supporters, in as far as they are officers in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., are in rebellion against the constituted authority which according to their ordination vows they are bound to obey, and that honor demands that they either sever all connection with such an institution or withdraw from the Presbyterian Church—failing to do which the presbyteries to which they belong ought to put them on trial and dismiss them from their offices. This charge, which Mr. Williams is not alone in making against the sponsors of Westminster Seminary, is a very serious one—one, we submit, that ought not to be brought without at the same time presenting compelling proof that the charge is well-grounded. None the less we believe that our readers will not be able to discover anything whatever in the above letter to justify the charge, other than the writer's *ipse dixit*. Others beside Mr. Williams, as we have intimated, have made the same charge but as yet no one, as far as we know, has offered any evidence to support the assertion that our presbyteries "have unquestioned legal grounds under our constitution" for bringing those of its members who back Westminster Seminary to trial and to dismiss them from their offices. If such evidence exists we wish that some one would produce it.

In order to justify the charge that the supporters of Westminster Seminary are "rebels," and should be dealt with as such, it is necessary to show that they are resisting some lawful authority. We submit that this has not been done, and that it cannot be done. Mr. Williams seems to be of the opionion that it is rebellion for a Presbyterian minister or elder to support a theological seminary not officially sanctioned by the General Assembly. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that he has no word of condemnation for those Presbyterian ministers and elders who are supporters of Union Theological Seminary of New York City. Are we to infer that he thinks it is an act of rebellion to support an orthodox seminary but not an act of rebellion to support an unorthodox seminary? However this may be his notion that the supporters of Westminster Seminary are "rebels" indicates an amazing ignorance of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church and the liberty it allows. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church forbidding the establishment of a Seminary not under the control of the General Assembly. Moreover there is nothing whatever in the Constitution making it mandatory that prospective ministers study in institutions under the control of the General Assembly or any other court of the church. The General Assembly has no authority to forbid the establishment and maintainence of such a seminary, and should the General Assembly issue such an order it would not be rebellion to ignore it—inasmuch as it is a well-settled principle in law that unless the authority that is disobeyed be lawful there is no rebellion, for instance it is not an act of rebellion to resist an officer who acts beyond his legal powers. What Mr. Williams, and all those who make this charge, need to realize is that the Presbyterian Church has a Constitution; and that even the General

Assembly is bound by that Constitution. Here the words of Dr. Charles Hodge, which the Auburn Affirmationists have cited in support of a contention which as far as we know no instructed Presbyterian denies, are very much to the point:

> "It is an axiom in our Presbyterianism that the General Assembly can make no law to bind the conscience. It cannot alter by adding thereto or detracting therefrom the constitutional terms of ministerial or Christian fellowship. Those terms are laid down in express words in our Form of Government, which we are all bound to obey. Assent to the truth or propriety of the deliverances or testimonies of the Assembly is not one of the terms prescribed. . . . We have no security for liberty of conscience, no protection from the tyranny of casual majorities, if the principle be once admitted that the Assembly can make anything beyond what the constitution prescribes, a condition either of admission into the ministry of our church or of continuance in it. . . . The Assembly of course has the right to express its judgment and give instructions on all points of truth and duty. So has every presbytery and every minister or Christian. But such judgments have only the authority due the advice or opinions of those from whom they proceed. They have no legal force on any man's conscience or conduct. . . . The Popish doctrine of the infallibility of church courts does not suit Americans. It is high time that these simple principles of righteous liberty should be clearly announced and openly asserted" (Princeton Review Vol. 37, pages 508-510).

Not only does Mr. Williams' representation imply ignorance of our Church's Constitution, it seemingly implies ignorance of what the General Assembly has done. His letter is at least fitted to convey the impression that the General Assembly not only approved the reorganization of Princeton Seminary as recommended by Dr. W. O. Thompson's committee but that it forbade the organization of a new Seminary to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of old Princeton. Such an act would not have been binding even if it had been taken (because extra-constitutional). As a matter of fact, however, no such action was taken. How then is it possible to even plausibly maintain that the supporters of Westminster Seminary are in rebellion against constituted authority? Can one be accounted a rebel who has broken neither a law nor a command of a constituted authority? Possibly Mr. Williams thinks it a species of *lese majesty*, actionable before the law, to even withhold approval from what the General Assembly does. If so, we freely admit our guilt as we have in no wise changed our opinion as to the action of the General Assembly relative to Princeton Seminary. In our judgment its action in ousting the Old Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary, and in virtually forcing the flower of its Faculty to resign was not only brought about by unfair, unjust and illegal methods but was unwise in itself and destructive of the peace, purity and prosperity of the Church. If so, however, he holds an utterly un-Presbyterian conception. "All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice," reads our Confession of Faith. "Adhesion to Assembly deliverances and judgment cannot be made a condition of Christian or ministerial communion: it would be a contradiction to allow protest against a deliverance, and then demand approbation of it as a condition of membership in the Church or ministry," wrote Dr. Charles Hodge (Church Polity, p. 411).

Mr. Williams maintains that the supporters of Westminster Seminary, in as far as they are members of our presbyteries, ought to be disciplined. We agree with him, provided he is right in his contention that their position in the Church is that of a group of rebels. We would welcome such disciplinary action by the presbyteries. If it be a crime to be loyal to the existing Standards of the Presbyterian Church, as the supporters of Westminster are loyal, then let the courts of the Church take the action called for. However, let it be noted that if the supporters of Westminster Seminary, in-so-far as they are Presbyterians, are "rebels", then by parity of reasoning there are an immense multitude of other Presbyterians—many of whom have no sympathy with Wesminster Seminary—who are also to be classed as "rebels." How great this multitude is, is indicated in the communication below, written by Mr. James F. Shrader, an elder of the Presbyterian Church and a trustee of Westminster Seminary as well as a prominent member of the Philadelphia bar, and printed as an appendix to our reply. If we mistake not Mr. Shrader has given the finishing stroke, the *coupe de grace* to Mr. Williams' contention.

Mr. Williams says that "the honorable course for the Westminster group to follow is to form a new denomination to be true to historic Presbyterianism and Christianity as they conceive both." This statement as intimated rests on an exaggerated notion of the authority of the General Assembly that is rooted in a profound ignorance of the form of church government that as yet exists in the Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterian Church has a Constitution and it is loyalty to the provisions of that Constitution rather than loyalty to the mandates, expressed or implied, of the General Assembly that determines whether a man is a good Presbyterian. It is safe to say that there is no group in the Presbyterian Church that is more loyal to its existing Constitution than is the group that is supporting Westminster Seminary. How can it, then, be reasonably maintained that this group ought to "resign and withdraw from the denomination" but that it is quite proper for those to remain and enjoy its property and other privileges who doubt or deny the truthfulness of the Bible or who reject or at least regard as of no real importance many of the fundamental doctrines of its Confession of Faith? Such a notion is nothing short of preposterous. It is the Auburn Affirmationists and those who are equally or even more unorthodox—all in fact who do not believe in the full trustworthiness of the Bible and who do not accept the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith as that taught in the Bible —not the supporters of Westminster Seminary, who ought to resign and withdraw. It is they, if anybody, not we who are in a dishonest position in remaining in the Presbyterian Church.

But while we regard it as nothing short of absurd to say that honor demands that the supporters of Westminster Seminary withdraw from the Presbyterian Church, we are aware that such is the case only because the forces that are now apparently dominant in the Presbyterian Church have not yet made the creed of the Church to conform to their wishes. Should the creed of the Church be brought into harmony with the Auburn Affirmation, for instance, it would be perfectly true, in our judgment, that the supporters of Westminster Seminary would not be able to justify their continuance in the Presbyterian Church. We speak only for ourselves, but, if that ever happens, we will certainly not remain in its ministry or even in its membership. For the present, however, as we have intimated above, it is the Auburn Affirmationists among others, not ourselves, who are unable to justify their membership in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. If the time ever comes when the Confession of Faith is made to conform to the views of those now dominant in the councils of the Church, or when the Confession of Faith (though remaining as it is) is so much "more honored in the breach than in the observance" that it is obvious that it does not express the convictions by which the Church lives, we believe that those who are truly devoted to the Bible and the gospel it contains will be in duty bound to separate themselves from the Presbyterian Church either to unite with some existing church organization or to form a new church organization that will bear clear and consistent witness to the gospel of the grace of God. There are some who think that time has already come; there are many who think that it is rapidly drawing near; but there are also many who think that it may be averted. If so, we believe that it will be in large part because God is pleased to use such an institution as Westminster to train up a body of ministers who will stand intel-

ligently but unswervingly for the Bible and the Reformed Faith against all those who oppose, whether within or without the Church.

We have dealt with Mr. Williams letter at such length because it is the best expression we have received of a viewpoint we have reason to believe is being widely urged by those hostile to Westminster Seminary, the too hasty acceptance of which has already led many genuinely loyal Presbyterians to look askance at this institution. It is a viewpoint, however, that is rooted in ignorance and misunderstanding and that no loyal and intelligent Presbyterian ought to entertain. It can be made to sound plausible to the uninformed, but we must not look at it too critically or scrutinize it too closely if we are going to allow it to influence our conduct. The situation in the Presbyterian Church being what it is, we have no hesitation in saying that there is no existing institution that so deserves the support of genuinely loyal Presbyterians as does Westminster Seminary. It is located at 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

## Appendix

THE whispering campaign against Westminster Theological Seminary seems now to be taking the form of a suggestion that its Presbyterian professors, trustees, supporters and students should be unfrocked or treated as "rebels" within the Presbyterian fold. Be prepared for an ecclesiastical sun-rise execution! Here is the company:

1. All of the Presbyterian professors, directors, students and supporters of all educational institutions independent of Presbyterian ecclesiastical control. In addition to its theological seminaries the Presbyterian Church has its Board of Christian Education and its "57 varieties" of colleges with varying degrees of denominational affiliation and control. The church is definitely in the field of education, general and specialized. All institutions of higher learning not under it are competitive with it. Their existence is a continuing protest against the adequacy of "Presbyterian" institutions. Those who put service or money into them are ecclesiastical "rebels"! In the theological field of course the outstanding example is Union Theological Seminary in New York City. Its Presbyterian president, professors and students lie down under this verdict with those at Westminster! Aside from any mutual resentment at this classification, it will probably be as little comfort to them to remember that their predecessors in rebellion walked away from the Presbyterian Church with great assets and endowments, as it is to us to recall that we were practically forced into ecclesiastical independence with no assets other than our own abounding faith in God and in His faithful followers in the denomination. The cases are distinguishable—of course—but only on the theory that inclusiveness tolerates everything excepting old school, old-fashioned, orthodox, "faith of our fathers" Presbyterian beliefs, and that rebellion when it is accompanied by physical violence—at least to the treasury—and is continued and persisted in sufficiently long becomes an ecclesiastical virtue. Then in the general education field we have the great host of college and university presidents, professors, trustees, directors and students in as far as they are Presbyterians who serve or attend the many institutions which were once Presbyterian, now independent, the great state universities, and the colleges of other denominations. We have in mind one good Presbyterian elder who is president of an institution supported by a trust which forever prohibits a clergyman of any religion entering within its gates.

2. The Presbyterian Church is officially in the field of journalism. The General Assembly maintains its Publicity Department. The denomination has its official organ—*The Presbyterian Magazine*. In competition here are all the so-called "Presbyterian" papers. The "rebels" here include all of the editors, directors, trustees, contributors and subscribers to these unofficial organs.

3. The Presbyterian Church has its Pension Plan. It is thus in the field of ministerial insurance or annuity business. It also has its Board of Ministerial relief. All independent insurance and annuity companies are thus in direct competition with the denomination insofar as they deal with Presbyterian ministers. The "rebels" here include all those good Presbyterians who serve or patronize insurers ecclesiastically uncontrolled. Directors, officers, experts, agents, solicitors—all of them. This involves an insurance company represented as the oldest in the United States which insures only ministers—Presbyterian preferred. Rank rebellion and insubordination!

4. There are hospitals, orphanages, sanitariums and homes for aged bearing the Presbyterian label and more or less ecclesiastically connected. The church also has its extra-institutional welfare work and ordained officers to administer it—the Board of Deacons. The "rebels" include all Presbyterians who serve or contribute to or accept benefits from any un-Presbyterian humanitarian enterprises. Public moneys derived from taxes are increasingly being appropriated to these welfare purposes. *Good* Presbyterians must now become tax delinquents, or face the firing squad!

5. The Presbyterian Church is in the missionary business at home and abroad. All Presbyterians who serve or support any missionary cause under any ecclesiastically unrelated auspices must be excommunicated. This involves every Presbyterian who in any manner serves or supports such a venerable institution as the denominationally independent American Sunday School Union—and many other agencies which might be mentioned. Our Lord's great commission must be rewritten for Presbyterians to read:

   "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, *under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church.*"

6. The Presbyterian Church, under its present constitution and creed has an existence separate and apart and distinct from other denominations. Among the "rebels" note the great and distinguished company of Presbyterians who are actively opposed to this constitutionally guaranteed denominational attribute, separateness—zealots for denominational suicide—those working with and without Presbyterian dollars in their pay-envelopes for church union. It is no answer to say that this matter now has ecclesiastical sanction. It had its original conception in some human mind, antedating General Assembly sanction, and so far as the detail of the basis of union is proposed or formulated today—that has no church sanction.

7. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church goes regularly on record against particular individual habits, points of view and social practices. We are humbled. We find ourselves in the condemned company of Presbyterian advocates of unholy methods of attaining temperance and international peace; yes even this, we are outcast with SMOKERS! Rebels all! Let the slaughter be general, comprehensive, complete, indiscriminate!

