

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

HEADQUARTERS

25 EDWARDS PLACE

PRINCETON NEW JERSEY

OFFICERS

WM. TREMAN BLACKSTONE, *President*, Princeton, New Jersey
Princeton Theological Seminary

FRED R. TIFFANY, *Vice-President*, Chicago, Illinois
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary

NICHOLAS GOSSELINK, *Secretary*, Holland, Michigan
Western Theological Seminary

JOHN H. DE GROOT, *Treasurer*, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary

GENERAL SECRETARY

PAUL WOOLLEY, Th.M.

ADVISORY BOARD

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary

LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D., Hamma Divinity School

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., Princeton Theological Seminary

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., Calvin Theological Seminary

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., Temple University

"By the word of truth, by the power of God."—2 Corinthians 6: 7.

The League of Evangelical Students is a continent-wide organization of students, founded in 1925 by a student group. Its aim is to exalt our Lord Jesus Christ—by setting forth the gospel of His grace as presented in the inerrant Word of God, by promoting the intellectual defense of the evangelical faith, by proclaiming the joy of Christian living through the indwelling power of the Spirit, by presenting the claims of the gospel ministry at home and abroad. By these means it desires to present a well-rounded witness, spiritual and intellectual, to the truths of historic, evangelical Christianity. It is an organization of, and for, students. It is set for the proclamation and defence of the gospel.

A student group in any higher educational institution may become affiliated with the League. Its membership may range in size from three to the total number of students in the institution. The procedure is extremely simple, and is explained in the following extract from the Constitution:

"Any student association, society, or club of any theological seminary, school for the training of Christian workers, college, or other institution of higher learning may apply for membership in the League upon the ratification and adoption of this constitution by a three-fourths vote of its members. Otherwise, a local chapter of the League may be formed, consisting of not less than three members, such a chapter to have the same standing—in proportion to the number of its members—as an entire student body or association that constitutes a branch of the League.

"Application for membership shall be sent to the Secretary or General Secretary of the League." (Article III, Sections 3 and 5.)

The Evangelical Student is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

PRINTED AT THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

VOL. III

Princeton New Jersey, April 1929

No. 3

EDITORIAL

WHY is it that some Christian people are always looking *forward* to having a good time? Are you one of them? Why not have a good time *now*? That such an experience is possible is one of the glorious things about being a Christian. There is a double reason for this. Both Jesus and Paul by the Holy Spirit impress upon us through the pages of the New Testament that God is the Sovereign of this universe and that all things are under His control. If our Father,—for if we are Christians, *then* we are sons of God and God is our Father,—if our Father is the almighty sovereign Ruler of all, how can we help rejoicing in what happens under His rule?

And the second reason is that God has sent His Holy Spirit to be the immediate Companion and Guide of every Christian and by His supernatural power to make possible the fulfilment of the injunction in the inspired epistle of Paul to the Philippians (4:4), "Rejoice in the Lord always," and that in Ephesians (5:20), "Giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God, even the Father." These things being so, there is no escape from the conclusion that it is the Christian's privilege to be having a good time *now*.

This does not mean that there will not be times when we will have greater joy than at others. A great victory for Christ in our own heart or in the heart of another will produce such added joy. Nor, and this is more important, is this simply an expression of that cheap disregard of all difficulties which simply says, "Smile, smile, smile." It is because facts are recognized, not disregarded, and because the proper place is given to that great fact the sovereignty of the Christian's Heavenly Father that it is possible and desirable that the Christian should always have a good time.

What has caused the number of missionary volunteers to fall off to such a notable extent during the past few years? This question is being given increasing attention, and it is well worthy of it. That the enrolments in the Student Volunteer Movement in 1928 were only one-tenth as many as they were in 1920 is startling and demands explanation. Many solutions are offered. The causes advanced range through 1) the increasing demand for highly-trained specialists as missionaries, 2) the widespread impression that the growth of nationalist feeling on mission fields makes mission work unfruitful or useless, 3) a feeling of disgust with denominational rivalries, 4) the inadequate standard of remuneration, 5) the

feeling that there is not liberty to apply modern methods to mission work as now conducted, 6) a fear of friction on the field with missionaries of an older generation holding to different standards and aims for the work, 7) an increasing knowledge of the good that there is in "heathen" religions and consequent lack of interest in the propagation of Christianity, 8) an absence of confidence in one's own Christianity.

We believe that the whole matter can be reduced to much simpler terms than such an array of reasons indicates. For years the missionary enterprise was carried on by men and women who universally believed that the Bible was the *unique* revelation from God to all mankind. On that basis they also believed, because of the statements of the Bible on the subject, first, that it was every Christian's duty and privilege to obey Christ's words, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations," (Matthew 28:19), and, second, that "as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law," (Romans 2:12), for "in none other (than Jesus Christ) is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." (Acts 4:12.) Given such a basis, the privilege of missions was a glorious one. No wonder that there were volunteers.

But now the situation has changed. To an increasing degree the officers and secretaries of mission boards and societies no longer believe that the Bible is a unique revelation from God presenting the only way of salvation, and the same is coming to be true of many members of the missionary forces themselves. Under such circumstances, and holding such opinions, why should young men or young women go out as missionaries? Frankly, we see absolutely no reason why they should. We should say that it were perfectly foolish to do so.

And is it any wonder that for the man who contemplates going out as a missionary with no belief in the unique authority of the Bible or in Christ as the *only* way of salvation, there is fear of friction with older missionaries, that there is an absence of confidence in his own Christianity, that there is a lack of interest in propagating Christianity? To a young man or woman who does not believe in a revelation of final truth from God, who does not rejoice in the assurance that "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth," (Psalm 60:4), why should not denominational differences seem like so much tommyrot? Indeed, why should not being a missionary appeal to such an one as, after all, just entering one of a number of different professions in which the scale of remuneration is one of the important factors to be considered? As already indicated, we see no answer to these questions except the obvious one, and hence we see no occasion for surprise that the number of missionary volunteers has declined. After all, it is a sign of sound sense and clear thinking that there are so few volunteers among those who hold these opinions.

There is one more phase of the matter that seldom receives the consideration it deserves and that serves to still more fully explain the decline in numbers of the missionary volunteer ranks. When the foundations of

the faith, the faith that makes missionaries, are being so violently attacked here in the missionary-sending lands, it is natural to suppose that the call of God would come to many who might otherwise go to lands abroad, to concentrate their energies on the proclamation of the truth here at home. Little regard has been paid to this factor, but we believe that the civil struggle at home, and deplorable as it is, it is vitally necessary, has robbed the advance ranks in foreign lands of some who might otherwise have joined the battle there.

