# 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-MARCH, 1931 Vol. 1 No. 11

$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE


# The Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord: Its Importance

THE General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed that it is an essential article of Christian faith that our LORD JESUS CHRIST "rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered." The fact that the General Assembly has deemed it necessary to make such a pronouncement bears witness to the fact that even within the Presbyterian Church there are many who do not hold this opinion concerning the place that the bodily resurrection of CHRIST occupies in Christian thought and life. Within the memory of living men His resurrection—meaning of course, His bodily resurrection—was regarded by friend and foe alike as an article of a standing or falling Christianity. Our fathers, certainly our grandfathers, whether they were Christians or non-Christians, would have been practically unanimous in approving the representation of the late DR. FAIRBAIRN:

> "The resurrection created the church, the risen CHRIST made Christianity, and even now the Christian faith stands or falls with Him. If it be proved that no living CHRIST issued from the tomb of JOSEPH, then that tomb becomes the grave not only of a man, but of a religion, with all the hopes built on it and all the splendid enthusiams it has inspired."

Today, however, there are many calling themselves Christians—and apparently their number is on the increase—who, so far from looking upon CHRIST'S resurrection as an article of a standing or falling Christianity, maintain that it can be discarded altogether without sacrificing anything essential to Christian faith. This, if we mistake not, is one of the fruits of that anti-supernaturalism of thought and sentiment that has become so dominant in recent years even among those calling themselves Christians. In the nature of the case, just as the "non-miraculous Christianity," so much in vogue today, cannot allow that an event so obviously miraculous is needed to account for the orgin of Christianity, so it cannot possibly allow that confidence in its reality is fundamental to the Christian's life and hope. Be this as may, we are fully persuaded that those who take this new attitude toward the resurrection of CHRIST are profoundly mistaken, and that as a matter of fact His resurrection is so essential to Christian faith and hope as to warrant the strong language of PAUL:

> "If CHRIST be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and our faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of GOD; because we have testified of GOD that He raised up CHRIST whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not CHRIST raised: and if CHRIST be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

The basic question at issue in this connection is, of course, the question, Did JESUS really rise from the dead? That is not the question before us now, however. The question before us is rather, assuming the reality of this event does it so enter into the substance of Christianity as to constitute an indispensable element in the religion we profess? It need not be overlooked, however, that, if the resurrection of JESUS is essential to Christianity, the whole mass of that evidence that evinces the truth of Christianity also evinces the reality of the resurrection.

It is impossible in the space at our disposal to even mention all the ways in which the resurrection of JESUS enters as a constitutive and indispensable element in making Christianity what it is. All we can hope to do is to direct attention to some of the more outstanding considerations which make clear that the resurrection of CHRIST is essential to Christian faith and hope.

## IN THIS ISSUE:


Is the Northern Church Theologically Sound?—Editorial Comment ..... 3

Let the Orthodox Unite! ..... 6
John Clover Monsma

What is Truth? ..... 8
R. B. Kuiper

Letters to the Editor ..... 10

Notes on Biblical Exposition ..... 12
J. Gresham Machen

Books of Riligious Significance ..... 14

Ministerial Changes ..... 16

News of the Church ..... 17

To maintain that faith in a resurrected CHRIST is an essential Christian belief is to maintain that this event has more than an evidential value. Its importance in this respect is indeed great. Despite the attacks made upon it, we have no hesitation in saying that it is "the most certain fact in the history of the world." And yet it ought to be clear to all that if the resurrection had only an evidential value, it could not be spoken of as absolutely essential to Christian faith and hope. Somewhat as the testimony of COLUMBUS and his crew was once more or less indispensable as an aid to faith in the existence of this Western continent, but is no longer needed for that purpose, so it might be maintained in that case that though the resurrection was once indispensable to faith it can now be attained in other ways. We hold indeed that the resurrection of CHRIST is the fundamental apologetical fact of Christianity, and that its reality carries with it and substantiates all the main claims of Christianity, including its claim to be the one supernatural religion, but we are far from supposing that its value is only evidential. An essential article in the nature of the case is an article necessary to the very existence of Christianity.

Some of the more outstanding respects in which the resurrection of CHRIST is essential to Christian faith and hope follow:

(1) The resurrection of CHRIST is inseparable from belief in the trustworthiness of the New Testament Scriptures. No doubt if the resurrection were only mentioned here and there in the New Testament Scriptures it would be possible to believe in their general trustworthiness while denying the reality of the resurrection, but in view of the generally admitted fact that the reality of the resurrection is everywhere assumed throughout the New Testament Scriptures it is evident that we cannot deny the reality of this event without believing that said Scriptures are through and through untrustworthy.

(2) The resurrection of JESUS is inseparable from belief in the trustworthiness of JESUS himself. He deliberately staked the validity of His claims, His teachings and His promises on this event. How can we have confidence in Him if His body mouldered under the Syrian skies?

(3) The resurrection of JESUS is an essential element in our conviction that JESUS by His death made atonement for our sins. The thought of JESUS as alive would afford us small comfort apart from our assurance that on the cross He offered up Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to GOD. What would it avail us to be assured that JESUS lives did we not know that by virtue of His atoning death He is qualified to bestow upon us the forgiveness of our sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified through faith in Him? And yet His rising in the same body with which He suffered is inseparable from this conviction. We would not be able to say, "He was delivered for our offenses," if we could not also say, "He was raised again for our justification." CHRIST'S dying for us may show His love for us, His eager desire to save us, but it was His rising again from the dead that showed His power and ability to save us. The most we could do apart from the resurrection would be to repeat the sad words of the disciples on the way to EMMAUS: "We hoped that it was He who would redeem ISRAEL." But accept the words of those who said, "We have seen the LORD," and the death of JESUS becomes not the death of our hopes, but their ground and basis. Then, we too may join in the glad jubilation: "Blessed be the GOD and FATHER of of our LORD JESUS CHRIST who, according to His great mercy, begat us unto a living hope, by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away."

(4) The resurrection of JESUS is an essential element in the revelation of the Christian doctrine of immortality. Christianity does not merely teach the immortality of the soul; it teaches the immortality of the whole man—and the whole man according to the Scriptures and a sound psychology includes a body as well as a soul. CHRIST'S resurrection is both the pledge and the pattern of our own. It is because we believe that He lives in the completeness of His divine-human nature that we have the courage to believe, as we lay away our dead in their graves, that ultimately they shall live again not merely as disembodied souls but in the fullness of their natures.

Such are some of the ways in which the resurrection of CHRIST evinces itself as fundamental to Christian faith and hope. More might be said—for instance the bodily resurrection of our LORD is a presupposition of His return as prophesied in the New Testament—but we hardly think that more need be said. If the thought of the immortality of the whole man is not fundamental to Christianity; if the thought of the trustworthiness of the New Testament is not fundamental to Christianity; more especially if the thought of the trustworthiness of JESUS Himself is not fundamental to Christianity; and more especially still, if possible, if the thought of JESUS as the living One Who by virtue of His death upon the cross is qualified to be our SAVIOUR from sin is not fundamental to Christianity—then surely there is no such thing as Christanity as it has been confessed by the Church of all ages, including the Church today in all its great branches.

We are not absurdly arguing that the resurrection of CHRIST is essential to all that is called Christianity. There are those calling themselves Christians to whom the expiatory death of CHRIST is abhorrent, to whom JESUS is merely the first Christian and in no proper sense an object of worship—even those who say that as far as their religious lives are concerned it would make no difference even if it should be discovered that JESUS never lived. This merely means, however, that we must distinguish between real Christianity and Christianity falsely so called.

In insisting that the resurrection of CHRIST is essential to Christianity we would not be understood as affirming that all those who do not agree with us on this point are non-Christians. That would be the case only if intellectual consistency were a condition of Christian discipleship. Fortunately for many, it is not. We have been discussing, not the terms of salvation, but what it behooved CHRIST to be and do in order that He might save us. Saving faith is not necessarily conditioned by the thoroughness with which the intellect grasps its content and presuppositions. At the same time ignorance and intellectual inconsistency are not advantageous to the maintenance and spread of Christianity, and in the long run we may be certain that genuine Christianity will stand or fall in proportion as the resurrection of CHRIST is rightly grasped and firmly believed.

# "Is the Northern Church Theologically Sound?"

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

UNDER the title "Is the Northern Church Theologically Sound?" Dr. ERNEST TRICE THOMPSON, Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., has written a twenty-five page article that appears in the January issue of the *Union Seminary Review*. This article has been written in the interest of the proposed union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America, more particularly for the purpose of removing what he has found to be the chief obstacle in the way of such a union on the part of Southern Presbyterians. "The argument against union," he writes, "that seems to carry the most weight is the doctrinal argument, not so much an argument as a fear that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (Northern) is unsound in the faith." Dr. THOMPSON maintains that this fear is groundless and that the events in the Northern Church which have aroused the suspicions of many in the Southern Church, rightly understood and fairly interpreted, indicate that "our sister denomination is fundamentally sound in the faith." In the course of his article Dr. THOMPSON reviews and expounds those developments in the Northern Church that have done most to arouse the fears of his own brethren—from the BRIGGS trial in 1892 to the reorganization of Princeton Seminary in 1929. It may be added as a matter of information that the section of the article dealing with the Auburn Affirmation, which Dr. THOMPSON says is "the chief action cited to prove the unsoundness of the Northern Presbyterian Church," has been re-printed in substance in all the weekly papers of the Southern Presbyterian Church, viz., *The Presbyterian Standard, The Presbyterian of the South*, and *The Christian Observer*.

### Doctrinal Soundness Before 1924

Dr. THOMPSON has no difficulty in showing that previous to the publication of the Auburn Affirmation in January, 1924, nothing had happened that indicated any wide-spread unsoundness in the faith in the Northern Presbyterian Church. The reaction of the Church as a whole to the heretical teachings of Professors BRIGGS, SMITH and MCGIFFERT, especially their denials of the inerrancy of Scripture, indicates that during the closing decade of the nineteenth century the Northern Church was still sound in the faith. Again the outcome of the agitation for the revision of its standards which began in 1889 and culminated in 1903 evidences that the Church was still sound in the faith during the opening decade of the twentieth century; for while opinion may differ as to whether the changes made in the standards in 1903 were improvements it is generally admitted that such revision of the standards as was adopted wrought no fundamental change in the doctrinal witness of the Church. Moreover the fact that the union with the Cumberland Church in 1906 was on the basis of the Westminster Standards, as revised in 1903, precludes any one from seeing in that union evidence of wide-spread theological unsoundness on the part of the Northern Church. Yet again the response of the Church at large in 1910, 1916 and 1923 to the actions of New York Presbytery indicates that whatever may have been true of New York Presbytery, and of individuals here and there throughout the Church, the Northern Presbyterian Church as a whole was still sound in the faith, or at least that nothing had happened as yet that justified an opinion to the contrary. In each of these years, as Dr. THOMPSON points out, the General Assembly reaffirmed its adherence to the historic standards of the Church and approved the declaration of the Assembly of 1910 with reference to certain articles of the faith that had been called in question, to wit:

**"1. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.**

**"2. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.**

**"3. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God.**

**"4. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that on the third day He rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession.**

**"5. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God as the supreme standard of our faith that the Lord Jesus showed His power and love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it."**

### The Auburn "Affirmation" of 1924

It will be generally admitted, we believe, that previous to the appearance of the Auburn Affirmation nothing had happened that proved that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. was unsound in the faith. There was indeed plenty to indicate that a considerable number of individuals were unsound in the faith, as judged by Presbyterian standards, but there was lacking definite proof of a wide-spread departure from orthodoxy. We submit, however, in opposition to Dr. THOMPSON, that what has happened since the Auburn Affirmation was first published in January, 1924, indicates the contrary, viz., that while there are still many in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. who are fundamentally sound in the faith yet the majority—if we are to judge a church by its official acts—are rightly spoken of as unsound in the faith.

Whether we or whether Dr. THOMPSON is right in this connection hinges, it seems to us, on the question whether the fact that a man signed the Auburn Affirmation is conclusive proof that he is doctrinally unsound. If Dr. THOMPSON is right in maintaining that it is ignorance of the contents of the Auburn Affirmation, or worse, that lies back of all representations that said Affirmation offers proof that its signers are doctrinally unsound, we are willing to admit that evidence is lacking that proves that the Northern Church is fundamentally unsound in the faith. On the other hand, if the contents of the Auburn Affirmation are really such that it offers incontestable proof that its signers are doctrinally unsound, that fact in connection with the history of the Presbyterian Church since its publication offers, we believe, conclusive evidence that said Church, as judged by its official acts, is fundamentally unsound in the faith. A reference to some of the outstanding events since the publication of the Auburn Affirmation will indicate why we so judge.

### "Affirmationists" Become Dominant

When the Auburn Affirmation was first published in January, 1924, it contained but 150 names. As republished in May, 1924, however, it contained approximately 1300 names with the statement that "the Committee has certain knowledge, through many letters and conversations, that besides the signers there are in our church hundreds of Ministers who agree with and approve of the Affirmation, though they have refrained from signing it." Subsequent events would seem to indicate that the Committee might have used the word "thousands" instead of "hundreds" in the statement just cited and still kept within the truth. Certainly it was not long before those who agreed with or approved the Auburn Affirmation came to be not merely a party of protest but the dominant faction in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Dr. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY was elected Moderator of the General As-

sembly in 1924 by a close vote but since that date no man has been elected Moderator who has not been acceptable to the Auburn Affirmationists. As matters now stand it is generally conceded that no man who has openly opposed the Auburn Affirmationists has any chance whatever of being elected Moderator of the General Assembly. What is more signers of the Auburn Affirmation in increasing numbers are being placed in positions of power and influence and honor in the Church and those who oppose said Affirmation relegated more and more to the background. At the last General Assembly three of the Chairmen of Standing Committees appointed by the Moderator were signers of the Auburn Affirmation and not one of them a man who in any vigorous way had opposed the Auburn Affirmationists. Moreover two out of the three Ministers elected to the Judicial Commission were signers of said Affirmation. What is even more significant a signer of the Auburn Affirmation was elected as editor of the *Presbyterian Magazine, "The Official Magazine of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."* Furthermore four of the fifteen ministerial members of the Board of Foreign Missions and seven of the sixteen ministerial members of the Board of National Missions are actual signers of the Auburn Affirmation, while those who have taken an attitude of pronounced opposition to it are so few as to have no real influence in their councils. Especially significant in this connection is the fact that the "Candidate Secretary" of the Board of Foreign Missions, the man whose function it is to interview candidates for the mission field and whose recommendations in the nature of the case has much to do with their acceptance or rejection by the Board, is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. Perhaps the crowning evidence of the dominance of the Auburn Affirmationists and their sympathizers in the councils of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is supplied by the reorganization of Princeton Seminary in 1929 when the General Assembly took the control of that institution out of the hands of a Board of Directors, the majority of whom were openly opposed to the Auburn Affirmation, and placed it in the hands of a Board of Control acceptable to the Auburn Affirmationists. That we are not misrepresenting the new Board of Control at Princeton is indicated not so much by the fact that two of its members are signers of the Auburn Affirmation as by the fact that the Board as a whole in an official statement has commended these Auburn Affirmationists to the confidence of the Church. It may be added in this connection that the other leading Seminaries of the Northern Church—Chicago, San Francisco, Western and Auburn—not only have Auburn Affirmationists on their governing Boards but on their Faculties as well. More might be said, but surely enough has been said to make clear that *if* the Auburn Affirmation itself offers evidence that its signers are unsound in the faith Dr. THOMPSON's thesis that the Northern Presbyterian Church is fundamentally sound is untenable.

### Are "Affirmationists" Sound in the Faith?

In view of what has been related it seems clear that the question whether conclusive proof exists that the Northern Church is theologically unsound hinges on the nature of the contents of the Auburn Affirmation. To show that a man can both be sound in the faith and a signer of the Auburn Affirmation would not indeed prove that everybody in that Church is theologically sound—Dr. THOMPSON does not allege that that is true of the Northern Church any more than he alleges that it is true of the Southern Church—but it would prove that the "chief evidence that is offered to prove the unsoundness of the Northern Presbyterian Church" is irrelevant and immaterial. In our judgment the Auburn Affirmation offers conclusive evidence that whatever may be true of the rank and file of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. those dominant in its councils are unsound in the faith or at least indifferent to unsoundness in the faith on the part of others.

