

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING  
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

ETHEL WALLACE, Assistant Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO., Inc.,  
525 Locust Street, Phila., Pa.

AUGUST, 1937  
Vol. 8

No. 4

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE  
Entered as second-class matter May 11,  
1931, at the Post Office at Philadelphia,  
Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### DR. ALLIS REPLIES TO DR. CHAFER

**T**HE October-December issue of *Bibliotheca Sacra* contains a lengthy and somewhat pretentious article by LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER that has as its objective not only the removal of misunderstandings but more especially a constructive statement of the fundamentals of what he calls "conservative Dispensationalism." And as he evidently thinks that DR. OSWALD T. ALLIS has done much to engender these misunderstandings by his two articles in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, entitled "Modern Dispensationalism and the Doctrine of the Unity of Scripture" and "Modern Dispensationalism and the Law of God" (reprints of which may be obtained from the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. of Grand Rapids, post free, for ten and twelve cents respectively) there is frequent allusion to and criticism of DR. ALLIS' views in the course of his article. As we commented at some length on both of DR. ALLIS' articles it is not surprising that he should have accorded us the privilege of printing his reply to DR. CHAFER—not to DR. CHAFER's article as a whole but merely to some of his specific allusions to himself.

It would ill become us to take part in this exchange of views between DRs. ALLIS and CHAFER. It may not be out of place, however, for us to direct attention to two or three of DR. CHAFER's statements which not only lie outside the circle of interests covered by DR. ALLIS' article but which do not even enter into the substance of DR. CHAFER's constructive statement.

DR. CHAFER objects to DR. ALLIS' use of the term "Modern Dispensationalism" on the ground that it implies that Dispensationalism is *modern*. It seems to us, however, that DR. CHAFER's criticism of the use of this term is far from convincing. It is no doubt true that dispensational distinctions are very ancient, going back in fact to the Scriptures themselves. It does not follow, however, that the Dispensationalism advocated by DR. CHAFER is not a modern phenomenon any more than it follows that Darwinism is not modern in view of the fact that evolutionary theories are very ancient. As a matter of fact, whether it be heresy

or orthodoxy, few will deny that Dispensationalism of the *Scofield Bible* type is of relatively recent origin.

Closely related to what has just been said is DR. CHAFER's criticism of those who say, "I am a Premillennialist, but not a Dispensationalist." It is no doubt true that one cannot accept Premillennialism without having it exercise a dominating influence over his interpretation of Scripture as a whole "since it bears on the whole divine program from its beginning to its end." Hence the importance of the Premillennial issue. It does not follow, however, that one cannot be a Premillennialist without accepting Dispensationalism as advocated by DR. CHAFER. It is natural no doubt for DR. CHAFER to think that the logic of the situation demands that the Premillennialist be a Dispensationalist in his sense of the term, but, as a matter of fact, many of the ablest Premillennialists differ with him at this point. And if it be true, as we think it is, that such Dispensationalism is of recent origin it is obvious that throughout most of the history of the Church Premillennialists have not been Dispensationalists in his meaning of the term.

In an editorial that precedes DR. CHAFER's article (written by his colleague, ROLLIN THOMAS CHAFER, but which doubtless had his approval) "eschatological freedom" is condemned. "The one-time theory was," we read, "that if two men saw eye to eye in their Christological and soteriological views violent differences in eschatological outlook should not disturb their fellowship. And we all recall instances in which ability to dwell together in Christian fellowship were conspicuously demonstrated. However, in view of the fact that true Christian theology is a systematization of all revealed truth, there seems to be no more warrant for freedom of choice in one division of theology than in another." This would seem to mean, if it means anything, that differences of opinion relative to the return of our Lord are as little differences among Christian brethren as difference relative to the deity of Christ and the method of salvation. It certainly looks in the direction of the organization of a Premillennial Church in which those who hold the A-millennial or the Post-millennial view of our Lord's return will not be recognized as Christian brethren. In our judgment, provided they all believe in the actual return of our Lord "in like manner" as He ascended into



heaven, it is quite absurd to imply that the differences between those who hold the A-millennial, the Post-millennial and the Pre-millennial views of our Lord's return are on a par with the differences between those who confess and those who deny His deity or those who confess and those who deny that His name is the one name given under heaven whereby we may be saved.

## FIVE BOOKS ON ESSENTIAL DOCTRINES

**S**OME time ago the American Tract Society offered a prize of one thousand dollars "for the best treatise on one or more essential evangelical doctrines of the Christian faith." A committee representing six denominations unanimously awarded this prize to Dr. HARRY A. IRONSIDE, pastor of the Moody Memorial Church of Chicago, for his treatment of the theme, "Except Ye Repent." Among the manuscripts submitted there were four others judged by the committee to be of such exceptional value and merit that their publication was strongly advised. These included "The Cross of Christ," by Dr. GEORGE P. PIERSON, for some forty years a missionary in Japan under the auspices of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions; "The Heart of the Christian Faith," by Dr. FRANCIS SHUNK DOWNS, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, California; "The Christian Evangel," by Dr. JOHN McNICOL, Principal of the Toronto Bible College; and "The Triune God," by Dr. C. NORMAN BARTLETT, of the Faculty of the National Bible Institute of New York City. Hence as a result of this prize contest the American Tract Society published during April and May of this year not merely one but five books dealing in a highly illuminating manner with essential doctrines of the Christian Faith. These books are approximately the same in size—they range from 173 to 208 pages—and the price of each is \$1.50.

Despite the unanimous vote of the committee, opinion will no doubt differ as to the relative merits of these books. This is not said by way of detracting from Dr. IRONSIDE's book—we imagine that most readers would have given it first place and that few would have given it less than second place—but by way of calling attention to the fact that one or two of the others are nearly as good if not better. It is not without warrant that the publisher refers to them as a group of books "of outstanding value and importance." What Dr. IRONSIDE says of his own book, "I have not written for literary critics or for theological quibblers, but for earnest people who desire to know the will of God and do it," applies in almost equal measure to the other four books with the possible exception of that on "The Triune God" by Dr. BARTLETT—an exception, however, in as far as it is an exception, that is due to the profundity of the subject with which it deals. All five books seek to be loyal to the Bible as the Word of God and evangelical in content.

Dr. IRONSIDE's discussion of the nature and importance of repentance is certainly a tract for the times and we hope its message will be widely read and heeded. It is particularly refreshing to note the manner in which he stresses the

indispensableness of repentance to salvation at the present time as over against certain Dispensationalists with whom he is more or less closely associated. This book is a thorough-going exposition of our Lord's solemn words, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

Dr. PIERSON's book contains a rich, many-sided and highly original discussion of the central doctrine of Christianity. It views the Cross from above, from its remote background, from its near background, from itself, from the left and right and foreground, from below, and from the after centuries. Its purpose—a purpose that it accomplishes with large success—is to show that "heaven, earth, and man are intelligible only in a Cross-centered circle of truth, and further, that from Jesus' own eyes the easily escapable Cross was the supreme goal of His incarnation, humiliation, and all the glory that followed."

The books by Drs. McNICOL and DOWNS deal with "doctrines" of the Christian faith and so are more general in character. Dr. McNICOL's book is "an effort to draw out of the sacred text the essential elements in the Christian Gospel" with stress on the fact that a knowledge of both the Old and the New Testaments is needed for a thorough understanding of the Christian faith. It is in effect a commendable answer to the question, What is Christianity? Dr. DOWNS' book (introduction by Dr. WM. HALLOCK JOHNSON) covers a wide range of topics as the titles of its chapters indicate: "The Inspired Book," "The Person of our Lord Jesus Christ," "The Atoning Cross," "The Glorious Resurrection," "The Holy Spirit and Man's Regeneration," "The Christian Life and the Christian Church," and "Things to Come." "By reading his book," writes Dr. JOHNSON with warrant, "mature Christians will find that their faith is made stronger and more intelligent, and it is hoped that a thoughtful study of it will help many young people and inquirers to see the attractiveness of the Christian faith and will lead them to accept Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord." Dr. DOWNS' book will probably appeal to a wider circle of readers than any other of these books. In his discussion of the return of our Lord, Dr. DOWNS seeks to steer between the premillennial and the postmillennial view. It is somewhat strange, however, in view of the teachings of the Westminster Standards, to which Dr. DOWNS subscribes, not to mention the fact that he studied under Prof. GEERHARDUS VOS, that he should have omitted any reference to the amillennial view in this connection. As a whole his discussion of "Things to Come" is marked by a sanity and restraint that does not always characterize writers in this field. Dr. DOWNS' book contains a running defence as well as an exposition of the essentials of the Christian faith.

Dr. BARTLETT's book deals in an illuminating manner with the doctrine of the Trinity—a doctrine which he rightly claims lies at the very heart of Christian truth. Its object is to show the essential reasonableness and intelligibility of the Scriptural doctrine of God. Much of the book is confessedly speculative but it seeks to show, with no small measure of success, that faith in a unipersonal God such as the anti-trinitarians posit is untenable. It seems to



us that Dr. BARTLETT especially in his discussion of the self-sufficiency of God and his discussion of the "kenosis or self-emptying of Christ" makes some highly questionable statements but on the whole the book is to be commended as an original and penetrative contribution to one of the profoundest subjects with which the mind of man has ever engaged.

The American Tract Society has reason to be proud of the publication of this group of popular books.

## MORE ABOUT INFANT SALVATION

What follows is intended as supplementary to what we wrote in our June issue under the heading "Calvinism and Infant Salvation." The main object we had in view on that occasion was to point out that Calvinism, so far from being the harshest of the Christian systems of thought as regards the fate of those dying in infancy is really the most generous and inclusive.

We pointed out, for instance, that it is the confessions of the strictly Calvinistic churches and of those alone that positively affirm the salvation even of all the children of believers who die in infancy—churches like the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran and the Episcopalian being kept from doing this by reason of the stress they place on baptism as a means of salvation.

We also pointed out relative to the children of unbelievers that while there have not been lacking Calvinists as well as others who have held that some or even all of these are lost yet that most have taken either an agnostic attitude as regards their fate or positively affirmed their beliefs in their salvation—the latter being for many years the prevailing opinion on their part. This latter view, as is generally known, is the official view of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as expressed in the Declaratory Statement adopted in 1903: "We believe that all dying in infancy are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how as He pleases."

We might also have pointed out that while the history of Christian thought on this subject shows that many Calvinists have fallen short of believing that all those dying in infancy are saved yet that none of the Calvinistic confessions ever asserted that any of them are lost. It has, it is true, been held that this is implied in the Westminster Confession of Faith—in fact it was to guard against this inference that the Declaratory Statement from which we have just cited was adopted—but such a view is not only a misinterpretation of the teaching of the Confession of Faith but absolutely forbidden by historical considerations. The history of the phrase, "elect infants dying in infancy" makes perfectly clear that the contrast implied was not between "elect infants dying in infancy" and "non-elect infants dying in infancy" but between "elect infants dying in infancy" and "elect infants living to grow up." It is true, of course, that the Confession of Faith in its original form does not affirm the salvation of

all those dying in infancy but at the same time it is equally true that it does not affirm or even necessarily imply that any such are lost.