And in close connection with this phase of the matter lie the acts and statements of many officers and members of the home staffs of mission societies and boards. Why should a young man feel encouraged to go to the natives of Asia, Africa or South America with the message of salvation only through the finished work of Christ, when the members of the sending board do not believe the message? How can he face non-Christian systems with full ardor, when he knows that he is liable to petty interference and possibly recall from the rear? He goes out to carry on a hand-to-hand conflict with the powers of darkness abroad and finds no relish in the thought that he may, at the same time, have to fight opposition and interference originating at headquarters in the home land thousands of miles away.

If the mission boards and mission movements are earnestly seeking an explanation of the tremendous decline in the number of missionary candidates, they must look not to the young people themselves, but to that considerable portion of the teaching ministry of the church in its seminaries and pulpits which has ceased to teach the authority of the Word of God and to the same sections of their own board memberships. Young people are wise enough to know that unless one believes with the heart in the authority of the divine Word of God, being a missionary is not an apostolic calling, but is simply a profession, and they will judge it upon the terms appropriate to such a classification.

The eventual appearance of the full report of the Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists, held at Oxford last year, the first since the war, promises to provide a volume of great interest to those following the course of Old Testament scholarship. Preliminary reports tell of at least four papers read during the Congress which are of particular value in indicating that there are, on the continent of Europe at least, a body of scholars, apparently a growing body, who are fully aware of the fact that Julius Wellhausen neither spoke the last word in Old Testament criticism, nor laid down the fundamental canons by which all subsequent research in the field must be tested.

A. S. Yahuda of Heidelberg presented to the Congress a paper concerning the language of the Old Testament, setting forth the conclusion that Old Testament Hebrew took on its form as a literary language in Egypt, and expressing his opinion that the stories in Genesis were put into their present form in the Egyptian period of Hebrew history. This is in perfect

harmony, of course, with the authorship of our book of Genesis by Moses, but is quite contrary to the scheme championed by Wellhausen and generally accepted in American Modernist circles. It is interesting to compare these conclusions of Yahuda, which will be amplified in his book, shortly to be published, *Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen*, with the results of Robert Dick Wilson, published in his article, *Foreign Words in the Old Testament*, in the *Princeton Theological Review* for April 1928. Wilson showed that Egyptian words were very frequent in the Pentateuch as compared with the other parts of the Old Testament thus indicating its origin in close connection with Egypt.

The second Oxford paper noted was by B. Jacob of Dortmund on "The Literary Unity of the Biblical Story of the Flood," opposing the critical division of the story of the flood into two contradictory parts and making the natural supposition that the two periods of time mentioned, forty days and one hundred and fifty days, are respectively the periods during which it rained and during which the waters remained upon the earth's surface. We suppose that this natural assumption, which is indicated by the text itself, would occur to the average reader automatically, were he not told by many higher critical experts that the two numbers are contradictory, a purely unnecessary and unwarranted conclusion, but one which fits in splendidly with their other assumption that the flood story comes from two different authors. Against this theory Jacob protested with his sensible paper.

Speaking upon Deuteronomy, Coppens rejected the date near the reform of Josiah upheld by many critics since De Wette, and on the contrary, stated that the book might well be Mosaic in origin.

Possibly the greatest surprise of the Hebrew section of the Congress, because of its opposition to one of the famous "universally accepted" conclusions of the Wellhausen branch of Old Testament science, was the paper of A. Kaminka of Vienna, devoted to opposing the idea that the book of Isaiah was written by two or more authors. Kaminka came forth boldly with the conclusion that the whole of our book of Isaiah is from the one prophet Isaiah who lived at the end of the eighth century, B.C., the time indicated by the opening passage of the book.

So we await the fuller reports with interest, and heartily greet these thinkers and scholars who are not unwilling to state their conclusions in an International Congress even though they run counter to long-held critical positions. May we have more of like stamp.

THE MISTAKES OF MODERNISM

A. Z. CONRAD

MODERNISM is an elastic term. There is a sense in which all believers are Modernists. No one is so thoroughly up to date as the evangelical Christian who is making constant application of the truths of Christianity to the needs of the present hour. Later than the last dispatch is the divine message which comes to the soul through the Spirit. In point of recentness, there is nothing more truly up to the last minute than the teachings of Jesus. Modernism, however, is a term which has come to have a very particular significance in religious relations. It stands for a certain type of thought and for a certain group of individuals whose assumptions and presumptions are very conspicuous. Modernists are accustomed to throw into the scrap heap the lines of thinking represented by the advocates of evangelical Christianity.

Fundamentalism is also a term elastic and variously interpreted. It may represent a small fanatical group who overemphasize certain features of the Christian faith and insist on interpretations of the Bible which may very properly be called fanciful and irrational. On the other hand, Fundamentalism in its broader aspects, as representing evangelical Christianity, definitely means those who accept the Bible at its face value, the Gospel of Christ as a blessed reality, Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the atoning work of our Saviour as indispensable to eternal life. Let us now turn our attention to a few of the multitudinous mistakes of Modernism.

I. The first mistake of Modernism is this, that Modernism is new in its teachings and representations. Truth is timeless. It has nothing to do with remoteness or recentness as such. Reality is independent of all time relations. It is eternal. It is changeless save in application. New cults are constantly appearing, which plead for the support of people on the ground that some new, striking or even startling discovery has been made with which the world has never been familiar. Furthermore, older organizations departing from the traditional conceptions of Christianity are calling the beliefs which have been entertained for centuries incapable of retention. They assert that all these things were well enough in their day but that they have become antiquated and inapplicable to the present needs. With much sophistry and perversion of truth they lead people to feel that the fathers were ignorant or misinformed and that it is time to leave the old moorings under the direction of a new pilot and a new chart. It will invariably be discovered that what purports to be new is centuries old. There is not a single modern cult that is other than the expression and amplification of what has been repeatedly presented to the world before. There is no objection which Modernism makes to the Bible, to the Atonement or to any feature of Christianity which has not been made and perhaps better made by objectors who lived in the latter part of the first or in the second century. We all believe that new truth will ever break forth from the Word of God. But when it comes, it will not by any means be Modern-

ism. Modernism is essentially destructive and not constructive, since it is ever attacking the positions maintained by the Church for generations.

II. A second mistake of Modernism is the claim that it is synonymous with value and progress. Mere modernity does not give value to anything. Worth is determined by certain well-known criteria. We have the time test, the acid test, the fire test which we apply in determining the value of jewels. These same tests can be applied to truth. To run after some novelty that strikes hard blows at truth long accepted is to reveal a lack of mental poise such as should characterize a true student of Revelation. The very fact that a thing is modern is reason enough to wait, to weigh, to measure and to put it to the test. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Fruit is not the result of an overnight process. A thing may be very modern and very worthless. Modernism is very fond of employing epithets calculated to discredit long-accepted evangelical truths. We are told they are old-fashioned, out of date and irrational. What should concern us is not newness but trueness.