In expressing the above judgment, we would not be understood as implying that our reaction to the Auburn Affirmation is one wholly of dissent. It is true that the Presbyterian Church merely requires its Ministers to "receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures" and that this does not, in the words of the Affirmation, "require their assent to the very words of the Confession, or to all its teachings, or to the interpretations of the Confession by individuals or church courts." It is also true that the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church can be lawfully amended only by concurrent action of the General Assembly and the Presbyteries; and hence that a mere deliverance by a General Assembly, or even a succession of General Assembles, is without binding authority. We may be at some loss to understand why the Auburn Affirmationists should have felt it necessary to stress what as far as we know nobody ever denied—even the Philadelphia Overture of 1924 asking the General Assembly "to direct that all who represent the Church on the Boards, General Council, Theological Seminaries and every other agency of the Church be required to affirm or reaffirm their faith in the Standards of the Church, together with the historic interpretations as contained in the doctrinal deliverances of the General Assembly, notably that of 1910" expressly stated that said deliverances were regarded "not as an addition to or substitute for the doctrinal standards of the Church, but as a declaration that these doctrines as stated in said Standards are essential to the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures"—but at any rate we are in full agreement with them as regards these two points.

### The "Affirmation" as Repudiating the System of Doctrine of the Westminster Confession

But while it is true that the Presbyterian Church requires its Ministers to "receive and adopt" the Confession of Faith only in as far as it contains the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, *it does require them to "receive and adopt" the Confession of Faith to that extent.* Obviously one cannot "receive and adopt" a system of doctrine and at the same time reject the individual articles that are essential and necessary to that system. That the Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923 mentioned the five particular doctrines they did as essential doctrines finds its explanation wholly in the fact that these were the particular doctrines that were being questioned at that time. They did not assert or even imply that these were the only essential doctrines. Rather they expressly stated the contrary. But while they expressly stated that other articles of faith were "equally" essential and while they advised all the presbyteries to take care not to admit to the ministry those who did not accept "all the essential and necessary articles of the Confession" yet they did declare that "these five articles of faith are essential and necessary." Now, if the aforesaid Assemblies were right in holding that these articles of faith are "essential doctrines of the Word of GOD and our standards" it goes without saying that the signers of the Auburn Affirmation are unsound in the faith inasmuch as they maintain the contrary. This they do in language so clear and explicit as to leave no doubt as to their meaning. If any have read the Auburn Affirmation without realizing this, it must be because they have not read it in the light of the fact that the five doctrinal statements which the Auburn Affirmationists repudiate are the five doctrinal statements of the Assembly deliverances of 1910, 1916 and 1923. We would suggest to our readers, therefore, that before proceeding further they turn back and re-read the Assembly deliverance printed above in bold-faced type. Having done that they will be in better position to perceive the full significance of Section IV of the Auburn Affirmation, to wit;

**"The General Assembly of 1923 expressed the opinion concerning five doctrinal statements that each one 'is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards.' On the constitutional grounds, which we have described, we are opposed to any attempt to elevate these five doctrinal statements, or any of them, to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing in our Church.**

**"Furthermore, this opinion of the General Assembly attempts to commit our Church to certain theories concerning the**

**inspiration of the Bible, and the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ. We all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines; we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our ever-living Saviour; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vicarious death and unfailing presence He is able to save to the uttermost. Some of us regard the particular theories contained in the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1923 as satisfactory explanations of these facts and doctrines. But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our Standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines of our religion, and that all who hold these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship."**

Dr. THOMPSON represents the matter as though the Auburn Affirmation was merely or at least mainly a protest against the assumption that the Constitution of the Church can be amended by Assembly action without the concurrent action of the Presbyteries. Such, however, is obviously not the case and would seem to indicate that he has read the first but not the second paragraph of Section IV of the Auburn Affirmation just cited. Had the Auburn Affirmation confined itself to an attack on the doctrinal deliverances of the Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923 on constitutional grounds we might think it unwarranted but it would afford no warrant for asserting that its signers are doctrinally unsound; but the case is quite different in view of the fact that it went further and denied that its five doctrinal statements express essential doctrines of the Word of GOD and of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, and so doctrines believed by the sincere and intelligent Ministers of said Church. It is not alleged, of course, that all the signers of the Auburn Affirmation reject these five statements as untrue but it is alleged that they all regard them as unessential. However vague the language of the Affirmation may be at many points, it is perfectly explicit at this point.

### The Brief Confession of the Affirmation: Its Real Meaning

No doubt the sentence in the second paragraph of Section IV beginning "We all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines" is fitted to lead the ordinary reader (though hardly a theological professor) to think that the Auburn Affirmationists are soundly orthodox, but if so it will be only because they interpret it apart from its context. When it is interpreted, as it must be interpreted, in the light of the fact that its authors roundly declare that none of the five doctrines specified in the Assembly deliverance of 1923 need be believed even by Presbyterian Ministers, it is perfectly evident that such belief in the inspiration of the Bible as they profess is consistent with belief in its fallibility, that such belief in the Incarnation as they profess is consistent with disbelief in the Virgin Birth of our LORD, that such belief in the Atonement as they profess is consistent with disbelief in the notion that "CHRIST offered up Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to GOD," that such belief in the Continuing Life of our Lord as they hold is consistent with the belief that the body in which He suffered still lies in a Syrian grave, and that such belief in the supernatural power of our LORD as they hold is consistent with the belief that while during His earthly ministry He wrought "many mighty works" yet that He wrought no miracles. If the views expressed in Section IV of the Auburn Affirmation do not prove that its signers are unsound in the faith as judged by Presbyterian standards, we confess we are at a loss to know what would constitute such proof.

### The Attack on the Inerrancy of Scripture

The Auburn Affirmation is particularly explicit in its rejection of the doctrine of Biblical infallibility. It affirms, in fact, that this doctrine is not only false but harmful. "The doctrine of inerrancy," says the Auburn Affirmation, "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 unto 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 and of the Confession of Faith." If space permitted it would be easily possible to show the falsity of every statement in the words just quoted. We must content ourselves however, with directing attention to the fact that the signers of the Auburn Affirmation—despite the fact that every Presbyterian Minister at his ordination affirms that he believes "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be *the Word of God*, the only infallible rule of faith and practice"—assert that the doctrine of Biblical infallibility is not only not an essential doctrine of the Word of GOD and our standards but that it is one that should be opposed on the ground that it is harmful in its effects. Shades of CHARLES A. BRIGGS and HENRY PRESERVED SMITH! They were suspended from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church mainly because they did not believe in the inerrancy of the original manuscripts of Scripture; and yet today nearly 1300 Ministers of said Church proclaim such views and nothing is done about it unless it be to exalt some of the more outstanding of their number to positions of honor and influence in the Church. Surely if, as Dr. THOMPSON alleges, the reaction of the Church to the teachings of BRIGGS, SMITH and MCGIFFERT in the closing decade of the nineteenth century proves that the Church was then sound in the faith, its reaction to the teaching of the Auburn Affirmation proves that it is not sound in the faith at the present time!

Whatever else may be true about the Auburn Affirmation, it is at least certain (1) that it asserts that the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy is not only false but harmful and (2) that it asserts that such beliefs as the virgin birth of our LORD, His bodily resurrection (and by implication His return except in a spiritual sense) and His death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to GOD need not be held even by Presbyterian Ministers. And yet Dr. THOMPSON calmly assures his Southern brethren that the Auburn Affirmation "certainly cannot be taken as proof that a large number of its (Northern Church) Ministers . . . deny the fundamental doctrines of the faith."

### Dr. Casper Wistar Hodge on the "Affirmation"

Here the words of Dr. CASPER WISTAR HODGE of Princeton Theological Seminary are much to the point and make clear that whether or not we approve the Auburn Affirmation, in as far as it was a protest against the right of the Assembly of 1923 to make the doctrinal deliverance it did, said Affirmation offers conclusive proof that all who approve it are unsound in the faith—and that to a serious degree. To quote Dr. HODGE.

> "Whatever may be said as to the right of an Assembly to make any binding doctrinal declarations, the fact is that the plenary inspiration (and hence the inerrancy) of the Scriptures, the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of CHRIST, His substitutionary atonement by which He rendered a satisfaction to divine justice, and His personal return, are not only explicitly affirmed in the Westminster Confession, but are also essential to that common Christianity adhered to by the Romish, Greek, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and essential to the Christianity of the New Testament. Two of these doctrines—the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of our Lord—were held to be essential to Christianity even by the Socinians who attacked the other doctrines of common Christianity and of Christendom."

### The View of Dr. F. W. Loetscher

Surely Professor FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER, Professor of Church History in Princeton Seminary put it with all possible mildness,

and yet in a way that contradicts the representation given by the Professor of Church History in Union Seminary of Richmond, when he wrote:

"According to the Auburn Affirmation, there are apparently hundreds of our Ministers who, whatever may be their conception of the nature of their ordination vows, want liberty to hold, 'as explanations' of some of the fundamental 'facts and doctrines of our religion,' 'theories' which not only do not agree with, but flatly contradict, the sense in which our Church has always held these 'facts and doctrines.'" (*The Presbyterian*, Feb. 12, 1931.)

### More Recent Events

Dr. THOMPSON also devotes considerable space to the Report of the Special Commission of Fifteen and the reorganization of Princeton Seminary with the purpose of showing that neither of these events afford any warrant for questioning the orthodoxy of the Northern Presbyterian Church. But, as we have already intimated in the case of the reorganization of Princeton Seminary, neither of these events has any independent significance in this connection. Most of the report of the Special Commission is taken up with matters that have no bearing on the matter now before us; and while the Special Commission put on record "its deep conviction that the great body of the Church is sound in the faith, even when that faith is judged by the strictest Standards" yet the question whether that conviction is well-grounded hinges on the nature of the Auburn Affirmation. If the Auburn Affirmation is theologically indifferent that conviction may rest on a solid basis of fact, but if, as we think we have abundantly shown, said Affirmation offers conclusive proof of the theological unsoundness of its signers and sympathizers, that conviction is quite untenable. What is true of the report of the Special Commission is also true of the reorganization of Princeton Seminary. If the placing of that institution under the control of a Board that is acceptable to Auburn Affirmationists involves nothing inimical to the continuance of its historic doctrinal position there may be no warrant for fearing for its future, but if the Auburn Affirmationists are as unsound in the faith as we have represented them it seems quite certain that the future of Princeton Seminary will be quite different from its past.

In concluding his article Dr. THOMPSON makes this significant remark: "We have not reported unsupported charges or criticisms, but have preferred to follow the actions of the Assembly itself, and the reports of responsible committees appointed by the Assembly." We wonder if Dr. THOMPSON is as naive and unsophisticated as this remark would seem to indicate. Apparently he is not aware that the Special Commission of Fifteen, in the judgment of many Presbyterians, was hand-picked for the purpose of securing a report that would be acceptable to the Auburn Affirmationists, more particularly that would be acceptable to New York Presbytery and thus prevent a threatened split in the Church. Apparently he is also unaware that the Committee appointed to investigate conditions at Princeton Seminary was a thoroughly partisan committee and that the report it presented was a thoroughly partisan report—a report moreover that has repeatedly been shown to abound in inaccuracies and misrepresentation of the grossest sort. The result is, of course, that Dr. THOMPSON, wittingly or unwittingly, has given us a purely *ex parte* account of these recent events in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

### The Proposed Church Union

Dr. THOMPSON's article, as we have said, is written in the interest of the proposed union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches. If such a union is consummated, he says, "it will be on the basis of the historic standards; no other basis is considered." Such a representation, as was pointed out in the February issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, is far from accurate inasmuch as the plan as proposed involves a wide departure from the existing standards of the Presbyterian Church (Northern and Southern) as regards both doctrine and polity. According to the historic standards Ministers are required to "receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing *the system of doctrine* taught in the Holy Scriptures"; but, according to the proposed plan, they will merely be 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 would virtually mean that Ministers of the united church need not be Calvinists. 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 lacking in our standards, viz., the doctrine of the infallibility of church courts, in face of the fact that had LUTHER and CALVIN and ZWINGLE and KNOX accepted the decisions of church courts as final there would have been no Presbyterian and Reformed churches.

# Let the Orthodox in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Unite!

## A Plea for a "Reformation Fellowship"

By the Rev. John Clover Monsma
Formerly Editor of "The Ministers' Monthly"

THAT the morale of the orthodox forces in American Protestantism has been seriously impaired no honest observer, however staunch in the faith and sanguine as to its ultimate victory, can well deny.

There are certain deep-lying causes which could be dwelt on extensively. But that would carry us too far afield. In a book which the present writer has now in preparation and which Rae D. Henkle, Inc., Publishers, New York City, will bring out early next fall under the title "Principles and Methods of Church Reformation" the question of causes and remedies will be more broadly discussed.

There are a number of tactical mistakes, however, that in the writer's opinion the orthodox in their contest with the liberals have been constantly making and that have contributed not a little to the present doleful situation, and it is to these that the reader's attention is directed just now. That the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., is singled out as the special field of observation and action should not affect the interest of readers of other communions. Much of the comment, we believe, will be found applicable to Protestantism in general.

One of the tactical mistakes referred to is the general habit of the orthodox to refer to themselves as "conservatives." There is an unfavorable tang to that name. It is frequently considered synonymous with non-progressives, stand-patters, religious antiquaries, or something to that effect. It strikes people as being incongruous with our mentality, our peculiar national psychology. We are progressive, forward-looking. Why not use the name "orthodox," which simply means right and sound in doctrine, and which does not preclude, even by inference, true progress along straight lines and ambitious, lofty building on bed rock foundations? After all, we are far more aggressive in our plans and ideals than the liberals, liberal propaganda notwithstanding. Any other notion must be curbed, rather than thoughtlessly and carelessly helped along.

We of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., make another very serious mistake. We are frightfully careless in our choice of office-bearers, of pulpit-committees, and especially of commissioners to the General Assembly. The writer has been urged on several occasions to vote for this or that man as a commissioner to General Assembly because

of his "fine qualities," because he had relatives in the city where the Assembly was being held, because he was anxious to take the trip, etc. Candidates for commissioner will themselves solicit votes, on occasions. And thus we form our august, all-controlling Assemblies! Presbyteries usually find themselves in Stygian darkness regarding the principles and convictions of the delegates they send out; only the "councils" and "committees" seem to know.

A further mistake is our failure to make use of our constitutional rights of dissent, protest, complaint, etc. Why don't our professors, Ministers, editors, elders, yes, and even ordinary church members, make use of those rights? Why don't they provide the dockets of sessions, presbyteries, synods and assemblies with material strong and martial enough to force those bodies away from their mechanical contrivances, statistics and routine, out of their spiritual doldrums, and into the fresh, full winds of God?

Furthermore, there is a matter of an altogether different nature. By our inaction as orthodox people we have allowed others to become our mouthpieces—men and women with a burning love for the Gospel, it is true, but oftentimes having wrong, un-Presbyterian conceptions of the Gospel they love, and with little or no knowledge at all of historic, orthodox theology. "Fundamentalism" today is a term that covers a host of sects, persuasions, movements, opinions and vagaries. And historic Presbyterians, who mean to build on the scholarly foundations laid by the fathers, who still glory in the majestic elevations and unplumbed depths of the Standards of Westminster, the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Canons of Dort, and other similar products of the Reformation—find themselves judged by the trumpetings of all the "fundamentalists" in America and thereupon with a kindly smile pronounced unscholarly, not worthy of serious attention.

Closely akin to this is the accusation that we are too "otherworldly," and our mistake in letting that accusation stand. There is no group of Christians so thoroughly, vitally interested in this present, ordinary, workaday world, with all its difficulties and problems, its laughter and tears, than the historic Presbyterians, or Calvinists, if you will. Their doctrine makes it so. We need only point to the Netherlands, where Presbyterianism came to a new outburst of life during the past half-century, as the result, under God, of the reformatory efforts of Abraham Kuyper and associates. Beginning with church reformation, the great Dutchman soon broke into other fields—those of education, society, and politics. The end of the struggle saw Kuyper at the head of the Dutch cabinet—Prime Minister of Holland and The Dutch East Indies, controlling to a large extent the spiritual and worldly circumstances of some fifty-seven millions of people. All that happened just recently.

Still another mistake we have made. We have allowed the curricula of our theological seminaries—the fountainheads of the Church's thought-life—to become cluttered up with modernistic subjects. The subject to which our fathers gave first place, that of systematic theology, has been well nigh crowded out. When our preachers enter the ministry they know less about doctrine than thousands of laymen do in the churches of Scotland or in the Free Reformed churches of the Netherlands. We have also failed to preserve another subject of tremendous importance—that of the principles of church polity and government. We are "machine-ridden" because hundreds of our Ministers do not know the first thing about the Scriptural principles of ecclesiastical polity, and simply function as agents of the Boards. Dr. Charles Hodge has well said, now almost a century ago: "As our Church became lax in matters of government, it became, *pari passu* [with corresponding speed], lax in doctrine." (Princeton Review, 1838, p. 463.)