What we are particularly concerned to amplify in this connection is the statement that Calvinism is the only system of Christian thought in which the doctrine of the salvation of all those dying in infancy finds a natural and logical place. This means, provided this statement is valid, that if we as Christians are to believe in the salvation of all those dying in infancy in harmony with our other beliefs we must perforce be Calvinists.

Please do not overlook that we state that it is the only system of *Christian thought* with which the salvation of all those dying in infancy is conformable. There are those for instance, who believe that all will be saved because of their innocence—having committed no sins they stand, so it is held, in no need of salvation. No system, however, that posits their salvation on the basis of the innocence of human infancy is in that respect Christian. No doctrine of infant salvation in fact, is *Christian* that does not recognize that infants too are lost members of a lost race for whom there is no salvation except as they are savingly united to Christ. Think what it would imply if all those dying in infancy were to enter heaven apart from the saving work of Christ. It would imply that the great majority of the members of the human race who to date at least have entered heaven have done so under no obligation to Christ for their presence there. It is hardly necessary to argue the point. It is not even open to question that according to *Christian* thought none of any age enter life except as they are saved by Christ.

Before proceeding further, to prevent possible misunderstanding, let it be noted that we have not alleged that only Calvinists hold that all infants are saved but merely that they are the only Christians that hold this doctrine in consistency with other beliefs basic to their systems.

It is true that most Arminians, of whom the Methodists are the chief representatives, assert the salvation of all infants dying in infancy. It seems clear, however, that this doctrine is irreconcilable with their conception of the method of salvation. It is basic to their whole contention that Christ has made possible the salvation of all but that He actually saves only those who put their trust in Him and exercise evangelical obedience. It is obvious, however, that those dying in infancy leave this world without having put their trust in Christ or having exercised evangelical obedience. If none the less they are saved in the same sense as adults it must be that they are saved in an essentially Calvinistic manner, *i.e.*, on the basis of their unconditional election. Here the words of Dr. Warfield are very much to the point: "If only a single infant dying in irresponsible infancy be saved, the whole Arminian principle is traversed. If all infants dying such are saved, not only the majority of the saved, but doubtless the majority of the human race hitherto, have entered into life by a non-Arminian way."

It is also true that many, perhaps most present-day Lutherans affirm belief in the salvation of all dying in

(Continued on Page 79)



# "Modern Dispensationalism and the Doctrine of the Unity of Scripture"

By Rev. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D.

In the January, 1937, issue of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, President Lewis Sperry Chafer, of Dallas Theological Seminary, published an article entitled, "Dispensationalism." This article as the name suggests is not primarily a reply to criticisms, but an elaborate presentation of what is known as "dispensational truth" with incidental reference to recent criticism of it. The article covers 60 pages and a full discussion of all the matters touched upon might require as lengthy a reply. This I shall not undertake. But since Dr. Chafer has referred repeatedly in the course of his article, to criticisms of Dispensationalism recently made by me in the *Evangelical Quarterly* (June and July) and on several points has definitely requested a reply, I feel that I should not longer delay to make answer, lest silence on my part be misconstrued, even though for special reasons my answer must now be relatively brief.

In his book *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy* Dr. Chafer has made the following statement: "The covenants and destinies of Israel are all earthly: the covenants and destinies of the church are all heavenly" (p. 87). To a considerable extent his present article may be regarded as an elaboration of that thesis. He aims to show that "throughout the ages God is pursuing two distinct purposes: one related to the earth with earthly people and earthly objectives involved, while the other is related to heaven with heavenly people and heavenly objectives involved" (p. 448). During the present or church age the distinction is temporarily broken down, but for the kingdom age future it holds as rigidly as for the kingdom age past. It is in connection with this claim that Dr. Chafer deals most fully with one of the main criticisms of Dispensationalism contained in my first article. In that article I pointed out that an especially dangerous feature of Dispensationalism as it is taught in the *Scofield Reference Bible*, consists in the recognition of *four distinct forms* of the Gospel: the gospel of the kingdom, the gospel of the grace of God, the everlasting gospel and what Paul calls 'my gospel' (*S. R. B.*, p. 1343). As defined by Dr. Scofield there is a very striking difference between the gospel of the kingdom and the gospel of the grace of God: the former makes practically no reference to the Cross; the latter is full of it. As to the preaching of these *forms* of the gospel a further important distinction is drawn. The former was preached by John and its preaching continued by Jesus and His disciples up to "the Jewish rejection of the King" and it is to be preached again after the Church is raptured, i.e., "during the great tribulation and immediately preceding the coming of the King in glory." The latter, the gospel of the grace of God, i.e., the preaching of the Cross, is the gospel of the Church age. I pointed out that in the kingdom age "men are to be saved apparently by obedience to the King and not by trust in the Saviour."

Dr. Chafer refers in a lengthy footnote to my criticism of this distinction between the gospel of the kingdom and the gospel of the grace of God and with a view to establishing it more securely calls attention to "four out of many important differences between them." They are stated as follows:

"(a) The gospel of the kingdom as preached by Christ, by John the Baptist, and by the Apostles is declared and amplified in an extended body of Scripture (cf. Matt. 3:1-12; 4:17; 10:5-42; Lk. 3:7-14). Its distinctive "good news" is the announcement of the presence of the long-expected Messiah and His predicted blessings for Israel. Over against this, the gospel of the grace of God is even more extensive and announces a plan of perfect salvation

for Jew and Gentile alike. (b) The kingdom gospel, since it concerns Israel's national hope, was properly restricted to them. The heralds of this gospel went not to Gentile nor Samaritan, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 10:5-7; 15:24, 26). Whereas the gospel of the grace of God is to be preached to all nations and to the uttermost part of the earth. (c) The one and only requirement on the human side which the kingdom gospel imposes is *repentance*; while the only requirement in the gospel of the grace of God is *faith*, or *believing*. A covenant people return to the blessing of their covenants, when these have been lost through sin, by *repentance* and its outward expression—*confession* (Ps. 32:5; Matt. 4:17, 1 John 1:9). On the other hand, the requirement on the human side for present salvation is belief in Christ as Savior, which belief includes all the repentance (which is a change of mind) that a spiritually dead person can produce. John's Gospel, written that men may be saved through faith in Christ, and the Letter to the Romans, which is the very structure of the plan of salvation do not use the word *repentance* as a separate act in salvation, nor is anything added, nor could anything be added reasonably, to the one and only requirement—*believe*. However, believing as related to the Messiah must be distinguished from believing unto salvation. Since the first preaching of the kingdom gospel called for repentance only, it is evident that it was addressed to a covenant people, and it is to be noted that Israel was the only covenant people in that day. It is also evident that this gospel call was not for the salvation even of Israel, but was for their revival and restoration. (d) Since according to Matthew 10:7, 8 signs were to accompany the kingdom preaching—healing, cleansing of the lepers, raising of the dead, and casting out demons, and this they did (cf. Lk. 10:17) —, this seal is an inseparable feature of kingdom preaching. On the other hand, though certain miracles were wrought by the early preachers of the Grace Gospel, no signs were ever promised as an accompanying seal. Similarly, what place has Matt. 10:22; 24:13 in a Calvinistic conception of salvation? The questions may be asked in all kindness of Dr. Allis and all men of his school of interpretation, How many men have been led to a saving knowledge of a crucified and risen Savior by calling on them to repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand? And has this preaching been accompanied by the designated miracles which are the seal of a kingdom ministry?" (p. 436f.)

The first two "differences" may be taken together as they both deal with the claim that the kingdom gospel was exclusively for Israel. Since the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. 15:24, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" are so frequently appealed to, we may deal with them more especially. When taken together with Mt. 10:5f., they indicate clearly the primary and immediate object of Jesus' mission. He came first of all as the Messiah of the Jews. He offered Himself to them as their King, the Son of David. But they refused and rejected Him; and were themselves rejected by Him. The calling of the Gentiles followed the rejection of the Jews. All this is true. But it is also true and must not be overlooked that the particularism involved in the call of Abraham had universalism in its heart and as its ultimate goal: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be



blessed" (Gen. 22:18). This note of universalism appears very clearly in Ps. 72, and it is a marked feature of the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament (cf. especially Isa. 19:23f.). This note of universalism appears plainly in the Gospels. The universal note is sounded in the words of the angelic host who were heard by the shepherds to say "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, goodwill toward men;" and one of the first mortals to acclaim the infant Saviour declared that He should be "a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel." It appears most clearly in the witness of John to Jesus, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Apparently the first or nearly the first to believe on Jesus were Samaritans (Jn. 4, esp. vs. 39-42). His first sermon at Nazareth had as its theme the universal salvation heralded by Isaiah; and Jesus' exposition of it was so offensive to their national pride and exclusiveness that the Jews tried to kill Him (Lk. 4:25f.). He especially commended the faith of a Roman centurion (Matt. 8:5f.) and the gratitude of a Samaritan whom He had cured of leprosy (Lk. 17:11f.). He made a Samaritan the hero of one of His most impressive parables (Lk. 10:25f.); and He did this at the expense of the priest and the Levite. In view of these facts it is natural and proper to regard Jesus' words and His seeming reluctance to heal the daughter of the Syro-Phenician woman as intended to test and call forth her faith, which is what they actually did. Had He finally refused to heal her daughter, there would be some point to the objection that as the Jewish Messiah He had no mission to the Gentiles. But when we find that Jesus not only healed the daughter but commended the faith of the mother, the objection falls away. The glad tidings which Jesus proclaimed could not even temporarily be kept exclusively for the Jews; and Jesus was at pains to make this clear both by precept and by example.

As to the third "difference" between the two gospels, as it is stated by Dr. Chafer, that the kingdom gospel imposes one and only one requirement, *repentance*; the gospel of the grace of God but one, *faith*, it is to be observed that we have here what, if true, is indeed a striking difference. Repentance *vs.* faith. If there is such a difference as this, these two forms of the gospel are certainly distinct. But the trouble with this sharply drawn antithesis is that it is not found in Scripture. Dr. Chafer quotes three passages, Ps. 32:5, Mt. 4:17, 1 John 1:9, as proof that *repentance* and its outward expression *confession* are the duty of a covenant people, the Jews. That *faith* alone is required in the church age he argues in general from John and Romans without citing any specific statements. If we turn to Mt. 4:17 we read: "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." If this is to be regarded as a complete statement of all that is required, then it must be admitted that repentance was Jesus' sole express demand of the Jews. But we turn to Mk. 1:14f. and there we read that Jesus came "preaching the gospel of God and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: *repent ye and believe the gospel.*" Here *repentance* and *faith* are joined together. Both of these statements, it should be noted, belong to approximately the same stage in our Lord's ministry, His preaching after He heard that John had been cast into prison, i.e., to the beginning of the early Galilean ministry. They are apparently "parallel passages" and Dr. Scofield seems to treat them as such. In other words, Jesus at the time when, according to the Dispensational view, He was preaching the kingdom gospel and offering Himself to the Jews as their king demanded of them *both* repentance and faith. So much for the preaching of the kingdom gospel to the Jews by our Lord Himself.