III. The third mistake of Modernism is the claim that the unaided human intellect can deal effectively with the great problems of the soul. It is the assumption of Modernism that by mere intellection man may discover for himself all the truth essential to the perfection of character and the knowledge of God's will. As a matter of fact, the deepest spiritual truths positively require revelation because they are entirely unknown to any save God Himself. The very implications of immortality are such as to demand the voice of divine authority if the soul is to have peace and true understanding. The question pressing hard on the human mind has been from time immemorial, "If a man die shall he live again?" No satisfactory answer has ever been or can ever be given to this question except as God breaks the great silence. The greatest intellectual giants of the world are absolutely helpless in the presence of profound spiritual questions. A man can talk eloquently about the laws of hydrostatics, but when he starts to wade out into the ocean he soon gets beyond his depth. No one has ever come back from the invisible world to answer any questions about the experience of the souls beyond the grave. Even those who were witness to the transfiguration made no declaration which would lead us to believe that Moses and Elijah told them anything about the spirit life. Do not deceive yourself with the belief that there is any authority relative to sin, salvation and eternity except a supernatural authority.

IV. The fourth mistake of Modernism is this,—that the Bible is man's best word about himself and God, rather than God's best word about Himself and man. Modernism declares the Bible to be a distinctively human document and nothing more. To the Modernist the Bible is man's best word about himself, his soul's need, his aspirations, his outreach, his onlook regarding God. God thus becomes man's creation, but the true view is definitely opposed to this conception of Modernism. The Bible is God's best word about God and man. It is God's declaration to man, revealing who he is and what He wants him to do; what God has done, is doing and is willing to do for man. We know that progress does not rest upon the

shifting sands of error. We know further that the joy of the human heart and the growth of the human soul never come about by feeding upon ashes. We know, furthermore, that in view of the truth that man intellectually is not able to deal with spiritual problems unaided, therefore, whatever meets these great problems must be from God. We know that the progress of the world has been paralleled by the distribution of the Bible. Before Christ came, the world's progress rested largely with a group of people who were adherents to God's Revelation made through theophanies, by poets and prophets and the great teachers whom God raised up. Since the coming of Christ, the Bible has furnished the basis for every great progressive movement.

V. The fifth mistake of Modernism is that Divine Revelation is uncertain, untrustworthy and superfluous. Any unbiased student who turns to God's Word and reads the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament, then turns to the New and finds they are all fulfilled, must be convinced that God inspired the prophets and poets of Israel. The New Testament tested by results reveals the fact of a supernatural direction. We are told exactly what will happen through the acceptance or rejection of certain truths, and history and observation bear out the truthfulness of the statement. No individual has ever been able to say, "I trusted in Revelation and I have failed," nor can anyone say, "Oh Lord, I have made Thy Word my counsel and it has misled and deceived me." On the other hand, millions are prepared to testify that the Word of God has made them wise unto salvation and has been the man of their counsel and the guide of their lives.

VI. The sixth mistake of Modernism is that sociological relations are more important than theological principles. This idea is very prevalent. "Do not bother about your soul. Tend to the ordinary duties and let the next world take care of itself. Engage yourself in providing for the material well-being of people and nothing else will matter." As a matter of fact, there is no true service unless there is an abiding principle behind it. You must have a foundation before you can build. Spiritually there is no other foundation that can be laid than that which is laid in Jesus Christ our Lord. Never has there been greater interest shown in behalf of human liberty and human progress than that shown by people who trust in the ever-living Word of God. It was the belief "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself" that laid the foundation for Harvard and Yale and Princeton. The recent apostasy has been very great. Nevertheless, the Christian Church has been throwing out a bright light and in proportion as the Church has exalted God's Word it has been both a force and a fire. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." What shall it profit if you build splendid edifices? What shall it profit a man who accumulates a vast fortune and loses his own soul?

VII. A further mistake is, that sin is disease and misfortune to be dealt with pathologically and not evil to be eradicated and dealt with redemptively. The Bible declares, "The wages of sin is death." If sin could be successfully dealt with pathologically, remorse would be impossible. We

would say in view of any transgression, that we need not disturb ourselves since we are the victims of misfortune or temptation. Sin is a crime before God. You cannot eliminate that fact. Our very cry for forgiveness and the burden often carried upon the conscience is an indication that there is something evil within, which must be dealt with redemptively. There is no doubt but what improved surroundings and education retard the progress of evil. All the sophistry in the world will never do away with the fact that sin is sin and without salvation effected by Jesus Christ, the sinner is doomed.

VIII. The eighth mistake of Modernism is that culture and not rebirth can eliminate the destructive influence of transgression and can put man into right relations with God. What does God say? "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Culture has never yet removed one single sin stain. It never will. Cosmetics cannot eliminate a deep-seated malady. Lady Macbeth was unable to wash the stains and remove the "damned spot" from her hands. A man cannot bring peace, contentment and rest by any merely educational process. The more culture the better but for purposes of salvation it is useless. Why discard the utterance of the greatest Teacher the world has ever known who said, "Ye must be born again"?

IX. Modernism makes the mistake of assuming that Calvary represents man doing his utmost for God and not God doing His utmost for man. In the thought of Modernism Christ suffered martyrdom just as many others have done. Jesus at Golgotha was not man doing his best for God. It was God, the Son, dying upon the Cross to save the world. The Scripture declaration was explicit, unequivocal. "I lay down my life for the sheep." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." Modernism is definitely opposed to the Scripture when it rejects the Atonement. That changes no fact. The Atonement was accomplished by Christ on the Cross and is effectualized for the individual by the acceptance of Jesus.

X. What greater mistake could Modernism make than its continuous assumption that a creedless Church and a creedless personality make for liberty and self-expression? They do not. Why this absurd inveighing against creed? We often hear, "Let no one expect me to attach my name to a creed." But what is a creed? It is a statement of faith. If a true statement why oppose it? A true creed is simply a formulation of the truth of Revelation. The fact is, a creedless Church is a spineless Church. A creedless individual is a jelly-fish personality. Your creed may be the New Testament Scriptures, nevertheless it is a creed. A Church without a creed never stands against the stream of adverse tendency. It never produces great missionaries. In all the great missionary movements and activities the leaders have been believers and if believers, believers in something. That something was their creed. Not only should we have a creed but it should be an expression of a belief and a conviction for which we should be willing to die.

