

# THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

N. B. STONEHOUSE, *President*, Princeton, Princeton, N.J.  
R. L. ALDRICH, *Vice-President*, Evangelical, Dallas, Texas.  
A. A. MACRAE, *Secretary*, Princeton, Princeton, N.J.  
W. L. KENNEDY, *Treasurer*, Xenia, St. Louis, Mo.

## GENERAL SECRETARY

E. VAN DEUSEN, M.A., Princeton, N.J. (Pro tempore.)

## ADVISORY BOARD

M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., President of Xenia Theological Seminary  
L. S. KEYSER, D.D., Hamma Divinity School  
J. G. MACHEN, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary  
C. BOUMA, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary  
H. P. SLOAN, D.D., Pastor, First M.E. Church, Haddonfield, N.J.

## MEMBERSHIP

The League Constitution provides for the membership of student associations, or of chapters of less than entire student bodies, in theological seminaries, Bible schools of recognized standing, colleges and universities.

Art. III, Sec. 1 of the Constitution gives the qualifications for membership, viz.—“Faith in the Bible as the infallible Word of God, and acceptance of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, such as: the Trinity, the Virgin Birth of Christ, His Divine and Human Nature, His Substitutionary Atonement, His Resurrection from the dead, and His Coming Again.

Section 2. The above summary is not intended to be regarded as a complete statement, nor as an authoritative definition of the limits of Christian fellowship, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom the League welcomes as members.”

---



---

# The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

*Issued Quarterly by The LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS*

---

VOL. I

Princeton New Jersey, October 1926

No. 2

---

## THE SCRIPTURAL METHOD OF BIBLE STUDY

PROFESSOR O. T. ALLIS, PH.D.

THERE are certain things essential to the truly scriptural study of the Bible which need to be emphasized today in view of the insistent claims which are so often made by the advocates of the so-called "modern" or "critical" method of Bible study.

The first of these is the *unity* and *harmony* of the Bible. This characteristic has impressed believing scholars in all ages as a signal proof of its divine origin. The fact that so many different writers, so widely separated in time, wrote a collection of many books which are in the truest sense one book, the Bible, is a strong evidence of its unique inspiration. Yet one of the outstanding characteristics of the "modern" method is the way in which it exhibits, and the importance which it attaches to, the alleged disharmonies of the Bible. We cannot read beyond the first chapter of Genesis without being confronted with this cardinal doctrine of the critics; for the "second" account of creation (Gen. ii) contradicts, we are told, the "first." And this is but a sample. We have, they tell us, two accounts of the Creation and the Flood; three accounts of the Plagues and of the Crossing of the Red Sea; four of the Crossing of the Jordan. Furthermore, these accounts disagree and contradict one another. The theoretical Jehovist differs from the hypothetical Elohist; and the alleged Priestly writer contradicts them both. Judges discredits the account of the Conquest given in Joshua; Chronicles is proved unreliable by Samuel-Kings. The "great" prophets are represented as the opponents of the priests and as the more or less uncompromising foes of the ritual sacrifice. Micah and Zechariah are divided between at least two authors, Isaiah is given to three; and many of these documents are declared to be composite and to have been edited, or revised, by a later compiler or "redactor." All this partitioning and analyzing is made necessary, it is argued, by *differences* in language, style, ideas and manner of presentation, differences which not seldom amount to contradictions. The result is that for the "modern" student the Bible, especially the O.T., is characterized not by harmony and unity, but by discord and contradiction. How disastrous this is should be apparent to everyone, for nothing is more certain to discredit a book and destroy its influence with thinking people than to find that it does not con-

tain a consistent and harmonious presentation of the matters which it aims to set forth.