We turn to the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God in the Church age as defined by Dr. Chafer and Dr. Scofield. Did it demand only faith? Paul, in his farewell to the elders of the church at Ephesus, reminds them that from the very first day of his long ministry in Ephesus he testified "both to the Jews and also to the Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21). Now this preaching was during the "Church age," the period when the gospel of the grace of God

was preached. Yet Paul speaks of *repentance* and *faith* as required alike of Jew and Greek. If it is objected that, since Paul claims to have declared to the Ephesian Church "all the counsel of God" (vs. 27), this preaching was what Paul calls "my gospel," it is to be noted that according to Dr. Scofield "my gospel" is "the gospel of the grace of God in its fullest development." Consequently it is clear that in the Church age Paul preached repentance and faith as essential to the gospel of the grace of God.

It appears then that this clear-cut distinction between repentance and faith as required, the one of the Jew, the other of the non-Jew, not merely lacks support in Scripture but in fact conflicts with it. More than this it carries with it a very serious implication. It implies that the non-Jews were not covenant breakers and therefore not in need of repentance. But this cannot be so. Sin and repentance go together. If the Gentiles did not need to repent, it could only be because they had no sin to repent of. But Paul in his terrible exposé of the state of the Gentile world in Rom. 1 definitely asserts that because "the invisible things" of God "are clearly seen" the Gentiles are "without excuse" because "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God neither were thankful" (vs. 19-21). Paul then denounces the Jews for failure to prove worthy of their unique distinction that unto them were committed the "oracles of God," and his conclusion is a sweeping one. He assures us most emphatically that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (3:23). There is "no difference" between Jew and Gentile: both are sinners. And if both are sinners, both need to *repent*. The Jew had it is true broken the Abrahamic covenant and forfeited the blessings secured by it. But Jew and Greek alike had forfeited *every* blessing and were guilty before God because both had broken the law of God. To deny this is to deny that what we call natural morality and natural religion had any claim upon or made any demands of the Gentile and that failure to keep that law which was written in nature and conscience was sin which needed to be repented of.

Surely no one who believes the Bible can deny that the heathen are "guilty before God." They are guilty, not of failure to live up to the light of the gospel, of which they have not heard, but of failure to keep the law written in their hearts. And if they are guilty they should be called on to repent. Dr. Chafer of course believes this. So he proceeds to do what Dispensationalists so often do. Having stated a distinction in very definite terms, he proceeds almost immediately to tone it down and obliterate it. After having stated definitely that "The one and only requirement on the human side which the kingdom gospel imposes is repentance; while the only requirement in the gospel of the grace of God is *faith or believing*" he goes on almost at once to say, "On the other hand, the requirement on the human side for present salvation [through the gospel of the grace of God] is belief in Christ as Savior, *which belief includes all the repentance* (which is a change of mind) *that a spiritually dead person can produce.*" The words which I have italicized should be carefully noted, for two reasons. The first reason is that this qualification practically amounts to a surrender of everything that Dr. Chafer has just been contending for. Instead of the difference being as originally stated, "*repentance vs. faith*," it now becomes "*repentance vs. faith plus some repentance.*" Furthermore, since it was demanded of the Jew that he look for and accept his Messiah—repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,—Dr. Chafer cannot deny that under the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom repentance and return to the covenant involved acceptance of or belief in Jesus as Messiah, i.e., involved *some* faith, though he draws here an extremely damaging distinction between believing on the Messiah and believing unto salvation. So the sharp antithesis "*repentance vs. faith*" becomes "*repentance (plus faith) vs. faith (plus repentance).*" In other words it practically disappears. As a real antithesis it is thoroughly unscriptural. Qualified as it has to be qualified, it simply ceases to exist. Repentance and faith always have been, are now and always will be the means by which the sinner, be he Jew or Gentile must find acceptance with God.



In the second place, it is to be noted that in qualifying the distinction which he has drawn between repentance and faith, Dr. Chafer declares that "belief in Christ as Savior includes all the repentance . . . that a spiritually dead person can produce." We have just seen that this qualification proves that Dr. Chafer recognizes that faith must include repentance for sin. How much repentance, he does not tell us, but he implies that there is at least some. Yet by describing them as "dead in trespasses and sins" the Bible makes it very clear that spiritually dead persons cannot produce one iota of true repentance. "Repentance unto life" is correctly defined in the *Shorter Catechism* as a "saving grace." "Faith in Jesus Christ" is likewise a "saving grace." Both of these saving graces are the result of regeneration. How much "saving grace" can a spiritually dead person, an unsaved person, produce? None at all. He is dead in trespasses and sins. Saving repentance and saving faith—and they are the only repentance and the only faith worth talking about in this connection—are alike the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart and the evidence, in heart and life, that the spiritually dead has been regenerated, raised into newness of life by the mighty power of the saving and sovereign God.

In his endeavor to establish and prove a distinction to which the Dispensationalists attach much importance, Dr. Chafer has committed two errors characteristic of the advocates and exponents of Dispensationalism. He has drawn a clear cut distinction. Then he has practically obliterated it. It is this which prevents many people from perceiving the errors of Dispensationalism. It is this also which makes it hard to combat it. It is inconsistent. It has to be or its fallacies would be so apparent that it would cease to attract Bible-loving Christians.

As to the last of the "differences" mentioned by Dr. Chafer, the claim that according to Matthew and Luke *signs*—healing, cleansing of the lepers, raising the dead, etc.—were to accompany the preaching of the kingdom gospel and did so and are therefore indispensable evidence of it, we have only this to remark. The preaching which is immediately referred to in the proof texts is a preaching of the "kingdom gospel" by the *apostles*. A study of the Book of Acts will show that the same signs accompanied the preaching of the "gospel of the grace of God" when it was preached by the *apostles*. We are expressly told that Jesus gave such powers to the apostles. We are not told, unless it be in the "long ending" of Mark's Gospel, which is of doubtful authenticity (see *Scofield Ref. Bible*, p. 1069), that such signs were to follow the preaching of others than the apostles. It is a fact generally recognized at least by Protestants that such signs actually did cease with the close of the apostolic age.

We come finally to Dr. Chafer's questions: "What place has Matt. 10: 22; 24: 13, in a Calvinistic conception of salvation?" Our answer is simple. The Calvinist believes in "the perseverance of the saints," this means that those who have been "effectually called" will make their calling and election sure "by perseverance therein unto the end." We are at a loss to understand why Dr. Chafer, who is a Calvinist, should ask this question. Is he a Calvinist only dispensationally? Does he believe that Calvinism applies only to one or more of these four forms of the gospel, but not to all? "How many men have been led to a saving knowledge of a crucified and risen Savior by calling on them to repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand?" That is a question which God alone can answer. I can only say this. A preaching of the Gospel which does not seek to move men to repentance, by declaring that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" and exhort them "to flee from the wrath to come" is not Scriptural preaching. A preaching of the Gospel which does not seek to move men to faith in Christ by declaring that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," that does not declare to them in glowing words the glory of that heavenly kingdom into which only those can enter who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, is not Scriptural preaching. The awfulness of sin and the wonders of salvation—those are the two poles of all true gospel preaching. To

preach either without the other is to preach only half a gospel or no gospel at all. To preach both is to preach *the* gospel, the gospel of the grace of God, which is and has been and will be until the end of time the only gospel for the sinner, for Jew and for Gentile. Whether many or few are saved under this preaching is not the concern of the preacher. His one duty is to be faithful in proclaiming it. But it is this preaching which in the long history of the Church has had testimony born to it by the saving of many souls that it is the power of God unto salvation.

Before closing this article I must call attention briefly to several other points raised elsewhere by Dr. Chafer. He objects to the appeals which Professor Murray of Westminster Seminary and I have made to the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, in our criticisms of Dispensationalism. He asserts that this amounts to putting creedal statements above the Word of God. This is a misapprehension of our position; and it is one of which Dr. Chafer should not be guilty. Dr. Chafer, Professor Murray, and I are all Presbyterians and we have declared that we accept the Westminster standards "as containing the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture." The reason Professor Murray and I quoted from these Standards rather frequently was simply because we were writing primarily for Presbyterians, because we considered it of no small importance to prove that Dispensationalism was markedly out of harmony with these Standards and because we felt—here I have no authority to speak for Professor Murray but I am sure he would heartily agree—that on many of the points at issue the statements of the Standards could not be improved upon by us and their formulation of vital truth would carry far more weight with those for whom we were writing, than any statements of our own. If this is to exalt Creeds above the Bible then Dr. Chafer and the Dispensationalists in general should be more cautious about quoting Dr. Scofield and other dispensational authorities.

Without attempting to discuss Dr. Chafer's rather lengthy reply to my criticism of Dr. Scofield's contention that the petition of the Lord's Prayer ("Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors") is "legal ground" and not an appropriate petition for the Christian of the Church age, I would like to ask Dr. Chafer a very simple question. Jesus said to His disciples, "When ye pray say, Our Father who art in heaven," etc. Does Dr. Chafer obey this injunction and offer this prayer? Does he teach his students to do so?

In defending the so-called "postponement theory" regarding the Davidic Kingdom, Dr. Chafer mentions a certain unnamed "Presbyterian preacher of the South" and me and remarks: "These men are Calvinists, yet they are disturbed over the seeming conflict between divine sovereignty and human will" (p. 402). Not having seen the article by the gentleman alluded to—his name is not given and it is merely stated that the article appeared "in a reputable Presbyterian journal"—I can only speak for myself. What Dr. Chafer refers to is my discussion of Dr. Scofield's explanation of the meaning of the words "at hand" (Matt. 4: 17). He says "'At hand' is never a positive affirmation that the person or thing said to be 'at hand' will immediately appear, but only that no known or predicted event must intervene" (p. 998). After quoting the entire note in the *Scofield Reference Bible*, I made this statement:

"How such a statement can be reconciled as to the Old Testament with the 22nd and 110th Psalms and the 53rd of Isaiah, or as to the New Testament with the words with which the Baptist greeted our Lord, 'Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world,' or with the words of the risen Lord to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, 'O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?' or with the whole grand argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a mystery. They are simply irreconcilable."

The question of predestination does not enter into this matter. I accept the statements in Matt. 23: 37 and Acts 2: 23 just as



fully as Dr. Chafer does. The point is that the Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament, emphatically denies that when John declared the kingdom of heaven to be at hand, "the next thing in the order of revelation as it then stood, should have been the setting up of the Davidic kingdom."