XI. Another mistake: that prayer is a wholesome exercise in meditation,

but has no procuring power. No one questions that it is a wholesome exercise, but if people did not believe prayer had a procuring power they would soon cease to pray. As a matter of fact that is just what does happen in thousands of instances. Jesus said, "Ask and ye shall receive." He said furthermore, Pray for the things ye need. Jesus' idea of prayer was that it called in the activities of God to help meet earth's needs and answer our personal problems.

XII. Another mistake of Modernism: that sincerity independent of reality is a sufficient ground to secure divine approval. "No matter what you believe just so you are honest," we often hear. God says, "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." It makes all the difference in the world whether you are hugging a delusion, following an illusion, depending upon a mirage or relying on reality.

XIII. That man can deal adequately with sin, sickness, sorrow and death without Jesus Christ is another mistake of Modernism. No religion has ever pretended to deal adequately with these things except Christianity. Next to Jesus Christ, Paul was the great avenue of Divine Revelation. He declares that if Jesus did not rise from the dead we have no gospel and no hope. The whole fabric of the Christian Church is woven through and through with the truth that Jesus rose from the dead. It is this that guarantees the Atonement. Christianity meets man's need as a sinner and removes his guilt. It meets his deepest sorrow by the assurance of the future life. It meets his sickness by divine power. It meets his death with the guarantee of an endless life.

XIV. Modernism declares that the teachings of Jesus are subject to human revision and correction and hence are not final and authoritative. One of our theological leaders has recently written, "Of course Jesus thought this was so. He was simply mistaken." In other words, the wisdom of man is greater than that of Jesus and he may revise the findings of Jesus. Jesus said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The final seat of authority lies in the experience of Jesus Christ with God the Father. The Gospels give us the record of this and hence become an authority to us.

XV. Modernism assumes that traditional Christian beliefs are discredited by the discoveries of modern science and the revelations of archeology. The plain, unvarnished fact is this: not one, single statement of Holy Scripture from beginning to end has been successfully overthrown by any scientific truth or any archeological discovery. On the other hand, it is marvelous how God's Word has been accredited by the revelations of the spade.

XVI. The sixteenth mistake of Modernism is that accepted Christian beliefs are obstruational and non-progressive. This is stupidly untrue. Every great progressive cause has been led to success through the advocacy of Christian conservatives who accept the Word of God at its face value. Christianity is the most progressive and aggressive of all systems of truth.

XVII. Another mistake of Modernism is that all scholarship of the highest order is sceptical with respect to long-accepted beliefs of the Christian Church and hence radical. There is no phrase with which Modernism is more familiar than "All scholars." The presumption and the conceit connected with that phrase are monumental. The truth is that the highest scholarship today which is under the direction of the Spirit of God receives the truth of the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection and Regeneration.

The final court of appeal in all matters of faith is the appeal to Jesus Christ in His life, His teachings and hence, His experience with God the Father. My experience is valuable only as accrediting that which is greater than any human experience. My experience corroborates what God has revealed in Jesus Christ. It is my business to lay my conclusions beside the teachings of Jesus and see whether or not they correspond and if not, to correct them. Personally, I am willing to rest my eternal destiny upon the fact that Jesus Christ was the Son of God and God the Son.

IS THE BIBLE RIGHT ABOUT JESUS? III. THE WITNESS OF THE GOSPELS*

J. GRESHAM MACHEN

TODAY we have been considering the question: "Is the Bible Right about Jesus?" This afternoon we considered the witness of Paul. We observed that in the Epistles of Paul we have a fixed starting-point in all the controversy of the present day, since the genuineness of these Epistles is not denied by any serious historians—at least the genuineness of the chief of them. In the Epistles of Paul, we have Jesus presented clearly as a supernatural person, not primarily as an example for religious faith, but as the object of religious faith. We observed further that that stupendous presentation of the person of Jesus which is found everywhere in the Epistles of Paul is so presupposed as a matter beyond debate that the historian can hardly avoid the extraordinary conclusion that that lofty view of Jesus was also the view of those with whom Paul had come into contact, namely, the intimate friends of Jesus who had lived with Him when He was upon this earth.

Therefore as we examine the phenomenon of the religion of Paul, which is a fact of history that no serious historian denies, this question arises in our minds: Who was this Jesus who thus could be raised to divine dignity, and that not by later generations, but by His own contemporaries in the first Christian generation—so raised even by those who had seen Him subject to all the limitations of human life in their intercourse with Him while He was upon this earth? Even if the historian possessed only the Epistles of Paul as sources of historical information about Jesus, he would have enough to give him pause. But as a matter of fact we have other sources of information about Jesus; for in the four Gospels we find an extended picture of Him, an extended account of His life upon earth.

I shall not stop here to consider certain very important questions with regard to the Gospels, namely, questions of literary criticism with regard to the date and authorship of these books, except to say just in passing that the evidence for the authorship of one of these books—the Gospel according to Luke—is of such a singularly cogent kind that to the astonishment of the learned world it has within recent years convinced some scholars whose view as to the origin of Christianity is just as much out of accord with the traditional view of the authorship of these books as could possibly be imagined. You have the extraordinary phenomenon that

* This is the third and last of a series of three addresses, given in King's Hall, London, on June 10, 1927, under the auspices of The Bible League of Great Britain. It has been revised by the author for *The Evangelical Student*, and is printed by his kind permission and that of The Bible League. The first and second addresses were published in the October 1928 and January 1929 issues of this magazine. The entire series has been published in pamphlet form by The Bible League of Great Britain, and may be obtained from them at 40 Great James Street, Bedford Row, London, W.C. 1, England, at three pence a copy, or, in limited quantities, from the headquarters of The League of Evangelical Students, 25 Edwards Place, Princeton, New Jersey, at ten cents a copy, postpaid.

scholars like Professor von Harnack, of Berlin, whose view as to the origin of Christianity is of a thoroughly naturalistic kind, as far removed as possible from that which is present in the Lucan writings, have been so much impressed by the argument from literary criticism that they have actually come to the traditional view that the Gospel according to Luke was written by Luke the physician and companion of Paul, who was in Palestine in the year A.D. 58, and was there in A.D. 60, and probably during the interval (these dates being pushed back a few years if another chronology is adopted), so that he actually came into direct contact with James, the brother of this Jesus whom we are studying tonight.