Consequently the reverent Bible student will be very slow to accept these alleged contradictions. He will scrutinize them with the utmost care. If he does so, he will find that many of them are purely imaginary. There is nothing inconsistent about the statement in Num. xvi. that (1) a *Levite* and (2) three *Reubenites* were leaders in a rebellion against Moses, nothing to indicate that we have here two conflicting accounts of the same event. The mention of two parties simply shows that the revolt was widespread and serious enough to require drastic measures. There is nothing contradictory about the statement that (1) the Lord told Moses to lift up his rod and (2) to stretch forth his hand and that then (3) the Lord caused a strong east wind to blow, in order that the Red Sea might be divided before Israel (Ex. xiv. 16, 21). Such statements are *different* only in the sense that they record distinct features of the story, all of which are needed to complete the record. They become contradictory only when each statement is treated as complete in itself and placed in opposition to others which are designated to supplement it. Most events, especially if they be great ones, are complex; there are many factors which enter into them. Were the modern method of source analysis applied to almost any historical narrative which dealt at all adequately with an intricate situation it could easily be reduced to a mass of contradictions.

There are other alleged contradictions which are due either to a failure to recognize, or to ignorance of, all necessary facts. Thus, Hosea in pronouncing vengeance on the House of Jehu (i. 4), is not denouncing Jehu for obeying the command of Elijah as conveyed by Elisha. The explanation is given in 2 Kgs. x. 30 f. where the wilfulness of Jehu is exposed. And it is made still clearer by the prophetic denunciation of Baasha who provoked the Lord "in being like the house of Jeroboam; and because he slew him." By following in the sins of the House of Omri, Jehu's House merited the same punishment. Yet Hosea is cited as an instance of a later prophet denouncing what an earlier prophet had expressly commanded!

The second essential of which we would speak, is that the Bible student should understand and accept the *viewpoint* of the Bible. Many of the difficulties which the "modern" student finds with the Bible are the direct result of failure to do this, or, to put it more strongly, of the determination to judge and interpret the Bible by standards which are contrary to its whole teaching.

The oft-repeated reference in the first chapter of Genesis to *God* and to His sovereign *acts* is tremendously impressive: He spake and it was done. The Bible is a record of God's wonderful works for the children of men. No one can understand it who does not accept its great major premise—God—or who seeks to set limits to His power. The O.T. purports to be primarily the record of God's special dealings with a peculiar people to

the end that through that people all the nations might be blessed. The uniqueness of the religion of Israel, of the Covenant with Abraham, of the Law given through Moses, is affirmed again and again: "God hath not dealt so with any nation." To study the religion of Israel in the light of comparative religion as though it were similar in kind to the ethnic faiths, is to reject its most insistent claim—"All the gods of the nations are idols (*worthless things*), but the Lord made the heavens."

The religion of Israel is represented as the religion of *revelation*. God has revealed Himself in word and in deed. He has made known what man could not discover; He has wrought wonders beyond the power of man. Miracle and prophecy are, according to the Bible, signal proofs that God has manifested Himself. The supernatural is of its very essence. A student who rejects the supernaturalism of the Bible, treats its miracles as legend, and post-dates its prophecies or reduces them to shrewd conjecture, is taking offence at what the Bible declares to be, and what the Church in all ages has regarded as, a unique and convincing proof that God has indeed revealed Himself.

Finally the Bible is the story of *redemption*, of salvation from sin. John the Baptist sums up the Gospel and also shows it to be the fulfilment of O.T. religion with the words, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The Old Testament plainly teaches that the priestly sacrifices of the Law were divinely ordained; and the New Testament as plainly interprets them as prophetic of and fulfilled in the Cross of Calvary. To treat the priestly ritual as a survival of paganism and to affirm that it was repudiated by the "great" prophets of Israel leads logically to the rejection of the Cross which is the central fact of Christianity, God's sovereign remedy for sin.