We have also suffered from a lack of concerted action. Tens of thousands of orthodox Presbyterian church people are scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but they fail to be a support to one another because of their lack of cohesion, their failure to stand and act unitedly, their tragic supineness in ecclesiastical life. We hear enough of dirges and lamentations, as though David had reference to the liberals when he sang, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power," or when he jubilated in another psalm, "The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it." The liberals, yes! For while some of the orthodox were in a deep swoon, and others were making funeral song and music, the liberals put their heads together, held conferences, made graphs and blue-prints, laid out plans of strategy, occupied their places behind the officers' tables at church councils, and by a variety of well-thought-out-devices captured the ecclesiastical strongholds.

That we need a general, thoroughgoing reformation no loyal disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ and faithful member of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., will deny. But there has been too much talk in late years and no strong, well-planned action. If we wish to save our precious heritage there must be action. Christ will take care of his Church in general. The gates of hell shall not prevail against it. But church organizations as such have not that promise. They may deteriorate and collapse. They may be wiped out of existence entirely or continue only in name. Church history teaches frightful lessons in this connection. And think of the fate of countless immortal souls when such a calamity happens! And—what is far more—think of the honor of the King Supreme to whom such church organizations had once sworn perpetual allegiance!

There is, of course, the extremely important question of the *character* of our reformation. Shall we make a general spiritual revival our goal? That, of course, is an essential, an absolute prerequisite. Shall we emphasize evangelism of an interdenominational sort? Shall we seek purity in doctrine only and ignore church polity and the exercise of church discipline?

It seems to this writer that anything short of a complete, thoroughgoing, Calvinistic reformation would not meet the situation. As a Presbyterian people we confess to have a religious heritage that represents Christianity in its purest and noblest expression. We humbly believe—and we say it with a full measure of love for our fellow-Protestants of other communions—that with all our shortcomings and imperfections we come closest in our system of faith and government to the perfect and eternal Word of God. We believe to be closest to the Truth Divine. And we also believe, as a maxim eternally valid, that truth admits of no compromise.

As Presbyterians we should be untrue to God, to the fathers in various lands who shed their life blood for our particular faith, to the hundreds of scholarly men of history who devoted their lives to the development of our system, to our own consciences also, if in the reformatory work that God calls us to do we should roughhew our path, be indifferent as to particulars, ignore the "non-essential" elements of our faith and polity, tone down here and whittle down there for the sake of union with non-Calvinistic believers, and after all continue to move in the murky, misty atmosphere that has enveloped American ecclesiastical life, lo, these many, many decades.

To have our Presbyterian Church continue what it was, a strong, important, powerfully functioning section of the Church universal, our orthodox men and women—laymen as well as preachers—must be up and doing. There is no time to be lost! God the Holy Spirit desires to use us this very instant!

There is one first great step to be taken. It is to ascertain our strength. Elijah thought he was the only one who had not yet bowed his knee to Baal. God revealed to him that there were seven thousand others besides. At times our God cares very little about figures. Sometimes, not the least in extraordinary crises, He cares a great deal.

We must find out the numerical strength of those still true to Jehovah and to the Christ of the Gospel. We have been beating the air so far, in that respect. This writer has a lurking suspicion that our opponents might not welcome the information.

To procure this information we suggest the organization of a "Reformation Fellowship." All those favoring a reformation could join it, both preachers and laymen, both men and women. Such a Fellowship would hold the following advantages:

(a) As stated before, it would reveal our numerical strength. Though we could not expect to reach every last orthodox member

of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., yet it would cause the fog to lift sufficiently to enable us to observe the layout of our ecclesiastical landscape.

(b) The mere fact of the organization of such a Fellowship, but especially the facts revealed after it got to functioning, would raise our morale, which is now so deplorably low.

(c) It would open the way for concerted action—the very thing we have been lacking up to the present time.

(d) Congresses could be held under its auspices in such large centers as New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, and San Francisco or Los Angeles, where able, orthodox church men could deliver spiritual and scholarly lectures dealing with reformation problems, followed by general discussions.

(e) Under its leadership we could gradually seek to eliminate the various "tactical mistakes" mentioned in this article. At least, we could make determined efforts in that direction.

(f) The Fellowship could prepare for a thoroughgoing reformation. This would involve a great deal. It would involve far more than a correction of "tactical mistakes." Space limits forbid us to enter into details at this point.

(g) With its leaders aglow for Jesus Christ and his truth the Fellowship could become a spiritual radiation center for the whole Church, to the glory of the triune God.

In suggesting and urging the organization of such a Fellowship we would stress particularly the great need of constantly showing true love for those who differ from us. The majority of those who have left the paths of the fathers have done so in ignorance. We are convinced of that. In the case of many, many others the situation may be accounted for by the fact that they lack faith and spiritual vitality. Only a handful, comparatively, are making premediated and determined attempts to wreck that which was bequeathed to us. But even with regard to that "handful"—though our attitude in defense of the truth should be most determined and aggressive—the Law of Love should reign. We must fight them to save them.

The writer would invite all those who sympathize with the idea of a "Reformation Fellowship"—both men and women—to write to him. He may be addressed at Oostburg, Wisconsin.

# What Is Truth?

## A Sermon

By the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, D.D.
President of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.

*Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? John 18:38.*

JUST what did Pilate mean when he asked, *What Is Truth?* What was he driving at? In what tone of voice did he put the question? Did he ask it seriously or sneeringly? Did he mean to say: "I hear thee speak of the truth, King of the Jews. Thou sayest that thou camest to bear witness to the truth. Now that interests me keenly. I have long been an earnest seeker after the truth. Thus far, however, I have failed to find it. Canst thou really tell me what it is? If so, pray speak"? Or did he have in mind something like this: "Do I hear thee speak of the truth, thou Jewish Rabbi? But what's the use? Haven't men been searching for the truth for ages, and haven't they uniformly failed to find it? It is perfectly evident by this time that man cannot know the truth. Then let's quit talking about it."

To us it seems that Pilate asked his question in the latter spirit: not seriously, but sneeringly and scornfully.

It is a matter of common observation that a person whose education has been very limited will often speak with much more confidence about the truth than one with a broad liberal education. Here is a man who never graduated from the eighth grade, whose reading is confined to the daily paper, and who has never traveled outside his own state. When he answers the question *What Is Truth?* he does it with so much confidence, cocksureness even, that one can hardly escape the impression that he knows it all or at any rate thinks he does. And here is a university graduate whose reading is remarkably comprehensive, and who has traveled around the globe. When he tries to answer the question *What Is Truth?* he does it with so much hesitation that after a little you begin to wonder whether he knows anything at all.

The explanation of this seemingly strange phenomenon is easily discovered. The uneducated man has only his own ideas and it never occurs to him to call them into question. The educated man, on the other hand, is in touch with the ideas of others, has made the discovery that others know something too. He has observed that when opinions clash it is frequently very difficult to decide which is right. And so he finds the question *What Is Truth?* a hard one to answer.

Now let us apply this to Pontius Pilate.

He was a Roman. He was an educated Roman. He was an educated Roman of the first century of the Christian era. The Romans had subdued the world. The Roman eagle had flapped its wings over the whole of the then known world. In their conquests the Romans had come into contact with all kinds of peoples, all kinds of philosophies, all kinds of religions, all kinds of answers to the question *What Is Truth?* They had made the discovery that they, the Romans, did not know it all, that other peoples knew something too. It had even occurred to them that the gods of the Egyptians, the Babylonians, and the Greeks might be just as real and just as great as their own. They had begun to question whether the traditional Roman definition of the truth was quite correct. The Roman mind had been thrown into a state of quandary. Educated Romans especially had lost their moorings. Agnosticism was the philosophy of the day. And no doubt it was in the spirit of agnosticism that Pilate put the question *What Is Truth?* He meant to say: "What it is anyhow? Nobody knows."

We of the year of our Lord 1931 are as compared with previous generations well educated. Education is much more general today than even a generation ago. Today almost everybody gets a high school education and the demand for a college eudcation is so general that many colleges have had to place a limit on the number of their students. Almost all of us do considerable reading, though likely the quality has not kept pace with the quantity. Modern conveyances have made travelers, at least tourists, of most of us. The radio broadcasts much information and many views. May that not be one reason why many find it increasingly difficult to answer the question *What Is Truth?* If we were less well educated the problem might appear simpler.

Then too, our age is hardly one of traditionalism. Time there was when a young man was pretty sure to be a Republican if his father was, and a young lady would almost certainly join the Methodist church if her mother belonged there. But this time is rapidly passing. Nowadays young people

clamor for something different and often throw overboard the old just because it is old. Consequently it is not surprising that many of them have begun to doubt whether the answer which their parents, teachers, and preachers give to the question *What Is Truth?* and which they accepted without argument in childhood is after all correct.

Let us face a concrete question here. There are several religions in America, each of which gives its answer to our question. To mention just a few, there are Christianity, Liberalism, Humanism, Mormonism, Christian Science, Spiritism, and Buddhism. How do you know that the traditional Christian answer to the question *What Is Truth?* is correct and that all other answers, though of course not wrong in every detail, yet are essentially false? *Do* you know it?

Now don't worry! Don't suppose that we would sow the seeds of skepticism! God forbid that we should do anything of the kind! But we are trying to impress you with the exceeding difficulty of our question. And in doing that we would go a step farther still. So extremely difficult is this question that all men everywhere, if left to themselves, would never be able to answer it. The reply is far beyond the reach of the finite and sin-darkened mind of men. The only reason why we can answer it is that God has seen fit to reveal the truth to us. Apart from revelation agnosticism is reasonable. If divine revelation be left out of consideration it must be granted that Pilate was right.

II

It must have seemed almost ridiculous to Pilate to hear Jesus say: "To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth." Think of it! From time immemorial the whole human race had been in quest of the truth. The greatest thinkers had earnestly pondered the question *What Is Truth?* And the upshot of it all was that educated men had despaired of ever discovering the truth. They were sure of but one thing: that the truth could not be known. On a certain Friday morning along comes a Jew, a despicable Jew. He happens to come from Galilee, where the people were notoriously uneducated. And he is a prisoner in chains. All of a sudden he puts forth a stupendous claim. Says he in effect: "What the greatest philosophers of mankind in spite of mighty efforts have failed to find that I am come to disclose. I know what is the truth. To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth." Then Pilate could not suppress a smile, a sneer. He felt that there stood before him a religious fanatic. Perhaps he thought the Nazarene a paranoiac.

Would that the Roman had been willing to listen to the Jew! Would that the judge had come down from his throne, had invited the defendant to take his place, and then had humbly seated himself at his feet to listen to his words! Then Pontius Pilate would have learned the answer to the question *What Is Truth?* and would have been delivered from the bondage of error into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But alas! he was too proud for that.

Let not us be so proud. Let us even now very humbly, as little boys and girls, mere school children, sit down at the feet of the Divine Teacher to hear from His lips the answer to our question.

God is truth. About that there can be no reasonable doubt. It is a truism. To be sure, the gods of ancient mythology rather frequently committed dishonesties, but that very fact is proof that they were no gods. If there is a God, if God is God, He must be truth.

It follows that the truth does not change. As God is the unchangeable, with whom is no variableness or shadow of turning, so also the truth is the same yesterday, today, and forever. It is often suggested that the holy men who wrote the Scriptures did indeed write the truth for their day, but that the truth has changed so radically since that by this time the Bible is hopelessly out of date. The fact is that if the Bible ever was true it is true today.

God's revelation is truth. That is another truism. If God Himself is truth, then His revelation cannot but be truth.

God has revealed Himself in His Word. By His Word we mean both the inscripturated Word, the Bible, and the personal Word, Jesus Christ. The two are inseparable. The authors of the various books constituting the Bible were controlled by the Spirit of Christ, the great Prophet. And all the light of Scripture gathers round the sublime person of Christ. Both are truth. Said Jesus: "Thy Word is truth," and "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

We shall not weary you at this time with the traditional dozen or more proofs that the Bible is the Word of God. We are addressing a Christian assembly and take it for granted that you are convinced already. But allow us to shed a little light by means of an illustration on what has been called the most conclusive reason why Christians honor the Bible as the very Word of the living God. We refer to the testimony of the Holy Spirit within the Christian.

Let us assume that my father is in an adjoining room, the door to which is closed. I know him. I *know* him. Some of you have perhaps a superficial acquaintance with him, but not one of you *knows* him as do I. Now he speaks in his natural voice. At once I say: "That's my father speaking." If you ask me how I know my simple reply is: "Don't I know my own father?" You, however, do not recognize his voice because to you it is the voice of a stranger.

Listen! The Christian is a regenerated person. And every one who is born of the Spirit knows God. Consequently he recognizes God's voice as a matter of course, let us say intuitively. When he opens his Bible he knows at once that God, his heavenly Father, is speaking.

Not all truth is contained in the Bible. Don't let that statement alarm you. The whole Bible is true, but there is much truth not recorded in Holy Writ. That Columbus discovered America in 1492 and that George Washington was the first President of these United States are facts about which the Bible says nothing. There is a general revelation of God in nature and history as well as a special one unto salvation in the Bible. The former is as true as the latter. Surely, it behooves us Christians to study the one as well as the other. And let us never worry that the proper study of nature may lead our young people away from God. Let us be on our guard against science falsely so called and at the same time remember that the truly scientific pursuit of any branch of learning must of necessity lead the student Godward.

We come to a most interesting though difficult problem. Those who accept the Bible as the Word of God frequently differ among each other in its interpretation. This accounts in large measure for the rise of the various denominations. To be more concrete, there are Roman Catholics and Protestants, Calvinists and Arminians, Pedobaptists and those who would baptize only adults, Premillenarians, Postmillenarians, and A-millenarians. Now how are we going to decide which of various interpretations is correct, which has the best claim to being truth?

The problem is not altogether so bewildering as some would have us think. One frequently hears the remarks that there is hopeless confusion regarding the interpretation of Holy Writ. That is by no means the case. All those churches which hold unqualifiedly to the Bible as the truth have a common confession. We refer of course to the Apostles' Creed. It is a concise statement of certain fundamentals of the Christian faith, all of which are obviously taught in the Bible. It may well be called the norm of a church's Christianity. All Christian churches honor it. The church which rejects such doctrines as the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth of Jesus, and so on, forfeits its claim to the Christian name.

But we may go a step farther. Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would lead the church into the truth throughout the centuries. It goes without saying that this promise has been kept. Consequently there runs through the history of the Christian church a stream of orthodoxy, a line of truth. In the days of the apostles the church stood on the solid foundation of the truth. Almost at once error crept into the church. It began to prevail. The King and Head of the church at the right hand of God, mindful

of his promise, filled a certain man, or perhaps certain men, with the Spirit of truth. They reasserted the truth and called the church back to it. The church gave heed. Again error crept in. Again it began to prevail. Again Christ filled a certain man with the Spirit of truth. Again the church gave heed to his message. Such has been the history of the Christian church from the beginning to this day, and thus no doubt the course of its history will continue until Jesus comes again. The line of orthodoxy runs from Paul to Augustin, to the great reformers of the sixteenth century as Luther and Calvin, to the recent scholarly defenders of the faith, such men as Orr in Scotland, Kuyper and Bavinck in the Netherlands, Hodge and Warfield in our own America. All these men interpreted the Bible in essentially the same way. In essence they all reasserted the doctrines of the apostle Paul. Every one of them was an apostle of the truth.

We want to call special attention to one truth which all of these teachers stressed with all the powers at his command. It is the doctrine of salvation, not by works or by character, but by the sovereign grace of God in Jesus Christ. The Bible has been rightly called the Book of Salvation, and on this point in their interpretation of the Book they were an absolute unit. And do not all Christians in all denominations agree on this all-important point? Every sincere Christian, no matter what his theoretical theology may be, in his heart of heart is convinced that the one way to be saved is by sovereign grace.

To put the matter somewhat differently, the truth is expressed in the great historic creeds of Christendom, most precisely in such monumental expressions of the Reformed faith as the Westminster Confession.

It seems hardly necessary to add that the creeds are not of equal value with the Bible, that the two may not be said to be truth in altogether the same sense, that the church's confessions are not as authoritative as is God's own Word. That goes without saying. The holy men who wrote the Bible were guided infallibly by the Spirit. That claim cannot be justly made for the church in its interpretation of the Bible.

We should add that there is no good reason to suppose that the church at the time when the creeds were written had all the light on the truth that it would ever receive. To the contrary, the history of the Christian church is evidence that the Spirit leads the church in the truth progressively. To be sure, this progress is by no means uninterrupted. It may best be pictured by a zigzag line, rather than by a straight line running upward at a considerable angle. But the zigzag line too tends upward. And so it may well become the church's duty from time to time to add to its creed by virtue of additional light shed by the Holy Spirit on the truths of Scripture.