In view of what has been said above the reader of this article will not be surprised to find that I am not prepared to withdraw my objections to Dispensationalism and admit Dr. Chafer's contention that this system of interpretation "even though it does departmentalize the message of the Word of God according to its obvious divisions, does also discover the true unity and continuity of the Bible" (p. 446). On the contrary, Dr. Chafer's discussion and especially his method of interpretation only confirm me in my sincere belief that Dispensationalism is destructive of both the true unity and true continuity of the Bible because its characteristic divisions are not obvious but require the wresting of Scripture to prove them. The issue is not between "partial" Dispensationalists and "instructed" or thorough-going Dispensationalists, the difference is between Scriptural Dispensationalism and unscriptural Dispensationalism. To recognize the perfectly obvious Scriptural differences between the Old Testament dispensation and the New Testament dispensation is one thing. To insist that the Old Testament dispensation has only been temporarily suspended and that the Christian dispensation in which there is no difference between Jew and Greek is to be succeeded by a dispensation in which Jewish national expectation will be realized is quite another. To believe in the return of the Jews in the Pauline sense, that they will be grafted in again into the one olive tree into which the Gentiles have already been grafted is one thing. To insist that this return means the re-establishing of an earthly kingdom in which Jewish particularities will be revived is quite another.

While sincerely appreciative of Dr. Chafer's zeal for the Gospel and devotion to the Word of God as the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, I cannot but hold that the extremes to which he is obliged to go in the attempt to make good the claim that "through the ages God is pursuing two distinct purposes: one related to the earth with earthly people and earthly objectives involved, while the other is related to heaven with heavenly people and heavenly objectives involved" constitute clear and convincing proof that no such distinction is taught in Scripture.

## CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM

(Continued from Page 84)

to us and take place within us). Redemption was worked out for us by Christ, and was completed when He died on the cross. The application of that redemption to our souls and bodies by the Holy Spirit, however, is a long process which is carried forward throughout all of our lives here, and which is not completed until we stand with sanctified souls and glorious resurrection bodies before the throne of God. We are no longer under the curse of sin, but so long as we remain in this world we are subjected to temptations and innumerable times we fall into sin. We are enabled, however, more and more to die unto sin and to live unto righteousness. Likewise, in our physical nature we continue weak, subject to disease and certain to die—death being the last enemy to be conquered. The error of the faith-healers is that they set forth a thoroughly un-Scriptural idea of sickness and pain, and try to appropriate here and now those blessings which are not to be conferred until the process is completed.

## MORE ABOUT INFANT SALVATION

(Continued from Page 75)

infancy despite the fact that the Augsburg Confession teaches that baptism is necessary to salvation. Obviously most of those who have died in infancy have not been baptised. Hence if none the less all those dying in infancy are actually saved it seems clear that the Lutheran stress on the means of grace—the Word and the sacraments as the channels through which the benefits of Christ's saving work is communicated to individuals—is untenable. It is therefore only by a happy inconsistency that the Lutherans (as in the case of the Methodists) are able to believe in the salvation of all dying in infancy. If here the exception proves to be the rule the tenableness of their system is invalidated.

What is true of the Lutherans is even more obviously true of the Roman Catholics (and the Anglicans in as far as they hold the Roman Catholic conception of the sacraments). Roman Catholics fixedly holding as they do that baptism is necessary as a means of salvation are precluded from believing that anything like all those dying in infancy are saved. Moreover unlike so many Methodists and Lutherans they adhere to the logic of their position and make no profession of belief in the salvation of all dying such. But while there is no place in the Roman Catholic system for the salvation of all infants they do not consign them to hell. Rather they assign them to a neutral place—a place in which while deprived of the joy of salvation they are not subject to the pains of hell.

In view of what has been related it seems clear that the doctrine of the salvation of all dying in infancy is not conformable with either Arminianism, Lutheranism or Roman Catholicism and if true destroys the integrity of these systems. The same, however, cannot be said of Calvinism according to which the salvation of adults and infants alike hinges ultimately not on the ordinances of the Church or on anything that man himself may do but on God's free and loving election. Differences among Calvinists concerning the salvation of infants, until recent times at least, has turned on the question whether only the children of believers or whether all children (dying such) are included among the elect. Either view is consistent with Calvinism. As has been pointed out, most Calvinists today hold that all those who die in infancy are thereby proven to be among the elect. Our main contention is that it is in Calvinism and in Calvinism alone of the Christian systems of thought that such a belief finds a natural and a logical place.

In concluding we cannot refrain from pointing out that if it be true that all those dying in infancy are saved (as we believe), and if it be further true that Calvinism is the only system of Christian thought in which such a belief finds a harmonious place (as we think we have shown), then, it seems clear, we are here face to face with that which evidences in a peculiarly convincing way that Calvinism is the purest expression of the gospel of the saving grace of God.



# Christian Supernaturalism

By Dr. Loraine Boettner, Professor of Bible, Pikeville College

## Part V

### Cures Worked by the Faith-Healers

**A**NOTHER class of people who claim to work cures in our day are the faith-healers, Christian Scientists and mind-cure specialists. When a serious attempt is made to investigate these cases most of them, like those of the Roman Catholics, are found to be false. We must acknowledge, however, that some of them have been real. Practically all these latter cases have to do with nervous or mental disorders, rheumatic pains, or afflictions which are little if anything more than imaginary. Occasionally those who have been incapacitated for some time have made greater recovery than they realize, and when in connection with a faith-healer's suggestion they suddenly discover their regained strength they sincerely believe that a miracle has been wrought.

It is common knowledge that many people who think themselves to be seriously sick do by that very means make themselves sick. Every physician can testify that he has been called upon to treat dozens of such cases, and that in treating them his primary task is to get his patients into a different state of mind. In such cases the power of suggestion is much more effective than medicine. The cures of the Christian Scientists are in reality not Mind-cures but mind-cures, wrought by the patient's own change of thought—which, indeed, is the substance of what is asserted scores of times by Mrs. Eddy herself in her book, "Science and Health."

What finally emerges in these cases is a definite boundary which separates that class of cures which can be wrought by mental reactions, and those which cannot. In no cases have broken bones, cancer, spinal meningitis, scarlet fever, etc., been cured, nor have amputated limbs, or even such little things as lost teeth or lost hair been restored. The inability of faith-healers to work cures of this kind is in itself an admission that their cures are not truly supernatural.

Another point to be kept in mind is that comparatively few physicians are good diagnosticians, even though they may have practiced medicine all their lives. Perhaps there is no physician who has not been badly deceived more than once in regard to the nature of the disease he was trying to treat—as the autopsy has shown. This is only natural, since the human body is such a highly complicated organism. Doctors often pronounce a case hopeless, only to be surprised by the patient's recovery. Yet faith-healers never tire of telling how this or that doctor gave up a particular case as hopeless. Few contrasts are more remarkable than the scorn which the average faith-healer has for physicians as healers, and the unbounded confidence which he reposes in them as diagnosticians. If he can say that on the testimony of this or that doctor the case was hopeless, he considers that the end of all argument.

The question before us is not as to whether or not God hears and answers prayer, for we believe firmly that He does—we disagree with the faith-healers, however, in that we believe He answers prayer not by miracles, but in accordance with His general providential control; nor is it a question as to whether or not He heals the sick, for this we also believe. The question is: Does God heal the sick in ways which are truly miraculous, without the use of means, and does that healing take place in such a manner that the use of means is unnecessary, or a mark of a lack of faith, or even of sinful distrust on the part of Christians?

In the first place we would point out that the Scriptures contain no promises of such miraculous healings. The passage in Mark 16:17, 18, which is the chief one relied upon by faith-healers, is now recognized as spurious by practically all scholars. The evidence is that those verses were not in the original, but were added by later copyists. The second most quoted passage is James 5:14, 15: "Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." As Dr. Warfield has well said, "Here we have nothing but a very earnest exhortation to sick people to turn to the Lord in their extremity, and a very precious promise to those who thus call upon Him, that the Lord will surely hearken to their cry." The thing emphasized is that the sick man should get himself prayed for officially by the elders of the church, which prayer, offered in faith, shall surely be heard. The Lord always answers a sincere prayer, perhaps not in the way we ask, but in the way that is best for us. And in answer to the prayer for the sick, the Lord will raise him up, perhaps physically, but at any rate spiritually, which is more important. In this passage the anointing oil is a secondary thing. Certainly there is nothing here which would exclude the ordinary medical means. Oil was a well-nigh universal remedy in the medical practice of the day, and the passage means that the sick man is to be given his medicine in the name of the Lord. The resources of civilization are ours, and we should avail ourselves of all that science knows, remembering that God is the real physician who takes away sin, sickness and death, and that it is He who gives righteousness, healing and life.

Furthermore, we would point out that we have no more reason to believe that our sicknesses and diseases will be cured without means than we have to believe that if we fail to plow and plant we will nevertheless be given food. As well might we expect to live without eating as to recover from sickness without medicine. Surely faith-feeding is quite as rational as faith-healing. And if diseases are to be cured by faith, then why may not death, which is simply the result of disease or injury, also be eliminated in the



same way? If cures are to be had by faith, then each successive cure, each successive victory, should be easier than the last, and the body should become immortal. The Scriptures, however, tell us that "It is appointed unto man once to die" (Heb. 9:27); and not even the most zealous of the faith-healers have been able to overcome that affliction. The Bible knows nothing of the redemption of the body in this life. That, it teaches, is to be accomplished in the next life, at the time of the resurrection. After the most careful study we are convinced that the claims of the faith-healers are false.

To neglect the laws of nature which God has ordained, and to refuse to use means, is to act with presumption and to cast disrespect upon God Himself. We believe that the same laws which we depend upon to bring the harvest of corn and wheat may be equally depended upon to bring the harvest of disease and death which we reap every year. No matter how righteous and holy a person may become, if he violates the laws of nature he must suffer for it. If he walks out of the tenth-story window in defiance of the law of gravity he falls with the same certainty and with the same rate of accelerating velocity as other men. The law of gravity is not suspended because of his good moral character.

While faith-healers denounce the calling of a physician and the use of medicine as "un-Scriptural," "dishonouring to God," and as a certain mark of unbelief, almost every one of them in times especially of their last sickness has done that very thing. This was true of Mrs. Eddy, A. B. Simpson, A. J. Gordon, and others. Mrs. Eddy used eyeglasses instead of overcoming the defects of her eyesight by mind, and is reported to have been considerably annoyed when asked why she did not employ the mind-cure in that regard. She also employed the good offices of a dentist to obtain relief from an aching tooth, and even availed herself of his "painless method" to guard herself against unnecessary suffering. Yet according to her own teaching, the decayed tooth, the jumping nerves and the cruel forceps were only illusions.