In one of our great historic creeds the statement is made: "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." We need to remember this. "God is His own interpreter." If the Bible is the Word of God, it must be our final authority; *it cannot be correctly interpreted by any standards but its own*. If its human authors were inspired of God, God's Spirit will enable us to understand it aright, if we seek His guidance. To the wise of this world the Bible is a book of riddles, sealed with seven seals. It tells of a divine revelation, miraculously conveyed; they would have it speak of man's eager quest of truth and of his wonderful discoveries. It tells of God's great salvation for lost sinners; they would have it describe the development of man's religious nature and its limitless possibilities. In short the "modern" student is trying to restate in terms of a more or less frankly naturalistic evolution what the Bible states in terms of supernatural redemption. No wonder the "modern" student finds contradictions in the Bible and has to tear it chapter from chapter, verse from verse, and line from line, since he would so completely change its message. But those who study it reverently as the Word of God and seek the guidance

of His Spirit will be more and more impressed with the harmony and the heavenliness of its glorious message of redeeming love in Jesus Christ our Lord.

### THE SPIRIT OF ERROR

J. G. VOS

**E**RROR is always with us. It assumes many forms and makes various appeals. The systems of falsehood are almost without number. There are errors as old as the ages, and there are errors of recent origin. Errors appear, disappear, and reappear, while the truth of God abides continually. So sporadic, indeed, have been the errors, and so constant is the truth, that some have concluded that all error, because it is error, is about to die; and that all truth, because it is truth, is sure to survive.

This conclusion is certainly fallacious. It is true that error often dies, and that the truth usually survives; but the error does not die because it is error, nor the truth survive because it is truth. If error dies, it is because the Holy Spirit has used means to cut it off. If the truth survives, it is because the Holy Spirit has used means to ensure its survival.

Error will not die of itself, because the natural heart of man clings to it and loves it better than the truth. Idolatry, the worship of that which is not God, is almost as old as the race, and a large part of humanity still adheres to it, for the worship of the things that are seen appeals to the natural man. Christian Science, with its denial of the reality of sin, flatters the sinful heart of man. The idea of salvation by works, by character, by ideals, etc., appeals to the pride of man and conveniently removes the stumbling block of the cross of Jesus Christ. *While the heart of man is what it is, these errors will never die of themselves.*

*Error will not die of itself, because Satan is actively engaged in its propagation.* He is the father of lies, and there is no truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks of his own. Error traces its origin back to him, for he is a liar, and the father of it (John viii. 44). Errors and heresies are not indifferent things which come from nowhere; they are devised and propagated by the arch-enemy of the human race.

If error is to be overcome, it must be by active opposition on the part of those who acknowledge the truth. Christians must witness for the whole of revealed truth and oppose all contrary error. If we merely state the truth and neglect to point out and oppose the contrary error, we are not faithful witnesses. It is only as the truth is distinguished from error that its real character can be shown. The notion that we can forget about the error and merely preach the truth, that we can ignore "modernism" and meantime engage in "constructive" Christian work, is tragically mistaken. No doubt God could accomplish his purposes without using men as his instruments; no doubt he could bring about the victory of the truth without using our

testimony, but He has called us to be his witnesses, and it is our duty to testify.

The visible Christian Church is divinely appointed to bear a corporate witness to revealed truth, and therefore also to discountenance error. Christian students by their membership in the body of God's witnessing people support the truth and oppose error. In our day, however, great sections of the Christian Church have abandoned their testimony to the truth and their opposition to error, and other great sections seem about to do so. Doctrinal indifference is the first step; open toleration of error is the consequence. On this account Christian students should consider earnestly and carefully the question of their relation to a particular branch of the Christian Church, for membership in a witnessing church is itself a witnessing act, and membership in a church which tolerates error involves, to some extent at least, a tacit approbation of such toleration.

The League of Evangelical Students is essentially a witnessing body. We declare that we "bear united witness to the faith of students in the whole Bible as the inspired Word of God," (Constitution, Article II, Section 1). Those only are eligible for membership in the League who have "faith in the Bible as the infallible Word of God" and who accept "the fundamental truths of the Christian religion," (Constitution, Article III, Section 1). Let us not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord. Let us not fear the charge of intolerance. God has commanded his people to witness for the truth, but he has never commanded them to tolerate error. If we who have banded ourselves together into a League to witness for the truth and against error, are on that account called narrow-minded, bigoted, intolerant, or even unchristian, let us call to mind the words of the Lord Jesus which are recorded in Matthew v. 11: "Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake."