III

Let us suppose that all of us are agreed on the answer which we gave to the question *What Is Truth?* What does that mean? Does it follow that we are Christians? We reply with emphatic negative. It does follow that we are orthodox. But orthodoxy is not synonymous with Christianity. Orthodoxy—we shall not now seek to determine precisely to what degree—is indeed essential to Christianity, but it does not constitute the very essence of Christianity.

What the bones are to the human body that orthodoxy is to Christianity. Imagine a body without bones. Is it really a body? Hardly. It is just a lump of flesh. So Christianity without orthodoxy is not really Christianity. It is a nonentity. On the other hand a body consisting solely of bones is not a body either. It is a skeleton, and skeletons are wont to be dead. Such is orthodoxy without Christianity.

There is such a thing as the orthodoxy of demons. James tells us that they believe that there is but one God. About that they are absolutely right. But he adds that they tremble. For all our orthodoxy you and I might conceivably be demons trembling on the brink of hell.

What then constitutes one a Christian? Not merely to know about the truth, but to know the truth. Not just to know some, or for that matter many, things about God, but to know God personally. We must be able to say with the psalmist of old: "I love the Lord." We must sing from the heart:

"My Jesus, I love thee, I know thou are mine;
For thee all the follies of sin I resign.
My gracious Redeemer, my Savior, art thou;
If ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now.
I love thee because thou hast first loved me
And purchased my pardon on Calvary's tree;
I love thee for wearing the thorns on thy brow;
If ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now."

That constitutes Christianity.

And to such knowledge Christ referred when He spoke those mysteriously deep words: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

# Letters to the Editor

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

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: We all thank you for your ringing editorial in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. I refer to the editorial in reply to an open letter from Rev. Roberts Williams referring to Westminster Seminary. We have heard before much of this talk of a "rebel institution," "outlaw seminary" and that *ad nauseam.*

Thank God that in these days of apostasy there are yet the seven thousand, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal.

May you and the heroic band that centers about Westminster Seminary be sustained and prospered, and be instrumental in leading us all out of the wilderness of present day unbelief.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM A. GERE.

Syracuse, N. Y.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Thank God for the stand you are making. Too bad we don't have more that will come out and meet the issue straight in the face. I think Mr. Williams should join the Roman Catholic Church. I hope this will open his eyes and some of the eyes of others that are in the same class. Fight the good fight of faith.

Kindly renew my subscription.

In "Him."

C. A. BALCOM.

Olivet Presbyterian Church,
Volga, South Dakota.

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Only a line to express my thanks for current number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. If you could see it today—scored as it is from first page to last—you would at least see how appealing—deeply interesting—how delightful it is to an old retired preacher like me. We surely need such clear cut definite teaching today.

May you be long spared to bear such vital faithful testimony to God and His Word.

In all sincerity yours,
GEO. WM. FARYON.

Winnipeg, Canada.

## Mr. Williams' Rejoinder

*To the Editor of* CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I thank you for your courtesy in printing my letter. You render a distinct service in permitting such full and free discussion of vital church problems in your columns. I do not know offhand of any other church publication that would have

printed a letter so frank as mine upon a controversial question. May I ask you as a further courtesy to print this brief rebuttal.

In reply to Mr. Shrader I simply state the independent existence of Westminster Seminary competing with official denominational seminaries is not so far as I know subject to attack under our constitution. The wisdom and spirit of objection shown toward the solution of the Princeton problem by the General Assembly that marked its founding may admit of differences of opinion. I based my case on the facts that in its official appeal for funds and in the unofficial publications of some of its officials and apparently avowed spokesmen attacks were made upon the official seminaries of our denomination, their officers and teachers, specifically upon their doctrinal soundness. I contend such attacks are disturbing the peace and unity of our church and that our constitution specifically requires our Ministers and elders to preserve these as well as the doctrinal purity of the church. Possibly the legal term used should not be "rebellion" but "disturbing the peace" and perhaps also "bearing false witness against brethren." If the charges of doctrinal heresy or indifference thereto are not false and do warrant disturbing the peace and unity of the church let those who make such charges bring the offenders to trial in their presbyteries.

In reply to the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY I would reply that the doctrine of private judgment justly applied means the individual Protestant Christian has the right and duty in the light of Scripture and as he is led by the Holy Spirit to determine whether or not he will accept as true and obey the decrees or deliverances of any court, civil or church. Our Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., allows under its laws considerable latitude for differences of doctrinal interpretation and for protest and agitation against acts of our courts. But our constitution also in its letter and spirit provides that the courts, by due process of law, may discipline the members and officers of our church even to the point of expulsion for offences against the peace, unity and purity of our church if the COURTS, not the individuals, deem such discipline necessary. The courts determine under our laws who are or who are not guilty of heresy or of indiscipline. It is no defence against discipline for acts the courts deem prejudical to the peace and good order of the denomination to state the objectors are doctrinally sound and their opponents unsound. Let there be separate heresy trials for the opponents. The individual Christians retain the conscientious right to withdraw from the denomination and we may applaud their obedience to conscience while as strongly upholding the courts in taking disciplinary action.

I deem it unfair to make it appear I discriminate against Westminster and in favor of Union. I do not approve of Union's theological position. It may be the duty of their presbyteries to discipline their members who teach in or support Union. But Union to the best of my knowledge does not appeal to our congregations for funds, its teachers and officers do not commend it to our church by attacking the official seminaries as unsound.

If it has a place in this rebuttal may I state that I doubt if it can be shown that any Auburn Affirmationists have spoken in Princeton Seminary, at least since 1914, except Doctors William T. Hanzsche and Henry Van Dyke. The first spoke by invitation of the students, the second spoke only on the Book of Common Worship. Neither officially occupied the pulpit to uphold any doctrinal position whatever. Both are Ministers in good standing in our denomination and both hold high official positions in our church. To the writer it would seem to be rank discrimination for an official seminary to refuse these brethren invitations to speak on any topic in the seminary.

ROBERTS WILLIAMS.

Bordentown, N. J.

## Editor's Note

MR. WILLIAMS' "rebuttal," it seems to us, might better have been called a retraction. For while formerly he branded Westminster Seminary as a "rebel institution" and its supporters as "rebels," he now admits that there is nothing in Presbyterian law and practice to forbid its existence. The most he now asserts, apparently, is that those connected with Wesminster Seminary have reflected on the doctrinal soundness of some who are connected with certain of the seminaries under the control of the General Assembly. On this ground he accuses the supporters of Westminster Seminary of "disturbing the peace" and perhaps also of "bearing false witness against brethren." Whether they are guilty of the latter charge depends, of course, on the question whether they have told the truth. If they have told the truth, as we believe, they can rightly be spoken of as disturbers of the peace of the church as little as Ahab rightly characterized Elijah as a troubler of Israel (I Kings 18:17-18). Certainly the Ahabs of the Presbyterian Church, its real troublers, in our judgment, are other than the supporters of Westminster Seminary. We cannot take space to argue the matter; we hardly think it necessary in view of what was said in our last issue; we can only say that we do not think that the supporters of Westminster Seminary can be justly accused of having done anything contrary to the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church, and repeat what we said in our last issue, viz., "if it be a crime to be loyal to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, as the supporters of Westminster Seminary are loyal, then let the courts of the Church take the action called for."

There would seem to be nothing else in Mr. Williams' "rebuttal" that calls for special comment—it does not seem to us that what he says about the doctrine of private judgment is in rebuttal of anything we have said—unless it be what he says about the Auburn Affirmationists and Princeton Seminary. He does not deny our main statement in this connection, viz., that 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 Affirmationists to the confidence of the Church, but he does express doubt as to what we said about Auburn Affirmationists being invited to address the students and preach in the chapel. Mr. Williams does not give his authority for what he says about this matter but whatever the source of his information it is partial and inaccurate. We are at a loss to understand why he inserts the words "at least since 1914" when the Auburn Affirmation was not published until 1924; but at any rate not less than three Auburn Affirmationists have spoken at Princeton Seminary. Dr. Hanzsche spoke during the school year of 1924-1925 at the invitation of the students with the approval of the student adviser, Dr. Charles R. Erdman. After Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was made student adviser and until the reorganization of the Seminary no Auburn Affirmationists either addressed the students or preached in the Seminary chapel. During the current school year, however, not only has Dr. Van Dyke addressed the students but Dr. George A. Frantz, another signer of the Auburn Affirmation, has preached in the Seminary chapel. Mr. Williams tells us that Dr. Van Dyke "spoke only on the Book of Common Worship" but according to *The Princeton Herald* of Dec. 12, 1930, he also made reference to essential Christianity, original sin, the younger writers, clerical garb, the abolition of war and companionate marriage. Mr. Williams thinks that an "official seminary" has no right to discriminate against Auburn Affirmationists. We do not agree with him. Certainly the old Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary did not take that position. If he is right he has directed attention, in our judgment to another reason why there is need of such a seminary as Westminster. Surely Mr. Williams cannot be ignorant of the fact that "liberal" seminaries habitually discriminate against conservatives as speakers and preachers.

We are glad to know Mr. Williams does not approve of "Union's theological position," blind and unwarranted as his other allusions to that institution seem to us. He evidently wants to be on the right side and were he better informed concerning the existing situation we are disposed to think he would be a friend instead of a critic of Westminster Seminary.

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

## III. PLAIN SPEAKING IN A TIME OF PERIL

*"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).*

### "All the Brethren Who Are With Me"

IN the two previous numbers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY we have considered the significant addition which Paul makes in the opening of this Epistle to the bare name and title of the writer. He is an apostle, he insists, not through any merely human intermediation, as the Judaizing opponents contended, but by a direct commission from the Lord Jesus Christ.

But with himself Paul associates certain other persons. The letter comes, he says, not only from him, but from "all the brethren" who are with him when he writes. Such association of other persons with Paul occurs in the openings of a number of the Epistles. Thus I and II Thessalonians are sent in the name of Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus; I Corinthians, in the name of Paul and Sosthenes; II Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians, in the name of Paul and Timothy.

What is the meaning of this association of other persons with Paul in the openings of these letters? What part did these persons have in the letters that follow?

The true answer to that question is readily determined when we find a mean between two extremes.

### Paul Alone the Author

It is perfectly clear, on the one hand, that these persons did not have any actual share in the composition of the Epistles. That view is excluded by the whole character of the Epistles. It would be difficult to imagine any writings that present more clearly than these the marks of one very distinctive mind. Whatever else may be thought of them, it is perfectly clear that they are not composite productions. Moreover, the first person singular is used in the Epistles in the freest possible way. Thus in Galatians, immediately after the opening, Paul says, "*I* marvel that ye are so soon removing . . . . "; and he proceeds to write throughout the Epistle in the same thoroughly individual and personal manner. It is evident, therefore, that whatever this association of other persons with Paul in the openings of the Epistles may mean, it does not mean that these persons shared in the actual composition; these persons clearly were not joint authors with Paul.

On the other hand, an opposite extreme should also be avoided. It will hardly do to say that this association of other persons with Paul in the openings is only a polite way of indicating that these persons send greetings to the churches that are addressed; for the Pauline way of sending such greetings is to put them at the end. At the end of I Corinthians, for example, it is said: "Aquila and Priscilla, with the church that is in their house, salute you much in the Lord" (I Cor. 16:19); yet I Corinthians is one of the Epistles where another person—in this case, Sosthenes—is associated with Paul in the opening. Evidently the two things, the sending of greetings at the end and the association with Paul in the opening, cannot be exactly the same in meaning.

### Others Agree with Paul

If, then, the association of these persons with Paul in the openings does not means so much as that they have shared in the actual composition of the Epistles, and on the other hand means more than that they merely send greeting, what does it mean? Evidently it means something in between these two extremes. No doubt it means that these persons are acquainted, in at least a general way, with the contents of the Epistles, and unite with Paul in hoping for a favorable and obedient reception of them on the part of the churches to which they are addressed.

So here Paul no doubt means to say to the Galatians: "All the brethren who are with me join in what I am saying to you; will you, then, agree with me any less than they?"

By the words, "all the brethren who are with me," Paul hardly means to designate the whole church in whatever city he may have been residing in when he wrote the Epistle; for, as has well been observed, in Phil. 4:21 "the brethren who are with me" are distinguished from "all the saints" (verse 22), by which latter phrase Paul means to designate all the Christians in the city, Rome, in which the Epistle was written. Evidently the phrase, "the brethren who are with me," designated some smaller group, more intimately associated with Paul than were the members generally of that church at Rome. So here in Galatians Paul associates with himself in the Epistle not all the Christians in the city where he was residing, but some smaller and more intimate group of persons who could really be cognizant of what the Epistle contains.

### No Time for Pleasant Words

So far we have dealt with only one of the three parts into which the opening of the Epistle is divided. We have dealt only with the part that is in the nominative case, the part that designates the writer of the letter and his associates. The next part is the part in the dative case, the part which designates the persons to whom the letter is addressed. This part is very brief; it consists simply of the words, "to the churches of Galatia."

We have already seen that the nominative part of this opening is very peculiar as compared with the other Epistles of Paul; it contains a long addition directed against the attack which the Judaizers had made against the independent apostolic authority of the writer. But the dative part of the opening is no less peculiar than is the nominative part.

At first sight, that may seem to be rather a surprising assertion. "To the churches of Galatia," Paul says. What could be simpler than that? What is there so peculiar about it? We answer that there is nothing peculiar about it, and that that is just exactly what is so peculiar about it! In almost every one of the other Epistles of Paul, there *is* something peculiar about the way in which those to whom the Epistle is addressed are designated in the opening; Paul uses words which designate in some way the high Christian state in which the readers find themselves. So in Rom. 1:7 the readers are called "beloved of God, called to be saints"; in I Corinthians the church is called "the church *of God* which is at Corinth," and the members of the church are called "saints"; and similar words of recognition of the Christian state of the addressees are found in other Epistles of Paul. But here the Epistle is addressed, in the briefest and most formal kind of way, simply "to the churches of Galatia."

This brevity and formality in the designation of the recipients of the Epistle, this complete absence of words recognizing their Christian state or their progress in the Christian life, is without doubt significant. These Galatians were on the point of turning away from the gospel of Christ, and Paul has no intention whatever of commending them. It is true, he does address them, later in the Epistle, as "brethren"; and "brethren," in Paul's writings, means, "fellow-Christians." He does not, therefore, give them up. Though they are in danger of falling away, there is yet a possibility—if we may speak after the manner of men—

of saving them. But certainly it was no time for pleasant words. He calls them, therefore, simply "the churches of Galatia"; he does not call them "saints"; he does not go out of his way to call them a part of the Church of God. Whether they were truly to be designated by these high terms remained to be seen; they could not rightly be so designated unless they should reject the error of the Judaizers and should stand fast in the freedom with which Christ had set them free.

### What Would Paul Say Now?

How would Paul designate our churches of the present day? Would he fall in with the customary practice of saying that all is well? Would he sign the reports of the various Moderatorial commissions in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., which have as their function the crying of "Peace, peace, when there is no peace"? Would he go out of his way to commend as a true church of Jesus Christ an ecclesiastical body that includes among its ministers the thirteen hundred "Auburn Affirmationists" who have signed a formal document derogatory to the very vitals of the Christian faith? Would he commend an organization that has placed those men in positions of the highest ecclesiastical authority and is plainly dominated by the point of view that they represent, an organization that has recently removed from office the old Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary for no other cause but that with too great honesty and fearlessness it maintained the Confession of Faith of the Church? Would he speak with any essentially greater commendation of many other Reformed or Presbyterian Churches in this country? Would he commend the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., which is drifting away from the Bible and from the historic Faith almost without knowing it? Would he commend the United Presbyterian Church, with its recent adoption of a feeble, compromising "Confessional Statement," to supplement, and really to supplant, its great historic Westminster Confession which was founded squarely upon the word of God? Would he commend any of these churches that are toying with a plan of union which would substitute the power of committees and boards for a true, free unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and which, in its tentative form already announced, would do away with any effective creed-subscription on the part of the ministry and would give free course to indifferentism and unbelief? Would he commend churches so complacent toward those advocates of indifferentist church-union who, ever since the proposal of the "Plan of Organic Union" of 1920, have been engaged in undermining, undermining, undermining, where their office would have required them to be engaged in edification on the basis of God's holy Word?

We are convinced that he would utter no such commendation at all, but that he would speak the same earnest word of warning that he spoke in the presence of the Judaizers of old. And in these sad days, when Christian language so often conceals a profoundly unchristian mind and heart, would to God that we had, in all our churches, less of empty pious words, less of a foolish optimism, and more of the fearless honesty of Paul.