A great contrast between the Scripture miracles of healing and the reputed cures of the faith-healers is that so many of the latter are only partial cures, or cures which require a considerable period of time to become effective. But when Jesus healed the result followed immediately and was complete. He did not stop half way. He had only to say, "I will; be thou made clean," and the leper was healed. He opened the eyes of the blind by a touch, and commanded the palsied man to take up his bed and walk. The man's withered hand was restored whole. The blind man saw clearly. The lame man leaped up and walked. Jesus healed all who came to Him; yet it is acknowledged even by faith-healers themselves that the great majority of those who come seeking cures today go away not cured. They usually claim that those who go away uncured do so because of weak faith; yet Jesus healed all who came regardless of whether their faith was weak or strong. Furthermore, if miracles were to be considered common, everyday experiences, normal and not extraordinary, they would

attract no particular attention and could not be considered the credentials of the Lord's spokesmen, which was their chief purpose in biblical times.

Faith-healers are very emphatic in their contention that sickness is always contrary to the will of God, and that only a lack of faith keeps any person from being immediately healed. These claims, however, fail to take into consideration certain Scripture statements which declare that on various occasions God Himself has inflicted the disease or the suffering for wise and beneficent purposes. Miriam was smitten with leprosy in order that she and Aaron might be turned from their sinful course (Nu. 12:10). The Lord struck the illegitimate son of David because of the sin which had been committed (II Sam. 12:15). The psalmist said, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted; That I may learn thy statutes" (Ps. 119:71). When Jesus was asked; "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?" He replied, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him" (John 9:3). The sickness of Lazarus was "for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby" (John 11:4).

Paul was given "a thorn in the flesh, a messenger from Satan to buffet him, that he should not be exalted overmuch" (II Cor. 12:7)—a physical handicap which we find was intended for a good purpose, namely, that his eminence and success beyond that of the other disciples should not fill him with pride and arrogance. Though he earnestly "besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from him," it was not removed. We venture to say that in all the world today there is not a Christian mightier in prayer, more devoted, more Spirit-filled and enlightened than was the Apostle Paul. If God would not remove this affliction, though He was besought so earnestly to do so, certainly the faith-healers should hesitate a bit before censoring the suffering saint of today for a lack of faith which they claim would, if he had it, bring relief to his body. When Paul was told by the Lord that it was better for him to endure this suffering, that the Lord's grace would be sufficient for him, he answered, "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weakness, that the power of Christ may rest upon me" (II Cor. 12:9). In such cases where God is working out some great and good purpose (which probably is unknown to the person who suffers), no amount of prayer will bring healing. Further, we find Paul leaving Trophimus sick at Miletus (II Tim. 4:20), and in the realm of practical medicine urging Timothy to "use a little wine for his stomach's sake, and his often infirmities" (I Tim. 5:23).

Even Christ Himself, we are told, "learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8); and in bringing many sons into glory it was God's purpose also "to make the Author of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. 2:10). The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth" (12:6); and again, "God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is

(Continued on Page 84)



# Meditation

## "I Will Make It Rise"

By ABRAHAM KUYPER, D.D., LL.D.

Translated for "Christianity Today" by Rev. John Hendrik De Vries, D.D.\*

*Behold, I will make her health and healing to rise, and I will cure them, and will reveal unto them abundance of peace and truth. Jeremiah 33, 6. (Dutch ver.)*

IN ALL of life there is an ebb and a flood. Waters that rise and waters that fall. A coming up and a going down. An imitation of the lot in the life of the sun which rises, in the language of Psalm 19, "as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber," and which, at close of day has finished his swing around the firmament and sets in the red of blood.

Holy Scripture applies this rich thought of *rising* and *falling* also to the lot of Israel. The Psalmist makes record in the twentieth Psalm of the enemies of Sion that are brought down and *fallen*, but we are risen, and stand upright. In Jeremiah 51, 64 the prophet sings that Babylon shall *sink*, and shall not rise again, and in his Lamentations the same prophet mourns that Jerusalem has wonderfully *come down*. And over against that complaint of his servant God the Lord places the mighty promise: I will bring it health and well-being by my truth.

So in history repeats itself what is daily played off before our eyes in the rise of the waves of the sea and in their fall into the depths, and in the sun-rise and sunset in the blue of heaven. The mountains of granite stand fast, and at least to the eye show no change. Also the ground under our feet remains what it was for ages. But the waters that run down the hillside and wash the shores, are the image of the turbulent course of the ups and downs of life. As the terrible waters roar, so in the course of history roar the floodwaves of the nations. And as in the heavens the rise of light changes off with the coming down of darkness, so in the life of man and nation there are times of ascendancy and times of decline.

Also the life of our heart speaks of such a falling and rising. Especially of that one mighty *going down* in the fall of sin, and more strikingly still of that

one mighty *rising* in the quickening unto life, when God by the resurrection of Christ raises us up unto life.

Leaven is the image which Jesus borrowed from the life of nature, by which to demonstrate that *rising* as before our eyes. Dough when first made of flour is heavy, but when leaven has done its work, *rises* wonderfully high.

Thus, saith the Lord, it is with the spiritual life. The life of humanity, and the life of your own heart at first is low and empty, and into this the leaven of Christ's truth is put. And lo, as of itself, from within out, you see that life rise from the lower to higher levels, and the word of prophecy: I will bring it health and cure, is fulfilled. And then it seeks the things that are above, and lifts itself up to higher and nobler ways of living. It is as though an imperceptible power draws and lifts it up higher. It rises wonderfully. And a manner of existence, such as no one dared to expect, is born as before one's eyes.

This is the resurrection thought, the paschal mystery, the Divine thought of quickening, of resurrection, of raising, of inward elevation. It is the heavenly thought in which the almightiness of our God, if we may say so, excels itself. Does not the apostle in his epistle to the Ephesians (1, 19, 20) say, that herein becomes manifest "the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead." One selfsame Divine thought, and one selfsame Divine almightiness, both in the resurrection of Christ and in the lifting up of the sinner unto eternal life. Always effecting a *rise*. The rising of Christ from the grave, and the rising of those that were born in death and sin to the life of glory.

Not that we make ourselves *rise*, for God makes *us rise*. In this we are and

remain passive. The act is His, and His the fruit of the exalted life that comes to us. So this is no cause for self-exaltation, but for humble thanks, for eternal jubilation, in which nothing is ever great or adorable save the compassions of God that make us rich.

But that *rise* enriches us wonderfully. For we feel and are aware of it, whether we consider the difference between our former state, and our reborn state, or whether we compare our happiness with the spiritual poverty of those who are still unregenerate.

You also observe again and again, that he who is fallen falls deeper, and he whom God made to rise, He makes to rise ever higher. It is not the action of one moment, but an action that goes on. He, the Lord, does not let go the work of His hands. Ever further, always more. From glory to glory. And in fact the great shock, the great impetus shall only come when we breathe out our last, and having died unto sin we rise to the eternal light.

Only here too is ebb and flood. After every rise to more grace follows relapse, and only from that relapse God makes us rise again to a higher standpoint of grace, to richer experience of the inner life, to more abundant spiritual perception of power.

And therefore the Resurrection of Christ continues to appeal to us, always calling us again to the things that are above, where Christ is; and ever again new power goes out from that Resurrection of Christ, to lead us up to higher mountain levels. Hence when you rest content with your original conversion, and therewith deem your rise in the power of the Lord to be perfect, you suffer spiritual poverty. The original conversion indeed is entirely unique, it does not repeat itself, and without it there is no eternal life. Yet that original conversion is merely the starting point. It is the rise of the sun of your life above the horizon. But the sun of our life must not remain on that horizon. That sun also must rise, rise ever higher, until it has reached its zenith in the full splendour of high noon.

And that is the struggle of the Christian life. On one hand Christian satis-

(Continued on Page 87)

\*Copyright, 1937, by John Hendrik De Vries.



# Reminiscences of Sixty Years of Preaching

Break Thou the bread of life,  
Dear Lord, to me,  
As Thou didst break the loaves  
Beside the sea;  
Beyond the sacred page  
I seek Thee, Lord;  
My spirit pants for Thee,  
O living Word.

**T**HE singing of this hymn so closely associated with Dr. Campbell Morgan's Bible ministry, prefaced his reminiscences of sixty years of preaching on a recent Friday evening in the Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he also preached on the two Sundays of his brief and probably last visit to this country.

Welcomed by an audience which overflowed the church, he began by expressing wonder that so many had come to hear his story but in characteristic way he added, "if you were not interested, you need not have come."

The story was told concisely and chronologically. The following report is taken from notes made during the lecture. Unfortunately the correctness of the proper names cannot be vouched for.

Reminiscences of Sixty years of Preaching. Reminiscences are the calling to mind things that are past. They are not of sixty years ministry, but of sixty years preaching. What is preaching? Preaching is not discussing. Preaching is not lecturing. There are eight or ten Greek words in the New Testament for preaching but the two principal ones used denote the very genius of preaching. The one means "the telling of good news." It postulates human need and divine supply. The other means "to proclaim as a herald," as one who represents a king. It denotes the authority of a throne behind the herald which makes the demand on those that listen to obey.

Campbell Morgan's father and great-grandfather were preachers. His great-grandfather was a lay preacher. One of his earliest recollections was of hearing his father and other "giants of those days" preach. From seven years old, he went with his father with the greatest delight. His love of preaching came from the Welsh in him. He is not Welsh, not English, certainly not Scotch and not Irish. He is half Welsh and half English.

His first congregation—preached to when he was seven—was made up of one living and the rest not. It was not the only time he has preached to such a congregation. It was his sister and her dolls. It is a great thing when a man plays into his work. Not play at it but play into it.

In 1876 when he was thirteen, he went to some special services in a Methodist school room. The congregation made up of adults asked him to speak to them. His subject was Salvation. He has never had another theme, but many schemes.

From 1879 to 1880, he was constantly speaking in cottage meetings in villages. At the time he was going to Cheltenham School. One David Smith took him with him one evening to a little village called Birdlip. There were about thirty people that night in the cottage. Campbell Morgan preached on the text: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away with smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." On their way home, David Smith and he

came to a fence where David Smith said, "Let's pause." They stood together leaning over the fence. David Smith said: "You did well tonight." Campbell Morgan said, "Yes, I know I did." "Yes, I know you know you did." And for half an hour he "skinned him alive." It was a good and needed lesson. He had not been preaching but showing what he could do. Two weeks later he went again and preached on the text: "Come unto me." He broke down in the midst of his sermon and could not go on. But one man in the audience stepped out and became a follower of Jesus Christ.

From 1881 to 1882 he was teaching in day school, the lifework for which he had been trained. Amos said: "I was no prophet, but I was a herdman and gatherer of sycamore fruit: And the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people." Campbell Morgan never studied at a theological seminary not even in Philadelphia or New Jersey. But he has been president of one.

While teaching in the day school, he spent his vacations preaching.