## UNDERSTANDING THE WORD

E. VAN DEUSEN

THE Bible has shown itself to be the book for all times and places. Naturally, it had to be written in human language, and it was penned by men of given times and places. So, while its message is of universal meaning and application, its language is characterized by literary idioms and expressions significant to and understandable by the writers or speakers and their auditors. Accordingly, the first step toward a right understanding of the language of the Bible is to *take its words and statements in their natural and commonly understood sense* at the time they were written. The minute this simple but fundamental rule is violated, language becomes meaningless and the plainest fact of history may be changed into

a fable; then, meanings are made to depend on the reader's own imagination rather than on the historic sense of the written word.

Now, the Old Testament writers wrote in Semitic tongues—mostly Hebrew; and, while imagery, parable and hyperbole, not so common in occidental literature, are familiar in oriental speech, yet, in the Scriptures, statement of fact and figurative language need not be confounded; for example, no sane man can confuse the plain factual record of the Red Sea crossing, in Ex. xiv, with the poetic account of it in Moses' song—Ex. xv. As the King James version followed closely the original phraseology, our English text naturally contains not a few characteristically Hebrew idioms and forms of expression. Acquaintance with some of these characteristics should clarify an understanding of numerous passages that might otherwise be misunderstood. Thus—

1. A notable feature of Hebrew language is its marked preference for concrete—vs. abstract—expressions, often illustrated in the figures, parables, and especially the symbolism of the Bible: thus—"the heart" for the affections, Ezek. xxxvi. 26, "I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; Jer. xxix. 13, "Ye shall seek me and find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart." Or, the hand or arm representing power, Numbers xi. 23, "Is the Lord's hand waxed short? Thou shalt see now whether My word shall come to pass—"; Job xl. 9, "Hast thou an arm like God? or can'st thou thunder with a voice like Him? Or again, personal physical characteristics or defects as standing for moral or spiritual defects, Is. vi. 10, "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they . . . convert and be healed"; Ex. xxxiii. 5, "Ye are a stiffnecked people." Again, spiritual salvation is repeatedly referred to as "water," Zech. xiii. 1, "There shall be a fountain opened . . . for sin and for uncleanness"; Ps. xxiii. 2, "He leadeth me beside the still waters"; Rev. xxii. 17, "Let him take the water of life freely."

\*2. A person having some distinctive quality was termed the *son* or *child* of that quality: 1 Sam. ii. 12, "sons of Belial," referring to the wickedness of Eli's sons; Eph. v. 6, "children of disobedience"—or disobedient persons.

3. As in many languages, *son* may mean a remote descendant, and *father* may be any ancestor: Mal. iii. 3, "He shall purify the sons of Levi"; Gen. xvii. 4, "thou shalt be a father of many nations."

4. Similarly *brother* may mean any collateral relative: Gen. xiv. 16, Lot, Abraham's nephew, called his "brother."

5. In the Scriptures, names of parents or ancestors are often used to designate their posterity: Gen. ix. 25, "Canaan" represents his *posterity of like character*.

\* The following cases are based on Angus' "Bible Handbook."

6. "Round" numbers are often used instead of the exact number: Judges xi. 26, where 300 years is so used.

7. In Hebrew, certain numbers are used for large or indefinite totals: thus, *seven* and *seventy* indicate also "a large and complete though uncertain number"—Matt. xviii. 22; or *ten* expresses not only that number but also the general idea of many or much.