I might point out, too, with regard to all of the Gospels, that there is a certain self-evidencing quality in their narrative. Personal testimony is a very subtle thing; and when you face a witness on the witness-stand the credence which you will give to his testimony is dependent very often upon the subtle impression that you obtain of the person testifying. That sort of evidence, which often attains a high degree of value, has a larger place in the production of Christian conviction than often is supposed. If you are troubled with doubts about the truth of this extraordinary narrative which you have in the four Gospels, I should commend to you the exercise of reading one of the Gospels through from beginning to end with something like the rapidity which you apply every morning to the morning newspaper or to any book of the day. At other times study the Gospels, but for once just *read* the Gospels. I sometimes think that perhaps that is the reason why God has given us one Gospel which is so short as the Gospel according to Mark—that at one sitting we might easily read the whole book through. In the Gospel according to Mark you are not asked to sit quietly at the feet of Jesus and listen in an extended way to His teaching. You are not taken into the intimacy of His circle as is the case in the Gospel according to John. But you are asked to look at Him with something of the wonder which was in the minds of those first observers in the synagogue at Capernaum. It is a Gospel that makes a first impression; and I tell you, when you read it, if you will brush out of your mind everything you have read about it, and will let the total impression of it be made upon your mind, there will come to you an overpowering impression that that witness is telling the truth.

So it is also with the Gospel according to John. It has been my business for a great many years to read a great many things that have been said against the trustworthiness of the Gospel according to John, and sometimes, as I have read, I have been impressed with the plausibleness of much that is said; but at other times, after filling my mind with what is said about the Gospel according to John, I have just conceived the notion of reading, not what is said *about* the book, but the book itself, and when I have done that the impression has been overpowering. It does seem perfectly plain that the author of this book is claiming to be an eye-witness of the wonderful events that he narrates. There is no writer of the New Testament who lays greater stress upon the plain testimony of the senses than he, and the keyword of the Gospel, I think, is found in the words:

“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory.” You cannot sublimate those words into meaning merely that we human beings have heard about the incarnate Word, but they spring from the wondering gratitude of a man who himself had had the inestimable privilege of touching with his hands and hearing with his ears and seeing with his eyes the incarnate Word of God. When you read the book you have the overpowering impression that the author is telling the truth; and the hypothesis to which you are logically forced if you hold that the book is not true—the hypothesis that this writer is engaging in a refined bit of deception by subtly making the false impression of being an eye-witness when he was no eye-witness at all—this hypothesis becomes, when you become acquainted with the man by reading his narrative for yourself, a monstrous hypothesis indeed.

Tonight I propose not to examine these questions of literary criticism in detail, but just to take for a moment the total picture of Jesus that is provided in the Gospels. And I may say at the start that that picture is a picture of just the kind of person that is presupposed in the Epistles of Paul. Yet there does not seem to be the slightest evidence of any dependence of the writers of the Gospels upon the Epistles. In the Epistles of Paul there is presupposed everywhere a Jesus who was a supernatural person and yet lived a life upon this earth; and you have just such a person presented in all the Gospels.

There are three things that need to be said about the modern reconstruction of Jesus as distinguished from the Jesus who is presented to us in the Gospels. In the first place, that reconstruction involves the elimination of the supernatural from the life of Jesus; because the Jesus of all the Gospels is clearly a supernatural person. It used to be held, perhaps, that you have a difference in the Gospels in this respect; at one time, perhaps, the divine Christ of John was contrasted with the human Christ of Mark. But modern criticism of the Gospels has tended powerfully against any such distinction as that; and it is admitted by the dominant school of criticism today that in the Gospel according to Mark as well as in the Gospel according to John you have presented to you not a mere teacher but a supernatural person whose death had some sort of redeeming significance, not a teacher of righteousness merely, but a Saviour, essentially the sort of supernatural Christ that is presented in the Epistles of Paul.

Here is a strange problem: the Jesus of the Gospels is a supernatural person; He is plainly a real person who lived upon this earth; and yet from the point of view of modern naturalistic criticism a supernatural person can never be real, because by such criticism the supernatural has been eliminated from the pages of history.

Perhaps it may be well to say a word in passing as to what we mean by the “supernatural,” what we mean by a “miracle.” It is true, there is nothing more unpopular in the discussion of religious questions at the present day than this humble matter of the definition of terms; many persons are very angry when they are asked to check the flow of their thought by so humble a thing as a definition! Many definitions of the

word "miracle" have been proposed, but I confess that the only one of them that seems to me satisfactory is one which I learned many years ago. "A miracle," according to that definition, "is an event in the external world that is wrought by the *immediate* power of God." That does not mean that while other events are not wrought by God a miracle is wrought by Him. But it means that in the case of other events God uses means, whereas in the case of a miracle He puts forth His creative power just as truly as in that mighty act of creation which underlies the whole process of the world.

When you adopt that definition of a miracle you have based all your thinking upon a certain very definite philosophy, and that definite philosophy upon which you have based your thinking is called theism—if you will pardon a technical term for a very simple thing. It is the view of the world which Jesus of Nazareth held, as well as the view of the world which has been held by many philosophers. In a truly theistic view of the world it is almost as necessary to assert the real existence of an order of nature as it is to assert the real existence of a personal God. People say nowadays that we who hold to a belief in miracles are doing away with the possibility of science—science which seeks to set forth the orderly course of this world. As a matter of fact, we are being much more kind to science than science is kind to itself; because we are asserting that the order of nature has a real objective existence, a thing which, as I understand it, the scientists of the present day, from the scientific point of view, do not find it necessary to assert at all. We assert that there is such a thing as a really existent order of nature, created by God, upheld at every moment by God, not a machine set going by God and let alone, but something that is under God's control and yet a really existent thing. And what is meant from that point of view as a miracle is the entrance of the *creative* power of God at some point in the course of the world. I do not see how if you really believe in creation at all—and I do not see how unless you believe in creation you can hold to a theistic view of the world—you can have any objection of principle to the entrance of creative acts of God within the course of the world.

So much for the definition of miracle. From that point of view, it is clear that the miracles of the New Testament have a stupendous significance. Some one will say: "What a degrading thing it is that we should suppose that this order of nature had to be broken into. You are requiring us to suppose that there have been unaccountable and meaningless events; and our reasonable view of the world is gone!" Not at all, my friends. A miracle from the Christian point of view is not a disorderly thing, but it springs from the source of all the order that there is in the world—namely, the will of God.

Very well, in the New Testament you have Jesus presented as a supernatural person, and you have in the New Testament an account of miracles. At that point many persons enter upon a very peculiar line of thought. Many devout persons nowadays, even persons who believe in the fact of the miracles, will tell you that while miracles used to be an aid to faith,

now they are a hindrance to faith; that people used to believe in Jesus because of the miracles, but that now when they already believe in Him on other grounds they may then come to a belief in miracles, so that although the miracles may be a hindrance that can be overcome, still they are not an aid to faith, but a hindrance; that people used to believe in Jesus *because* of the miracles, but now they believe *in spite* of the miracles. Such a way of thinking involves a very curious confusion. Of course, it is perfectly true from one point of view that miracles are an obstacle to faith—but who ever denied it? The more commonplace a narrative is, the easier it is to believe. If I told you that as I walked the streets of this city I met several of my fellow-beings, my narrative would be very much superior to the narrative of the New Testament in one particular; it would certainly be far easier to believe. But then it is not likely that anyone would be very much interested in it. So, without miracles, the narrative of the Gospels would certainly be far easier to believe; but, do you not see, it would not be worth believing. Without the miracles, the thing that you would be believing would be a totally different thing from that which you are believing now. Without the miracles, you would have in Jesus a teacher and example; but with the miracles you have a Saviour from your sins.