In 1883 to 1885 he did not speak at all. There was an interval of silence. Why? Because the hour had come when he was not sure of anything. It was an age mastered by Huxley, Tyndall, Spencer. He was as sincere as he is today. His whole faith went under eclipse. God guided him to shut his mouth when he ceased to be sure. Goethe says: "If you have any certainties, let us have them. We have enough doubts of our own."

During these two years he discovered his Bible. It is true it could be said of him as of Timothy "from a child, (he) hath known the Holy Scriptures." His mother was his theologian. His father was a "hard-shelled Calvinistic Arminian." But Campbell Morgan was in darkness. He began to buy books defending the Bible, and thinking he should know both sides, those attacking

the Bible. But the more he read, the more confused he became. Then God led him to stop reading books about the Bible. He put his collection in a corner cupboard and turned the key. He can still hear the sound of that key. For seven years he never looked at them.

For two years he studied the Bible. He bought a new Bible and began to read. At the end of two years he was not sure of everything about the Bible: he is not yet. It has been said that he who is always dead sure is dead.

In 1886 he was thrust out in a remarkable way. After he had had the call, he had to preach. He went into evangelistic work, preaching on the authority of God. During that period he went to conduct a mission in Hull for two weeks. The word "mission" in England means a series of meetings. This mission was held in a hall which had been a shooting gallery. It was long and thin like himself. It had been reconstructed for Gypsy Smith. The mission was to be two weeks but it lasted for thirteen months. He preached to a class of people which he had not known much about before—down and out, illiterate, sunk in depravity. There he saw not only the power of the Gospel, but the power of preaching.

He then became district evangelist in the Methodist Church. He gave Bible readings and expositions in the afternoons. He noticed that these meetings were larger than his evening meetings. He discovered that his gift was exposition, rather than evangelism. He did not lose his evangelistic passion but he found that his special form of work was opening up the Book under the power of the Holy Spirit.

He was then called to the pastorate at Stone, Staffordshire.



Dr. Campbell Morgan



There was a different type of people there, but the same Book.

In 1889, when he was at another little village Rudleigh, things seemed going splendidly but perhaps unconsciously he had drifted back. One Sunday night he went home satisfied that he had preached a really fine sermon. In his study he reviewed it, delighting in its elocution and eloquence. Then suddenly a voice spoke to him, the question was asked in his soul: "What are you going to be, a great preacher or my messenger?" He was startled. He asked, "Why cannot I be both?" He stayed there until daybreak. In that little study, he went down on his knees and said, "O God; I want to be thy messenger." From that day in 1900 until now he cares nothing about reputation as a preacher. He cares everything about being God's messenger.

The people at Rudleigh had been country folk. He was then called to the city of Birmingham, then to London, a great cosmopolitan center. Everywhere he sought to be God's messenger, failing often enough but always conscious of the power of the thing he was preaching.

In 1901 he came to the United States and stayed here until 1904. Preaching, preaching.

In earlier days he was fond of lecturing on popular subjects. He had 46 lectures. He found that these were in danger of invading his preaching so he cut the whole of them out and devoted himself to the Word of God.

In 1904, he went to Westminster Chapel, London. It was a struggle to go back. Philadelphia is remembered by him because at that time John Wanamaker telephoned for him to come to see him. He said: "Don't go back to England. This country is in the making. We need you here. Do you see that site? If you'll stay, I'll build you an auditorium there." Campbell Morgan refused. "I'm not coming here to be John Wanamaker's man." Wanamaker held out his hand to him and replied: "You're dead right. God bless you."

He went back to England where he preached and taught for thirteen years. His health broke down. It was war-time. The Y. M. C. A. sent for him to go to Mildmay. He spent a year there. They were sending out Christian men to the army to do spiritual work. Hundreds passed through their hands. His work was to take men to the New Testament and show them its value for souls. He had each man for two weeks, one hour a day. At the time, a leader there was criticized—What can a man do in fourteen days? The leader replied: "You have been to the railway and seen the switches. You don't have much time, but you do have time to turn a train from one track to another. That is what we are trying to do." One man, a writer of detective stories, and a Christian, said that after having been there he was convinced that "the only thing worthwhile is to get these boys to come to Jesus Christ." It was a great work.

In 1919, once more unable to carry on in London, he came to America. For the first ten years he traveled all over the country, teaching, interpreting. He had no textbook, no theological creed but the Bible. Then for three years he was preaching, teaching in Tabernacle Church, Philadelphia. Then back to Westminster, London.

In conclusion, looking back over sixty years, one or two convictions master him on this subject and they gather around the people and the preacher himself. He has preached in every state in the Union and there are not many great centers he has not been in. As to the people all over the world, there is infinite variety held in unity. All congregations are alike in that they have a spiritual nature and spiritual requirement. He has preached at Potteries, the home of art, and music. He had to catch the genius of the people there. The next mission was at Crewe where there are great locomotive works. The people there are not interested in art and music. Accuracy, meeting of joint with joint—that is their great interest. There is no use using same method for all. But there is infinite variety held in unity.

Another conviction is that humanity is ready to listen but is asking for authority. Not dogmatic ignorance, but definite conviction of certainty. "Thus saith the Lord before Whom I stand."

If a man can say that today out of his own conviction, he will have an audience.

His conviction is that the preacher must still know that he is the authorized representative of a throne and must look for results. But he must not be anxious for immediate results or about statistics. He must aim at an issue, fight for a result, appeal for obedience, and claim it.

As the sun is westering and the shadows are lengthening for Campbell Morgan light is breaking through. He has now a better understanding of the word: "Cast thy bread upon the waters." God is allowing him some of the reaping as well as the sowing. He longs that these services may reveal anew the sublimity, the sanctity, the glory of preaching.

ETHEL WALLACE.

## CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM

(Continued from Page 81)

there whom his father chasteneth not? But if ye are without chastening, whereof all have been made partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons" (12:7). Instead of sickness being an evidence of God's displeasure, it is oftentimes the mark of His favor. The plain fact of the matter is that there is not so much as one verse in all the Bible which states that God wills that His children should be kept from all suffering and affliction. There are many verses which teach that God chastises His children for their spiritual enlightenment. It often happens that the best saints in the Church, those whose spiritual life is truest and deepest, are called upon to endure the greatest pain, while persons of immoral character often have relatively little suffering.

Health is, of course, the general rule for God's people. In each particular instance we are to pray for healing until it becomes clear that it is not God's will to heal the person; and then we are to pray for grace to bear it, that we may be able to say with Jesus in Gethsemane, "Not my will, but thine, be done." We are to remember further that no affliction can come to the children of God except as it is filtered through the sands of His love, and that it will not continue one moment longer than necessary to serve the wise and good purposes which He has in view. "To them that love God all things work together for good" (Rom. 8:28).

There is a sense in which the Devil is the author of disease and suffering, although he can inflict a penalty only as he receives permission from God. God often temporarily delivers a person over to Satan, that his bodily and mental sufferings may react for his salvation (I Cor. 5:5). One essential lesson in the book of Job is that the child of God is hedged about by protecting love and infinite power, and that Satan cannot touch him without first obtaining permission. In the New Testament accounts the Devil and the demons were immediately subject to the commands of Jesus.

In conclusion we would say that the chief error of the faith-healers lies in the fact that they confuse redemption itself (which is objective to us and takes place outside of us) with the effects of redemption (which are subjective

(Continued on Page 79)



# News of the Church

## Sixty-third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. BRYAN

ON THE evening of June 2nd, the Sixty-third General Assembly convened in Knox Church, Ottawa, Ontario. To succeed Rev. Malcolm A. Campbell, D.D., of First Church, Montreal, Rev. Hugh Munroe, D.D., of Westminster Church, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, was elected Moderator. The others nominated were Rev. Peter Reith of Tara, Ontario, and Rev. George E. Ross, D.D., of Fredericton, New Brunswick. Rev. Hugh Munroe was born sixty-six years ago in West Zorra Township, Oxford County, Ontario, a Highland Scotch settlement that has given many of its sons to the ministry at home and abroad. A graduate of the University of Toronto and Knox College, he was ordained in 1903 and was minister in Winnipeg, Manitoba and Cornwall, Ontario, before being called to New Glasgow in Pictou County. Rev. Frank Baird, D.D., of Pictou, who was Moderator in 1930, was the last minister from the Maritime Provinces who held that office.

Greetings were brought from the Church of Scotland by Rev. David Preston of Glasgow and Rev. J. F. Philip of Crieff; from the Presbyterian Church of England by Mr. S. W. Carruthers, M.D., Ph.D., of London; and from the Alliance of Reformed Churches (Western Section) by Rev. Charles E. Schaeffer. On Home Mission Night Rev. W. D. Grant Hollingworth of Prince Rupert told of his survey of the interior and northern coast of British Columbia, and Rev. W. M. Mackay, synodical missionary, reported on the new work in Northern Ontario mining towns. The following evening the overseas mission work was represented by Dr. G. Gushue-Taylor, Rev. and Mrs. J. D. Wilkie, and Dr. and Mrs. Eugene Stevens, all of Formosa; Rev. A. A. Lowther of Jhansi, India; Rev. Allan Reoch of Manchuria; Miss Ellen Douglas of the Bhil Mission, India; and Dr. Margaret O'Hara, a retired missionary from India. The Assembly preachers this year were Rev. John M. Macgillivray of St. Andrew's Church, Sarnia, Ontario; and Rev. M. Maxwell MacOdrum, Ph.D., of Sydney, Nova Scotia.

### Report of Survey Committee

The General Assembly of 1937 having appointed a committee "To make a careful examination of the policy, and investigation of the activities of the Church, to formulate such changes as shall be necessary or advisable for the most economical and efficient prosecution of these," Rev. J. S. Shortt, D.D., of Barrie, Ontario, the Convener, submitted the following recommendations which were dealt with as indicated:

I. "That the central church offices be re-

moved from their present location to one owned and controlled by the Church. We consider the Scott Institute to be suitable for the purpose" (after remodelling). This was referred to the Board of Administration with power to take such action as seems advisable.

II. That two Secretaries, one for Home Missions and one for Foreign Missions be appointed; that the services of Synodical Missionaries be discontinued, and that their work be given to Home Mission Committees of Presbyteries. Rev. J. B. Skene, Toronto, moved in amendment, seconded by Rev. M. P. Floyd, Melita, Manitoba, as follows: "That a Home Mission Secretary be appointed at the 1938 General Assembly, and that nominations for the same be called for as per the recommendation of the Board of Missions; that in the meantime no change be made in the status of the Synodical Missionaries; that the matter of a Foreign Mission Secretary be referred to the General Board of Missions, to call for nominations if they deem it advisable to do so, and to report to the 1938 General Assembly." This was carried, and the following amendment of Rev. W. T. McCree, Toronto, was added to it: "That the General Assembly refer to the General Board of Missions the question of the advisability of appointing Conveners or Secretaries to have charge of the work of the separate foreign mission fields of our Church." It was further recommended that contributors be allowed to designate their gifts to be used for a particular mission work, such gifts to be credited to the Budget givings of their congregation. This was approved.