8. Sometimes, though the immediate reference is to but *one* thing, a *plural noun* may be used to indicate that there are nevertheless more than one of that thing: Gen. viii. 4, "The ark rested . . . upon the mountains of Ararat"; Gen. xix. 29, "overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt," (i.e. Sodom, one of the five doomed cities); Judges xii. 7, "was buried in (one of) the cities of Gilead"; John xiii. 4, i.e. the *outer* garment—cf. Matt. xxi. 8.

9. Hebrew statements implying *comparisons*, especially those involving *choice* or *preference* are characteristically emphatic: Lk. xiv. 26 "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children—and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple"; also Deut. xxi. 15, Jno. xii. 25, Rom. ix. 13.

Such comparative priorities may also be expressed by *adverbs of negation*: Mk. ix. 37, "Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me but Him that sent me"; see also Matt. v. 39, Lk. xiv. 12.

10. Sometimes, where but a simple declaration, without reference to time or agent, is intended, or just a statement that something is regarded as done—or will be—a present active verb is used: 2 Cor. iii. 6, "The letter killeth"—i.e. the literal statement in effect says that death will be the result of sin; or, a prophet is said to do that which he foretells, Ezk. xliii. 3.

11. "Parallelisms," where similar, contrasted, or complementary ideas are expressed in successive clauses, are distinctly Hebraic. These may—(a) repeat the *same* thought—possibly with additions, e.g. Ps. i. 1, Prov. xvi. 32, Is. lv. 6; or (b) the *opposite* idea or sentiment, e.g. Prov. Ch. 10; or, (c) may be *verbal* parallels of like or similar words or of words or idioms used differently, e.g. Micah. iv. 2, "He will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths"; v. 3, "they shall beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruninghooks." Careful attention to such parallelisms—or, repetition in other words of the same or complementary or contrasted ideas—will often serve to explain apparently obscure statements. Also, this peculiarity, especially of Hebrew poetry, greatly *facilitates its translation* with an equivalent force into other languages—analogue to the far greater ease with which abstract spiritual truths put in the concrete form of *parables* can be translated and expressed in other tongues of later ages.

12. Finally, it should be remembered that in the Bible, as elsewhere,



*different* names are sometimes given to the *same* person or place—e.g. “Hobab” or “Jethro” were alternate names of Moses’ father-in-law; “Dan” and “Laish” were other names for “Caesarea” of Galilee. Or, the *same* name may be given to *different* persons or places, or to a person and a place: thus, “Agag” and “Benhadab” were the common names, respectively, of the kings of the Amalekites and of Damascus; again, there were two “Antiochs,” etc; while “Magog” was both the name of a son of Japheth—Noah’s son, and also of a country inhabited by the Scythian ancestors of the modern Tartars and Turks.

Recognition of these similarities, or differences, as to many names will reconcile apparent confusions from this source.

These language peculiarities indicate a few of the numerous facts—linguistic, natural, social, political, etc.—that should be considered if one would rightly understand the Scriptures. While it is to be expected from the nature of the Bible that it should contain some “things hard to be understood,” yet the vast majority of difficulties and (judging from past experience) all the so-called “contradictions” are due to our inadequate knowledge and yet imperfect understanding of all the factors involved in any given case, or to ignoring the several different considerations involved—due often to preconceived prejudices.

There are but *two* approaches to an understanding of the Bible: one is the way of *faith*—the direct and shortest way to the realm of truth; a way trod by apostles, martyrs and a multitude of those who in all ages have had peculiar insight into “the deep things of God”; Christ’s emphasis on “faith” was not arbitrary, but founded on a thorough knowledge of its utility to spiritual understanding.

But, if one will not tread this well-worn way, his only alternative is the long, steep, rough and dusty road of life-long, patient study, study, study of the numberless facts that precede simply an intellectual understanding of that exhaustless book, the Bible. Yet, the depths of its spiritual significance are revealed only by the Holy Spirit, who undertakes to guide at length into all truth every humble, honest, teachable student of His Word.