### The Churches of Galatia

Where were these "churches of Galatia", to which this Epistle was addressed? There are two views about this question. According to one view, called "the North Galatian theory", the churches were in the north central part of Asia Minor, in Galatia proper, the country of the "Celts"—the word "Galatians" is the Greek word for "Celts"—which was occupied by people of Celtic race after a back-migration into Asia Minor in the third century before Christ. According to the other view, "the South Galatian theory", the churches addressed in the Epistle were not in Galatia proper, but were the well-known churches in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, which were in those parts of Phrygia and Lycaonia that had united, or left united, with Galatia proper in 25 B. C. to form the large Roman province of "Galatia."

Upon this "Galatian question", the question as to which of these two views regarding the destination of the Epistle is correct, depends to some extent the question of the date of the Epistle. Apparently Paul had visited "the churches of Galatia" twice before he wrote the letter; for he says in Gal. 4:13, according to the most natural interpretation of his words: "Ye know that on account of a weakness of the flesh I preached the gospel to you *the former time*."

If the North Galatian theory is correct, the former of these two visits to the churches is to be put at Acts 16:6 (near the beginning of the second missionary journey) and the second of the visits to be put at Acts 18:23 (near the beginning of the third missionary journey), in both of which passages the phrase, "the Galatian country," is used. On the North Galatian theory, therefore, the Epistle could not have been written prior to the time of Acts 18-23, and in all probability it was written during the long stay of Paul at Ephesus which came just after that time.

If, on the other hand, the South Galatian theory is correct, the former of the two visits to the churches addressed in the Epistle took place on the first missionary journey, when Paul founded the churches in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe; and the second visit—at least so our first impulse would be to say—took place at the beginning of the second missionary journey, when the Book of Acts distinctly says that Derbe and Lystra were visited and when it apparently intends us to understand that Paul went on also to Iconium and Pisidian Antioch. On the South Galatian theory, therefore, the Epistle may have been written at any time after Paul's passage through South Galatia at the beginning of the second missionary journey.

Indeed, it is possible, on the South Galatian theory, to place the Epistle even earlier than that. On the first missionary journey, it will be remembered, Paul went first through Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe; and then he went back again over the same route. May not that return journey be regarded as the second of the two visits of Paul to the Galatian churches? If so, both of the visits may be placed in the first missionary journey, and the Epistle may have been written at any time after that journey was over.

In particular, the Epistle, on this view, may have been written *immediately* after that journey, or at Syrian Antioch during the period mentioned in Acts 14:26—15:2, a period prior to the "Apostolic Council" at which Paul met the Jerusalem Church in the manner described in Acts 15:3-29.

### The Importance of "the Galatian Question"

This early dating of Galatians would have rather important consequences for our understanding of the history of the apostolic age. If the Epistle to the Galatians was actually written before the Apostolic Council, then of course it cannot contain an account of the Apostolic Council; and the meeting described in Gal. 2:1-10 between Paul and the pillars of the Jerusalem Church cannot be identical with the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:3-29, but must be identical with a previous visit of Paul to Jerusalem, the "famine visit" of Acts 11:30; 12:25, when Paul and Barnabas took up to Jerusalem the gifts of the Antioch Church.

Now a large part of modern negative criticism of the New Testament has been based upon the assumption that Acts 15:3-29 and Gal. 2:1-10 are two accounts of the same event. Since they are two accounts of the same event, it has been said, they can be checked up by comparison with each other; and if they are found to be contradictory, one account or the other is untrue. But in any case it is clear that the account given by Paul in Galatians is essentially true, since Paul was actually an eyewitness of the events and since the genuineness of the Epistle is not denied today by any serious critics, whatever their general attitude toward the New Testament may be. If, therefore, it is said, there is contradiction between Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:3-29, the fault must lie on the side of Acts; and if Acts is thus discredited at this point, where we can check it up by comparision with a recognized authority, it is discredited elsewhere as well; and since the Third Gospel was written by the same man, that is discredited also, and the whole account which Luke-Acts gives of the life of

Christ and the beginnings of the Christian Church is shown to be untrustworthy.

This method of attack falls to the ground if Galatians was actually written before the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:3-29 took place; for in that case Gal. 2:1-10 is an account of an entirely different event from that which is narrated in Acts 15:3-29, and differences between the two accounts cannot possibly be regarded as contradictions. Thus the dating of Galatians before the Apostolic Council, which becomes possible on the South Galatian theory, constitutes one way, and a very effective way, of refuting what is perhaps the most serious modern attack upon the trustworthiness of the New Testament. This early dating of Galatians can no longer be regarded as a mere curiosity or baseless vagary of criticism; for it has received the support of several able modern scholars of widely differing views.

We do not, indeed, desire to create the impression that we adopt the early dating of Galatians. In particular, we do not desire to create the impression that we think it provides the only way of defending the trustworthiness of Luke-Acts. Even if Galatians was written after the Apostolic Council, and even if Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:3-29 do constitute, as the vast majority of scholars think they do, two accounts of the same event, still we hold most emphatically that there is no contradiction between them but that they present only those differences which are natural in two independent, but equally trustworthy, witnesses.

However, the early dating of Galatians, with identification of the event of Gal. 2:1-10 with the famine visit of Acts 11:30; 12:25, constitutes one possible, even though perhaps not probable, way of exhibiting the harmony between Acts and Galatians. It must be treated, therefore, at least with respect, and unquestionably it would serve to solve some of the problems. It there were no other way of defending the trustworthiness of Luke-Acts, then, because of the great weight of independent evidence to the effect that Luke-Acts *is* trustworthy, and that it was really written by a companion of Paul, we should regard as thoroughly scientific the adoption of this view.

The possibility of this early dating of Galatians is open only on the basis of the South Galatian theory. That constitutes, we think, the chief interest of the much debated "Galatian question" as to the destination of the Epistle.

We shall not endeavor to decide that question here, and indeed the decision is exceedingly difficult. Plausible arguments may be adduced on either side. The North Galatian theory has the advantage of placing the Epistle chronologically together with the Epistles of the third missionary journey—I and II Corinthians and Romans —with which it is very closely connected in thought and in style. Perhaps that theory may provisionally be adopted, though the South Galatian theory, with or without the dating before the Apostolic Council, must be kept in mind as a possibility which ultimately we might be led to adopt.

Fortunately the essential teaching of the Epistle is quite independent of the question where the churches to which it is addressed are to be found. Whether those churches were in North Galatia or in South Galatia, they were falling into a very modern, as well as a very ancient, error, and the Epistle which Paul wrote to them in the first century is eminently a tract for our twentieth-century times.

# Books of Religious Significance

*MORALS OF TOMORROW. By Ralph W. Sockman, Ph.D., LL.D. Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York and London. Price, $2.50.*

*FREEDOM AND RESTRAINT. The James Sprunt Lectures, 1930, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. By Robert F. Campbell, A.M., D.D., Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Asheville, N. C. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago. Price, $1.75.*

FROM the well-written book of Dr. Sockman it appears anew that Liberalism has determined upon the destruction of historic Christianity and theism. The God of Dr. Sockman is an immanent principle within the universe instead of the Creator and Sustainer of it. The Christ of Dr. Sockman is an exceptionally wise man but not the Son of God. The Scriptures are for Dr. Sockman the precipitate of past experience but not the word of God. Accordingly God no longer judges men.

Now it will at once be said that on such views of God, Christ and the Scriptures, there is no longer any authority for moral law. And this is true. Moral chaos is the logical result if Christian theism is relinquished. It is pathetic to see the author grasp in vain for some sort of authority. What he finds is the "authority of the expert." As one calls upon the doctor so one may still call on God, on Christ and on Scripture till nature takes its course in us. That is "moral authority for free minds." The "democratic temper of our time" can allow no other authority. Thus the church's business is to help men outgrow their "growing pains." And in doing this the church must make no mention of eternity. "When the children of the psychological era cry for the bread of happiness here and now, it will scarcely do to offer them the stone of a promised bliss hereafter" (p. 128). Such is said to have been the view of Christ himself.

Now against such a position it is useless to fight unless one uproots the foundations upon which it is built. Or rather, one must show that such a position has no foundations. Its foundations are the shoreless and bottomless waters of human experience. Whence has human experience come? The answer must be, "From the void," Whither is human experience going? The answer must be, "To the void." Upon what is human experience resting? The answer must be, "Upon the void." The whole of human experience then, is meaningless. And expert advice on moral questions too, is meaningless. Granted there were experts there would be no patients but corpses. Modernism is as the jackdaw pluming itself with feathers stolen from Christian theism.

In Dr. Campbell's book the question of authority comes to the foreground again. But if one expects to find in this book a good refutation of the position maintained by Sockman and Liberals in general, he will be disappointed. Dr. Campbell halts between two opinions. We would expect to be shown that except man moves in the medium of implicit obedience to God, and therefore to Christ and the Scriptures, he is as a fish on dry land. We would expect to be shown that tyranny and chaos are the twin monsters that face us if we do not face God. We would expect to be shown that we are slaves to sin if not slaves to Christ. We would expect to be shown that we are slaves to the word of the spirit of man if we are not obedient to the Spirit of the Word of God.

Instead of all this we have what looks very much like "authority for free minds." We are once more told that the authority of the Bible is that of the expert and not that of a judge (p. 17). Now this way of putting the matter is misleading. It implies that orthodox theology has been accustomed to think of God as a sort of judge who merely administers law that exists beyond Himself. It is thus misconceived and then caricatured that Sockman presents the matter. It is thus that Campbell misconceives the matter. As though the words of Abraham, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" have not found their echo in every believer's heart! Yes, we believe God's authority is expert. God is *the* expert not *an* expert. Therefore too, He has the authority not of *a* judge but of "the Judge of all the earth." It is for this reason too, that both guilt and pollution are involved in sin. Dr.

Campbell has omitted guilt. But if one omits guilt and thinks almost exclusively of pollution it is only a matter of time before one lands at the "growing pains" of Liberalism.

Dr. Campbell has sought to prove his view of the authority of Scripture by showing that Scripture itself appeals to us as judges as, for example in Isaiah 1:18. "Come . . . and let us reason together." But this appeal so far from proving rather disproves the author's point. There is in the first place a great difference between the Scripture's approach to covenant people and its approach to others. But, waiving this, we hold it evident that Scripture consistently speaks to the sinner as the sinner's judge. If sin is what the Shorter Catechism says it is, "want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God," God must always and everywhere be the sinner's judge. But the marvel of God's grace is this that the Judge offers pardon and even persuades men by His Spirit to accept it. And this is quite the opposite from the words of Coleridge, "the Bible finds me." Yet Dr. Campbell quotes these words with approval (p. 14). Coleridge meant that the Bible finds us at our greatest depth, as though our sinful nature were at bottom in harmony with instead of at enmity against God. So one cannot accept Coleridge's view of the Bible without giving up the Bible's view of itself. Modernism, we may be sure, is much pleased when orthodox writers waver on this pivotal point and send forth an uncertain sound.

A deflection at this point will soon lead to further and greater deflections. First the authority of the Scriptures is reduced to that of an expert. Thereupon the authority of Scripture is limited to certain fields. Experts should not presume to speak on all matters. They are experts by virtue of specialization. Now Scripture is, on this view, a specialist on religious and moral concerns. Hence we do well to listen to it on these matters, but we would be misinterpreting Scripture itself if we claimed its authority for positions held with respect to non-religious and non-moral questions. This view of inspiration as held by Dr. Campbell is historically known as the dualistic view of inspiration. It has been held by others and is held by Dr. Campbell because it seems to safeguard all that is necessary to believe concerning inspiration without making one an unnecessary target of higher criticism.

With respect to this theory it should be said that it involves a concession that is fatal to belief in the self-testimony of Scripture. Scripture testimony about its inspiration is unqualified and allows for no dualism. Least of all does Scripture allow a dualism of which man is to be the judge. Moreover, even if man were to be the judge he could not possibly extract the religious-ethical content of Scripture from its historical garb. And this is true not only because there would be endless diversity of opinion as to what should or should not be accepted but especially because redemption itself is historically mediated. One would first have to reduce special revelation to the mere communication of information before such a dualistic theory of inspiration could be countenanced. Jesus and the Apostles did not so conceive of the Old Testament.

Or if the author should complain that our interpretation of his view of inspiration charges him with an intellectualism that he does not want, we are glad to give him the benefit of the doubt between the theory just described and the dynamic view of inspiration as held by Schleiermacher the "father of modern theology." In either case the consciousness of man must decide what it will accept and what it will not accept of the Scripture. This view is not at all to be identified with that of those who hold to unreduced and unlimited inspiration but who allow for the possibility of minor errors in the text of Scripture. The author claims the authority of such writers for his views but it is a simple case of the jackdaw's stealing peacock feathers once more.

The whole issue is beclouded by the author in his second chapter on, The Letter and the Spirit. Paul's words from 2 Cor. 3:6, "for the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life," are wrought upon till they are made to tell against those who believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture. But even a cursory reading of the context reveals that Paul is contrasting those who ministered under the old covenant with those who, like himself ministered under the new covenant. Paul glories in "the glory that surpasseth." What person is there among those who believe in verbal inspiration who does not believe what Paul says in Rom. 7:4-6, that we are made "dead to the law by the body of Christ"; and therefore "we serve in newness of the spirit, and not in oldness of the letter?" The words of Paul about the letter and the spirit have no connection with the question of verbal inspiration. The author's argument here is Quixotic indeed.

Again the author spreads confusion when he holds that the theory of verbal inspiration militates against the Protestant view that each Christian must interpret the principles of Scripture for himself. But the author should have said that verbal inspiration militates against the modernist view of "interpretation" but is in complete harmony with the Protestant view of interpretation. The modernist means by "interpretation" that each person picks out what he wants of the Bible. The Protestant view of "interpretation" is that each person seeks to find out what exactly the Bible wants of him. Interpretation according to the spirit of the Holy Spirit is in consonance with and demanded by the theory of verbal inspiration but interpretation according to the spirit of the sinner's evil spirit, to be sure, agrees with the theory of verbal inspiration as fire agrees with water.

Even this is not enough. According to Dr. Campbell, believers in verbal inspiration cannot observe the need "of discrimination in drawing lessons from the inspired record . . ." (p. 50). But must we really follow the "sons of thunder" in praying down fire from heaven upon our adversaries because we believe in verbal inspiration? What person, believing in verbal inspiration is there that does not seek to condemn what God condemns and approve what God approves? And what believer in verbal inspiration is there who does not make the difference, made by Scripture itself, between the externalism and nationalism of the old covenant and the internalism, individualism and therefore universalism of the new. The author is beating the air once more.

Finally, to mention no more, literalism, if we may believe the author, is also a child of verbal inspiration. In this case it would be necessary for those holding to verbal inspiration to think the disciples were wiser than Jesus when they thought the "leaven of the Pharisees" meant some species of baker's bread. But does verbal inspiration have anything to do with figures of speech? What does the whole question of symbolic or literal interpretation have to do with verbal inspiration? Premillenarians, Amillenarians and Postmillenarians often agree heartily on verbal inspiration but differ heartily on symbolism.

Such a confusing of the main issue produces troubled waters in which the Modernist will find his fish.

One more point we would note. After observing the author's first major deflection on the matter of reducing the authority of Scripture by virtually qualifying the "natural man" as the judge of its truth, and after noting the author's second deflection of limiting whatever authority the first deflection left untouched, to matters of religion and morals, we do not expect that the author will thereafter be very much concerned about what the Bible says on such subjects as the home, the state and the church. In no case does the author determine what these institutions should be according to the Scripture in order thereupon to test in how far they have lived up to the Scriptural idea of them. On the contrary, the author argues chiefly from the basis of history as its own standard. Thus his method is scarcely open to the charge made by Dr. Sockman of being traditional in the sense of having neglected the empirical method. Dr. Campbell's method is scarcely distinguishable from the method of Dr. Sockman. This, we believe, is hobnobbing with the enemy.

We hope and trust that the compromising attitude revealed by Dr. Campbell is not symptomatic of the condition of affairs in the South. If it is we fear greatly that the waters of the Auburn Affirmation will meet with little resistance as they come rushing down toward the Gulf of Mexico.

C. Van Til.

# Interesting Facts Concerning Churches and Ministers

## Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

### Calls

Richard M. Mussen to Honeoye Falls, N. Y.;
J. H. Noeding, Ellsworth, Minn. to Lansing, Ia.;
John D. McGregor, Watertown. N. Y. to Cato and Meridian, N. Y.;
A. T. Clark Fairhaven, N. Y. to Caledonia, N. Y.