So the Jesus presented in the Gospels is a supernatural person. But from the point of view of the presuppositions of Modernism a supernatural person never existed upon this earth. What is the conclusion? It would seem to be that this Jesus never lived at all. There have been here and there a few who have held that view—Kalthoff and Drews in Germany, and W. B. Smith in America. These men have held that there was no real person corresponding to the Jesus of the Gospels at all. But that view is not held by really important historians. It is perfectly plain that we have here an account of a real person living at a definite time upon this earth, and that if the whole picture is to be regarded as fictitious then there is no way in the sphere of history of distinguishing truth from sham.

So this Jesus was a real person; He was a supernatural person; and yet, according to Modernist historians, a supernatural person is never real! What is the solution from the Modernist point of view? The solution proposed is that you have two elements in the Gospels: first a picture of the real, the purely human Jesus; and, secondly, a defacement of that picture by miraculous ornamentation: and that it is the duty of the modern historian to recover the picture of the true human Jesus; it is his duty to remove the coating of the supernatural which in the Gospels has almost completely defaced the portrait, to tear away from Jesus these tawdry trappings of the supernatural, in order that the true presentation of the man Jesus may burst upon the world.

It seemed at first, from the naturalistic point of view, to be a very hopeful task. You might say, of course, that the way to do it would be to claim that while the Gospels as we have them are full of the supernatural, if you get back to the original sources it would not be so at all. But the trouble is that in the earliest sources reconstructed, rightly or

wrongly, by modern criticism you have similar supernatural elements. So you have to go to work in some other way. All you can do is simply to go through the Gospels and just take the supernatural out. So a hundred years ago men went very hopefully to work. They said that the events narrated in the Gospels were historical, but not really supernatural; that the first observers put a false supernaturalistic interpretation upon events that were really perfectly natural. When, for example, it is said in the first chapter of Luke that Zacharias went into the temple, certainly it was true that a man of that name went into the temple, and that in the dim religious light he saw the smoke of the incense rising up, and thought in the solemnity of the moment that it was an angel, and that, as he had been thinking about certain things he thought that the angel spoke words to him. That is an example of what is called technically the rationalising method of dealing with the miracle narratives.

The most powerful critic, perhaps, of the rationalising method was not an orthodox theologian; but it was David Friedrich Strauss. The famous *Life of Christ* of Strauss appeared in 1835. It was directed against two opponents. In the first place, it was directed against the supernaturalistic view of Jesus, which takes these stories of the miracles at their face value and believes that they are sober fact. Strauss directed all the power of his attack against that view of the believing Christian about the miracles in the Gospels. And I should like to say that if you want a really powerful criticism of the Gospel narratives on the negative side, a really powerful attack against their truthfulness, you cannot do better than go back to the original *Life of Christ* by Strauss, because you will find that most of those who deal with the matter today are far inferior to Strauss in acumen and in the other qualities that are necessary to the task.

But Strauss also attacked the rationalising method to which I have just referred. He pointed out how ridiculous it is, when the thing for which the whole narrative exists is the miracle in it, to take away the miracle and think you have anything left. No, said Strauss; the whole reason for which these narratives were formed is found in the miracles that they contain; and if the miracles are not historical the thing to say is that nothing is historical and that these miracle narratives are just the clothing of some religious idea in historical form.

That is the mythical view of Strauss—that the narratives are to be taken as a whole and are to be regarded as the clothing in historical form of a religious idea. So if you are to get the miracles out of the Gospels, you have to go to work much more subtly than was thought necessary by Paulus and the early rationalisers. It is clear that you cannot just take out the miracles and leave the rest, but that if you are going to take out the miracles, you must also take a great deal of the rest of the narrative which exists simply for the sake of the miracles.

Here, then, is the phenomenon that has appeared in the modern criticism of the Gospels. You proceed to take the miracles out; in doing so you find to your consternation that great shreds of the rest have to come out also. It is like pulling a pound of flesh out of a living body. Very naturally,

therefore, there is a tendency in recent criticism to approach nearer and nearer to the absurd view that it is *all* unhistorical. That is the first difficulty in reconstructing your purely human Jesus—the difficulty of separating the miracles from the rest—because the whole picture is not an agglomeration, but an organism.

Then there is a second difficulty. Suppose you have taken the miracles out of the Gospels and have got a purely human Jesus. It cannot be done, but let us suppose it could be done—you have your human Jesus who never worked miracles (except miracles that you could explain away, such as faith-healing and the like, which are not miracles at all). It would look as though, from the naturalistic point of view, you were in a hopeful condition. At last you have the real Jesus whom we moderns can accept. But the trouble is that when you have reconstructed your purely human Jesus, you find that he is an entirely unbelievable figure. He is not only a person who never *did* exist, but he is one who never *could* have existed. He has a moral and psychological contradiction at the root of His being. That moral and psychological contradiction arises from the stupendous fact of the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus. It is a fact that the Jesus of the Gospels really did hold that He was the Messiah, and that He held that He was the Messiah, not in some lower political sense, as though it meant merely that He was a King of David's line, but in the stupendous sense that He was actually to sit on the throne of God and be the instrument in judging the earth.

Jesus called Himself the Son of Man. There is much misinterpretation of the term, "Son of Man," on the part of the readers of the Gospels; but it seems perfectly plain that the term does not set forth the human nature of Jesus as over against the divine nature at all, but is a reference to the tremendous scene in the seventh chapter of Daniel, in which one like unto a son of man is represented as being present with the Ancient of Days. The term, "Son of Man," is perhaps a more lofty, a more stupendous, a more supernatural designation of Jesus in the Gospels than the term, "Son of God," at least as that term might be understood in the minds of the people.