We suspect the sincerity of this whispered propaganda. Apparently someone is trying to kick us upstairs, ecclesiastically speaking. Either we must stay *IN* in "rebellion" or go *OUT* with the great mass of Presbyterians; and then, lo and behold, we look about, rub our eyes and find ourselves, ecclesiastically speaking, in the *MAJORITY*. We resent being forced into any such *POPULAR* movement. Visualize Dr. J. Gresham Machen and Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin in mutually sympathetic embrace—out in no-man's land,—shedding tears on each others shoulders!

JAMES F. SHRADER

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

## II. THE WITNESS OF PAUL.

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

### Human Merit vs. the Grace of God

LAST month we called attention to the fact that the very first word of the Epistle to the Galatians, after the bare name and title of the author, is the unpopular word "not." Unlike many men in the modern Church, Paul was not afraid to say "Not" or to say "No"; he had no sympathy with the feeble notion that a man can speak the truth without opposing error: and so this Epistle is a fighting epistle from beginning to end.

The enemy against which Paul is fighting in the Epistle can be reconstructed fairly well from the Epistle itself. Paul was fighting against the doctrine that a man can earn a part, at least, of his salvation by his own obedience to God's law; he was fighting against the doctrine that a man is justified not by faith alone, but by faith *and* works.

That doctrine was being propagated by certain teachers who had come into the Galatian churches from the outside. These teachers were men of Jewish race; and since they sought to induce Gentile people to "Judaize"—that is, to adopt the Jewish manner of life—they are commonly called "Judaizers."

The Judaizers agreed with Paul about many things: they agreed in holding that Jesus was the Messiah; they seemed to have no quarrel whatever with Paul's lofty doctrine of the deity of Christ; they believed in the resurrection of our Lord from the dead. Moreover, they even held, no doubt, that a man must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ if he is to be saved.

But their error lay in holding not only that a man must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ if he is to be saved, but that he must also do something else—namely, keep at least a part of the law of God. Salvation according to those Judaizers, in other words, is attained partly by the grace of God and partly by the merit of man.

### The Modern Judaizers

The particular form of merit which they induced men to seek was the merit of keeping the law of Moses, particularly the ceremonial law. At first sight, that fact might seem to destroy the usefulness of the Epistle for the present day; for we of today are in no danger of desiring to keep Jewish fasts and feasts. But a little consideration will show that that is not at all the case. The really essential thing about the Judaizers' contention was not found in those particular "works of the law" that they urged upon the Galatians as being one of the grounds of salvation, but in the fact that they urged any works in this sense at all. The really serious error into which they fell was not that they carried the ceremonial law over into the new dispensation whither God did not intend it to be carried, but that they preached a religion of human merit as over against a religion of divine grace.

So the error of the Judaizers is a very modern error indeed, as well as a very ancient error. It is found in the modern Church wherever men seek salvation by "surrender" instead of by faith, or by their own character instead of by the imputed righteousness of Christ, or by "making Christ master in the life" instead of by trusting in His redeeming blood. In particular, it is found wherever men say that "the real essentials" of Christianity are love, justice, mercy and other virtues, as contrasted with the great doctrines of God's Word. These are all just different ways of exalting the merit of man over against the Cross of Christ; they are all of them attacks upon the very heart and core of the Christian religion. And against all of them the mighty polemic of this Epistle to the Galatians is turned.

### The Authority of Paul

But it is time to return to our word "not" in the first verse of the Epistle. We have seen that that word is typical of the whole Epistle, since this letter is a polemic from beginning to end. But the particular reference of the word in this verse is not directly to the false gospel of the Judaizers, but to their personal attack upon Paul. The Judaizers had not been able to gain an entrance for their false teaching so long as the authority of the great Apostle remained beyond dispute. So they had proceeded to undermine that authority as best they could; they had said that Paul was at best an apostle of the second rank—that he had not been with Jesus in Galilee as had Peter and the others of the original Twelve, and that consequently whatever authority he possessed had come to him only through them.

It is against this attack that Paul utters the "not" in this first verse; in this verse he defends his apostolic authority, not his gospel. But of course the defence of his apostolic authority was altogether for the sake of his gospel; he is not interested in his apostolic prerogatives for their own sake, but only for the sake of the message which those prerogatives had been given him to proclaim. Hence the "not" of this verse is a very weighty word indeed; it involves, indirectly at least, the whole mighty conflict between pride in human goodness and the all-sufficiency of the Cross of Christ.

With this understanding, let us see how Paul defends his authority as an apostle of Jesus Christ. He is "an apostle," he says, "not from men nor through a man."

When he says that he is not an apostle *from* men, he denies that the *source* of his apostleship was found in men. So far, perhaps, even the Judaizers may have agreed with him; they may perhaps have admitted that ultimately his authority to preach came from Christ.

But the real point of his defence comes in the following words. "My apostleship not only did not come *from* men," he says—so much perhaps even his opponents admitted —"but it did not come even *through* a man." There is where the dispute arose. The Judaizers said that if Paul had any authority at all it came *through* those who had been apostles before him, but Paul says that it came to him directly from Christ without any human intermediary at all: not only was the source of his apostleship divine, but also the channel through which it came to him; the Lord Jesus did not use any intermediary to give him his commission as an apostle, but appeared to him directly on the road to Damascus.

### Paul's Commission and Ours

Thus in the words, "nor through a man," Paul refers to a prerogative that differentiates him sharply from ordinary Christians.

Every humble Christian can in a certain sense go with Paul in the former of the two phrases that we have just discussed. Every humble Christian can say: "My commission comes to me not from men but from Christ." Of course, the ordinary Christian cannot say, as Paul could say, that his commission is an apostolic commission; for by the term "apostle" is designated a high function that has not been continued in the Church. Nevertheless, even the very humblest Christian can say that he has a commission which has come to him not from men but from God. That is true of a preacher, and it is just as true of the sexton who sweeps out the church and of the treasurer who takes care of the funds.

But we ordinary Christians, whether preachers or sextons or treasurers, cannot go with Paul in the second of the two phrases: we cannot say that our commission did not come to us *through* a man; for as a matter of fact it did come to us through some true evangelist who preached the gospel to us, or through some faithful pastor or teacher, or through some godly parent. Christ gave us our commission, but He used human emissaries in doing so; we are not eyewitnesses of the risen Christ. But in the case of Paul there was no such human emissary; to him Christ appeared on the road to Damascus and gave him directly his high commission.

The reference to Paul's conversion is plain in the words that immediately follow those with which we have just dealt. "I am an apostle," says Paul, "not from men nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father *who raised Him from the dead.*" The reference to the resurrection of Christ is not, at this point, a mere general reference to something that was fundamental in the Christian faith, but Paul is thinking specifically of the fact that his apostleship came to him from the *risen* Christ. "I am an apostle," he says, "through Jesus Christ—yes, and through God the Father, since God the Father raised Christ from the dead and is concerned in all that the risen Christ does, including that call to me that came on the Damascus road."

### The Contrast Between Christ and Man

So far we have explained the words that Paul uses in this verse. But it is to be wondered whether all readers are aware of the stupendous implications of those words. When Paul says, "*Not* through a man *but* through Jesus Christ," has it struck the reader that that is a very strange contrast; does it seem at all strange that the Apostle should set Jesus Christ sharply over against humanity in this way, as though He belonged in an entirely different category, as though "a man" and "Jesus Christ" were two entirely distinct things?

If it does not seem strange to us, that is simply because our Christian conviction about Jesus Christ has become so ingrained in us that the wonder of it has been lost from view. Thank God that it does not seem strange to us! But to most modern historians, both within and without the Church, it seems very strange indeed.

### A Contemporary Witness

Who was this "Jesus Christ" who is separated thus by Paul so sharply from ordinary humanity and is placed on the side of God? Who was this person who is treated thus as a stupendous heavenly being to whom divine honors were to be paid, along with the honors paid to the eternal God, the Maker of heaven and earth? Was He a mythical personage of remote antiquity, around whom the legends of the ages would have been free to grow?

Not at all. He was a Jewish teacher, a contemporary of Paul, who had lived in Palestine and had died a shameful death only a few years before this Epistle was written. He was a person one of whose brothers Paul had actually met (Gal. 1:19). The genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians is admitted by all serious historians, whether friends or foes of Christianity. The Epistle was admittedly written, then, by Paul; and the date of it can be fixed within rather narrow limits. It was written not later than about A. D. 55, only some twenty-five years after the death of this Jesus of whom Paul speaks. When, therefore, Paul speaks of Jesus Christ as in such contrast with humanity and as standing so clearly on the side of God, he is not speaking about a personage of the dim and distant past, but about one of his own contemporaries. How shall so strange a phenomenon be explained?

The real Christian will have no difficulty in explaining it. "Paul speaks of Jesus as God," he will say, "because as a matter of fact Jesus *was* God, because He was the eternal Son of God who came voluntarily to this earth for our salvation, worked redemption for mankind, rose from the dead, and is now seated on the throne of all being to be worshipped and glorified by all who are His."

But to most modern historians, who regard Jesus as a mere man, the first verse of Galatians, together with all the rest that Paul says, presents a very strange problem indeed. How did a mere man, a Jewish teacher, come to be regarded thus as God, not by later generations but by one of His own contemporaries?

### One God, Yet Christ Is God

The thing would not be quite so strange if Paul, who attests this strange view of Jesus, had been a man of polytheistic training and belief. Had he believed in many gods, the adding of one more would not be quite so difficult to understand. But as a matter of fact Paul was a monotheist of the monotheists. Pharisaic Judaism of the first century was nothing if not monotheistic; it held with heart and soul to the doctrine that there is but one God. Paul shared that doctrine, both before and after his conversion, to the full. How could such a monotheist, such a believer in the awful separateness between the one God and the world that He had made, possibly come to exalt a mere man, Jesus, to the godhead and pay to him the reverence which belongs only to God?

That Paul does just that is attested not only by our verse but by his Epistles from beginning to end. He does, indeed, in certain passages, speak of Jesus as a man. In Rom. 5:15, for example, he contrasts the one man, Adam, with "the one man, Jesus Christ"; and a similar contrast between "the first man" and "the second man" occurs in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians. So also in I Tim. 1:5, Paul speaks of the "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." But in these passages the careful reader receives somewhat the impression that the Apostle regards it as a strange thing, worthy of special note, that Jesus Christ should be a man as well as something other than man. At any rate, these passages do not in the slightest invalidate the fact that in the Epistles as a whole, as in our verse in Galatians, Jesus Christ is separated sharply from ordinary humanity and placed clearly on the side of God. Everywhere Paul stands in a truly religious relationship to Christ. Christ is for him not primarily an example for faith but the object of faith; his religion does not consist merely in having faith in God like the faith which Jesus had in God, but in having faith in Jesus.

That fact is enough to give the thoughtful historian pause. Who was this Jesus who could be exalted to the throne of God not by later generations but by a man of His own generation, only a few years after His shameful death?

But we have not yet mentioned what is perhaps the most surprising thing of all. The surprising thing is not merely that Paul holds this stupendous view of Jesus, but that he does not argue about it, that he seems to be under no necessity whatever of defending it against attack within the Church. Even the Judaizers, so far as we can see, had no quarrel with Paul's lofty view of Christ. Paul said: "I am an apostle not through a man but through Jesus Christ"; the Judaizers said: "No, you are an apostle not through Jesus Christ but through a man"; but it never seems to have occurred to anyone in the Church to say: "You are an apostle through Jesus Christ and therefore you are an apostle through a man, since Jesus Christ was a mere man."

Certainly, at any rate, whatever may have been the attitude of the Judaizers, it is perfectly clear that even if they did differ from Paul about the person of Christ, the original apostles—Peter and others of the Twelve—gave them no slightest color of support on this point. The Judaizers may possibly have appealed to those original apostles on another point—namely, the attitude that was to be assumed in the Church toward the Mosaic law. Even that appeal—supposing they did make it, which is by no means perfectly certain—was, as we shall see, an utterly unjustified appeal. But with regard to the person of Christ, at any rate, they did not venture to make any appeal to the original apostles at all.

Here, then, we have the truly amazing thing. Not only does Paul hold to his stupendous view of the person of Christ, but he assumes that everyone agrees with him about it; in particular, he assumes that Peter agrees with him, and others of the intimate friends of Jesus. Those men had seen Jesus subjected to all the petty limitations of human life, as He had walked with them on the Galilean hills; and yet they agreed perfectly with the lofty view, which

*(Continued on page 15)*

# Books of Religious Significance

*EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS OF TODAY. By Walter Albion Squires. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. 268 pages. $1.25 net.*

THIS book deals in a large and informing way with some of the most important problems before the American people today. Small in compass it is exceedingly rich in content. We hope it will be widely read and pondered because upon the solution of the problems it raises the whole future of America in large measure depends. Dr. Squires writes out of many years of experience, particularly in the field of week-day religious instruction, and is otherwise well-qualified to deal helpfully with matters relating to religious education in Church and State and the relation that they ought to sustain to each other. Dr. Harold McAfee Robinson writes an appreciative foreword.

Dr. Squires' book, like ancient Gaul, is divided into three parts. Part I deals with movements in public education with the purpose of discovering their religious significance. He finds within public education well-defined tendencies favorable to religious education but at the same time powerful tendencies of an opposite character, viz., toward a secularization of its curriculum which in many instances include a pronounced anti-religious interest. Part I contains an informing discussion of what the separation of Church and State, as provided for in our national and state constitutions, permits. "First of all," Dr. Squires maintains, "it would permit public education to be founded on a broadly religious basis, just as our governmental systems, both state and national, are founded on a broadly religious basis. Second, it would permit such cooperation of State schools and Church schools as would lead to no interference of the State in the affairs of the Church or of the Church in the affairs of the State. In the third place, it would permit such cooperation as would be mutually helpful to both public and Church schools and would not give any one church or religious organization an advantage."