### Calls Accepted

Wm. Van Zile, Ebenezer Church, Macomb, Ill. to Irish Grove Church, Middletown, Ill.;
W. W. Kirby, First Church, Madison, S. D. to First Church, Mankato, Minn.;
S. Willis McFadden, Peekskill, N. Y. as supply to Del Ray, Fla.;
James W. McMillan to Hamilton, Ill.;
John Harries to Marietta, Pa.;
Charles A. Anderson to Presidency of Tusculum College, Tenn.;
Augustus D. Whitney to First Church, Camden, N. J.;
John Pattison, Waterloo, Neb. to Fullerton, Neb.;
V. A. Gordon, Scottsboro, Ala. to Willoughby-Westside Churches, Decatur, Ala.;
Roy W. Zimmer, Overland Park, Kans. to First Church, Independence, Mo.;
George S. Sutton, Marlborough Heights Church, Kansas City, Mo. to First Church, Herington, Kans.;
J. Lewis Kent, Esparto, Cal. to Fort Bragg, Cal.;
Frank J. Worthington, Belle Plaine, Kans. to Brotherhood Church, Wichita, Kans.;
R. K. Hickok, D. D., Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. to Presidency Western College, Oxford, O.;
George P. Horst, D. D. to First Church, Wichita Falls, Tex.;
D. A. Dickey, Butler, Mo. to Norfolk, Neb.;
Luther M. Bicknell to First Church, Goshen, N. Y.;
Edward Robinson to Brook Chapel, Hillburn, N. Y.;
George W. Uhnischneider to be stated supply Roscoe, N. Y.;
Halliday Woods, North Church, North Tonawanda, N. Y. to First Church, Ridgewood, N. Y.;
David M. Harrison, D. D., Lebanon, Tenn. to First Church, Berwick, Pa.;
Charles F. Bole, to be stated supply Edgeley and LaMaure, N. D.;
Claude Saunders, Gravette, Ark. to First Church, Ripley, O.;
Walter L. Turney, Decatur, Ill. to Fort Madison, Ia.

### Changed Addresses

William A. Eisenberger, 222 Washington St., Cumberland, Md.;
George McNab, 2542 Agnes Ave., Kansas City, Mo.

### Ordinations

Charles Dana Chrisman, Avondale, Pa., Feb. 19;
Antonio Piccardo, Venezuela Mission;
Charles F. Bole, Edgeley, N. D., Feb. 3.

### Installations

H. O. Hofstead, D. D., Redlands, Cal., Feb. 8;
Rex E. Lawhead, Colton, Cal., Feb. 15;
Thomas M. Corneilson, Logan, Ia., Feb. 23;
Willis B. Gillis, La Junta, Colo., Jan. 28;
D. Andrew Howey, Prospect Church, Dunlap, Ill.;
Stanley H. Bailes, Vermont Ave. Church, Los Angeles, Cal., Feb. 25;
Wm. J. G. Carruthers, Faith Church, Baltimore, Md., Feb. 27;
George Lee Forney, Christ Church, Lebanon, Pa., Feb. 5;
E. W. Perry, Kirkpatrick Memorial Church, Parma, Idaho, Feb. 15;
Paul Sappie, Galeton, Pa., Jan. 27;
George G. Culbertson, Great Island Church, Lock Haven, Pa., Jan. 28;
Raymond E. Muthard, Lawrenceville, Nelson Church, Beecher's Island, and Parkhurst Memorial Church, Elkland, Jan 28, 29, 30;
John C. Moore, Grove Church, Danville, Feb. 6;
Roscoe W. Porter, Waverly Church, Baltimore, Md., Feb. 24

### Resignations

Howard N. Bunce, Ph.D., Church of the Redeemer, Los Angeles, Cal.;
Grover C. Fohner, Rocky Grove Church, Franklin, Pa.;
Arthur T. Davies, Ukiah, Cal.;
Thomas Moore-Smith, Orangeburgh, N. Y.;
M. E. Bartholomew, Calvery Church, Lockport, N. Y.;
John Connell, D.D., Grace Church, Minneapolis, Minn.;
Andrew McAllen, Carrollton, Mo.

### Deaths

Scott Funk Hershey, Ph.D., L.L.D., Lake Helen, Fla., Jan. 25;
James L. Jewell, D.D., Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 24;
Almer W. Karnell, Phila., Pa., Feb. 3;
W. T. Rodgers, D.D., Harriman, Tenn., Feb. 19;
J. A. Ringold, Arcadia, Ia., Feb. 15;
Thomas E. Barr, Osceola, Neb., Feb. 14;
John McGuinness, Ph.D., Youngstown, O., Jan. 17;
Wm. Gemmill, St. Cloud, Fla., Feb. 2;
John L. Henning, Fairfield, Ia., Feb. 2.

## Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

### Calls

John W. Davis, Kingstree, S. C. to Miami, Fla. (declines);
W. R. Pritchett, Olanta, S. C. to Summerville, S. C. (declines);
J. W. Jackson, D.D., First Church, Columbia, S. C. to First Church, Greenwood, S. C.;
Harold Shields, Gordon St. Church, Atlanta, Ga. to Thomasville, Ga. (declines).

### Calls Accepted

C. G. McClure, Winnsboro, La. to Homer, La.;
K. C. Seawright, Philipp, Miss. to Alto, La.;
John Martin, Supt. of Home Missions of Holston, Tenn. Presbytery;
J. Lee McLean, Fairmont, N. C. to Capon Bridge, Hanging Rock and Bloomery, W. Va.

### Changed Addresses

William Easson, 109 E. Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

### Installations

T. S. Smylie, Central Church, St. Louis, Mo., Feb. 15;
J. R. Hooten, Lebanon and Little Mountain, S. C.;
M. A. Durant, Upper Longcane and Greenville, S. C.;
J. W. Jackson, D.D., First Church, Greenwood, S. C.;
J. S. McFall, Jr., Aliceville and Pleasant Ridge, Ala.

### Deaths

W. T. Howison, D.D., San Antonio, Tex., Jan. 26.

## Christian Reformed Church

### Calls

William Hendriksen, Third Church, Zeeland, Mich. to Allen Ave. Church, Muskegon, Mich.;
S. Struyck, Willard, O. to West Sayville, N. Y.;
G. Hoeksema, Roseland Church, Chicago, Ill. to Allen Ave. Church, Muskegon, Mich.;
Joseph Van de Kieft, Aetna, Mich. to Randolph, Wis.;
M. J. Van der Werp, Peoria, Ia. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.

### Calls Accepted

D. Flietstra, Allen Ave. Church, Muskegon, Wis. to Platte, S. D.

### Installations

I. Couwenhoven, McBain, Mich.;
N. DeVries, Zillah, Wash., Feb. 8;
K. E. F. J. Malefyt, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, Feb. 8.

## Reformed Church in the United States

### Calls Accepted

N. J. Dechant, Millersburg, Ind. to First Church, Olney, Ill.

### Ordinations

Charles F. String, Egg Harbor City, N. J., Feb. 27.

### Installations

H. I. Aulenbach, St. Andrews Church, Allentown, Pa., Feb. 15;
H. W. Black, Latrobe, Pa., Feb. 22;
E. F. Menger, Saron Church, Dundas, Ill., Feb. 15.

### Resignations

A. G. Lohman, Superintendency Deaconess Hospital, Cincinnati, O.;
H. A. Croyle, Vandegrift, Pa.

## Reformed Church in America

### Calls

H. Hager, Chicago, Ill. to Hope Church, Los Angeles, Cal.;
H. Frieling, Lafayette, Ind. to Union Church, Paterson, N. J.;
John Steunenberg, Seventh Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. to First Church, Firth, Neb.

### Deaths

L. Dykstra, Eagle Rock, Los Angeles, Cal., Jan. 2.

## United Presbyterian Church

### Calls

R. Francis Hall, DesMoines, Ia. to First Church, Portland, Ore. (declines).

### Calls Accepted

C. G. Lunan, Piqua, O. to Third Church, St. Louis, Mo.;
A. T. Smith, Portland, Ore. to be stated supply First Church, Klamath Falls, Ore.

### Changed Addresses

J. I. Frederick, Rockaway, Ore.;
J. A. McConnelee, 443 N. Galloway St., Zenia, O.

### Installations

J. Campbell White, Ph. D., L.L.D., W. 44th St. Church, New York, N. Y., Jan. 15.

## Presbyterian Church in Canada

### Calls

J. Keir Fraser, Renfrew, Ontario to Alberton, P. E. I.

### Calls Accepted

R. J. McKay, Knox Church, Walkerton, Ont. to St. Pauls Church, Prince Albert, Sask.

### Changed Addresses

J. J. Cowan, Box 66, Boissevain, Man.

### Resignations

J. S. Flook, Wellwood, Man.

# News of the Church

## Women Suggested for General Council

THE first official admission of women to membership on the General Council of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is proposed in an overture adopted by that body on March 4, at its session in Philadelphia.

The proposal recommends the amendment of the Form of Government, Chapter XXVI, Section V. At present, three ruling elders are chosen annually by the Assembly. The Amendment will substitute for the words "Three of whom shall be ruling elders," the words "Two of whom shall be ruling elders and one of whom shall be a woman in full communion of the Church." The admission of women as ruling elders in 1930 makes it thus also theoretically possible for the two elders elected to be women, if the new proposal should be adopted. The new enactment would do away with the present system of "corresponding members," under which provision Miss Margaret Hodge, of Philadelphia, represents the Board of Foreign Missions, and Mrs. Frederick S. Bennett, of New York, the Board of National Missions. Before becoming the law of the Church, however, the overture must be approved by the Assembly and by a majority of the Presbyteries.

## Western Section of "Presbyterian Alliance"

A MEETING of the Western Section of the "Alliance of the Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System," was held at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, in Washington, D. C., February 24th to 26th. Addresses were given by the Rev. Clarence MacKinnon, D.D., on "The Faith That Overcomes," Prof. Geo. W. Richards, D.D., on "Messengers of Good Tidings," the Rev. David M. Sweets, D.D., on "The Essentials of Christian Education," the Rev. Willard D. Brown, D.D., on "The Various Methods of Student Aid," the Rev. C. B. McAfee, D.D., on "The Foreign Mission Motive in 1931," the Rev. Walter L. Lingle on "The 1930 Home Mission Congress at Washington," the Rev. J. R. Sizoo, D.D., on "America's Need of Religious Revival," the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., on "The Lambeth Conference," and the Rev. W. I. Wishart, D.D., on "The Doctrinal Basis for Presbyterian Church Union."

Reports of committees were given as follows: Publicity, Mr. O. R. Williamson, Chairman; Ministerial Relief and Service Pension, Rev. David M. Sweets, D.D., Chairman; Finance, Mr. H. E. Paisley, Chairman; Presbyterian and Reformed Church History, Rev. Frank Baird, D.D., Chairman; Christian Education and Literature, Rev. James E. Clarke, D.D., Chairman; Foreign Missions, Rev. C. S. Cleland, D.D., Chairman; Home Missions, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D., Chairman; Work on the Continent of Europe, Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., Chairman.

Perhaps the most interesting event of the meeting was the selection of the new Chairman for the Section. The election devolved upon the Rev. W. M. Rochester, D.D., Editor of *The Presbyterian Record*, Toronto, one of the delegates from the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The significance of this election arises from the fact that scarcely six years ago those agitating the abortive "Union" of the Canadian Churches which ended in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church, predicted that the "Continuing Presbyterians" would be a scattered, fragmentary number, hardly deserving of the name of "Church." Since 1925, however, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, animated by rekindled zeal, has knit together and has grown much faster proportionally than has the "United Church" consisting of the former Methodists, Congregationalists and those who left the Presbyterian Church. The election of Dr. Rochester as Chairman of the Section is not only a deserved personal tribute to a man of much ability and charm, but is also a tribute to the fact that the Presbyterian Church in Canada is a great and worthy body.

## Memorial Service for Dr. Wilson

A SERVICE commemorating the eminent services rendered the Christian Church by the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., will be held in Witherspoon Hall (Juniper and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia) at 3:30 o'clock on the afternoon of May 12th. The service will form a part of the Commencement program of Westminster Theological Seminary of which Dr. Wilson was a founder and in which he was at the time of his death the senior professor. The Commencement Exercises will be held at 8 o'clock the same evening.

## Hampden-Sydney Honored

HAMPDEN-SYDNEY College, in Virginia, is very much in the limelight because of its proud distinction of having a greater percentage of living Alumni represented in "Who's Who in America" than any other college or university in the United States. The percentages were worked out in *School and Society* by Professors D. B. Prentice and B. W. Kunkel, of Lafayette College. The distinction that has come to this great-small-college is regarded generally as being wholly deserved. Hampden-Sydney has long been recognized as an institution of sound learning, culture, and Biblical Faith. The whole of the South has felt honored through the recognition given to this famous old college. It is regarded also as a testimony to the fact that fine scholarship and Christian Faith go hand in hand. The percentage of those in "Who's Who" is as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Hampden-Sydney | 7.45 |
| 2 | Amherst | 7.40 |
| 3 | Harvard | 6.60 |
| 4 | Wesleyan | 5.98 |
| 5 | Trinity (Conn.) | 5.45 |
| 6 | Yale | 4.78 |
| 7 | Hobart | 4.75 |
| 8 | Williams | 4.54 |
| 9 | Princeton | 4.50 |
| 10 | Haverford | 4.20 |
| 11 | Brown | 3.74 |
| 12 | Hamilton | 3.73 |
| 13 | Bowdoin | 3.48 |
| 14 | Centre | 3.28 |
| 15 | Union | 2.97 |
| 16 | Marietta | 2.70 |
| 17 | Lafayette | 2.65 |
| 18 | Dartmouth | 2.64 |
| 19 | F. and M. | 2.61 |
| 20 | Earlham | 2.58 |

There are 700 living graduates of Hampden-Sydney. Twelve years ago the enrollment was 89. From 1776 to that time the average had been about 100 each year. In the last twelve years the enrollment has grown from 89 to 274.

## Bishop Cannon and Dr. Diehl Cleared

IN previous issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, it was reported that charges had been preferred against Bishop Cannon, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and against the Rev. Chas. E. Diehl, D.D., President of Southwestern College, Memphis, Tennessee. The charges against Bishop Cannon were undisclosed. After having spent a number of days in hearing the evidence for and against him, the Committee empowered to hear the charges against Bishop Cannon decided that no case had been established warranting suspension until he could be formally tried by the next General Conference of the Church.

The charges against Dr. Diehl related to his alleged views on inspiration, his supervision of finances and regulation of student dances on the campus. After having made an investigation, the Board of the College declared Dr. Diehl to be vindicated. It has been reported, however, that further action might be taken against Dr. Diehl in the courts of the Presbyterian Church in the

U. S., of which he is a Minister. CHRISTIANITY TODAY is glad to give the same prominence to the vindication of these gentlemen as it gave to the original charges.

## Day of Prayer at Westminster Seminary

TUESDAY, March third, was observed at the Seminary as a special day of prayer. All class-room exercises were suspended. In addition to the group meetings of faculty and students for prayer, there were services at 11:00, 3:30 and 7:15 o'clock conducted by Rev. T. Roland Philips, pastor of the Arlington Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., and a member of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary. Mr. Philips spoke upon several of the great themes of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

## Sherwood Eddy Joins the Socialists

MUCH comment has been aroused by the resignation of Sherwood Eddy, internationally known, as Secretary for Asia of the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A. The resignation was tendered, it is understood, on the ground that he purposes to be an active member of the Socialist Party and "to devote himself to the cause of social justice." Dr. Eddy came to the fore a generation ago during the campaign of the Student Volunteer Movement to "Evangelize the World in this Generation." From 1896-1911 he worked among the students in India under the auspices of the Y. M. C. A. From 1911 until the present year he has been Secretary for Asia, of the Y. M. C. A., serving without salary. For some years it had been apparent that Mr. Eddy was becoming more radical in his thinking, but it was not generally anticipated that he would grow too advanced for the Y. M. C. A. Many who know Dr. Eddy and who feel a warm affection for his great and unselfish personality keenly regret his doctrinal drifting. It is a source of sorrow to multitdues that any man should feel it necessary to break with orthodox theology or with distinctively Christian agencies in order to work for social justice.

## National Convention of the League of Evangelical Students

THE Sixth Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students was held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Feb. 13th, 14th and 15th. All of the meetings of the convention except the final one, Sabbath evening, were held in the chapel of the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The League is an evangelical youth movement organized in Seminaries, Colleges and Bible Schools for the defense and propagation of the historic Christian Faith. At present there are 30 chapters scattered over the country. One of the inspirations of the convention was the sight of Christian students gathered from such widely separated sections as Texas, Massachusetts, South Carolina and Michigan. Probably this convention was the most truly national of all the six conventions held thus for by the League. The League aspires to be a national organization because it feels that it has a message for students everywhere, the message of salvation through the Blood of Christ.