People sometimes say: "We are not interested in theology and metaphysics and all that; we are not interested in the doctrine that the creeds set forth about the person of our Lord. It is sufficient for us to read the Sermon on the Mount and try to do what Jesus there says and get rid of all theology." Well, the Sermon on the Mount contains a most stupendous theology; and it contains a stupendous theology just in its presentation of the person of Jesus. If there is one passage in the whole of the New Testament which is loved by the Modernist Church it is the passage in which Jesus represents the scene at the last judgment, where it is said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." But just in that very passage you have the stupendous notion presented by Jesus Himself that *He* is to be the one who will sit on the throne of God at the final judgment and be the judge of human beings who

have lived in all the periods of history. Why, it is a perfectly stupendous theology, a perfectly stupendous presentation of the majesty of the person of Jesus. What would you think of a mere man who should look out upon his contemporaries and say that *he* was to be the one who was to determine their eternal destiny at the last judgment? You would say he was unbalanced or insane. Some persons are saying that about Jesus today. They have written long and learned books to show the particular kind of insanity with which Jesus was afflicted. It does not worry me a bit. Indeed, I think it is a hopeful sign of the times that these alienists should be investigating the case of a mere man who thought he was divine. At the time when there were emperors of China it used to be thought a pretty sure sign of insanity for a man to declare that he was emperor of China; but, you know, if actually the emperor of China had declared that he was *not* the emperor but someone else, that would have been an equally sure sign of insanity. So these alienists are investigating the case of a man who thought he was divine and was *not* divine; but against one who thought He was divine and *was* divine they have, obviously, nothing to say.

In other words, you have here in modern form the old problem of the stupendous claims of Jesus. How could Jesus have made these claims if they were not true? Some have held that Jesus never really made the claims, that He never claimed to be the Messiah at all. But that view has been held by comparatively few modern scholars, because it is faced by such an overpowering weight of contrary evidence. It was the claim to be the Messiah that cost Jesus His life. That claim is thus deeply rooted in the narrative. Usually, therefore, modern scholars pursue a different policy. They say that Jesus did not know how to express His sense of a mission except in the (somewhat unsatisfactory) category of Messiahship. Sometimes they have held that it was at the baptism that He came to think that He was the Messiah. Very interesting popular presentations of some such view have appeared in modern times. When I was a student in Germany, about twenty years ago, everyone was reading Frenssen's *Hillegenlei*, a novel which incidentally brings in a very interesting psychological reconstruction of Jesus. Jesus is represented as thinking about the Saviour that was to come, and at last He comes to the conclusion that He is that Saviour Himself. It is a very dramatic representation of the way in which He came to that conclusion—and it is also totally unconvincing. It does not make one bit of difference whether you put this acceptance of Messiahship at the baptism, or as many modern scholars have done, at some later time; whether you put it late or early it does—unless the claim was really justified—put a moral stain upon the character of Jesus. And that means putting a moral stain upon the character of a stainless One. Even modern men are forced to admit that as a whole the character of Jesus was totally inconsistent with any lack of mental balance. Thus at the very centre of the being of the reconstructed, purely human Jesus, there is a hopeless contradiction. The reduced Jesus of modern naturalism is a monstrosity, whereas the Jesus presented in the Gospels, though He is full of mystery,

is yet a person whom a man can love, and a person who might, by the wonderful grace of God, really have lived upon this earth.

That, then, is your second difficulty—your reconstructed Jesus is an unbelievable figure. Then there is a third difficulty. It is found when you raise the question how your purely human Jesus ever could have become a divine Jesus in the belief of the Church. Certainly that step must at least have been taken at a very early time. It is a very extraordinary thing how people can tell us in the modern Church that we have to take a reverse step, that we have to go back from the apostolic Church to Christ Himself. These modern men admit that in the early apostolic Church Jesus was made not merely the example for faith, but the object of faith. But it is said that Jesus did not present Himself in that way; He did not present Himself as an object of faith; and we have to reverse the step which was taken by the primitive apostolic Church and get back to the real Jesus! It does seem to be an extraordinary thing that you have the Christian Church appealing to Jesus of Nazareth and yet that the whole thing is found to be a total mistake, that the mistake was made at the very beginning, and that the whole power of the Church comes from that mistake! We have got to go back, we are told—back from the gospel which sets forth Jesus as Redeemer to the gospel which Jesus Himself preached. It is strange how people who say that seem to think they are bringing us nearer to Jesus. Constantly we hear it asked: "Why should we trouble ourselves with all this puzzling theology about the death of Christ and the resurrection? It is a barrier between us and Jesus. Even such of it as is presented by Paul and by the primitive Jerusalem Church must be wiped out; we must preach the gospel of Jesus instead of the gospel about Jesus."

But the gospel of Jesus, if that is all you have, does not mean that you have any close touch with Him. You can have a gospel of D. L. Moody, but not a gospel about him; a gospel of Paul, but not a gospel about him. "Was Paul crucified for you?" When we say we have a gospel about Jesus we mean that we have a gospel of which Jesus is not the mere author or proclaimer, but the very substance. Jesus proclaimed not only a gospel, but a gospel which had His own person in the centre of it. When you read the Gospels a little closer, you will find that everywhere Jesus presented Himself as a Saviour, not merely as a teacher or an example. If He did not present Himself as a Saviour, then His teaching is the most gloomy teaching that there ever was in this world. You may talk about the thunderings of Sinai. But what are they compared with the terrifying law of the Sermon on the Mount? How much higher, how much more terrible that is than the law that is set forth in the Old Testament! How shall we stand if only such persons as those whom Jesus there describes can come into the Kingdom of God? When you read the Sermon on the Mount, you are led straight to the foot of the Cross; if such be the law of God, you need Christ not merely as a Teacher but as a Saviour.

When we come to the Lord Jesus, let us not take Him as reconstructed for ourselves in a way after our own choosing, but let us receive the Lord

Jesus Christ "as He is offered to us in the Gospel." When we so receive Him, we have a wonderful confirmation of the documentary evidence. Possibly you may have a certain feeling of dissatisfaction with what I have been saying tonight; possibly you may feel that while we may argue about these intricacies of historical criticism, somehow what we want is immediacy of conviction with regard to Jesus. Well, you may have such immediacy of conviction, because by accepting this Gospel message you may come into living communion with Christ. But right there is where modern men go wrong. They say: "We have our communion with the living Christ, and so we do not care whether the Bible is true or not. We care nothing for the element of history in the Bible. The Bible is infallible only in the sphere of the inner life." That is very sad. It looks as though you had climbed up to the heights of Christian experience by means of the Bible, and when you are there you kick your ladder down, thus preventing others from coming up by it. But as a matter of fact the Bible is not a ladder but a foundation. Here is what Christian experience does: it does not give you Christ whether the Bible is true or not, but it is confirmatory evidence to show you that as a matter of fact the Bible is true. What I think we ought to be opposed to is a partial view of the evidences of Christianity. Let us not appeal to experience as over against the Bible; let us take along with the documentary evidence in the Gospels the great wealth of evidence that comes to us in other spheres, the evidence provided by the consciousness of sin, of the need of salvation, the need of a Saviour. Then we can come to the wonderful message of the gospel. It has then evidencing value enough. Accept it, and come to the feet of Jesus, and hear Him say to you, as you contemplate Him upon the Cross: "Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace."