It was also recommended "that in the conduct of Foreign Mission work—the chief stress be laid upon evangelistic work." This was passed.

III. "That all salaried servants of the Church, appointed by the General Assembly be retired at the age of seventy years, save in exceptional cases, the term might be extended for another year." Upon motion of Rev. A. S. Reid, D.D., Montreal, this was referred to the Board of Administration to consider and report back to the next General Assembly.

IV. That the Principals and Professors of our Theological Colleges seek opportunities of presenting the claims of theological education to congregations. Approved.

That a General College Board be appointed to supervise and administer Theological Education in the Church, taking the place of the present Senates and Boards of Management of our two colleges. Withdrawn.

V. That the General Assembly reconsider the matter of taking over the Presbyterian Publications, and if this is done, that the "Presbyterian Record" be edited and published by the same department subject to a Committee on Publications appointed by the Assembly. Defeated.

VI. That the General Assembly consist of one-eighth of the number of ministers whose names are on the rolls of presbyteries instead of one-sixth, and an equal number of elders. Defeated.

The report, as amended, was then adopted and the committee thanked and discharged.

### Report of the Board of Administration

This report was presented by the Convener, Mr. C. M. Pitts of Ottawa. It was agreed that \$500,000 be the objective for the Missionary Budget for 1938 instead of \$420,000. The Budget includes Home and Foreign Missions, Theological Colleges, Administration, Sabbath Schools and Young People's Societies, Pension Fund, the Missionary and Deaconess Training Home and General Assembly expenses. The Board of Administration was given authority "to take the necessary steps to secure the passing of an Act or Acts incorporating a Board of Trustees." Presbyteries are to be instructed to ascertain in what way congregational property is held and forward such information to the Board of Administration. The recommendation "That the negotiations with the United Church of Canada referred to in the report of the Board, be continued, with power to the Board to issue," was also adopted.

### Theological College Reports

The Senate of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, reported a total registration of 61 students, exclusive of B.D. extra-mural students, 26 in Theology and 35 in Arts, and the staff consisted of Principal F. Scott MacKenzie, Professors W. Harvey-Jellie and F. W. Beare, Principal Emeritus D. J. Fraser, and Professor O. W. Howard of the Diocesan College (Church of England).

The Senate of Knox College reported 35 students in Theology, 32 in Arts, and 17 candidates for the degree of B.D., a total of 84. Principal Thomas Eakin, in presenting this report, said: "In this mad world of ours our only hope is an evangelical ministry and the proclamation of the Gospel. You may talk as you like of a social gospel, but it is not enough." Rev. J. B. Thomson of Dufferin Street Church, Toronto, former member of the College Board and father of a Knox College student, paid tribute to the principal and professors, saying: "I think it is time that the whispering campaign regarding the college ceased." The Board of Knox College reported that it was not yet ready to ask



Presbyteries to make nominations for the vacant chair of Systematic Theology. The staff in 1936-1937 was as follows: Principal Thomas Eakin, Professors W. W. Bryden and J. D. Cunningham, and Mr. J. Stanley Glen, lecturer in first year Philosophy of Religion, second term.

#### Petition of Rev. A. A. Murray and Westminster Congregation, Sydney

Rev. R. G. Stewart, D.D., reported for the Judicial Committee appointed to consider the reference from the Presbytery of Cape Breton and Newfoundland and the petition of Westminster congregation, Sydney, and Rev. Alexander A. Murray as follows:

1. That it has examined all relevant papers and documents, and heard Mr. Murray and other parties to the case.

2. We find from his own statements, that Rev. Alexander Murray has been guilty of following a devious course in that:

- a. He aided and abetted in the founding without consent of Presbytery, a congregation, which thereby is an independent entity, and that the said independent congregation exists to the detriment of the regular Sydney congregation and to the unsettlement of other congregations.
  - b. We find that the said Alexander Murray ordained elders and erected a Session in contravention of the rules of the Church.
  - c. He failed to regard with due reverence the solemn vows taken at the time of his induction into the charge of the Presbyterian Church, Sydney.
3. We further find that the Presbytery was somewhat remiss in its duty in that it did not consistently deal with the congregation and Mr. Murray in the manner provided by the law of the Church.

Nevertheless we recommend that the Presbytery be enjoined to:

- a. Discipline the said Alexander Murray in accordance with the rules of the Church.
- b. That Presbytery be enjoined to assume its rightful responsibility to deal with the petition of Westminster congregation in accordance with the rules of the Church.

Rev. W. G. Brown moved in amendment that the preamble to the report in section 2 be omitted; this was carried. The Assembly then amended section 3 to read: "That the Presbytery be enjoined to deal with Rev. Alexander Murray and the petition of Westminster congregation in accordance with the rules of the Church," the word "discipline" being omitted.

The report of the Board of Education was presented by the Convener, Rev. D. J. Fraser, D.D., Montreal, Presbyteries were given permission to receive the following ministers: Revs. S. W. Hirtle, William Quigley, and Joseph Thackeray. Mr. Thackeray's reception is subject to his congregation, Queen's Road Congregational Church,

St. John's, Newfoundland, being received also, and the application from that congregation was referred back to the Presbytery of Cape Breton and Newfoundland "for further consideration and negotiation, and to report to the next Assembly." It was agreed to allow Rev. F. MacLennan to labor outside the bounds of the Presbytery of London and to give full standing as a minister of the Church to Rev. A. S. MacLean, Cape North, Nova Scotia. Mr. H. Lindsay Simpson may be taken on trial for license, the Assembly resolved, and Mr. V. E. Orsborn is also given full standing. The application of the Presbytery of Saskatoon to license and ordain Mr. John Brent, missionary at Coleville, Kindersley, Ealingford, Dewar Lake, and Luseland, Sask., was approved. The application of Prince Albert Presbytery to take on trial for license Mr. Martin J. Bohn, Melfort, Sask., was not approved. Rev. J. W. MacNamara, D.D., was reappointed Acting Secretary of the Board of Missions for one year. Opposed by the Moderator and others, the motion of Rev. L. H. Fowler, Renfrew, Ontario, to restrict the admission of ministers and licentiates from other churches was defeated. It was decided to consider each case on its merits. Rev. J. A. Pritchard, Springhill, Nova Scotia, a Welshman who graduated from the Faculty of Theology of the University of Dubuque, Iowa, is reported to have said: "It is high time the younger men of our churches who have graduated in the last few years would make us feel at home." Rev. L. H. Fowler said that "He was not casting any reflection on those who had come into the Church." Rev. J. W. MacNamara, D.D., Clerk of Assembly, reported a communicant membership of 177,062 at December 31, 1936, showing a decrease of 2,897, which was thought to be mainly due to purging of rolls and to inaccurate returns. The total amount raised for all purposes showed an increase of \$59,267 over 1935, and the amount received for the Budget from congregations was \$289,437, an increase of \$6,935. The number of ministers increased from 732 to 737 and the preaching points from 1296 to 1301. Since last Assembly 24 ministers were called away by death, the largest number reported in any one year since the disruption of 1925. The General Assembly granted pensions to the following ministers who are retiring: Revs. J. D. Anderson, George Atkinson, R. J. Douglas, G. P. Duncan, R. Honeyman, S. Lawrence, R. MacKnight, J. A. Mustard, W. D. Reid, and N. Stevenson. The Assembly also voted to send the outline of the sustentation plan to the presbyteries to report to the 1938 General Assembly. Under this plan a minimum salary would be paid to all ministers in charges out of a central fund.

The General Assembly adjourned to meet in Calvin Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Ontario, of which Rev. Joseph Wasson is minister, on the first Wednesday of June, 1938. KINISTINO, SASKATCHEWAN.

#### The Winona Lake Bible Conference

THE Winona Lake Bible Conference will convene at Winona Lake, Ind., for the 43rd consecutive year on Aug. 11 and continue through Aug. 22. The director is Dr. W. E. Biederwolf. The list of speakers includes: Dr. W. Graham Scroggie, of Scotland; Dr. Mark A. Matthews, of Seattle; Dr. Merton S. Rice, of Detroit; Bishop Arthur J. Moore; Dr. Edward G. McCown; Dr. Herbert W. Bieber; Dr. Harry Rimmer; Dr. Paul S. Rees; Dr. J. A. Huffman; Dr. A. R. Clippinger; Miss Bertha Palmer; Dr. J. Palmer Muntz; C. A. Tevebaugh; Martin S. Charles; Joseph Hoffman Cohn; the Rev. A. B. Machlin and the Rev. H. B. Centz.

#### A Summer Camp for Pioneer Missionaries

A THOUSAND tribes in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the islands of the sea have never received the Bible in their own languages. The majority of these tribes live in regions where the accommodations of civilization are not available. Efforts to reach them with the Gospel, made at countless cost both as regards money and lives, have often failed because consecrated workers lacked pioneer training. Gifted workers with college and seminary training found themselves unequipped to live in a primitive environment and wrest strange languages from hostile peoples without the aid of books and teachers. As a result pioneer missions lost many a talented worker either through death, sickness, or retirement to work among peoples whose languages had already been reduced to writing.

Camp Wycliffe, in the Ozark Mountains of Arkansas, was founded to meet this crying need. Would-be pioneers are there submitted to the test of "roughing it" over a period of three months and are given the advantage of training which will prepare them in advance for the special problems that will confront them on their respective fields. Living conditions at camp will approximate as nearly as possible the conditions to be met later. Food is simple and prepared by the students themselves. Long hikes are taken regularly and, together with swimming and other sports, help harden the muscles for the strenuous life of a pioneer.

The Summer Institute of Linguistics provides linguistic training of a specialized nature, given by men who have had practical experience in reducing languages to writing on two continents. It has been well said that two and a half months of training (mostly in non-Indo-European linguistics) in the Summer Institute of Linguistics, which provides the linguistic courses for Camp Wycliffe, will save two and a half years on the field.



The camp is operated much as a faith mission station with the students electing their own officers, managing their own affairs, publishing their own news sheet, and arranging for their week-end deputation trips. Thus very valuable training is provided along this line.

Seventeen men and women now working in four different countries under different organizations on three continents have found the training that Camp Wycliffe provides to be invaluable. The Pioneer Mission Agency endeavors to interest boards and individuals in assisting promising students to get out to pioneer fields.

Applicants should be college graduates with some systematic training in the Bible. A working knowledge of Greek is particularly desirable. Willingness and ability to endure hardships is an absolute essential. Exceptions to some of the other requirements may be made in exceptional cases. Orthodox beliefs doctrinally and an ardent love for souls, however, are prerequisites which cannot be waived. Men and women already under appointment by some board for pioneer work will be given the preference. A Girls' Camp operated a few miles from the Men's Camp, but with classes together, makes it possible to take in a few young women.