Here (ignoring for the time the man’s spiritual attitude) is where much of the criticism of the Bible originates, viz. in hasty, superficial conclusions; the critical person has not or will not examine all the pertinent data; he has not or will not patiently study and search for the true meaning with an open, teachable mind; but, running onto some obscurity or seeming difficulty, he at once jumps to the conclusion that he has discovered “another contradiction in the Bible.” Such opinions are as superficial as they are worthless—for they are not founded on an honest and judicial study of all the pertinent facts.

## CHRIST AND EXPERIENCE

Summary of a Tuesday evening talk given at Princeton Theological Seminary by the Rev. Dr. Harold Paul Sloan,—editor of "The Call."

**E**XPERIENCE is made the supreme test and final norm of the religious life in so-called "modernism." Personal feeling or impressions, rather than the recorded facts of Christian history, is held to be the authority as to what is Christian truth. Spiritual reality is pared down to the measure of individual experience.

Quite naturally, experience has a place and a value in Christian theology and life. In general, the relation of experience to revelation is three-fold: (a) Experience is corrected and directed by revelation; human thought tends to exaggerate the value in God's sight of personal good works; this tendency needs the correction of revelation; (b) Experience leads us to look for those spiritual truths that are clearly given in revelation; (c) Again, experience helps to interpret revelation—"If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine."

But experience shows that the needs of the human soul are greater and deeper than is human experience. Besides, as our moral and spiritual faculties are rendered abnormal by evil, our observation and analysis of the deep things of experience is unreliable and uncertain. If one could always be sure of the exact content of experience, it would, of course, have value as a source of theological knowledge. But, as it is, final dependence must rest upon an objective norm—the Scriptures. So "modernism" fails by the test of its own most authoritative rule—experience. Experience demands the supernatural, which "modernism" denies in the name of the experience which demands it.

The Christ of the Christian creeds, because of His very *transcendence*, meets the needs and answers the demands of human experience. The naturalistic Christ of "modernism" is not only too small to satisfy experience, but does not reflect the Christ of history. Modernism cannot relate in its naturalistic Christ the combination, for example, of humility and supreme self-consciousness that marked the incarnate deity presented to us in the Scriptures.

Napoleon was haughty, over-bearing, intolerant; Jesus humble, accessible, gentle. Yet, in "The Corsican," made up from Napoleon's personal papers, there is less self-consciousness than in just the Synoptic accounts of Jesus.

In the Synoptic accounts of Christ are recorded some 259 of his teachings: of these 25 are purely ethical, 103 religious, etc., and 131 involve expression of His self-consciousness. In John's Gospel this is even more marked: 2 cases are purely ethical, 14 religious, etc., and 163 involve expression of self-consciousness.

Classified, these teachings may be tabulated as follows:

28 relate to Himself as *The Son of Man*;

- 27 relate to God as *My Father*;
- 25 relate to His *second coming*;
- 19 relate to His *ascension* and final *return* in glory as *Judge*;
- 18 relate to His claim as *the supreme motive*;
- 16 relate to His *death as redemptive* and by the will of God;
- 9 relate to the peculiar *unity* of Himself with God;
- 8 relate to His moral and religious *authority*;
- 8 relate to commending *faith* in Himself;
- 6 relate to His prediction of His *resurrection*;
- 6 relate to His promise to be *supernaturally present* with His followers during His bodily absence;
- 5 relate to His acceptance of the title *Son of God*;
- 5 relate to His final *authority as Judge*;
- 5 relate to His *authority over nature*;
- 2 relate to His claim as Master.

The contrast between Jesus' self-consciousness expressed in these claims and the self-effacement expressed by those outstanding men, the Jewish prophets, is startling: the prophets were overawed by the awful majesty of Jehovah; Jesus manifests at once the humility and the familiarity of his stupendous Sonship.