Part II deals with movements and tendencies in religious education within the churches. Dr. Squires finds evidence of an educational awakening among the churches of America which, however, is not always wisely directed. This leads him to define the specific educational task of the Christian Church, which he rightly says is "the leading of the individual to faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord and to the dedication of a trained and obedient life to His service." He insists on the supremacy of Jesus in all matters connected with the Christian religion and offers some valid and worthwhile criticism of educational theories that conflict with Jesus' rightful place in the field of religious education. It is a satisfaction to note that the Jesus upon whose supremacy he insists is the real Jesus that was and is not the fictitious Jesus of modern religious naturalism.

Part III deals with the problem of the relation of Church and State in the matter of religious education. His treatment of this difficult and as yet unsolved problem makes no claim to finality but is wholesome and to be commended to the attention of all. Dr. Squires' proposed solution is along the line of cooperation between public schools and Church schools in the establishment of a national system of education. He seeks to steer between State supremacy and Church supremacy but opposes the notion that the separation between Church and State should be so absolute that all suggestions of religion should be excluded from the public-school program and the public-school curriculum. He rightly maintains that such an absolute separation would mean a wholly secularized system of public education and that a wholly secularized system of education would mean not merely a non-religious but a distinctly anti-religious system. "To make our system of education wholly secular," he writes, "is not to debar sectarianism from our schools, but to turn them over to the sectarianism of unbelief. Atheism and agnosticism are sects quite as truly as orthodox Christianity and orthodox Judaism. No reasonable person would seek to secure for either Christianity or Judaism the advantage which might come from a place of dominance in our system of public education; why should atheism and unbelief be given such an advantage?" Especially informing are the two chapters "Some ways in which Church and State may cooperate in Education" and "The Achievements and Significance of Week Day Religious Education"—chapters which not only advise us of what is being done along these lines but what is legally possible in the way of cooperation between Church schools and State schools according to existing legal decisions in various States.

This is a popular book in the good sense of that much-abused word. Written with adequate knowledge it deals with a matter of universal interest in a manner intelligible to the general reader. Dr. Squires has not written the last word on the exceedingly important problems he raises and discusses but he has made a valuable contribution to their solution.

S. G. C.

*TWENTY-FOUR VIEWS OF MARRIAGE. Edited by Clarence A. Spaulding. The Macmillan Company. 452 pages. $2.50.*

THE General Assembly of 1929 authorized the appointment of a Commission "to make an exhaustive study of the subject of marriage, divorce, and subsequent remarriage, making use of the studies available and analyses of the statutes of the several states on the subject and efforts of the Protestant churches and social service agencies to deal with it, and report its conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly of 1930." This Commission made a tentative report to the last Assembly and was continued "to carry its study and research further."

This book is one of the fruits of that Commission's labors. Its editor is a member of the Commission and it bears upon its title page the words, "From the Presbyterian General Assembly's Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage." The object of the Commission in putting forth this volume is the commendable one of making available for Christian leaders in general "the best pronouncements on this subject by leading religious, moral, social, psychological, biological, and judicial students, who while revealing divergent opinions on details, might help establish a consensus of virile opinion on the permanence and sacredness of the marriage tie, the domestic and social obligations of those who enter into married relations, and the need of perpetuating the integrity of family life in the face of disintegrating social influences and personal delinquencies." This book does not profess to add to the existing literature on the subject of marriage. Apart from its preface, introduction and bibliography it contains no original material. What it professes to do is "to present, within the span of one volume, outstanding chapters from already recognized and established books and magazine articles, so that the reader can have the whole problem of human relations presented to him from the angle not only of the conservative, but also of the liberal, and even radical."

This book makes available a mass of information that would otherwise be inaccessible to most general readers. There is, we suppose, no single volume, other than the one before us, so revealing in respect to current thought on the subject of marriage. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that it contains anything like a complete symposium of views on the subject. Moreover it is lacking, if we mistake not, just where we would naturally expect it to be full and adequate, seeing that it has been

published under the auspices of a Commission of the Presbyterian Church. When its editor tells us that the material of which the book was composed was selected with the thought of presenting the problem of the sexes from "the angle not only of the conservative but also of the liberal, and even radical" we are not to suppose that he is referring to the differences that exist among those calling themselves Christians so much as to the differences that exist among men in general. As used by him, roughly speaking, "conservative" seemingly refers to those who believe in monogamy, "liberal" to those who believe in monogamy with reservations and "radical" to those who believe in companionate marriage and easy divorce. At any rate the viewpoint that receives least consideration in the book is what would ordinarily be called the conservative Christian. Much space is devoted to the views of men like Bertrand Russell, Walter Lippmann, Benjamin B. Lindsey and other enemies of Christianity but no definite space is allotted to those holding either the Roman Catholic or the orthodox Protestant view. It seems to us that better things might have been expected of a book put forth under such Presbyterian auspices. Much as we dissent from the view expressed in the recent Papal Encyclical we think it infinitely preferable to many of the views that find expression in this book and are at a loss to know on what principle it was excluded and the views of atheists and other open enemies of Christianity included. More especially we are at a loss to understand why the book includes no statement of the orthodox Protestant view. Possibly its editor would hold that the orthodox Protestant view is set forth in substance in that portion of the Commission's report to the last Assembly that is included in the book, together with the extracts from the reports of somewhat similar Commissions appointed by the Federal Council of Churches and the Protestant Episcopal Church; but, if we mistake not, even these contain little that could not have been written by a non-Christian and almost nothing that could not have been written by a "liberal" or "modernist" Christian.

Opinion may differ as to the propriety of a Commission of the Presbyterian Church inviting persons like Bertrand Russell, Benjamin B. Lindsey, A. A. Brill, Walter Lippmann and Ellen Key, not to mention Maude Royden, Sherwood Eddy and Joseph Fort Newton and others to contribute to a symposium intended for the instruction and guidance of Christian leaders in their efforts to learn what really constitutes marriage and the conditions and limitations that should be imposed on the privilege of divorce; but it seems to us that there is little room for difference of opinion when it is maintained that a symposium issued under its auspices should give some prominence to that view of marriage and divorce expressed or implied in the teachings of Christ and His apostles. The failure to include in this symposium anything like an exposition and defense of the Biblical conception of marriage and divorce is particularly surprising in view of the fact that all the members of the Commission are either ministers or elders of the Presbyterian Church and so on record as holding that the Bible is the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We are somewhat afraid that the Commission is more concerned to present a conception of marriage "based upon demonstrable scientific data" than one based on the Word of God. They seemingly forget that as yet scientific theories come and go but that the Word of God abideth forever.

This volume may be commended to those wanting to learn somewhat about the break-up of family life in America; also to those interested in knowing the non-Christian and partly Christian conceptions of marriage that are being advocated and practiced today; but it has small value for those primarily interested in marriage as a divine institution as it was ordained by God and blessed by Jesus Christ.

S. G. C.

*THE KARL BARTH THEOLOGY OR THE NEW TRANSCENDENTALISM. By Alvin Sylvester Zerbe, Ph.D., D.D., Professor Emeritus, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio. Central Publishing House, Cleveland, Ohio. Price, $2.25.*

READERS of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, particularly in North America, will be interested in this volume since it is perhaps the only work in English dealing exhaustively with the much discussed theology of Karl Barth. As such it is to be commended as a clear and readable aid to the understanding of a significant modern movement.

Karl Barth's theology is based upon an antitheistic theory of reality. Barth has made God and man to be correlatives of one another. Barth has no genuine transcendence theory. At first blush it would seem as though the opposite were the case. His whole theology is heralded as a reaction against the modern emphasis upon God's immanence in the universe. And his reaction is extreme. He even denies the real significance of the temporal world. The whole of history is to be condemned as worthless. The eternal is said to be everything and the temporal is said to be nothing. Does not this seem as though Barth holds to a genuine transcendence of God? Does it not seem as though transcendence means everything for Barth? It does seem so—but it is not truly so. Barth holds that "the only real history takes place in eternity." If then man and the temporal universe in general are to have any significance at all they must be an aspect of God and as such be really as eternal as God. Anything to be real, says Barth, must transcend time. Man is real only in so far as he transcends time. We are true personalities only in so far as we are experiences of God. We are not to say with Descartes, I think therefore I am, or even with Hocking, I think God therefore I am, but we are to say, I am thought by God therefore I am. (Dogmatik, pp. 50-60). Abraham's faith takes place in eternity. Resurrection means eternity. The entire epistle of Paul to the Romans is said to bring this one message that we must be eternalized. To be saved means to be conscious of one's eternity.

Barth has made God to be highly exalted above time. For this we would be sincerely grateful. Only thus is God seen to be qualitatively distinct from man. Only thus can we stand strong against Modernism. But Barth has also made man to be highly exalted above time. For this we are sincerely sorry. By doing this Barth has completely neutralized the exaltation of God. By doing this God is no longer qualitatively distinct from man. Modern theology holds that both God and man are temporal. Barth holds that both God and man are eternal. The results are identical. Whether I travel in style with the Graf Zeppelin or plod along laboriously with my old "Model T" is only a difference of pleasure while on the trip. We have stared at the Graf Zeppelin till we thought that it really was above space and time. Whether God and man are regarded as correlatives in the thick, heavy atmosphere of time or in the rarified realms of eternity makes no difference. In both cases man is as necessary to God as God is to man. In both cases the Universe is greater than man not only but also greater than God. In both cases God is reduced to a universal principle that is manifest in equally original particulars. In both cases the transcendence of God, without which there is no God, has disappeared. Karl Barth's theory of reality is as antitheistic as that of Pragmatism.

In the second place Karl Barth's theology is based upon an antitheistic theory of knowledge. He has basically denied the complete self-consciousness of God as absolute personality. He has no room for revelation. At first blush it would seem as though the very opposite were the case. He says that only in the eternal is true knowledge. He says that all knowledge comes by revelation. But again Barth has overworked his principle. Pragmatism says that all knowledge, for God as well as for man, is based upon synthesis, upon investigation of the facts as they are somehow spurted forth from chaos unto the void. For neither God nor man can the ideal of knowledge be that of complete comprehension because there is no telling how many more facts will appear. On the other hand Karl Barth says that all knowledge for man as well as for God is based upon analysis of the eternal truths that exist apart from time. The ideal of knowledge for man as well as for God is complete

comprehension. Knowledge is no knowledge unless it is completely comprehensive. Thus Barth seems to be very theistic in comparison with Pragmatism because he flatly denies that the temporal world produces anything new. But the illusion that Barth is a theist in his theory of knowledge quickly disappears when it is observed that man is once more put on the level with God by being placed with God above the temporal order. God and man are engaged in a common analysis of principles that exist independently of both. Knowledge is made a cooperative enterprise between God and man so that man may "reveal" his findings to God as well as God "reveal" his findings to man. And thus there is no real knowledge of comprehension even for God since the Universe is higher than He, and analysis is reduced to synthesis for both God and man. There is only one step between Karl Barth and Pragmatism; theism is equally opposed to both.

It is upon the basis of these antitheistic theories of reality and of knowledge that Barth's system of doctrine is built. His system of doctrine does not present to us an essentialy Reformed or Christian viewpoint with divergencies here and there. His system of doctrine springs from an antitheistic root and presents some external similarities to the Reformed point of view but never on any point agrees with Reformed theology. This can readily be seen in his conception of creation. Barth denies that creation as it came forth from the hand of God was good, and was to have a genuine significance. Instead, Barth's doctrine resembles that of paganism which held that the spatial-temporal world was somehow existing independently of God and was evil in itself. Accordingly Barth has a very low conception of sin. Man is not really responsible for sin and is not really guilty inasmuch as sin or evil was already in the world. Hence Barth has a very low view of redemption. The whole of objective redemption is reduced to the prosaic level of setting the ideal of the eternal before man. The incarnation is not historical nor is the cross. In so far as they are absolute and have significance Barth says they are above history. Historic Christianity is destroyed and a philosophy of ideals put in its place. Subjective redemption too, is no longer the victory of God's grace over sin in man but is reduced to the pagan principle of elevation in the scale of being. Christian ethics is no more. Heaven offers release from time, not release from sin. Paul's teaching that death has entered into the world because of sin must be replaced by the doctrine that death is natural because a constitutive element of the Universe. There is thus no real difference between Christianity and other religions because all of them are historical and the historical is as the night in which all cows are black. All "Bibles" are in this respect alike. No preacher needs be bound by the authority of any sacred book because the Word may come through him apart from it. Thus the acceptance of the "results" of higher criticism are not merely an inconsistent concession to the spirit of the times on the part of an otherwise Reformed theologian. On the contrary rationalism in this sense is founded upon the more basic rationalism of all non-theistic thought which makes man autonomous and sets him up as the source and standard of truth. Barth knows no absolute God. His theology is a "sport" and will soon revert to type. Professor McGiffert of Chicago predicted last summer that Barthianism would not last because it was really a recrudescence of Calvinism. If we might venture a prediction it would be that Barthianism may last a long time because it is really Modernism, but that neither Barthianism nor Modernism will last in the end because they are not Calvinism, that is, consistent Christianity.