Board and room at Camp Wycliffe, holding its fourth session from July 15 to October 8 this year, will cost ten dollars a month. No tuition charge will be made for the linguistic course by the Summer Institute of Linguistics for students of Camp Wycliffe.

Further information may be obtained by writing to the Pioneer Mission Agency, Room 506, 1201 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

## News Letter from Mexico

By ALICE J. MCCLELLAND

THE recent news from Korea about the retirement of the Southern Presbyterian Mission from the field of secular education came to us Presbyterian missionaries in Mexico more or less in the way of consolation. There it was on account of the Japanese government's requirement of reverence to be done to Shinto shrines. With us it was a constitutional reform requiring the teaching of "socialistic education," often interpreted to mean atheism, and also made it unlawful for a school to be supported by a religious body. It isn't so much a case of misery loving company as that it comforts us to feel that we are not the only ones now who have made large investments in school equipment, buildings, land, etc., and have seen them become white elephants, for the present at least. If we were unwise in making the investments in the first place, we are not the only missionaries who made the mistake.

It is also a satisfaction to us to realize that, as God has used our restricted circumstances to intensify the evangelistic work of the Mission and the educational missionaries in religious education, so He will make the seeming limitation in the Korea missionaries' sphere of action work out for the advancement of His Kingdom and the personal satisfaction of the missionaries themselves.

In recent issues of "El Faro" (The Lighthouse), the official organ of the Presbyterians in Mexico, several news items have appeared referring to the work of Prof. Robert A. Brown, for many years president of the Presbyterian School at Coyoacán. Since the closing of that school, famous far beyond the Mexican frontiers, Prof. Brown has been assigned by the Mission to Bible Institute work. He is particularly welcome in this kind of work because he could hardly visit a church of any size in the country without finding one or two at least of his former students there. From the reports in *El Faro*, written by some of those attending his institutes, the work has been exceedingly successful and used of God to build up the faith and Christian character of the brethren.

Prof. R. C. Morrow, former principal of the "Graybill Memorial School" (agricultural and industrial) at Zitácuaro, State of Michoacan, is another who is finding his time wholly taken up with evangelistic and religious education work. A recent report shows trips through the States of Mexico and Michoacan, visiting churches, showing stereopticon views, and serving on the Religious Education Committee of the Mission, which directs the work of missionaries and former teachers (Mexican) who are serving in evangelistic work with women, vacation church schools, etc. Prof. Morrow also states that during the months of August and September they will give Bible courses in the church at Zitácuaro, using a part of the school buildings as dormitories for those who come from a distance to attend. A six weeks' course held there last year was very successful and this is expected to be equally so.

Miss Katherine Gray, former principal of the Secondary School at Zitácuaro, has this year begun work in Toluca, capital of the State of Mexico, where she is helping maintain a Bible School for women sponsored by the Presbyterian. The student body is small so far, but it is beginning in a most promising way, judging from reports of its activities.

While in some parts of Mexico we hear of rural teachers being asked to sign a statement renouncing all religious faith and promising to refrain from attending any kind of religious gathering, in other parts of the country religious liberty is much greater than in former years. The State of Tabasco is a case in point. Several years ago the State was given over to an active

campaign against any kind of religion. In the capital soldiers searched homes for images of saints and those found were burnt in the public square. The cathedral was torn down and the Presbyterian church was turned into a warehouse. Mr. Kenneth Grubb, of the World Dominion Movement, made a trip of investigation through the State and reported some five hundred professing evangelicals, but in such a pitiful condition of discouragement that the Protestant Church seemed in danger of being wiped out entirely. The change in the political regime came suddenly and was swiftly accomplished. Those responsible for the anti-religious campaign left in airplanes and became refugees in foreign lands. At present there is no opposition to the holding of religious services and we hear of the moving of the Spirit in many ways. Though apparently there are few organized churches functioning as yet, we hear of the formation of prayer circles, of evangelistic work in the ranches and of faithful service of lay-workers being crowned with success. The brethren are planning to invite the Synod (which is the highest court of the Church at present) to meet in the State for its next regular session.

CHILPANCINGO, GUERERO.

## MEDITATION

(Continued from Page 82)

faction, orthodox self-sufficiency, the thought: We are the people, Jerusalem is ours! and therefore, without the knowledge of higher need, remaining where one stands. But also, thank God, over against this the never slumbering need of ever drinking fresh, new draughts from the Fountain of Life, ever entering deeper into the mysteries of salvation, and ever thirsting more fervently for the living God.

The measures of meal must not merely rise a little, and remain as they were. No, the leaven must make the dough rise higher and higher, until the three measures of meal are leavened through and through.

And therefore everytime again and especially after Easter let the cry of the *Excelsior* go forth among all that love Christ. From one mountaintop, which we climbed, straight before us, we see again a higher top which beckons us from afar. And towards this we direct our steps, confident that from that new, that higher top, a still wider, still more glorious prospect shall open itself before our eye, in the joy of which our soul shall sing a still nobler song of the grace and glory of our God.



## News in Nutshells

### Mission Converts in Ethiopia Suffer Persecution

A LETTER to the Sudan Interior Mission from one of its missionaries who still remains in Addis Ababa says: "Since February there has been a systematic attempt to take off the scenes most of the intelligentsia of the country. Those who have had any connection with missionaries are especially under suspicion, and a great many have been imprisoned. A considerable number have been executed or sent into exile. Many of the prominent members of the native missionary society connected with another mission were arrested the day the trouble began, and later the whole native society—44 altogether—were taken to prison. Several have already disappeared, and it is certain that some have lost their lives. This is one of the most serious aspects of our predicament, since it seems that we endanger the lives of any with whom we have close association."

### Dr. Niemoeller Jailed

THIS strong defender of the faith who has been recently jailed by the Nazi authorities in Germany in a last sermon said: "We no more think of arbitrarily eluding the grasp of the authorities than the Apostles did. We also hope that we, like them, would never think of keeping silence, for the sake of worldly regulations, about what the Lord our Saviour has commanded us. It remains, and will remain as long as the world lasts, that God ought to be obeyed rather than men."

Very recently he published a book in English entitled, "The First Commandment." Many sermons are being preached in Germany on that subject today. A distinguished German pastor writes: "The German Faith-movement and kindred organizations are making the swastika, which is the political symbol of the Third Reich, into the religious symbol of Nordic heathenism; as such they are setting it up against the Cross of Christ and attempting thereby to claim the Third Reich as the Reich that fulfils the world-old Nordic heathenism, and that can find no place for the utterly different Christian faith. . . . Who does not see here the danger of the idolatry of State and people through the elevation and transfiguration of the earthly and political into the divine and eternal?"

### Jews Reached in Scotland

THE General Assembly of the Church of Scotland reports: "Never have so many Jews been reached with the Gospel, and never have they been more sensitive to the appeal of Christ than today."

### The Great Physician

ON THE eve of the annual meeting of the American Medical Association, Dr. Richard C. Cabot, distinguished Boston physician, told the Massachusetts Medical Society that the doctor is accountable for only ten per cent. of the healing process. "The body simply has a super-wisdom which is biased in favor of life, rather than death," he said. "And it is a force that does not make as many wrong diagnoses as I did when I was in practice. What is this powerful force? It is God—the healing power on which all of us depend in order to be here today. I earnestly commend the medical profession to let the patient know of this great force that is working within him, working on the patient's side, on the doctor's side. It adds to the patient's confidence in his own life, in the doctor, the drugs, and therapeutics. It does the medical profession no good to avoid the word 'God.' Why not teach the people the truth?"

### "Thy Touch Has Still Its Ancient Power"

THE Government of India has marked its appreciation of a remarkable work of the Salvation Army in the Andaman Penal Settlements, by the award of the Kaiser-i-Hind medals in gold and silver to their officers, Major and Mrs. Sheard. Six hundred brutal outlaws, one-hundred-and-twenty of whom were convicted of fifty murders and of robberies totalling £22,500 worth of goods have become a law abiding, thrifty and prosperous community. Some of the more desperate characters were the personal servants of the officers. Many former murderers have become Sunday-School teachers and Gospel preachers.

### Church Statistics for 1936

THE annual compilation of the statistics of all the Churches in the United States by Dr. George Linn Kieffer appeared in the July issue of the *Christian Herald*. The death of Dr. Kieffer occurred several months ago and the present tables were carried to completion by his wife, Mrs. Maud H. Kieffer.

The religious bodies showed a net gain in membership last year of 837,404, bringing the grand total to 63,493,036.

The Baptists continue to lead all other Protestant denominations with a total increase for the year of 140,308. The Reformed Church follows with a gain of 81,958; the Lutherans, with 43,905; the Methodists, with 41,798; the Unitarians, with 38,026; the Protestant Episcopalians, with 21,193; the Evangelicals, with 9,390; the Presbyterians, with 6,507; the Nazarenes, with 5,867; the Adventists, with 5,435; the Mennonites, with 4,101; the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, with 5,225; the Moravians, with 1,624; and the United Brethren, with 1,073.

The Baptists also continue to lead all Protestants in total membership with 10,332,005. The Methodists have 9,109,359, and the Lutherans 4,589,660. The Roman Catholics have an "adult" membership of 14,956,758 and a total membership of 20,831,139.

The Presbyterian Churches show a total membership of 2,687,772, a net gain during the year of 6,507 members. The number of Presbyterian ministers is 14,564, a gain during the year of fifty-five. Churches number 14,748, a decrease of fifty.

### Liquor Interests Seek to Control Pennsylvania

REV. DR. F. SCOTT McBRIDE states that the most powerful political group in the State at the present time is the big brewers headed by Mead Mulvihill. They would lift beer which contains alcohol out of its present class and make it as common as soda water, coca cola and other non-alcoholic drinks. They remember the past and are trying to unload. In the recent Legislature, they sought legislation to sell beer in grocery stores and delicatessens. They tried to repeal the law of 1881, prohibiting the sale of beer in baseball parks and other places of amusement. By the hardest possible efforts these provisions were defeated.

The two outstanding dates for the dries to put in their calendar for Pennsylvania are September 14, 1937, the municipal primary day, when there will be opportunity to vote on beer and liquor, and the second, May 17, 1938, which is the primary day for the general election which will determine largely the character of the next Legislature at Harrisburg.

### IN THIS ISSUE:

#### EDITORIALS:

Dr. Allis Replies to Dr. Chafer .....	73
Five Books on Essential Doctrines .....	74
More About Infant Salvation .....	75
Modern Dispensationalism and the Doctrine of the Unity of Scripture .....	76
Oswald T. Allis	
Christian Supernaturalism .....	80
Lorraine Boettner	
"I Will Make It Rise" .....	82
Abraham Kuyper	
Reminiscences of Sixty Years of Preaching .....	83
News of the Church .....	85
News in Nutshells .....	88