The contrasts in the historic Christ, however, are unified into a consistent character by His supernatural nature. Everywhere, both in deeds and in consciousness, He is supernatural: supernatural in His stainless life, in His ethical intuitions, in His power over nature and in the use of that mastery, in His triumph over death, in His spiritual elevation. This is the Jesus of history, the mystery of whose unique character no *a priori* naturalistic theory can solve.

V.D.

### VIRGIN MEANS VIRGIN

Summary of an article by Professor Robert Dick Wilson in "The Princeton Theological Review" for April, 1926.

**R**ECENTLY it has been asserted that the word "virgin" in Isaiah vii. 14—cited in Matthew i. 23—may mean a young married woman. Probably the foremost authority on such a question—a Semitic scholar internationally known, said to possess a working knowledge of forty-five different languages and dialects—has made his usual careful and exhaustive study of this matter. Naturally, his findings are detailed and technical—involving studies in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Samaritan, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Coptic, Assyrio-Babylonian, and kindred languages.

He first takes up the various version renderings of the original Hebrew word there used for "virgin," and finds no evidence to show that 'alma

(the Hebrew word) ever meant or was so translated that it might mean "a young married woman."

Next, he investigates the *root* meaning of this word in the Semitic languages, and finds its derivatives applied, for example, to the child Miriam when she came to watch the boy Moses in the ark among the bulrushes; to the unmarried Rebecca; to Esther before she was married to Xerxes, and to the seven maidens who waited on her.

Then, this scholar examines the meaning and use of two other related words used in Hebrew and in the Semitic languages, and finds that in both the masculine and feminine forms the reference is uniformly to unmarried persons, "chaste ones," including also boys and girls.

The scientific conclusions are expressed in twelve statements. Abbreviated, we may note that (a) 'alma never has the meaning of "young married woman" elsewhere in the Old Testament, so that it is entirely illogical to assume that its meaning is different in Isaiah vii. 14; (b) in the Syriac version of the Old Testament, made by Jews—and *that* in the first century after Christ—'alma is rendered by a word which is the unqualified and specific word for "virgin"; (c) both the Septuagint (Greek version of the Old Testament) made 200 B.C., and over, and the Vulgate (Latin version) made about A.D. 400, both render the Hebrew word by the unquestioned equivalents for "virgin"; (d) the word used in Isaiah vii. 14 by the Jewish "Targum" is used as the equivalent of *four* different words (including 'alma), none of which ever means "young married woman"; further, the same word is used of Rebecca, when she came to the well and met Eliezar, of Miriam when set to watch the infant Moses, of the four hundred virgins of Jabesh-Gilead, etc.

Without following further the evidential conclusions, we quote finally: "None of the ancient languages or versions give any evidence to show that 'alma ever meant 'young married woman'." "The language itself is not the difficulty. The great and only difficulty lies in disbelief in predictive prophecy and in the almighty power of God; or in the desire to throw discredit upon the divine Sonship of Jesus." Even in the Koran the angel is represented as replying to Mary's incredulity—"Thus God creates what he pleaseth. When He decrees a matter He only says BE, and it is."

V.D.

---

## NOTES AND NOTICES

### BRANCHES AND CHAPTERS

**J**UST a word of explanation. When an entire student body or association, as of a thoroughly evangelical seminary or accredited Bible school, votes approval and adoption of the aim and platform of the League, applies for membership and is accepted by it, such body of students con-

stitutes a *branch* of the League. But when part only (three or more) of a student body signify their accord by signing their names to a ratification of the League's Constitution, such individual signers together (not as individuals) may be accepted and voted in as a League *chapter*. Both Branch and Chapter are on the same footing as to votes, i.e., in proportion to the relative size of their memberships.

Individuals as such, however, though ineligible to regular membership, may become Maintaining members, or may be elected to the limited group of Honorary members.

#### ADDITIONS AND SUBTRACTIONS

**N**ATURALLY, during summer when educational institutions are closed and students scattered, not many League additions are likely. However, a new chapter has been formed at Hampden-Sidney College, located at Hampden-Sidney, Va., noted through one hundred and fifty years for its distinguished men who have founded, revived, or headed eighteen higher educational institutions—among them its first president, Samuel Stanhope Smith, later president of what is now Princeton University, and Archibald Alexander, its third president, and then founder and first president of Princeton Theological Seminary.