It seems that the author of the book under review agrees in the main with the position all too briefly outlined above. The author has studied widely and carefully in the literature of Barthian theology. What is more, the author came to the study of Barthianism with a true historic sense and a knowledge of his Reformation theology. Accordingly he will have nothing of the hasty identification of Calvinism and Barthianism. The author shows by many telling criticisms that the two spring from different roots. For Barth he says: "Creatureness, sin and death go together. Scripture, however, says that God saw everything that he had made, and behold it 'was very good'" (p. 70). More important still our author says of Barth: "He is weakest at the point where weakness means failure, his doctrine of God" (p. 253). And as to the hope of some that Barthianism is an effective cure for Modernism our author sees right well that it is based upon an illusion. Says he, "Unless it be remedied, we fear that Barthianism is a poorly disguised agnosticism and unfitted to confront this God-defying age" (p. 261). Barth is a captive to his death-enemy, Modernism. "We are almost at the point at which, if charity did not forbid, we could charge Brother Brunner with himself starting with and accepting a 'religion of immanence', for like the rest of mankind he must start with an Ego" (p. 215). We believe therefore that the author's book will be conducive to the highly desirable end that every branch of the Reformed churches will resolutely disown Barthianism as an offshoot of Reformed theology. We are very thankful for its reaction against the prevalent emphasis upon God's immanence but this does not lead us to accept its transcendence doctrine as Christian or theistic.

CORNELIUS VAN TIL.

# Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

## Christ and the Old Testament

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*In your December issue you maintain that Jesus "taught that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are completely trustworthy." I am interested to know how you reconcile such a representation with Jesus' own words in the Sermon on the Mount. See Matthew 5:21-48. It would seem that Jesus himself did not regard the Old Testament as "completely trustworthy."*

*Sincerely,*
*C. M. B.*

IT is frequently asserted that in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus criticised the Old Testament and condemned it as faulty. This objection drawn from Matt. 5:21-48, however, is easily refuted. Throughout this passage the contrast is not so much between Jesus' own teaching and the teaching of the Old Testament as between Jesus' interpretation of the Old Testament and that of the ancients. Ordinarily when Jesus quoted the Old Testament He employed the formula, "It is written" but here He uses the formula, "Ye have heard that it was said." Moreover an examination of what He quotes evidences that He had in mind traditional interpretations rather than the actual teaching of the Old Testament. It is the more surprising that this passage should be cited as implying that Jesus rejected moral teachings of the Old Testament when in the paragraph immediately preceding, speaking specifically of the moral teaching of the Old Testament, He had said: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." It would seem almost as though Jesus forseeing that what He was about to say might be understood as criticism of the Old Testament itself expressly warned against such a misuse of His words. The very most that can fairly be said is that Jesus, like all who hold to the complete trustworthiness of the Bible, regarded the Old Testament as incomplete; but that as the Son of God He took upon Himself to legislate more adequately for the children of the kingdom. His "But I say unto you" is an expression of the Messianic consciousness of our Lord, not of a consciousness common to Christians. That Jesus should have

asserted His own right to legislate for the kingdom of God, notwithstanding the divine authority He attached to the already existing legislation, finds its explanation in the fact that He regarded Himself as one with the Father in rank and dignity. This utterance of Jesus is, therefore, in complete harmony with His other utterances concerning the Old Testament and not at all contradictory to the supposition that He looked upon the Old Testament as completely trustworthy.

## Infant Baptism

*Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

*May I ask you to give the Scriptural teaching concerning infant baptism? Is there an inexpensive book on the subject which would be satisfying to one who believes in baptism of believers only?*

*Yours truly,*
*Mrs. H. F. C.*

NO doubt there are books on the subject of infant baptism that have proven satisfactory to those who believe in the baptism of believers only—in the sense implied. Otherwise it is hardly likely that there would be so many who adhere to that position. We do not think, however, that there is any book that advocates the baptism only of those who have come to years of discretion that ought to be satisfying to Christian men and women; and that because we believe that the practice of baptizing infants has the sanction of Scripture as well as the sanction of the vast majority of those who call, or have called, themselves Christians.

It is admitted that the New Testament does not explicitly either command or forbid the baptism of infants. In this respect the practice of infant baptism is to be compared with the change of the holy day from the seventh to the first day of the week. It is also true that there is no example of infant baptism recorded in the New Testament. It is equally true, however, that there is no instance of a woman partaking of the Lord's Supper recorded in the New Testament. It will hardly do, therefore, to take the position that nothing is a Christian duty that does not rest on an express command of Scripture or that cannot cite a practice sanctioned by the founders of the Christian church.

But while there is no express command or example yet the baptism of infants seems to be clearly implied. The New Testament mentions the baptism of "households"—of Lydia (Acts 16:15), of the jailer at Philippi (Acts 16:32), of Stephanas (I Cor. 1:16). These incidents should, it seems to us, be interpreted in the light of the fact that "house" and "household" as employed in Scripture includes little children. When so interpreted it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the apostles baptized infants. If now these "household" baptisms are interpreted in the light of the fact that children were members of the Church and partakers of the covenant blessings under the Old Testament dispensation it seems even more difficult to escape such a conclusion. Otherwise the position of children under the New Testament dispensation would be inferior to that which they enjoyed under the Old Testament dispensation. No doubt there are those who seek to escape this conclusion by maintaining that children were not members of the Old Testament church. In order to do this, however, they are forced to maintain that circumcision was not a sign and seal of the spiritual covenant of grace but that its significance was purely national. Such a notion we regard as quite untenable. When it is remembered that under the New Testament dispensation baptism has taken the place of circumcision it seems clear that the absence in the New Testament of any express command to baptize infants is an argument for rather than an argument against the practice. If in the New Testament dispensation the children of believing parents were not to be regarded as members of God's church and sharers of the blessings of the covenant of grace—as they were under the Old Testament dispensation—then it is reasonable to suppose that there would have been a plain, unequivocal pronouncement to that effect either by Christ Himself or by His apostles. As a matter of fact we find such statements as those recorded in Matt. 19:14; Acts 2:39; and I Cor. 7:14.

A fundamental question in connection with the question of infant baptism is the question whether the individual or the family is the unit of the Church. As the rule at least, those who object to infant baptism hold that the individual is the unit of the Church while those who approve the practice regard the family as the unit. We think the evidence conclusive that according to the Scriptures the family is the unit. It would take too much space to cite this evidence but in both the Old and the New Testament it is the "People of God" who constitute the church and always the promise is unto us and our children. When the Scriptures are interpreted in the light of the fact—for fact we hold it to be—that the family is the basic unit of the Church, it is almost always the case that it is recognized that they sanction the baptism of infants.

While it has only an indirect bearing of the question of the teaching of Scripture it is a highly significant fact that the immense majority of Christians have always practiced infant baptism. The practice seems to have been practically universal in the early church and only in recent times has it been opposed by any considerable number of Christians.

It is needless to say that we do not hold that infants should be baptized in order that they may be saved. Rather we hold that the infants of believers should be baptized because they have a birth-right membership in the visible church. Hence the question that confronts such a child when it reaches years of discretion is not whether it will "join" the church but whether it will leave the church. No doubt those baptized in their infancy often give no evidence in their later life that they belong to the church invisible, but that is also true of many baptized as adults. It is obvious that the question of the relation of the children of believers to the church as well as the manner in which they should be instructed and trained is closely related to the question of infant baptism.

## Notes on Biblical Exposition—Concluded

Paul presents in his Epistles, of Jesus as the Son of the living God.

That fact presents to the modern naturalistic historians, who reject the picture of Jesus which the New Testament contains, a serious problem. According to those historians, Jesus was a mere man, and His first disciples regarded Him at first as such. That, then, according to these historians, was the original, the "primitive," view of Jesus; Jesus presented Himself and was first regarded, as a mere prophet of righteousness, or at most as a purely human Messiah. Yet the plain fact is—a fact which no historian can deny—that if that was the original view of Jesus it gave place to a totally different view not in some later generation but, as attested by the Epistles of Paul, in the very first Christian generation, when the intimate friends of Jesus were leaders in the Church.

The rapidity of the transition is very strange. But still more strange is the utter absence of any conflict at the time when the change was produced. The absence of conflict, the absence of any throes of transition, is eloquently attested by the Epistles of Paul. What we are asked by naturalistic historians to believe is that the true, the original, the "primitive," view of Jesus as just a great religious teacher, proclaiming the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, suddenly gave place, just after His shameful death, to a totally different, a totally incongruous, view, and that that mighty transition was effected without the slightest trace of any conflict in the Church!

That is really too much to believe. No, the matter-of-course way in which Jesus, as the Epistles of Paul attest, was regarded as a supernatural person in the earliest apostolic Church shows that there was something in His person from the very beginning that justified such a view.

Such is the witness of Paul to Christ. It is not dependent upon details in the Epistles, but is involved, rather, in the total phenomenon which the Epistles present. It has not been invalidated in the slightest by modern research.

## Letters to the Editor

[EDITOR'S NOTE: We are glad to publish another letter from our good friend Mr. Farmer. Up to date he has personally paid for 540 subscriptions to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. We invite all who believe in our ministry to aid in the same manner. Although not himself a Presbyterian, Mr. Farmer is generously bringing CHRISTIANITY TODAY to many Presbyterian members, especially in the South. It is his hope and ours, that some Presbyterian laymen may be led to help combat Modernism, whether North, South, East or West, by putting CHRISTIANITY TODAY in the hands of those in strategic places.]

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I am enclosing a list of new subscribers, all of whom are Ministers in Georgia. You have already acknowledged receipt of two other lists in last December, some for Georgia, but most of them for Ministers in other Southern States.

As you note, I am sending your very valuable paper to only a few of the laity, as it is a little gift from me to our preachers, most of whom, however, are strangers to me. I know they have much to do and to read, but I am anxious that each one read this paper, and then carry to the laymen and women some of the worth-while things that they are sure to find in it.

I am sorry that I have not been able to write to each one to whom I have sent the paper, as each one should know who sent it. I have written to many of them, and later received a large number of letters that made me feel very happy, because they not only acknowledged the little gift from me, but expressed themselves as highly pleased with the paper, and what it is doing.

If my preacher friends will give your paper a place in their regular reading, and all pray for me, that I may be directed by our Lord in these humble efforts, I am making for the Master, and the saving of souls, I shall continue to be very happy.

Your brother, sincerely,

R. E. L. FARMER.

Bartow, Fla., Box. 529.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: As a Methodist minister in far away Australia I wish to congratulate you on the production of your excellent paper. I am a subscriber (through local agency) from the very first number and shall be pleased to recommend it to my friends as I have opportunity. I rejoice in the firm stand you take on the inspiration and authority of the Word of God and on all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. It is with deep regret that I learn the news of the death of that stalwart defender of the truth—Dr. R. Dick Wilson, whose works as well as those of Professor Machen are known and appreciated in this Commonwealth. Wishing you success in your important undertaking.

(Rev.) ROBERT KELLY.

Ivanhoe, Victoria, Australia.

# Current Views and Voices

## The Presbyterian Magazine and Shailer Mathews

*From The Sunday School Times*

The September issue of *The Presbyterian Magazine*, which is the official organ of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., published a review of a book entitled "The Atonement and the Social Process," by the well-known Modernist Dr. Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago. [See CHRISTIANITY TODAY for November, p. 11.] The review, signed by A. B. McCormick, said, concerning such old-fashioned views as atonement through the death of Christ "in sacrificial . . . and substitutionary terms," that "our scientific age has outgrown such ideas," and then made a statement of the atonement as follows: "Jesus, while suffering from others' maladjustment to personality-evolving forces of the cosmic process—triumphed through His own adjustment to those forces, and thus became our Saviour." This review was commented on editorially in the *Times* of November 22, under the title "An Improved Atonement." The *Times* has received letters of bitter denunciation from the reviewer, Dr. A. B. McCormick (who is pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Oil City, Pa.) and from Dr. W. T. Hanzsche, Editor of *The Presbyterian Magazine*. Thus Dr. McCormick writes, in part:

> You know very well that no book review in any magazine represents the editorial mind and policy of the magazine. You know that all that is attempted in those short reviews of six or eight lines in length is to suggest the nature of the contents of the book in review, usually without praise or condemnation. And yet, knowing this, you have deliberately spread abroad through the world a lying accusation against *The Presbyterian Magazine*. . . .

To this letter the Editor of the *Times* replied:

> As an editor, I am afraid I cannot agree with your statement in your letter of December 1 that "no book review in any magazine represents the editorial mind and policy of the magazine." For many years the book reviews in *The Sunday School Times* have been, and are, scrupulously careful to represent the editorial mind and policy, and the deepest conscientious convictions, of the *Times*. If the book under review sets forth views or teachings that we count unscriptural, we are careful to say so in no uncertain terms, even in the briefest of our reviews.
>
> I am sorry you have felt called upon to write such a letter. If we have misunderstood the review that appeared in *The Presbyterian Magazine*, we shall of course gladly publish a correction. Before doing so, however, may I ask whether you, as the reviewer of Dr. Shailer Mathews' book on the Atonement, repudiate his teaching concerning the Atonement, and count it grossly unscriptual, as we do? If I may have a letter from you to that effect, I shall gladly let our readers know of the reviewer's repudiation of Dr. Mathews' teaching.

In his reply Dr. McCormick does not answer the question as to his repudiation of Dr. Shailer Mathews' teaching, but says the Editor of the *Times* is "sidestepping the issue," and of the *Times*' editorial that "you go off half-cocked and give a lie to the winds."

In reply to a letter from the Editor of the *Times* to Dr. Hanzsche, asking for information as to the attitude of *The Presbyterian Magazine* toward Dr. Mathews' teaching on the atonement, Dr. Hanzsche writes declining to give any such information, and says in part:

> The book reviews in *The Presbyterian Magazine* are written by various ministers. They have nothing to do with the editorial policy of the magazine. The writer of each review signs his name beneath it, thus testifying that the review is his opinion, and only his opinion. . . .
>
> If your conscience is not educated enough along Christian lines for you to discover the dishonesty and the unfair implication of your argument in your editorial, no letter from me can awaken it. If you are not gentleman enough to understand that it is you who should apologize for a wrong deed, and not me, why should I write an apologetic confession of faith to your magazine?