The Convention was exceptionally fortunate in obtaining an outstanding group of Christian leaders for the convention addresses. The main speakers were Dr. Samuel G. Craig, Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Editor of *Christian Faith and Life*, Dr. R. B. Kuiper, President of Calvin College, Dr. Robert H. Glover, Home Director for North America of the China Inland Mission, Dr. James M. Gray, President of Moody Bible Institute, and Dr. J. Gresham Machen of Westminster Theological Seminary. In addition, devotional addresses were given by Mr. I. H. Linton of Washington, D. C., Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, President of The Evangelical Theological College of Dallas, Texas, and Dr. Charles G. Trumbull, Editor of the *Sunday School Times*. The keynote that ran throughout all the addresses was the declaration that Christianity is true and that it is capable of meeting the attacks, whether from the scientific or any other quarter of the day. The Christian religion was set forth as the one true faith, the only one that can save from sin. In the midst of an age that is doubting and confused, these speakers gave a clear and lucid testimony to the Scriptures as the eternal Word of God and the only guide of life.

In addition to the regular addresses a missionary meeting was held on Sabbath afternoon, February 15, at which four returned missionaries gave short but gripping testimonies of their work in foreign lands and of the need there. The main message of this session was brought by Dr. Robert H. Glover who gave to the young people before him a picture of the terrible conditions existing in heathen lands and a challenge of a life, not of ease but of hardship, in service there. In the past year the League has added a strong missionary emphasis to its program in the conviction that such an emphasis is an integral part of an evangelical youth movement.

Business sessions were held after all the Friday and Saturday meetings at which the work of the past year was reviewed and plans for the coming year were discussed. One of the most impressive features of these sessions was the reports by the various chapters of activities engaged in during the year which had just passed. The work of the League Chapter might be considered as twofold, internal and external. Internally, the local Chapter bands Christian students together for mutual study and fellowship. In this day of apostasy Christian fellowship is hard to find on many a college campus. To meet this need and to strengthen themselves in their Christian lives practically all the chapters reported meetings for prayer and Bible study at regular intervals. The League is fully committed to the view that the Bible is capable of defense and in accord with this view one of the Chapters reported a series of four studies on the internal and external evidence for the Old and New Testaments. Externally the League tries to give a definite Christian witness to those outside of Christ. Each Chapter fulfills this purpose according to its own need and opportunity. As a result there was a large range in the type of work done. Mission work was carried on in old people's homes, in prisons and on city streets. John Brown College of Siloam Springs, Arkansas, provided student Ministers, weekly, in neglected country areas of the Ozarks over a territory 75 miles square. Gospel teams were sent out and many chapters carried on deputation work in behalf of the League in other institutions. Finally a Christian witness was given on the local campus. It is a source of great rejoicing to all connected with the League to be able to report that as a result of this testimony, many definite results were obtained and that souls were born again.

The delegates were inspired at one of the business sessions by the words of a visiting delegate, unofficially representing the Intervarsity Christian Fellowship of Canada, who told of the activities of the Fellowship. The type of work carried on by the League of Evangelical Students is not confined to this country but is found in Canada, Great Britain and the Netherlands. Leaguers learned that there was the same need in the Canadian Universities, that God had moved the hearts of Christian students to band together to meet this need, and that he had wonderfully blessed the efforts of the Intervarsity Christian Fellowship of Canada. The students of the world sorely need Christ and where He has been lifted many have been drawn to Him.

One of the most encouraging features of the whole convention was the adoption of a program of expansion far surpassing that of former years. For example, the budget was greatly increased and it was voted to appoint six part-time regional secretaries to assist the general secretary, Rev. William J. Jones, in his growing field work.

In this way it is hoped more effective work can be done in presenting the cause of the League to those schools where it has not been established and in strengthening those chapters already formed.

Expectation for such progress is based largely on the appointment of a strong Board of Trustees to advise and help direct the students in their control of League af-

fairs. The League is a youth movement, composed of students and aiming to carry on activities among students but it feels the need of the mature counsel and assistance which the Board of Trustees will be able to give. The fifteen members of the Board are: Mrs. William Borden of New York City; Dr. Clarence Bouma, Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, President of The Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas; Dr. Horace M. Du Bose, Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Dr. Leander S. Keyser, Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg, Ohio; Dr. R. B. Kuiper, President of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle, Pittsburgh-Xenia Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Mr. I. H. Linton, Attorney-at-Law, Washington, D. C.; Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dr. John Paul, President of Taylor University, Upland, Indiana; Dr. Albertus Pieters, Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan; Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Editor of Christian Faith and Life, Haddonfield, N. J.; Dr. Harry Framer Smith, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois; Mr. Gerard H. Snell, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Mr. Paul Woolley, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

After attending many young people's conferences where a "liberal Jesus" was held up and where only a social gospel was preached, it was a great spiritual feast for many to mingle with this group of earnest, consecrated youth and to hear the ringing truth of the Gospel as it was presented by the speakers. Christian people, everywhere, are praying and longing for a mighty revival of Evangelical Christianity, and the League feels peculiarly responsible for sowing the seeds of such a revival among the students of America. For this God-given task it solicits the prayers and support of God's people.

## Honorary Degrees—Two Conceptions

A CURIOUS example of how two sets of minds working on the same problem can come to an opposite conclusion is evidenced by the attitude toward honorary and earned degrees in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the largest, and in the Church of Scotland, the oldest Presbyterian Church in the world. At the last General Assembly, in Cincinnati, it was decided by a very close vote henceforth to eliminate honorary degrees from the official publications of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. A motion to include earned degrees almost carried, but the view prevailed that earned degrees should be recognized. Now the General Administrative Committee of the Church of Scotland has adopted a "direction," "finding" or "minute" to the effect that hereafter only the degree of D.D. shall be recognized in the publications of that Church. Officially, at least, men who have earned doctorates will not be recognized as "Reverend Doctors." Considerable agitation on the part of many Ministers has followed this Scottish ruling, looking to its rescinding. These men claim that the earned degree is an evidence of solid merit, while the honorary degree makes one a "Doctor by Kindness." A writer in the *Scots Observer* says, referring to bureaucratic tendencies in the Church:

"The General Administration is in no sense a parent Committee of Assembly Committees, a kind of Bishop among Committees, nor has it any entrée to Presbyteries. Already there is a jealousy and restiveness about the presumption of some Assembly Committees, which will not be allayed by this ecclesiastical mustard plaster."

## World Mission Congress in Chattanooga

ONE of the largest mission gatherings of modern times was held under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., from February 16th to 19th, in Chattanooga, Tennessee. For three full days thousands of persons attended morning, afternoon and evening sessions in the great Chattanooga Memorial Auditorium. At least three thousand persons attended each of the daytime sessions, the numbers increasing to about four thousand in the evenings. The delegates were gathered from all parts of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., and its foreign fields. With a list of notable speakers, the Congress was primarily concerned with bringing a new sense of the need for witnessing to the Gospel. Almost nothing was said about money, the feeling being that if the Church could gain a clear vision of the world-task and Christ's call, there would be no trouble in getting men, women and money. Around the gallery, in large letters, were the words, "And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come."

The Congress operated in a unique manner. Various Commissions presented reports, and after hearing them, the Congress broke up into groups of ten persons each, meeting in nearby churches. Each group then discussed the report and presented any conclusions it might have reached.

The music of the Congress was under the personal direction of Mr. Homer Hammontree, assisted by Mr. Howard Hermanson. The singing by the great throng was one of the features of the three days,—with great emphasis upon the stirring dignity of the mighty hymns of the Church. An added feature was found in a male chorus from Union Seminary in Virginia, and in male quartettes from Columbia Seminary, and Austin Seminary.

Delegates attending the Conference have enthusiastically reported it as a notable success in every way,—an undertaking large in plan and in realization. In this connection *The Presbyterian of the South* remarks:

"Was the Congress on Missions a success? we were asked just before its close. That was not an easy question to answer. We must first answer the question, as to what was its purpose. If its purpose was to get together large audiences, it was a success. If it was to secure a large enrollment, it was a success. If it was to bring together a representative group from all parts of the Church, and from all classes of its membership, it was a success. If it was to have able reports presented and able speeches made, it was a success.

"If success is to be measured by the results accomplished, it is too soon to answer the question. Inspiring and enthusing those who were present was a great deed, but the real result will be seen, when we find out how much of that enthusiasm has been carried back to the churches."

Excerpts from the reports of the Commission on the Mission message to the Church are given below. While in the main these sentences are ringingly evangelical, there are elements in the reports that have caused observers to fear that some Modernist leaven may have been working, even if unsuspected in the minds of those who helped frame the reports. The excerpts follow:

### THE MISSIONARY MESSAGE AND OBLIGATION

#### Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions

I. A Changing World

There is a vast difference between the world into which the first Christian missionaries went nineteen hundred years ago and the world today. Great changes have been wrought in the material world by the discoveries and inventions of science. . . . All along the line, inventions and discoveries have so revolutionized the material world and so changed our ways of living, that this seems to be a different world from that in which the first Christian missionaries lived and worked.

Changes in modes of thought have been just as marked as the changes in the material world. . . . It is a far cry from the modes of thought employed by the medieval scholastic philosopher to those employed by the twentieth century man of science. . . .

The changes, which have taken place in the non-Christian world, are just as marked and striking as those which have taken place in so-called Christian lands. . . . Some of the non-Christian religions have undergone marked changes. They have been affected by the modern, scientific spirit and by their contact with Christianity.

### The Unchanging Gospel

We cannot change the Gospel. It is the everlasting Gospel. The great fundamental principles underlying the Gospel message will never change. They cannot be changed. God does not change. He is the eternal God. From everlasting to everlasting He is the same. Jesus Christ does not change. He is the same yesterday, today and forever. The teachings of Jesus do not change. They were given once for all. The meaning of the cross on Calvary does not change. It was there, that "He bare our sins in His own body on the tree." The Holy Spirit does not change. He is the same eternal Spirit. Man's sinful nature has not changed. His need of salvation is as great today as it was two thousand years ago. Turn in whatever direction we will, we discover that the fundamental elements which enter into Gospel message abide forever.

### Interpretations May Change

While the Gospel never changes, our interpretation of it is ever changing. Jesus promised that the Holy Spirit would lead His people into all truth. All through the centuries He has been leading His Church into a fuller understanding and appreciation of the Gospel. He is still leading and teaching. As a result, our understanding of certain teachings of the New Testament is fuller and richer than the understanding which the Church had a thousand years ago. For example, our interpretations of the Atonement today are far richer and fuller than the interpretations which were held by the Church in the Middle Ages. . . .

There are heights and depths in the Gospel which we have not yet reached. We have not yet fully comprehended the mind of Christ. The Holy Spirit is able to lead the whole of Christendom through the present theological turmoil into a fuller understanding of the good news of the Gospel than the Church has ever yet reached. The Holy Spirit may use the Christians of India, China, Japan, Korea, and other lands to lead the Church into a deeper meaning of the Gospel than our Western minds have been able to attain. . . .

### Statements May Change

It has been necessary from time to time for the Church to restate her faith. Even though her beliefs may not greatly change, it may be necessary for those beliefs to be expressed in language which the people of a given country or a given century can understand. . . .

So, we need not be alarmed, if it becomes necessary for Christians in mission fields to state their faith in terms which they can understand, and terms which will grip the minds of even the young people in their respective countries. . . .

### Emphasis May Change

The fundamental truths of the Gospel cannot be changed to suit the whims of a changing world, but the emphasis may be changed to meet the needs of different centuries, different countries, or different conditions. . . . The emphasis may have to be placed upon certain fundamental doctrines to reach the heart of a Hindu, and upon other fundamental doctrines to reach the heart of a follower of Confucius. Even in Christian lands the emphasis has shifted so greatly during the past fifty years. . . .

### The Approach May Change

The Gospel cannot change, but our approach to non-Christian people with the Gospel may change, to meet changing conditions. The prophet Amos, though he claimed to be neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but a cowherd, makes a very remarkable approach. He was a southern prophet who was sent to the northern people to tell them of their sins. The book which bears his name is probably only a bare outline of what he said. You will observe that he first told those northern people of the sins of the surrounding nations and of his own southern people, before he preached to them about their own sins.

## II. The Missionary Message

What is the missionary message? In other words, what are those essential doctrines of our Christian religion, which the missionary should attempt to impress upon the hearts and minds of the non-Christians in mission lands, with a view to winning them to Christianity? There is room for a variety of opinions on this subject. We will set down those which we believe are most essential.

### God

The great central theme of the missionary message in God. A true conception of the only true and living God is the greatest contribution which Christianity can make to the non-Christian world. All of the non-Christian religions are fatally defective in their conceptions of God. . . .

Confucianism takes the view that God exists but is unknownable. . . .

Buddhism is also mystical and pantheistic. It has no definite doctrine of the personality of God. Some Buddhist sects show a tendency toward agnosticism or even atheism. In a report which was prepared for the Jerusalem Council we find this striking statement: "And because there is no supreme, perfect personality at the heart of things, it is not strange that the founder of Buddhism was hesitant in affirming that human personality has premanent meaning and value. . . . Let those, who so glibly say that all religions are virtually the same in their essentials, face this fact, that Buddha had little or nothing to say about God, the heavenly Father, and that Jesus had little or nothing to say which did not make God central." . . .

God is always central in the Christian religion. The Bible begins with God and ends with Him. He is the Alpha Omega. Theology is a systematic study of what we know about God as He is revealed in the Bible and in the world about us. Whole libraries have been written on theology. It is a marvelous picture which the Bible gives us of God. . . .

The Missionary Message must first of all give to those living in non-Christian lands this richer and fuller conception of God. Dr. Robert E. Speer quotes a paragraph from Clarke's "Study of Christian Missions," which admirably expresses what we are trying to say: "Christianity is superior and unique in its idea of God. It has such a conception of God as no other religion has attained; and what is more, it proclaims and brings to pass such an experience of God as humanity has never elsewhere known. . . . The God of Christianity is one, the sole source, Lord and end of all. He is holy, being in Himself the character that is the sole standard for all beings. He is love, reaching out to save the world from sin and fill it with His own goodness. He is wise, knowing how to accomplish His heart's desire. He is Father in heart, looking upon His creatures as His own seeking their welfare. All this truth concerning Himself He has made known in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, in whom His redemptive will has found expression and His saving love has come forth to all mankind. . . . The conception of God with which Christianity addresses the world is the best that man can form or entertain."

### Christ and Him Crucified

The Apostle Paul tells us that, when he went as a missionary to Corinth, he determined to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" was his missionary message. At first glance this may seem to be a rather limited message, but the more we think of its meaning the more we are convinced that it is limitless in its scope. It is an infinite as the Christ Himself. It includes all that Jesus was, all that He did, all that He said, all that He stood for, and all that He suffered. It crowns the whole with "Christ Crucified," which means that it tells of His atoning death on the cross and His power to save. The great aim of the missionary is to know Christ and to make Him known. If we adequately preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified we cover all that is essential in Christianity. It is impossible even to catalogue in one brief paper all that is included in the message which centers about Jesus Christ and Him crucified. We will note a few of the essential things which enter into it.

### Christ Revealing the Father

First of all, Jesus Christ reveals the Father. . . . If you want to know what God is like, look at Jesus Christ. The missionary message should picture Jesus as He

walked the roads of Palestine, living a life of love, showing a heart of compassion, and burning with righteous indignation against all that was wrong. A picture of this kind would be a true picture of God.

### The Divine Christ

A purely human Christ could not be the express image of the Father and contain in Himself all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. He could not fill the whole sphere of God. Only a Divine Christ could do that. Dr. James Denny . . . writes: "Our conception of the Person of Christ determines our conception of the whole Christian religion. What we have to proclaim to men as a gospel depends on the answer we give to Jesus' own question, 'Whom say ye that I am?' A Christ, who is simply human, cannot be to men what a Christ is, who is truly divine. The Gospel identified with Him cannot be the same; the spirit of the society which gathers round Him cannot be the same. It is futile to ask whether such a Gospel and such a spirit can fairly be called Christian; they are in point of fact quite other things from the Gospel and the spirit which are historically associated with His name." . . .

### The Human Christ

The missionary message also preaches the true humanity of Jesus Christ. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." Moffatt's translation reads: "Full of grace and reality." The incarnation was a reality. This is one of the most essential, and, at the same time, one of the most precious doctrines of the Christian religion. The incarnation made it possible for the Son of God to make atonement for our sins. . . .

Prior to the Protestant Reformation the Church had practically ceased to teach the humanity of Christ. The people began to think of Jesus manly as the Judge of all the world. The next step was to pray to His Mother Mary and the saints to intercede with Him. Christianity became a religion of fear. . . . One of the great blessings of the Protestant Reformation was that it rediscovered and preached the perfect humanity of Christ, and the companion doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. The doctrine of the perfect humanity of Christ will never lose its power. . . .