The students of the well-known Los Angeles Bible Institute have also joined the League as a body.

Since the League's Annual Convention in November, 1925, three of the honorary members have died; H. F. Lutz, PH.D., of Cincinnati; J. T. Christian, D.D., of New Orleans; and W. B. Hinson, D.D., of Portland, Ore.

#### SECOND CONVENTION

**T**HE second Annual Convention of the League is to be held November 26 to 29 in St. Louis at Xenia Seminary, which has courteously given an invitation and will act as host for the three days. This conference will be not only a very important one, at which a number of questions concerning the League's interests will be considered, but a full and very valuable program of addresses by able speakers is in prospect.

Registration of delegates and assignments will be from two to four p.m. on Friday the 26th, followed by an opening business meeting at four o'clock. At eight p.m. the first public meeting will be held at the Westminster Presbyterian Church, with brief introductory remarks by President M. G. Kyle of Xenia; an address of welcome by Dr. William Crowe, one of the best known and popular speakers in St. Louis; and an inspirational address by Professor Clarence Bouma of Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Important business meetings will occupy Saturday until four p.m., when

the distinguished archeologist, Dr. Kyle, will give an important illustrated lecture on his recent extended explorations and excavations at Kirjeth Sepher in southern Palestine, southwest of Hebron. At eight p.m., the third public gathering will be held, with stimulating addresses by President H. C. Wayman of William Jewell College, Missouri, and by President James M. Gray of Chicago.

On Sunday, the 28th, at four p.m., one of the speakers will address the delegates and the public at a special vesper service. This will be followed at six p.m. by a "get-together" supper, with a talk by Dr. N. B. Harrison, of the Memorial Presbyterian Church of St. Louis. In the evening the fifth and last public meeting will be addressed by Bishop James R. Winchester, D.D., of the Episcopal diocese of Arkansas.

On Monday forenoon the Conference will close with a gathering of all delegates at 8:30 a.m. A devotional period will be followed by consideration of any unfinished business, and concluded with an inspirational final address by President L. S. Chafer, of Dallas, Texas.

Every branch and chapter of the League should send at least one delegate to represent it at this Convention; some should send more; none can afford to miss the inspiration and information to be had from this gathering. It is the Convention of every member of the League; each needs what the Convention can give, and the Convention needs what each can give it.

The speakers represent Baptists, Christian Reformed, Episcopalians, Reformed Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and United Presbyterians. Meetings are to be held in Congregational, Baptist, Episcopal, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches. Not denominationalism but personal faith in Jesus Christ as God's only-begotten Son and our only hope is the tie that binds.

### HOW TO GET THERE

**F**ROM the Union R. R. Station, take any car on 18th St., ride three blocks north to Olive Street, there transfer to a westbound Delmar-Olive car, and ride to the end of the line; walk one block south to Washington Ave., and one block west on Washington to southeast corner of Trinity Ave. and Washington, where you will see Xenia, our host. Don't forget! Put this in your hat!

---

### HAVE YOU READ?

#### AN IMPORTANT BOOK

**H**AVE you yet read "The Leaven of the Sadduces" by Ernest Gordon? If not, get it at once! A masterly piece of work, and one that every conservative person should "read, peruse, and inwardly digest." Not only

parents and prospective students should read it—especially chapters five and seven—but business men and others who support non-business institutions of education, etc.

It costs only a dollar, and can be ordered through your book-dealer. Get it now!

Two other valuable books—though along a somewhat different line—are Dr. Zerbe's "Christianity and False Evolutionism"; also, the well-known university special lectures of Prof. L. T. More, published under the title "The Dogma of Evolution."

All these books should be read by all honest-minded, serious students of truth.