*The Sunday School Times* is always ready to correct any misstatement that may have been made in its columns, and in view of the vehement objection, by both the reviewer of Dr. Mathews' book and the editor of *The Presbyterian Magazine*, to any identifying of their views with the teaching of Dr. Shailer Mathews, the *Times* publishes this repudiation on their part,—if indeed it is a repudiation, for both the reviewer and the editor of the magazine declined, when asked, to express any opinion on Dr. Mathews' teaching.

Not only in *The Sunday School Times* but in many other magazines, secular and religious, do the reviews state the editorial mind and policy of the magazine. It was natural

and proper, therefore, for the *Times* to assume that the review comments on Dr. Mathews' book reflected the views of the reviewer and of the editor of the magazine, as well as a statement of the position of the author of the book, since there was no hint of any dissent in the review.

An additional fact bearing on the matter is well known to the Presbyterian public. Dr. Hanzsche, the Editor of *The Presbyterian Magazine*, is one of the signers of the so-called Auburn Affirmation, which states that "the doctrine of inerrancy, intended to enhance the authority of the Scriptures, in fact impairs their supreme authority for faith and life, and weakens the testimony of the Church to the power of God to salvation through Jesus Christ. We hold that the General Assembly of 1923, in asserting that 'the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error,' spoke without warrant of the Scriptures or of the Confession of Faith." The signers of this Auburn Affirmation also deny that it is essential that Presbyterian ministers be required to believe the virgin birth of Christ, or the resurrection and ascension of our Lord with the same body in which he suffered, or Christ's death as an offering to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God. In view of these well-known facts it is not surprising that the Editor of the *Times*, with many others, would assume that the Editor of *The Presbyterian Magazine* sympathized with Dr. Shailer Mathews' teachings, and that the review reflected this viewpoint. If the *Times* was mistaken, it gladly corrects the mistake.

## Repudiation Up-to-date

*Editorial in The Christian, London, England.*

As affording illustration of a point of view which no one can pretend is faithful to Christ and His work, there appeared in the London newspapers a few days ago some account of the external decoration of a church edifice in the neighborhood of New York—a building on which millions of dollars have been lavished, with the result that now at length the structure is boastfully described as "the biggest Non-conformist church in the world." It seems that, as symbolizing the advent of a new age in religious thought, among carvings in stone above the main doorway of the edifice are figures of Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed. And these *along with* Christ!

If it is permissible to question the wisdom of the man who makes a carved statue of Christ, and sets up the same in a place of worship, what shall we think of the religious leader who provides a specious Pantheon, so monstrous as that suggested, with scientists and philosophers given a place alongside teachers of false religions, so to say all in a row with Christ? No place can be found for Christ in solitary grace and majesty; but with a studied perversity the same Lord is set forth with others, worthy and unworthy, and with a purpose far removed from the conception of the Apostle Paul, who declared himself on the side of Christ in terms that knew nothing of compromise—"determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

The linsey-woolsey combination of which we speak will doubtless shock people of sober mind, in America as well as in Great Britain; but nevertheless, there are those who seem to approve spiritual confusion, even though blasphemous in its character. And in line with such approval there comes from one quarter an arrogant explanation of circumstances that it is impossible to defend. If Dr. H. E. Fosdick inspired the grouping of men, with a figure of Christ among them, another American preacher has come forward with a wanton justification of the infidel act. These are the words of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, of New York:—

> "The present churches are rapidly disintegrating, and the churches of the future will present a synthesis of the great religions of the world."

Thus it is placed beyond doubt that the so-called tolerant mind has no place for the transcendent Christ. It may know something of the "Man of Nazareth," perhaps enough to give Him a seat among human worthies designated to be "saints," although not so called on any ground provided in the teaching of the New Testament. But it seems to show no deeper intelligence. To place the names of Luther, Calvin, Bunyan, and Carey along with those of Confucius, Buddha and Mohammed is assuredly no compliment to men who, to say the least, claimed to be Ministers of Christ; but who does not see it to be an impious outrage to introduce the Person of Christ in a senseless Pantheon, thus bringing the Divine Name into association with men who have rightly been classed—even then with words inspired by charity—among the spiritual misleaders of mankind?

## Proposed Church Union—Concluded

until the report appears in its final form; but whatever the explanation it must be obvious to all that the organic union of these churches in harmony with the proposals of this "partial report" would have a far-reaching influence on the future of Presbyterianism in America and throughout the world. In our judgment that influence would be exceedingly harmful. We hope, therefore, either that the plan will be greatly modified or rejected by the churches concerned.

Our disapproval of the plan as proposed is not due to any objection to such a union in principle. It is due wholly to its terms—terms which we are confident will be so highly unsatisfactory to at least a large minority in each of the churches involved that it is almost certain that it would be divisive rather than unitive in its ultimate results.

We believe that the plan should at least be modified in the way of giving some recognition to the rights of minorities, as was done in the union of the Canadian churches. As the plan stands, it is expected that the "united Church will succeed to and become vested with all of the property rights and powers of the constituent churches," which means if this expectation is well-grounded, that those who refuse to enter the union will do so at the cost of all their property rights. Such an ignoring of the property rights of minorities we regard as not only unfair but un-Christian inasmuch as it would constitute in many instances a species of legalized robbery.

Perhaps it will be maintained that no injustice in matters of property will be involved because the basis of the proposed union is the existing standards of the churches concerned, but—and here we mention our main reason for opposing the plan as proposed—such a contention, if made, will be thoroughly specious and misleading. That the proposed plan departs widely from the present standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., for instance, both as regards doctrine and polity, ought to be perfectly obvious to all from the questions it proposes to put to Ministers "before their ordination or admission to a charge." According to the existing standards Presbyterian Ministers are required to "receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing *the system of doctrine* taught in the Holy Scripture," but in the proposed plan of union they are merely required to "believe and acknowledge *the fundamental doctrines* of the Christian faith professed by the united Church and contained in its standards"—a change so radical that it virtually means the rejection of the Calvinistic or Reformed Faith as the doctrinal position of the united Church. Again, according to the proposed plan, Ministers must promise to submit themselves in the spirit of meekness to the authority of the courts of the Church and "*to follow no divisive courses*"—a change that introduces something now wholly lacking in our standards, viz., the doctrine of the infallibility of church courts, in face of the fact that had our spiritual forefathers accepted the decisions of church courts as final there would have been no Presbyterian and Reformed churches.

We submit not only that the "united Church" would be a non-Calvinistic Church (since it would not require its ministers to accept the Calvinistic system of doctrine) but that no real Presbyterian, that no man in fact who recognizes that the supreme rule of duty is to obey God rather than man, will agree to abide by whatever church courts may decide. We think it high time that those who perceive the real nature of this proposed plan for the organic union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches make themselves articulate.

# Ministerial Changes

## Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

### Calls

Donald Mitchell to Cottage Grove, Wis.;
Edward W. Hale to Beloit College, Wis.;
M. S. Benjamin, Plymouth, Ind. to Bethany Church, Milwaukee, Wis.;
Francis E. Reese, First Church, Aberdeen, S. D. to First Church, Spokane, Wash.;
Robert L. Burnes, Walnut Grove and Lincoln Churches, Farmington, Ark. to Wagoner, Okla.

### Calls Accepted

E. Lawhead, Federated Church, Beaumont, Cal. to Colton, Cal.;
C. C. Hulet, Sunday-school Missionary of S. Oregon Presbytery to be Assistant Pastor, First Church, Albany, Ore.;
J. A. Steele to Elk City, Okla.;
W. W. Alverson, Frankfort, Kans. to Walters, Okla.;
August W. Sonne, D.D., Second Parish, Portland, Me. to be Stated Supply Elmwood Church, E. Orange, N. J.;
George P. Horst, D.D., to First Church, Wichita Falls, Tex.;
Robert G. Higinbotham, Caledonia, N. Y. to Western Church, Palmyra, N. Y.;
John A. Steele, Fort Branch, Ind. to Elk City, Okla.;
Peter A. DeBeer, Ryder, N. D. to Plankinton, S. D.;
Alfred T. Cory, First Church, Stanley, N. D. to Brewster, Minn.;
Wm. J. Bone, Newtown, Pa. to Smyrna, Del.;
H. L. Manning, First Church, Nebraska City, Neb. to Kimball, Neb.;
Geo. C. Moore, Phila., Pa. to Grove Church, Danville, Pa.;
Geo. G. Culbertson, Washington, D. C. to Great Island Church, Lock Haven, Pa.;
H. L. Turner, Birmington, Ala. to Covenant Church, Atlanta, Ga.;
Ralph W. Lloyd, D.D., Edgewood, Pa. to be President Maryville College, Tenn.;
B. F. Edwards, Grand Ridge, Ill. to Leon, Ia.;
Francis E. Gaupp to Sharon, Pa.;
F. H. Nelson, Delray Beach, Fla. to Community Church, Lakewood, O.;
J. L. Glenn, Pierce, Fla. to New Smyrna Beach, Fla.;
W. R. Dawson, D.D., to Ft. Saunders Church, Knoxville, Tenn.;
Monroe G. Everett, Oregon Agricultural College to University of Penna., Phila.;
Joseph Kalabany, Hungarian Reformed Church to Hungarian Church, South Bend, Ind.;
J. Robertson Macartney, D.D., Vermont Ave. Church, Los Angeles to Bellingham, Wash.;
John W. Armstrong, McLeansboro, Ill. to White Pigeon, Mich.

### Installations

H. C. Kuhnert, Westminster Church, Madison, Wis., Jan. 18;
Harold J. Ockenga to be Assistant Pastor First Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., Jan. 28;
Frederick D. Viehe, Ph.D., Frankford, Del., Jan. 6;
W. H. Petry, Woodsfield, O., Jan. 12;
C. E. Nash, Caldwell, O., Jan. 14;
Irvin C. Wise, Frankfort, Ky., Dec. 28;
R. F. Cressey, Henry, Ill., Jan. 21;
E. G. Lindberg, Calvary Church, Peoria, Ill., Feb. 4;
Wm. Wright Stoddart, Westminster Church, Keokuk, Ia., Jan. 21;
John Hammond, D.D., Delta, Pa.;
Howard D. Borley, D.D., Central Church, Zanesville, O., Jan. 30;
Lewis B. Wissinger, Roseville and New Lexington, O., Jan. 22;
Irvin Askine, Spalding-Akron-Cedar Valley, Neb. churches, Jan. 4;
Claude S. Conley, Mercer, Pa., Dec. 30;
C. E. Bovard, St. Petersburg, Fla., Jan. 23;
Paul C. Voris, D.D., Litchfield, Minn., Jan. 22;
Lewis Herbert Knight, First Church, Hoosick Falls, N. Y., Jan. 26;
Harry W. Hansen, Holdrege, Neb.;
Vard V. Gray, Corona Church, Denver, Colo., Jan. 25;
Frank March, Elizabeth, Colo., Jan. 28;
Wm. E. Fry, Valverde Church, Denver, Colo., Feb. 1;
Douglas V. Magers, Bethany Church, Joplin, Mo., Jan. 30.

### Resignations

Roger F. Cressey, Corry, Pa.;
O. Curtis Griffith, Eastminster Church, Erie, Pa.;
John W. Van Dyke, Linn Grove, Ia., Dec. 31;
G. O. Schultz, Lenox, Ia., Jan. 25;
Robert Lloyd Roberts, Curtisville, Pa.;
Geo. L. Forney, Pleasant Unity, Pa.;
Wm. P. Lemon, D.D., Andrew Church, Minneapolis, Minn., Jan. 31;
Wm. H. Gleiser, First Church, Portsmouth, O., March 1;
R. H. Hartley, D.D., First Church, La Jolla, Cal.

### Changed Addresses

Lewis H. Knight, 130 Church St., Hoosick Falls, N. Y.;
Hugh B. Sutherland, Crannell, Cal.;
Oliver M. Humphreys, 5444—37th Ave., S. W., Seattle, Wash.;
Walter H. Waygood, D.D., Wyncote, Pa.;
Arthur K. Korteling, 144 S. 29th St., Lincoln, Neb.;
L. M. Real, Ord, Neb.;
J. M. Martin, R. F. D., Carthage, Mo.

### Deaths

Charles R. McCracken, Utica, Pa., December;
James D. Campbell, Jackson's Point, Canada, Jan. 1;
Frank N. Palmer, New Smyrna, Fla.;
John M. Bolton, Akron, O., Jan. 12;
Finis M. Johnson, Hastings, Neb., Dec. 27;
Robert W. Holman, Los Angeles, Cal., Jan. 20.

## Presbyterian Church in the United States

### Calls

Paul S. Van Dyke, missionary to Japan, to First Church, Kerrville, Tex.;
Daniel J. Currie, De Funiak, Fla. to Mt. Vernon and McRaie Churches, Ga. (declines);
John Martin to be Superintendent of Home Missions in Halston Presbytery, Tenn.

### Calls Accepted

J. E. Cousar, Jr., St. Albans, W. Va. to First Church, Covington, Va.;
M. A. Durant, Upper Long Cane and Greenville, Abbeville Co., S. C.;
A. F. Doty to Calhoun Falls, S. C.;
James W. Jackson, D.D., First Church, Greenwood, S. C. to First Church, Columbia, S. C.;
Clement Ritter, Palmyra, Mo. to First Church, Dothan, Ala.;
F. W. A. Bosch, Louisville Seminary to Tabernacle Church, Springfield, Mo.;
Paul B. Freeland, Opelousas, La. to First Church, Duncan, Okla.;
M. L. Baker, Haskell, Tex. to Beal Heights Church, Lawton, Okla.;
Walter Swetnan, Ph.D., Linden, Ala. to Oakland and Hickory Withe, Tenn.