### Christ Crucified

The Apostle Paul made the cross of Christ central in his missionary message. He preached Jesus Christ and Him crucified. For two thousand years the Church has been trying to fathom the meaning and mystery of the cross. Many theories of the atonement have been formulated by the theologians. It is impossible to discuss these various theories in a brief paper. However, we venture to say that all the theories put together do not exhaust the full meaning of the cross. But whether our theories are adequate or not, the great fact of the cross and of the atoning death of Jesus Christ remains. . . .

As some theologians study great passages they say that the death of Christ was an exhibition of the love of God, others say that it was an exhibition of His wrath against sin. It was both. But it could not have been either, without being vastly more. It was vicarious. He died in our stead.

The true missionary message will always make the cross central. Salvation by grace through faith in Jesus Christ is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. Eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. . . .

### Our Risen Lord

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead was a vital part of the New Testament missionary message. It occupied a large place in Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost. In the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians Paul goes so far as to stake the whole truth and life of the Christian religion upon the fact of the resurrection in these words: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The resurrection is vital because it means that we have a Divine Christ. . . .

### The Holy Spirit

The work of the Holy Spirit is an essential part of the missionary message. . . .

In some non-Christian lands the people stand in continual fear of the evil spirits, but they have no doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who teaches, leads and comforts God's children. When the Minister, or the missionary, fails to rely upon the Holy Spirit he need not be surprised if he has no power. The same is true of the Church.

### The Social Message

The true missionary message will always place the proper emphasis upon the social teachings of the Bible. Those are the teachings which deal with our duties and our relationships to our fellowmen. The Gospels abound in such teachings. . . . These form an essential part of the missionary message and the missionary program.

One of the imperative needs of the Church today is that Ministers, missionaries and all professing Christians should translate these social and ethical teachings into life, just as Jesus did in the days of His flesh. . . .

## III. Missionary Obligation and Motive. Christ the Only Foundation.

In dealing with the obligation of the Christian Church to carry the Gospel to the non-Christian lands we are touching the crux of the whole problem today. Why is it that the interest in foreign missions is everywhere lagging and that gifts are falling off? It is because the Christian people are no longer gripped by a burning conviction that men everywhere are lost without Christ. . . Our modern world has largely lost this urgent note in salvation. We need to restore it. We need to learn that we are in danger not only of the wrath of God hereafter, but that here and now a world without Christ faces immediate disaster in its economic, social and international relationships. . . .

What has destroyed this burning conviction that the non-Christian world is lost without Christ? The problem here is very little different on the foreign field from what it is at home. The disease has only come to a head a little more quickly on the frontier lines. What has destroyed the Christian conviction both at home and abroad is the rising tide of secularism. . . .

If this abiding missionary conviction and obligation is to be restored, then we must show to the world, both at home and abroad, that personality and modern civilization will perish, unless they are built upon the Rock Christ Jesus. For other foundation can no man lay—not science, philosophy, secularism or humanism—than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. We need to show to the world anew the meaning of sin both in its individual and in its social aspects, to make clear that all secular foundations for the soul and for society will ultimately fail, to present attractively and convincingly the unchanging Christ as the solution of the world's problems, and as bringing salvation both here and hereafter.

### Our Obligation to Christ

We are under eternal obligation to Jesus Christ. He loved us and gave Himself for us. All that we are today, and all that we hope to be through the eternal ages to come we owe to Him. He wants us to tell all the world the story of His redeeming love. He has made His heart's desire known to us in many ways. He has ever commanded us to go and preach the Gospel to every creature. His love should be a constraining motive. His command should be final with those who love Him. We have a longing to be Christ-like. If we really want to be like Him, we must share His desire that all men should be saved. . . .

### An Appeal

We close with an appealing paragraph from the "Statement," which was made by the Jerusalem Council: "We believe that men are made for Christ, and cannot really live apart from Him. Our fathers were impressed with the horror that men should die without Christ—we share that horror; we are impressed also with the horror that men should live without Christ. Herein lies the Christian motive; it is simple. We cannot live without Christ and we cannot bear to think of men living without Him. We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-Christ-like. We cannot be idle while the yearning of his heart for his brethren is unsatisfied. Since Christ is the motive, the end of Christian missions fits in with that

motive. Its end is nothing less than the production of Christ-like character in individuals and societies and nations through faith and fellowship with Christ the living Saviour, and through corporate sharing of life in a divine society. Christ is our motive and Christ is our end. We must give nothing less, and we can give nothing more."

The report was signed by Rev. W. L. Lingle, D.D., Chairman; Rev. Chas. H. Pratt, D.D., Rev. J. B. Green, D.D., Rev. T. E. Gouwens, D.D., Rev. Cecil V. Crabb, Rev. D. Clay Lilly, D.D., Rev. D. S. Gage, D.D., Rev. R. F. Campbell, D.D., Rev. W. E. Hill, D.D., Mrs. Frazer Hood, Miss Janie W. McGaughey.

## The Presbyterian Church in Canada

IT is not often that voices are heard abroad in behalf of the Presbyterian Church. Years of publicity effort were designed to bring it into disrepute. Dr. T. R. Glover, formerly a professor of Queen's University, Canada, now a professor in Cambridge, England, after returning from Canada a short time ago expressed himself in the *Baptist Times:*

> "The United Church of Canada," he thinks, "is not so happy a family nor so unqualified a success as was prophesied. In certain instances the authorities of that Church have acted oppressively, and not in a very Christian spirit, in relation to the dissentient Presbyterians. There is no doubt at all but that the dissident Presbyterian Church is going to continue and that it will get a fresh foothold in provinces from which it was supposed to have disappeared." One thing that struck Dr. Glover was the gratitude of the "continuing" Presbyterians to the Baptists for standing by them in the hour of trial.

In Toronto the Church supports a Redemptive Home which, under the care of the late Miss Ratté, a woman of rare gifts and deep sympathies, accomplished much for an unfortunate class. Miss Ratté's death took place last year and now her assistant, Miss M. MacKinnon, her trusted and faithful assistant for ten years, has been appointed superintendent. Her personal qualities, attainments, and experience guarantee that the good work of the Home will be continued under her direction.

In ministering to the unemployed throughout the Dominion the Church has done good service. A particularly busy place in Toronto for the past few months is the Scott Institute, the centre for the Jewish work, at the head of which is Rev. Morris Zeidman. Over 50,000 meals have been served to the needy in the past three months. The Presbyterians have responded splendidly to the call in this particular, both in furnishing supplies and in providing help. The Toronto congregations have taken turn in sending ladies to act as waitresses in the serving of meals. On New Year's Day hospitality was extended to 955. Through the generosity of Lieutenant-Governor Ross, a member of new St. Andrew's Church, a sufficient number of chickens was provided to give a Christmas dinner to all. Sleeping accommodation for young men has been added to the service rendered thus far.

Several new churches have been completed and dedicated recently. The congregation at Hemingford, Que., now occupies the former Presbyterian building which it has renovated within and without. This church was placed at the disposal of the Presbyterian minority group through the influence of a member of the former Methodists, making a bright spot in the history of the relationship between the Presbyterians and the United Church.

The congregations of Indian Head and Moosomin, Sask., have erected new buildings. Quite a controversy prevailed in the latter place. The Presbyterian congregation had entered the United Church but, becoming dissatisfied, a considerable number withdrew and were churchless in consequence. Negotiations for the purchase of the Presbyterian Church which was unoccupied were abortive, and, although this splendid building was available, the Presbyterians were under compulsion of erecting a new edifice, a heavy burden in a small community. The former Presbyterian Church is now used as a gasoline service station, an indoor golf course and its grounds as a tourist camp. The facts in this case led the Moderator, Dr. Baird, to say that the whole thing is a scandal to religion.

## The Pope's Radio Address

GLORIA in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis."—"Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to men of good will," were the first words of greeting uttered by Pope Pius XI to the world at the inauguration of Radio Station HVJ, in the Vatican City, on February 12, the ninth anniversary of his coronation.

The Pope spoke over an international radio network including 150 stations in the United States and Canada. The Soviet Government of Russia forbade its people to listen to the broadcast.

Ceremonies began toward evening in Rome, toward noon Eastern Standard time in the United States.

The Pope's red motor car carried him seated in his gilded, damask-covered motor throne, from the Vatican Palace, over the graveled roads of the Vatican gardens to the small, red-brick, garden-surrounded broadcasting station.

Guglielmo Marconi, inventor of wireless, Senator and Marchese of Italy, builder of station HVJ, a great and good friend of the Pope, fell to his knees, kissed the papal ring. The Pope was smiling, and showed traces of excitement. The Marchese Marconi and entourage entered the small building over a thick red-and-blue carpet. Whimsically the Pontiff threw in switches which set electrical devices in motion; he tapped a wireless key, punched a teletypewriter's keys, proceeded to the transmitting room where he spoke into a microphone while seated on a throne.

At first his voice trembled with both the novelty and the import of the occasion. Quickly, however, his Latin gained measured speed. Latin adepts had difficulty keeping up with his racing thoughts and Italian pronunciation. As soon as he finished, translators, who had stood by him, vernacularized in English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Polish the substance of his message which began:

To ALL CREATION: "Having in God's mysterious designs become the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, those Apostles whose doctrine and preaching were by Divine command destined for all nations and for every creature, and being the first in that position to use and employ this truly wonderful Marconian invention, we turn first to all things and all people and with the assistance of the holy scripture, here and in what follows, we say:

" 'Hear, O ye heavens, the things I speak; let the earth give ear to the words of my mouth.

" 'Hear these things all ye nations; give ear all ye inhabitants of the world, both rich and poor together.

" 'Give ear ye islands, and hearken ye people from afar to God.' "

After exhorting All Creation "His Holiness" proceeded to address, from the Roman Catholic premise, the various grades of humanity:

AD CATHOLICOS (*To Catholics*): "Turning now to men: The Apostle commands us to do good to all men, especially to those of the household of faith. . . . We are pleased, therefore, to speak, in the first place to all such, namely, to those who have received in the Master's family and the Master's fold of the Catholic Church and dwell there, and call us by the loving name of Father. . . ."

AD HIERARCHIAM (*To the Hierarchy*): "We address you our fellow-laborers, Cardinals of the Most Holy Roman Church, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, prelates and priests of the various orders of the hierarchy, chief objects of our daily solicitude as well as sharers and helpers in our labors. We beg and exhort each one of you to persevere in the vocation in which he was called, and that you walk worthily in the vocation in which you were called: feed the flock of God which is among you, being made an example for the flock in your souls, so that when the Prince of Shepherds shall appear you may receive a never-fading crown of glory. . . ."

AD RELIGIOSOS (*To the Religious*—i e.,

monks, nuns): "We now speak to you, sons and daughters of our love, who, eager for the nobler graces, by the pledge of your holiest vows and by a lifelong religious discipline, faithfully obey, not merely the commandments, but also the desires and the counsels of your Divine King and Spouse. You fill God's Church with the fragrance of your chastity, you glorify her by your contemplations, you support her by your prayers, you enrich her with your learning and knowledge, you beautify and perfect her from day to day by the ministry of the word and by apostolic labors. . . ."

AD MISSIONARIOS (*To Missionaries*): "Now our words go out to you, our dearest sons and daughters in Christ, who in mission fields are laboring in prayer to propagate the Holy Faith of Christ and to spread His kingdom. As the first Apostles of the Churches, so you too 'by dangers, by great patience, by necessities, by tribulations,' are made an example. . . ."

AD FIDELES UNIVERSOS (*To All the Faithful*): "Our heart is opened to you all. . . . Like the first believers, men and women, whom the Apostles for that reason praises, you are God's people and the sheep of His fold. You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy family. . . ."

AD INFIDELS ET DISSIDENTES (*To Unbelievers and Dissenters*): "To you also who are still separated from the faith and the unity of Christ our thoughts and our prayers are turned. Daily, indeed, do we offer prayers and sacrifices for you to the God and Lord of all, earnestly beseeching Him to illuminate you with His light and to lead and unite you to those sheep who hear His voice, that there may be 'one fold and one Shepherd.'"

Other categories followed fast. THOSE WHO RULE (*Ilii Qui Praesunt*) the Pope urged "to govern in justice and in charity." THOSE WHO ARE RULED (*Qui Subsunt*) he admonished to "be obedient, not as to men but as to God." TO THE RICH (*Divitibus*) "Christ Jesus himself has confided the poor." CONCERNING THE POOR (*Pauperibus*) "whilst they are endeavoring to better their condition, as morally they may, let them . . . not strech forth their hands to iniquity." "We earnestly entreat LABORERS AND EMPLOYERS (*Operariis et Datoribus Operum*) to put aside hostile rivalry and strife and unite in friendly and brotherly accord. . . ." To the AFFLICTED AND SO ON (*Afflictis, etc.*) he offered "our prayers and as far as possible our help."

His last words were:

"There remains only the imparting, with all Our hearts, of the Apostolic Benediction to the city and to the world, and to all those who live in it, which we do in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost."

There are many who hardly understand how the Pope could consistently impart his benediction to those who reject his lofty claims, and consider the pretensions of his body to be un-Christian and blasphemous.

## Faith Healing

HIS subordinate priests have asked Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, to write them out an Office for faith healing. They want him to prescribe what unctions to use, how to apply them, how to "lay on hands," what prayers to utter and in what order. The Archbishop, who is Anglican Primate of All England, will prepare such an Office. But his version will endure only until the Canterbury House of Bishops prepares an official office. It will of course have no authenticity other than exemplary in the Archdiocese of York or other subdivisions of the Church of England.

Although the Archbishop of Canterbury is second in command after King George V (titular head of the Church of England), William Temple, Archbishop of York and Primate of England, is a potent and virtually independent third. It would require a convocation of both archdioceses, such as met four years ago, to formulate such a new Office for the entire Church of England.

England's demand for faith healing became apparent at the recent Canterbury convocation in London. Anglican priests and bishops want faith healing authenticated and formalized under the strict discipline of the Church for two reasons: (1) many have been anointing the sick and laying their hands on them in haphazard fashion; (2) they wish to combat Christian Science, which they consider a growing menace to the Church of England. London now has twelve Christian Science churches, whereas five years ago the number was only seven, and ten years ago only three. A Rev. T. F. Monahan was moved to state harshly: "I don't suppose there's any more fantastic theory than that on which Christian Science is founded, and yet I suppose there's no means of faith healing that has been so successful in many cases as what's called Christian Science."

## Attempts to Eliminate the Thirty Nine Articles in the Church of England

IN the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, mention was made of the questions involved in the recognition of the Orders of the Ministers of the Church of England by the Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox Church. The Eastern Churches were persuaded thus to regard the English Church as unreformed on the ground that the Protestant and Calvinistic Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England were to be "interpreted" in the light of the Prayer Book, which, it was alleged, contained "Catholic" as opposed to Protestant doctrine. The Anglo Catholic party in the Church of England has consistently ignored and flouted these Articles, which are still the law of the English Church. Every candidate for ordination in the Church of England must formally assent to the Articles, with their emphatic repudiation of the Romish practices and superstitions,—practices and superstitions which the Anglo Catholic party is attempting to reintroduce into the English Church in order to rob it of its Reformed character. Notwithstanding the casuistry which has enabled those not believing in the Articles to give their formal assent to them, it is the strong desire of the Romanizing party to eliminate them. An attempt has recently been made to do so. At the recent Church Assembly the Commission on the Staffing of the Parishes, in reporting through its chairman, the Bishop of Southwark, recommended "that assent to the Thirty Nine Articles should no longer be required as part of the doctrinal test necessary for admission to Holy Orders." The ostensible basis upon which the recommendation was based was the decline in candidates for the Ministry, the Commission being of the opinion that if the Articles were dropped, the number of candidates would be increased. Lord Brentford, in opposing the report, remarked that the reference to the Articles reminded him of the Lambeth Conference statement that the Articles must be interpreted by the Prayer Book. There was no legal authority for such a statement. In order to induce young men to take Orders, they were proposing to allow them not to signify assent to Articles to which every one of the Bishops had more than once signified their assent, he presumed without any strain on their consciences. He appealed to the Assembly that it should not by a side-wind cast reflection upon what was still an important formulary of the Church of England. After other opposition, the report was referred on motion of Prebendary Hinde, to the Diocesan Conferences for consideration, which is a courteous manner of shelving the matter for some time. The *Life of Faith (London)* comments as follows upon this action: "These occurrences have to be viewed in connection with the whole existing situation. The Eastern Bishops were recently told that the Thirty Nine Articles are to be interpreted by the Book of Common Prayer; and it is plain that some of those who take that position interpret the doctrine of that Book in a way that, we are convinced, cannot be reconciled with the Articles in their plain meaning, or with the historical conditions which gave the Articles their origin. They are, in fact, a bulwark of the Evangelical interpretation of the Prayer Book, and it is of the highest importance that they should remain as the authoritative test of the exposition of the doctrine of that Book. It seems to have been suggested that there is only the desire to remove archaisms, and not to alter doc-

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