### Installations

Edgar C. Oakley, Lauderdale-Toomsuba-Simmons group, Miss., Dec. 14;
George Stanley Frazer, Litt.D., First Church, Pensacola, Fla., Jan. 25;
E. S. McGavock, Milton and Kuhn Memorial Churches, W. Va.;
W. I. Howell, Jr., First Church, Nitro, W. Va.

### Changed Addresses

A. W. Wood, Greenlee, Va.;
W. P. Gibbs, Willis, Va.

### Resignations

Wriston Hartsell, Woodlawn Church, Atlanta, Ga.;
John Crockett, D.D., Central Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.

### Deaths

I. S. McElroy, D.D., Kings Mountain, N. C.;
R. C. Morrison, Fountain Inn, S. C.;
Alexander F. Laid, Bennetsville, S. C.

## Presbyterian Church in Canada

### Calls

Robert G. McKay, Walkerton, Ont. to St. Paul's Church, Prince Albert, Sask.;
William Swales, Knowlesville, N. Y. to Maple Valley, Singhampton and Feversham, Ont.

### Calls Accepted

T. O. Miller, Monkton, Ont. to Markdale and Flesherton, Ont.;
Calvin A. McRae, D.D., Knox Church, Detroit, Mich. to Riverside Church, Windsor, Ont.;
A. Leslie Howard, Ph.D., Simcoe, Ont. to Knox Church, Georgetown, Ont.

### Ordinations

J. L. W. McLean, M.A., Director of Rel. Education, Knox Church, Toronto, Ont., Dec. 16.

### Inductions

Wm. Swales, Stated Supply to Maple Valley, Feversham and Singhampton, Ont.;
J. C. Robinson, St. Andrew's Church, Campbellford, Ont.;
James Wilson, D.D., Wychwood Church, Toronto, Ont., Dec. 4;
J. A. MacLean, D.D., Argyle and Duff's, Ont., Dec. 11;
Andrew D. Sutherland, St. John's Church, Hamilton, Ont.;
John A. Pritchard, Monkton, Ont.;
Geo. M. Dunn, Todmorden Church, Toronto, Ont., as Stated Supply;
J. Fraser Evans, Scotsburn, N. S. as Stated Supply;
J. C. Robinson, St. Andrew's Church, Campbellford, Ont., Jan. 15.

### Resignations

M. C. Campbell, D.D., Knox Church, Embro, Ont.;
William W. Stoddart, Bonar Church, Toronto, Ont.;
Otis G. Dale, D.D., Dovercourt Rd. Church, Toronto, Ont.

## Reformed Church in America

### Calls

Gerret John Wullschleger, Maplewood, N. J. to New Paltz, N. Y.;
Wm. Goulooze, Prairie City, Ia. to 8th Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.;
Harke Frieling, 1st Church, Lafayette, Ind. to Union Church, Paterson, N. J.;
C. H. Spaan, Grand Rapids, Mich. to American Church, Hull, Ia.;
A. A. Schermer, Hollandale, Minn. to Carmel Church, Rock Valley, Ia.

### Calls Accepted

Chester C. Chilton, to Hurley and N. Marbletown, N. J.

### Deaths

Adrian Van Oeveren, Greenwich, N. Y., Nov. 20.

## Reformed Church in the U. S.

### Calls

Carl Green to Zions Church, Harvard, Neb.

### Calls Accepted

Paul L. Troutman to Lansford, Pa.;
C. G. Beaver, Dayton, O. to Lancaster, O.;
Ira W. Frantz, Clinton, O. to Fullerton, Pa.

### Installations

Ellis Hay, D.D., Saegerstown, Pa., Dec. 28;
R. Ira Gass, Cochrantown, Pa., Jan. 4;
William A. Alspach, Hale Memorial Church, Dayton, O., Jan. 18;
C. G. Beaver, Grace Church, Lancaster, O.;
David A. Winter, Basil, O.;
Charles H. Riederel, Whetstone, O.

### Changed Addresses

Raymond C. Stine, 220 S. West End Ave., Lancaster, Pa.;
C. Earl Gardner, Roaring Springs, Pa.;
J. M. G. Darms, D.D., 9 Farwood Rd., Carrol Park, W. Park St., Phila., Pa.

### Resignations

Clarence E. Whetstone, Clear Springs, Md.

### Deaths

Christian W. Summey, Edinburg, Va., Dec. 22.

# News of the Church

## The Overtures

LATEST advices from the office of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., show that Presbyteries have voted upon the overtures as follows: Overture A (On the Permanent Judicial Commission) Yes, sixty-three, No, eleven, No Action, one. Overture B, (On the rescinding of Constitutional Rule No. 1, respecting Local Evangelists) Yes, seventy-nine, No, twenty, No Action, one.

## Mellons Give New Pittsburgh Church

WORK will be begun this spring on the construction of one of the most imposing church edifices in the country for the East Liberty Presbyterian congregation of Pittsburgh, the gift of Richard B. and his wife, Jennie King Mellon. The new building will be of stone, will be Gothic in style and it is expected the structure will be completed within two and a half years.

The gift is the climax of over 100 years of devotion to the East Liberty Presbyterian congregation of the Negley and Mellon families. It was in the home of Mr. Mellon's grandparents, Jacob and Barbara Negley, that the idea of a Presbyterian church in the East Liberty Valley was first discussed over a century ago.

It was on land donated by them for the purpose that the first building was erected. On this identical piece of ground, supplemented by a strip on Whitfield street, given to the congregation several years ago by Mr. Richard B. Mellon, and his brother, Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, the new church is to be erected.

A feature of the new edifice will be a mission, which will be open day and night where hungry and homeless wayfarers always can find refuge and a friend. In this mission will be a rest room, chapel, showers, lunch counter, dormitory and a place where the needy will be provided with clothing. There also will be located headquarters of the deacons of the congregation whose duty it is to extend relief to the needy.

The new church has been designed by Ralph Adams Cram, famous Boston architect. Among the notable buildings he has designed are the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York; St. Thomas' Episcopal church, New York; the Chapel and the Graduate School at Princeton University, and some of the buildings of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

In style the church is to be fundamentally Gothic. An effort has been made to develop a contemporary expression of this great Christian style without doing violence to its principles.

The church will be cruciform in plan. The interior length will be 200 feet, the nave 43 feet wide between columns and 67 feet including the aisles. The transepts will give a width of 120 feet. The polygonal chancel will be 44 feet in depth and the same width as the nave, and the total height to the crown of the vault will be 82 feet. Over the crossing will rise the central tower about 48 feet square and 350 feet to the top of the spire. The church will seat from 1,800 to 2,000 people.

Below the nave is a large assembly room seating 500 persons. This is furnished with a spacious stage, with all necessary dressing rooms. On this level, also, will be a cafeteria, together with a large kitchen, serving room and all other necessary accessories. There are several direct approaches to this assembly room, not only from the church and Sunday school building, but also from the several surrounding streets.

The Parish House and Sunday school building will contain rooms of such number, size, proportions and relations as will adequately house a program of Christian education for a school with an enrollment of more than 2,000.

Provision will be made for bowling, basketball, handball and other recreations, with lockers and showers. In addition are suites of executive offices, board-rooms and club-rooms and special rooms for collections of mission curios, for religious art, for the library, and for instruction in Christian hymnology.

The Parish House extends along Baum Boulevard and Highland avenue until it connects with the large chapel on Penn avenue. This forms, within, a large cloistered court 60 feet by 75 feet, in which there will be a pool and fountain, flowers, shrubs and possibly some slender trees. This cloistered court is entirely shut off from street traffic by the church and surrounding buildings, forming a quiet sanctuary.

The edifice will be of solid masonry construction and intended to last a thousand years or more. The material for the exterior will be some comparatively light stone. It is intended to have concealed flood lights so that at night the lofty spire with its surmounting gilded cross can be illuminated, brilliantly at the top but fading away toward the base. Many other unusual lighting effects are under contemplation, including the lighting at night of the chancel windows and of those in the front, the former being lighted from outside, the latter from inside, so that they will be visible, when there are evening services, to everyone passing along the avenue. It is intended also to provide for the transmission of the music and the sermon from the church to the assembly room in the basement and also to the large chapel.

The Rev. Stuart Nye Hutchison, D.D., is the minister of the church. The new edifice will cost several million dollars.

## Book of Daniel Confirmed by Archeology

RECENT archeological discoveries in ancient Ur of the Chaldees, have tended, it is declared, to confirm the historicity of the Book of Daniel.

In 1927, the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania united their forces to send an expedition that would excavate the ruins of Ur,—now called Mugheir. The expedition was put in charge of Mr. Leonard Woolley. His careful excavations have thrown considerable light on history that has been obscure for ages, and leads back to the very dawn of civilization. He found tombs dating from 3500 B.C. Many of the objects he has discovered cast light on the general background of the Old Testament. It has been proved that Ur was no mean city. The inhabitants were versed in literature and skillful in craftsmanship, as is evidenced by an alabaster vase, now five thousand years old, mosaic pictures and statutes, cleverly carved lyres surmounted with bulls' heads, figures of rams in lapis-lazuli, ivory and gold (one like Abraham's ram, was caught in a thicket), large varieties of pottery and chains of precious stone. Showing that the women of the upper classes lived in luxury, are silver and gold hair-ribbons, hair-rings and earrings, diadems and bracelets, many of which are inlaid with flowers. There was uncovered the basement of the temple of the Moon God,—which basement measured 198 by 133 feet, with a surrounding wall 30 feet wide. The city wall was four miles in circumference, and after 4,000 years the ruins still measure four-fifths of a mile across.

As in the Roman civilization, images of household gods, or teraphim, were plentiful. This apparently throws light on Rachel purloining her father's household gods, and upon Michal deceiving her father, King Saul, by placing the teraphim-image in bed to save David. These teraphim were used by apostate Hebrews, consulted as oracles, and be-

lieved to be endowed with magical powers. It has been declared that the "mascot" of today appears to be a distant descendant of these images of 5,000 years ago.

Another notable discovery is evidence of the deluge, as recorded in the Bible. At Ur, there was found a stratum of clay, water-laid, and eight feet thick, which could only have been deposited by a colossal flood, such as that described in the Book of Genesis. In this layer there is no evidence of man, neither pottery, ash, nor human remains; but underneath this layer, relics of human life and industry often appear. So the excavations at Ur have led back to the remote patriarchal civilization anterior to the flood. In a communication to the London *Times* Mr. Woolley says: "Already, with the work only half done, we have one of the most monumental ruins existing in Mesopotamia; the splendid brickwork, more than 70 courses in it, going down sheer into the ground with the great staircases at the bottom is more impressive than if it stood up above the surface, and makes a much stronger appeal to the imagination; what may be below and behind it all, we have yet to learn."

Four thousand years ago Ur was beyond dispute one of the foremost cities of the world, yet today, possessing business tablets (of baked clay) it is possible to study her arts and crafts, translate her ancient learning, and explore her extensive library. This leads the Rev. T. W. Fawthrop, D.Litt., F.R.C.S., writing in the *Fundamentalist* (British) to remark, "Yet quasi-critics dare to suggest that Moses had not sufficient learning to write the Pentateuch! If the Abrahamic age was so cultured, as is evidenced by Ur of the Chaldees, why not the Mosaic, in another advanced civilization, and five hundred years later, i. e., five centuries more in which to develop?"

The striking confirmation of the Book of Daniel was in the finding of four clay-baked foundation cylinders, containing prayers of Nabonidus, King of Babylonia, for his son Belshazzar. Only a few years ago, Dean Farrar, writing in the Expositor's Bible could say "Belshazzar—history knows no such King." A few years later, Sir Henry Rawlinson found in these same ruins of ancient Ur, cylinders containing the prayers of King Nabonidus for his son Belshazzar. The existence of Belshazzar is now generally recognized. The discoveries of Mr. Woolley have also served to fit in otherwise blank places in the historical corroboration of the Book of Daniel. Sir Charles Marston, famed British Archeologist says that the discoveries showed that the prophet probably wrote his book at the same time as the events recorded.

"Mr. Woolley has discovered the palace of Princess Bel-Shali Nannar, the sister of King Belshazzar of Babylon, whose great feast was interrupted by the writing on the wall," he said. "Their grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar, conquered Jerusalem and took the Jews back to Babylon. Archeology has proved that the sack of Jerusalem took place, and it is quite feasible that Daniel may have seen this palace.

"While scientists have doubted the authenticity of the Book of Daniel, this discovery does much to confirm the story of Belshazzar. Cuneiform writings have been deciphered giving remarkable confirmation of the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel."

Thus again the fact is evidenced that the Bible has nothing to fear from Truth,—no matter in what quarter it may be found. Slowly but surely secular history is beginning to untangle the discrepancies between itself and Daniel. And it is secular history that is being rewritten, *not* the Word of God.

## The Clarence Edward Macartney Library

THE Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh and former Moderator of the General Assembly, delivered the address Jan. 7 at the laying of the cornerstone of the Clarence Edward Macartney Library at Geneva College, Beaver Falls. The library is the gift of the Misses Deal of Philadelphia, friends of Dr. Macartney, who formerly was Minister of Arch Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. In his address Dr. Macartney said:

"In the old days a library was about the last thing a college secured; now, when a college is founded, it is the first thing secured. There is no human progress without memory. But for memory, man and society would be perpetual novices. Science, art, religion, could not exist. Hence the importance of the library: it is the storehouse of the world's knowledge and experience.

"Unfortunately, books are the foes as well as the friends of mankind. Milton said, 'As well kill a good man as kill a good book.' That is always true. But now that vicious and degrading books have become the vogue, the best way to combat them is by well-stocked libraries where those who read can think upon whatsoever things are pure, just, honorable, and of good report.

"In his old age, Thomas Campbell, the Scottish poet, and author of 'The Pleasures of Hope,' said to his friends: 'It is an inexpressible comfort, at my time of life, to be able to look back and feel that I have not written one line against religion or virtue.' What Campbell congratulated himself upon seems now to have become the one thing which many authors strive to avoid. Both religion and virtue would pass from the earth, if popular literature, with its sex and cesspool flavor, could accomplish that end. But the good book, the book that opens for the mind and spirit windows into the higher places of life, still holds its own and refuses to abandon the field.

"Books are our most faithful friends. They speak when we desire them to speak, and they are silent when we wish them to be silent. For every mood of the soul there is a book; and one BOOK which still can minister to all the moods and desires of the spirit of man."

## Not the Bones of Jesus Christ

A NAME was scratched on a piece of limestone Dr. Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, archeologist of the University of Jerusalem, dug out of the dry soil of the Holy Land late in January. When he got it free of dirt, he deciphered it: JESHUA BAR JOHOSEPH (Jesus, Son of Joseph). The limestone proved to be one side of a box-like ossuary, similar to many found in that district, built to contain the thigh-bone of the deceased.

Dr. Sukenik was careful in his report of his find to make clear that he did not believe the ossuary contained the thigh-bone of Jesus Christ. He said: "The inscription 'Jeshua Bar Johoseph' is to be regarded as a mere coincidence, as no further particulars of the time of entombment or of the life of the man are available. . . . The historicity of the New Testament is reinforced in that we have found on this and hundreds of similar ossuaries many names that occur for the first time in the New Testament but of which we hitherto had no proof that they were current. . . ."

No one need imagine that the body of the Lord Jesus Christ will ever be found. He is risen from the dead, and sits at God's right hand in the same body with which He suffered.

## Bigotry Rebuked in Ireland

THE fears, widely entertained eight years ago, that the Government of the newly-created Irish Free State would use its power arbitrarily, and attempt to squeeze the Protestant minority out of existence, do not, in the light of subsequent experience, appear to have had solid foundation. If further re-assurance were needed, it has been provided by the firmness with which the Free State Minister for Local Government has met a flagrant challenge thrown down by the Mayo County Council. A few weeks ago, the Local Appointments Commissioners recommend a lady for the vacant post of County Librarian. The Library Committee rejected the nomination, and their action was endorsed by the County Council for the threefold reason, that the lady in question was not qualified in the Irish language;

that she was a Protestant and therefore not a fit person to take charge of a library in a largely Romish district; and that she was a graduate of Dublin University, which the Council condemned as an "anti-national" institution. Despite the verdict of a government inspector, following a sworn inquiry, that the County Council had acted illegally, the latter body persisted in their refusal to give effect to what was a clear statutory duty. The government instantly replied by dissolving the County Council, and appointing a commissioner to take over their duties.

Later, at the request of the Local Government Department a special meeting of the County Council was summoned, in order to give that body an opportunity for reconsidering its attitude in the matter. After a discussion lasting nearly three hours, however, the Council affirmed its previous decision by 21 votes to 6. Proposing that Miss Dunbar he appointed, Mr. P. O'Hara said every one of the thirty-eight councillors was anxious to secure the managership of Mayo when the Council had been abolished. Mr. J. J. Duffy, seconding, approved of public appointments being made by the Commissioners because of the bribery rampant in the district. After all, the selection of books lay with the Library Committee, and in addition there was a censorship. The chairman asked whether they ought to be browbeaten by a Minister or induced to change their opinions by the slavish utterances of "Castle Cawtholics." Mr. B. Joyce, opposing the appointment, referred to a letter that he had received from Mgr. d'Alton, Parish Priest of the Roman Church, Ballinrobe.

Supporting the Council's decision, Mr. M. H. Donnell declared that, as a graduate of Dublin University, Miss Dunbar was bound to be a West Briton. He made no apology for introducing religion. It was striking at a fundamental principle to appoint a Protestant librarian. The appointment of a Protestant was intolerable. Mr. Morahan said Trinity was an anti-Irish outpost, and they should shun such an institution like a pest. In the Free State tolerance and slavishness were synonymous. Although opposing Miss Dunbar's appointment, Mr. P. Sweeney said that if the passing of an examination in Gaelic were made a qualifying test, few such appointments would be made in Co. Mayo. Mr. J. T. Ruane observed that the appointment had been opposed on religious grounds by members who cited ecclesiastics as their authorities, but if Mayo were a "Catholic county," surely the appointment of one Protestant would not upset its equilibrium. Some heated interchanges followed.

## Strange Bedfellows

MGR. IGNAZ SEIPEL, Minister of Foreign Affairs and formerly Chancellor of Austria, and Mohammed Abuel-Fadl, rector of Al Azhar University, Cairo, have been added to the joint presidency of the World Conference for International Peace Through Religion, to be held in Washington, D. C., November, 1932. They share the presidency with Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Dr. Albert Einstein of Germany, Sir Rabindranath Tagore of India, the Lord Bishop of Liverpool, England, and Baron Y. Sakatani of Japan.

"The acceptance of Dr. Seipel and Mohammed Abuel-Fadl brings to the movement two outstanding figures in the Roman Catholic and Moslem faiths," said Linley V. Gordon, associate secretary of the conference. "The former is a priest as well as a statesman, who has served the cause of peace during trying times. The latter, as director of the oldest Moslem university, brings to the presidency of the World Conference the finest spirit of Islam."

The faiths represented in the World Conference for International Peace Through Religion already include Christian, Buddhist, Confucianist, Hindu, Shintoist, Moslem, Hebrew, Zoroastrian, Sikh, Jain, Theosophist, Bahaist, the Sufi Movement, Brahmo-Somaj, the Ramakrishna Movement, and the New Thought Movement.

Evangelical Christians will wonder.

## Romanist Protests Alter "Movie" Script

REVISION of the motion picture script of "Seed," Charles Norris' novel purchased for film adaptation by the Universal Pictures Corporation, has been announced by Carl Laemmle, president of the Corporation, in order that doctrines offensive to the faith of millions of Roman Catholics in the United States, will not be included in the picture.

An article by Walter White appearing in *The Catholic Standard and Times*, Philadelphia, of January 2, under the title of "Talks About the Talkies," dealt with the proposed filming of "Seed"—with its advocacy of birth control. Readers of the official organ of the Romanist Archdiocese of Philadelphia were urged to write letters of protest to Mr. Laemmle, pointing out that the subject of the novel was an offense throughout the Roman Catholic world, and that it might work damage to undisciplined minds.

Upon receipt of the letters of protest from readers of *The Catholic Standard and Times* and from Roman Catholics in all sections of the country, Mr. Laemmle determined to undertake a complete revision of the scenario. To this end he obtained the co-operation of Romanist clergy and laity. The final script was read by the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., of St. Louis. The completed version is said to be without the objectionable features of the novel and to uphold the sacredness of maternity.

"Frankly, I am more than pleased with the treatment given to a very dangerous story," Father Lord stated. "There were infinite possibilities in the original for treatment that would have caused much unpleasant controversy."

## Anglican Orders Recognized by Patriarch of Alexandria

THE "Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Alexandria" has passed a resolution requesting the Patriarch to notify its formal recognition of Anglican Orders and its adherence to the encyclical of July 28, 1922, to the Ecumenical Patriarch, the heads of the Orthodox churches, and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The encyclical dated July 28, 1922, in which the Ecumenical Patriarchate announced its acceptance of the validity of Anglican Orders and invited the other Orthodox churches to follow its example, was answered affirmatively by the Churches of Jerusalem and Cyprus. The reply of the Patriarchate of Alexandria and the other Orthodox Churches was deferred till they had received the Patriarch's report of the discussions held in July between the Orthodox delegation to the Lambeth Conference and the Conference's Committee on Unity. The elucidation of certain points then discussed was endorsed in general terms by a resolution of the Lambeth Conference.

When the Patriarch Meletios accepted these orders, in 1922, and asked the different Orthodox Churches to do the same, there were some who demurred. They felt that Anglicans ought to be given an opportunity to speak for themselves. In addition they were not certain as to whether the Church of England was a Reformed Church, or one of the "Sacramental" Churches that style themselves as "Catholic." The acceptance stood as an official document but was not accepted by all the Orthodox.

The conference between Orthodox and Anglican bishops at the recent Lambeth Conference has now apparently cleared up what difficulties remained. The Conference appointed a committee of Anglican bishops to meet the Orthodox and confer with them, and the explanations that these gave as to the Anglican position have now again been accepted by the Orthodox, this time both officially and generally.

This is regarded as a notable and far reaching event in the history of the Church, for more is involved than appears upon the surface.

The Church of England, if its official standards, the "Thirty-Nine Articles" of 1563 are to be used as authority, is in its doctrine, a distinctly Reformed Church. Transubstantiation and the "sacrifice of the Mass" are explicitly rejected. Of Transubstantiation, Article XXVIII says it "is repugnant to the

plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Of Masses, Article XXXI says: "Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." The doctrines of Purgatory, images, invocation of saints, and confession to the priest, are expressly condemned. The thirty-nine articles are Calvinistic and reformed to the core. The Royal Declaration of 1628 concerning the Articles says of them ". . . that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

The Church of England has always taken the position that, while Reformed, it is the English Branch of the Church Catholic. Exactly the same view is taken of itself by the Church of Scotland, which is distinctly a Reformed Church. Neither of these Churches has seen any reason to deny that Reformed Churches are also Catholic in the true sense of the word. The Westminster Confession explicitly affirms this catholicity of the visible church and, so far from surrendering the word "catholic" to Rome, has affirmed that Rome, because of its heresies and corruptions, is no church at all, much less the *Catholic* Church.

From time to time, however, strong influences in the Church of England have sought, heretofore unsuccessfully, to change its Reformed (Protestant) character. They have claimed that the church could not be Protestant and Catholic at the same time, and that the Church of England being a branch of the Catholic Church, should re-establish many doctrines which were rejected in the Reformation,—for example, the Mass, invocations of saints, confessions to the Priest, adoration of the Sacrament, etc. Of late years this party has generally been called the "Anglo-Catholic" party in the Church of England, while those who are seeking to maintain the Protestant character of that Church as by law established, are termed "Evangelical Churchmen." (Modernists in the English Church are generally termed "Broad Churchmen.")

The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England contains a form of service for the Holy Communion which is largely based on historic Christian liturgies, yet without representing the Communion as a "Mass" or in any way an "unbloody continuation" of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary.

The great obstacle in the way of the Anglo-Catholic party has always been the Reformed character of the Thirty-Nine Articles. How could one escape them? Various expedients have been tried, chief of which is the suggestion that instead of being interpreted "in the literal and grammatical sense" as the Royal Declaration requires, they should be interpreted "in the light of the *Prayer Book*." Anglo-Catholics think that they find in some phrases in the Prayer Book a warrant for asserting that the doctrine of the Book is not Reformed but "Catholic" in the only sense in which they will use the word. That their interpretation of the Prayer Book is correct or fair is denied by all but Anglo-Catholics. However, they insist that the Thirty-Nine Articles should be "interpreted" by the Book of Common Prayer,—while what they really do is to "interpret" the articles by their *interpretation* of the Prayer Book. Evangelicals deny the right to "interpret" the Articles by the Prayer Book or anything else save the clear meaning of the Articles themselves. Further they deny that the Prayer Book contains the unreformed doctrines ascribed to it by Anglo-Catholics.

But when the Anglo-Catholics have "interpreted" the Articles, many of them are changed to mean exactly the opposite to what they obviously read. The Article condemning Masses in no uncertain terms is interpreted as approving them! The Article condemning Purgatory is "interpreted" as *teaching* purgatory. Article XXVIII says distinctly that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." But when "interpreted by the Prayer Book" it appears that the Thirty-Nine Articles permit "adoration" of the elements reserved in the Church after the service is over, and that they also permit the use of a "Pyx" in which many Anglo-Catholic clergyman deposit the consecrated elements. Sometimes this Pyx is suspended from the ceiling of the church by a chain so that the faithful can worship its contents. And so, by a process of "interpretation" similar to that of many Modernists, the Thirty-Nine Articles are at last triumphantly adduced as supporting the Anglo-Catholic position. Many Priests of the Church of England advertise and "sacrifice" masses, teaching their people that their Church is not Reformed, but that it is similar to Rome generally except for acknowledging the Pope.

The Anglo-Catholic Movement has gained great headway in England, and has some influence in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. The two English Archbishops, while not labelling themselves as such, have clearly taken the Anglo-Catholic position.

The "Greek" Church, sometimes called the "Orthodox" Church, is the Eastern Branch of Christendom which broke away from the Western Church centuries ago. It is, however, an unreformed Church,—for example, in regard to the Lord's Supper, while claiming to hold to the definitions of the first six General Councils (325-680) it by no means stops short at even 680, but accepts decisions reached at Nicea in 787. When in 1633, Cyril Lucar, then Patriarch of Constantinople, who had become imbued with the Reformed doctrines at Geneva, sought to teach the truths of Scripture in his church he was, after various vicissitudes, falsely accused of treason and strangled in 1638. Synods at Constantinople and Jerusalem, 1638 and 1641, and at Jassy, 1642, condemned the Reformed Doctrines and in the "Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church," then drawn up, crystallised the errors then current in the Greek Church. In regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it affirmed that the substance of the bread and the substance of the wine are by consecration changed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit. The Greek word employed to denote the change in the elements is practically equivalent to the Latin *transubstantiatio*. The Orthodox Confession goes on to assert that after the bread and wine are changed into the true body and blood of Christ, there remain only the species or appearances. In subsequent conciliar decisions, in catechisms, in symbolic pictures, and interestingly enough, in the claim of the Roman Bishops that their doctrine on this subject coincides with that of the Greek Church it is plain that all who contemplate union with the Greek Churches *as they are* must face the fact that they are asking Reformed Churches which reject the Mass and Transubstantiation to ally themselves with Churches that have for centuries taught and practised both.

Anglo-Catholics of the Church of England have been exceedingly anxious that the Eastern Church recognize the Church of England and fraternize with it. This they knew the Eastern Churches would never do as long as they believed the Church of England to be a truly *Reformed* Church. So the Anglo-Catholic party set itself to the task of proving to the Eastern Bishops that the Thirty-Nine Articles must be interpreted by the Prayer Book, and that that interpretation showed the Church of England to be unreformed. After years of hesitance and investigation, the Eastern Bishops have now, on the solemn assurance of a committee appointed by the recent conference at Lambeth, accepted this interpretation. Therefore this "recognition" of the validity of the orders of the Anglican clergy is significant in showing that high parties in the English Church have induced the unreformed "Orthodox" Church to regard the Church of England as neither Reformed nor Protestant.

Experienced observers of the present situation believe that the rejection of the "deposited" (Anglo-Catholic) Prayer Book of 1928 by the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain shows clearly that the English nation and Church are emphatically Protestant at heart. Nor do they believe that the Reformed nature of the Thirty-Nine

Articles can be permanently obscured by "interpretations" which they regard, at bottom, as only denials.

## New Russian Calendars

THE first calendars for 1931 appeared on Jan. 22, in Moscow, combining the anniversary of Lenin's death, January 21, 1924, and the St. Petersburg revolt, January 22, 1905. Though the new year was expected to arrive as usual and plans for printing the calendars were made with the usual gusto, the accomplishment was four weeks late by reckoning, which is not unusual.

The calendars, headed "continuous production in 1931," show the months and the names of the seven days of the ordinary week with the days of the five-day week sponsored by the Soviets, in different colors, each color designating particular individuals' day of rest.

Restaurants and government hotels, having abundant customers, increased their prices of food thirty-five per cent. in honor of the day. Government theatres also increased their prices twenty per cent.

Thus Soviet Russia carries on its attempt to destroy the God-ordained seven day week, an attempt that is doomed to abysmal failure.

## The Sunday Question in England

A TERSE homily on the way to get rid of an unpopular law was delivered Jan. 27, by the Court of Appeals in ruling that London and other British cities must do without motion pictures or other amusements on Sunday because they are in violation of the Lord's Day Observance Act of 1781. If a statute is unpopular, repeal it; don't break it, is the view of the British bench.

"The doctrine that an act becomes obsolescent because a certain number of persons do not like it and therefore do not obey it is a dangerous proposition for any constitutional country," said Justice Scruton in handing down the decision dismissing an appeal of the London County Council against the lower court's ruling that its Sunday licensing system for motion pictures was illegal. He thereupon censured the London authorities for trying to evade the law.

"So long as an act is on the statute books, the way to get rid of it is by repeal and it is not for any subordinate body to take upon themselves the task of disobeying it."

The Sabbath Day Observance Act of 1781 forbids any kind of professional entertainment on Sundays. For the last 20 years, however, the London County Council has granted licenses to moving picture exhibitors within its area to open on Sunday provided that the entertainment was "decent and healthy," that the employees did not work a seven-day week, and that all profits were given to charities. This arrangement, which has been bringing in as much as $1,000,000 a year to various charities, might have continued in operation, but for the desire of theatre and music hall proprietors to enjoy the same privilege. They have accordingly contested the legality of these licenses, with the result that the court has ruled that the County Council has no power to grant them. Its judgment, of course, affects such other municipal authorities as have followed the example of London. In spite of the fact that the statute of 1781 provides a penalty of $500 a day for its infringement, the "movie" proprietors have decided to carry on for the time, and also to introduce into Parliament a bill to repeal the existing statute and thus legalize the opening of all places of entertainment on Sundays.

There would be strong opposition to a bill of this kind, and its prospects of becoming law are very doubtful. At the same time many leaders of the Churches feel that the 1781 Act is unsuited to twentieth-century England and needs amendment. They believe that the defense of Sunday should rely on persuasive argument rather than on coercion imposed by enactments made in a different age. A proposal has come from the Rev. Henry Carter, secretary of the Social Welfare Department of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. While declaring that he is himself against Sunday performances, he recognizes that the matter must be determined by the opinion of the general public. He therefore suggests that Parliament should empower town and county councils to settle for their own areas the Sunday opening or closing of places of entertainment, but on certain fixed conditions, e. g., (1) No Sunday opening for commercial profit. All proceeds, after deduction of legitimate expenses, to go to approved charities. (2) No opening during the hours of Church services. (3) No seven-day work for any employee. (4) A committee, appointed by the local council, to insure that films shown on Sundays do not conflict with the moral sense of the community. Mr. Carter's "local option" scheme would protect those communities which object to Sunday entertainments, while it would not debar such entertainments in places where there is a majority demand for them.

## Calvin Square Church, Budapest

THE largest Presbyterian congregation in the Continent of Europe is the Calvin Square Church, of Budapest, Hungary, which recently celebrated the hundredth anniversary of its establishment. The services of commemoration were attended by representatives of other Presbyterian and Reformed Bodies. It may surprise Americans to know that at the end of the eighteenth century Protestants simply were not allowed to be the citizens of the Hungarian capital. Only after the Edict of Tolerance, issued under the reign of Joseph II., Protestants began to settle down in Pest and Buda, then two separate towns on both sides of the Danube. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were hardly more than a few hundreds of Presbyterians in Pest, when they decided to build a church. It took nearly 30 years to build it, the richer congregations of the whole country helping the small and enterprising congregation of Pest in their great work. There were also non-Protestants who helped in the building of the church. The Romanist bishop of Vác, a city north of Budapest, gave many thousands of bricks as a present, and the rest which were needed for a considerably low price.

The growth of the Pest congregation was remarkable. When the first service was held in 1830, the membership of the congregation was still well under a thousand, they had one Minister for the pulpit and a teacher for their small church school. Now, a hundred years after, the number of Presbyterians, amongst the one million inhabitants of Budapest, is a little over 100,000, and the number of Ministers, Catechists and other workers of eleven congregations is about two hundred. The formation of new congregations, especially during the years following the war, was considerable. The services in a fine and large new church of a newly-formed congregation in Buda began in November, and another new church is under building in Pest. The Central Presbytery is working already to shape a new organization for this large Presbyterian Church of Budapest, and this work of organization is influenced a great deal by the example of the large city congregations of the Scottish Church.

Besides this organization work the centenary of the Calvin Square Church gave a new impulse to the plan to build a large center of the whole Hungarian Reformed Church around the present church, where the block of buildings was acquired by the Budapest congregation as the result of a bargain with the City Corporation of Budapest. When in the coming years this "Calvineum" will be built, it will be the worthy continuation of the heroic work which was done by previous generations of the last hundred years.

Budapest thus ranks as one of the great Presbyterian centers of the world, and the steady growth of the Reformed Faith in Hungary bids fair to be even greater in the future than it has been in the past.

## "Religious Liberty" in Egypt

RELIGIOUS liberty was guaranteed in Egypt some seven years ago, yet today it is not possible for Christians to express their minds freely on social problems without real danger of rousing Moslem antagonism. A young Moslem nurse who was work-

ing in a Church Missionary Society hospital in that country, impressed by the teaching and the Christian life of those around her, decided to become a Christian. After her baptism certain of her relatives insisted that she should be made to return to her Moslem home, but, being very happy in the Christian atmosphere of the hospital compound, she had no wish to do so. Her relatives thereupon appealed to the local court, and she was handed over to them, for by Moslem law an unmarried woman never ceases to be under the guardianship of her nearest male relative.

## Proposed World Council

A PROPOSAL that the Reformed Churches of the world should hold a Council or Conference on the same lines as the Lambeth Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion is attracting some attention. It has been put forward by the Rev. J. A. Findlay, the joint convener of the Church of Scotland Colonial Churches Committee, as the result of a recent mission to Canada. Mr. Findlay suggests that the Church of Scotland should take the lead in this matter, in order that a World Council might be formed.

## Religious Persecutions in Russia

ALTHOUGH it would have been regarded as "unthinkable" a few years ago, the twentieth century has seen in several countries a revival of fierce religious persecution. Perhaps it has not been as severe in any land as in Russia. Latest advices are that Dr. Wilson, Bishop of Chelmsford, England, in a letter to his diocese, quotes from a letter received from the Metropolitan Antony, writing from Belgrade "with full knowledge of what is happening in Russia." This latter declares that "31 Bishops, 1,560 clergymen and more than 4,000 monks have been killed without trial solely for acknowledging our Lord. Besides which 48 bishops, 3,700 priests and more were in prison. The exile prison is an island in the White Sea, where there are said to be 40,000 "convicts" who are brutally mis-used, and under-fed in that terrible climate.

These figures do not include the many lay-confessors who have laid down their lives for the name of Christ.

## The Rejected Anglican Prayer Book

THE ecclesiastical correspondent of The London "Daily Telegraph" gave in a recent issue of that paper a view of the non-salability of the Rejected Prayer Book. He tells us that:—"The Revised Prayer Book is dead—such is the opinion vouchsafed by some of the leading Church booksellers. The head of one such firm told me that during the year ended March last they sold 10,000 copies. At first sight this may seem to be a large figure, even though a considerable proportion of the sales may be attributed to curiosity to examine the book in its final form. I learnt, however, that in the same period the sales of the old Prayer Book amounted to over 200,000. The comparison was startling. If the Revised Prayer Book does not sell now, when is it likely to? My informants all agreed that since the first flush of interest the sales have steadily declined, although there is still a small demand for the Occasional Offices, the new Burial Service, and Baptism Service, which are issued separately." Protestants, who, from the first, have denounced the Bishops' authorisation of the Book rejected by Parliament and illegal in use, are generally rejoicing that the attempt to force it on the Church of England has proved to be a costly failure.

## Westminster Seminary Notes

ALTHOUGH Westminster Seminary is but temporarily located at 1528 Pine Street in the heart of Philadelphia, it has already felt the need for more space with which to properly care for its growing student body. An opportunity for meeting this need, seemingly providentially provided, has recently been presented in the form of an agreement to lease to the Seminary on reasonable terms the residential property at 1526 Pine Street. This property immediately adjoins the Seminary's present location on the east, and the authorities of the institution have just announced that a short-term lease, which will in no respect interfere with the temporary character of the Seminary's present location, has been signed.

The property thus added to the Seminary's facilities almost doubles the amount of floor space immediately available for Seminary uses. The two houses are so built that passage from one to the other is easy without going out upon the public thoroughfare. The new building is now being thoroughly renovated, painted and papered throughout, and should be available for use within about four weeks. The first floor will provide space for a reading room and common room for the students, while on the second floor there are excellent facilities for an expansion of the already crowded library. The remainder of the second floor and the floors above will be used as a dormitory, thus bringing a number of the students closer to the main Seminary building than they have ever been before. The rooms are large and comfortable and will be arranged for the most part in suites of two rooms each, for the occupancy of two students, the students having a common study and a common bedroom. The demand for these new facilities promises to be large.

The annual Day of Prayer for the members of the student body will be held on Tuesday, March third, under the direction of the Rev. T. Roland Philips, Minister of the Arlington Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, Maryland. The day will be opened by the meeting of small group for prayer for colleges, specifically those represented by the alumni in the student body. The later program for the morning, afternoon and evening will be in charge of Mr. Philips. All classes, of course, will be suspended and the day given over to earnest waiting upon God.

## Roman Progress in India

SEVERAL groups of Jacobites, members of a body of some 300,000 oriental Christians in India, are being received into the Roman Church following the lead of their Archbishop Ivanios and Bishop Theophilus, who made their submission to Rome in September. In mid-November Archbishop Ivanios, to whom the Pope had granted faculties of receiving all Jacobites, admitted into the Church thirty-five families, totalling 180 souls, at Mavelikara.

Nearly as many families, including an elderly Jacobite priest, made their submission to Rome at Airur. Two leading Jacobites of Madras, were received recently in that city.

## Spiritism in the Church

AN active interest in spiritualism among some clergymen of the Church of England was revealed January 15th by a meeting held at All Souls Church, London, of the Church of England.

News leaked out of what was supposed to be an invitation affair and ministers of all denominations crowded into the building. Many were turned away.

After the meeting was over, it was announced that a committee had been formed to arrange further gatherings of Ministers which will be attended by a well-known clairvoyant.

## Baptist and Romanist Growth in Russia

SIR BERNARD PARES, professor of Slavonic at London University, and a recognized authority on Russia, recently lecturing in England on religious life in Russia said that due to persecution the two religious bodies making most progress were the Roman Catholic and the Baptist. He did not think it was an excessive estimate to put the number of Baptists in Russia at about 2,000,000. Russian Baptists, he added, are not politically aggressive, but generally speaking, they are men of fine character and destined to play a considerable part in moulding the Russia of the future. The Soviet government is apprehensive of this Baptist movement and is doing its utmost to check it.

BENJ. F. EMERY CO., PHILA