WHITHER STUDENTS?

WINFIELD BURGGRAFF

The crest of the Council of Christian Associations has upon it the words: UT OMNES UNUM SINT. As a quotation from Scripture it is true. It must needs be so. But even so, I reject the interpretation given it by the Christian Associations in the last years. The report of the Milwaukee Conference of two years ago, published in the volume: *Religion on the Campus*, shows that the movement has made absolutely no progress since my student days, while one is forced to conclude, on the contrary, that they have left the front line trenches and are on the retreat. Time was when positive claims for the Lordship of Christ were made. Now they proceed first of all to defend their mention of Jesus at all. Time was when they asserted; now they discuss. And you have, especially in our student world, the repetition of the very thing of which Burke complained more than a century ago: "Such is now the misfortune of our age, that everything is to be discussed, as if the truth of religion were always to be a subject rather of altercation than of enjoyment."

I reject the interpretation given to the above quotation of Scripture, because it is not what Jesus meant. He prayed for the unity of all those whom the Father had given Him, meanwhile admitting in so many words that apart from those whom the Father had given Him, there were also those whom he called "the world,"—those whom the Father had not given Him. That is, He draws a line, He makes a difference. He Himself is the Great Divide, and never does He pray for the unity of those whom He Himself separates. The present interpretation of the motto by the leaders of the student movement lands us in what Dilthey calls a *universale Theismus*, a belief in the Fatherhood of God over all men, ignoring the difference which Jesus Himself recognizes. It is a rejection of Christianity even while one names the name of Christ.

Modern thought is under bondage to Pantheism. It may be the mystic Pantheism of the Orient, or the idealistic Pantheism of the German, or the materialistic Pantheism of some of our own American scholars. In religion the quest of the soul for unity has brought about the Pantheism of the mystics and the quietists of pre- and post-Reformation days. In thought the quest for unity has brought about the philosophical Pantheism of the idealist and the materialist. And while in the lecture room of the universities this philosophical Pantheism has been fighting a losing fight, still the aftermath of it is felt in our popular thinking of today, which we might call practical Pantheism. I do not mean that every individual philosophizes about the essential unity of God and the universe. But the wiping out of differences, the blotting out of lines of demarcation is the characteristic of our modern thought and life. There is not any longer the ancient difference between the Creator and the creature,—we have democratized God; between deity and humanity (as in Jesus, for instance), for we have deified man; between man and woman,—for we have equalized them; between government and the people,—the people

are the government; between rich and poor,—we all have a car and a radio; between free-will and heredity,—the murderer is never guilty; between *ethos* and *logos*,—we moralize everything, and the anti-intellectualism of the day increases; between sin and virtue,—sin is virtue, because it helps us up the steep steps to perfection. These, and more, are all logical consequences of the Pantheistic view of life and the world. In a universe where only God is, there can be no contradictions, no dualisms, no differences. There is no sharpness of issues. Everything is still an “open question.” But in a universe where the human head and heart are constituted as ours is, this indecision, this tendency to discuss, this lack of positive faith in absolute truth must finally bring agnosticism, and, to state it bluntly, drive a man crazy. The human heart must have certainty! And the human mind, while it cannot and may not poke about in the hidden things of God (Deuteronomy 29:29), must nevertheless have certainty about some things. Our nature demands it, and it demands just this because God has commanded it.

From the Pantheistic point of view, we can think only in terms of inclusiveness, in terms of identity. The Christian view of life and the world, on the other hand, while it emphasizes an inclusiveness (*ut omnes unum sint*), at the same time asserts the exclusiveness of Christ. There is not only a Christ in the world; there is also an Anti-Christ! And even as the Christ includes and excludes, so, too, does the Anti-Christ include and exclude. There are some who are *not* gathered into the arms of Jesus,—“I would have . . . but ye would not.” It is nonsense, in a moral universe, to argue the absolute identity, morally and religiously, of every human. Christ knows those that are His, and so does the Anti-Christ. And those that are Christ’s are not the same as those that belong to the Anti-Christ. In this world and the next they are different.

The history of God’s doings with man as recorded in the Scriptures, shows this very clearly. To begin with, God recognizes the breach which has been made by human sin. It has brought about separation. Now, God does not ignore the separation, but places over against it a separation of His own choosing and making. He calls Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, and separates him from the religion and the associations of paganism; He separates Israel from the nations, and so (I am quoting from Dr. A. Kuyper), in human life itself He places a dam to ward off the flood of sin and utter paganism. Within that separated people of Israel Christ makes His separation, and calls into life His own group who, through separation from the world are being fitted to overcome the world. The New Testament church, by the dictum of God’s revelation through the Apostles, as well as by their own Christian consciousness, are a separated people, a chosen people, absolutely and essentially different from the world. The world is in darkness, it lieth in sin, it knows not God, it crucified the Lord of Glory. But YE, and how that YE must have resounded against the sounding-board of their own regenerated hearts, YE are the people of God. And when one follows the history of the Christian Church during those great years of the Reformation, the same fact stands out clearly.

It is best seen when one looks at the matter nationally, or even more, provincially. In the villages and towns those who had come under the power of the Gospel recognized with a recognition that is born of God, that they were different. There was a great breach between them and the deniers of Christ. And ever since then, in any new reformation of the church the same thing has shown itself to be true. The reformatory movements in Holland about 1834 and again in 1886 have shown themselves to be owned and blessed by God not merely through the attainments of the years, but much more by the martyr blood which flowed, and the martyr spirit which was shown. The call of God has always been a call to separation, and not a call to unity, except insofar as there is to be a unity of the separated.

This is not Separatism. By Separatism we usually mean that some people who believe the Christian truths are not willing to associate with other Christians in the instituted Church of God, but, because of a holier-than-thou attitude, or because of an interpretation of one or two texts of Scripture, separate themselves into a religious community of their own. The Bible and the leading men of the Christian Church have always condemned this, while the history of these groups or sects shows how invariably they have deteriorated into something less than a Church of God.

What we are speaking of here is something entirely different. It is necessary at times, when life is running into danger of just frittering away into death, to take that life away from the things that harass it, so that in and through a period of isolation it may regain its strength. Not that this isolation is the ideal of life. When, through isolation, the strength has been regained, then that life must take upon itself again the responsibilities which once belonged to it, to exercise its powers and to make its proper contribution to the greater life of the world.

Applying this truth to the life of Christianity in the world, we hasten to admit that the analogy is not the first reason for making a plea for separation from the world. The first reason lies in the very nature of Christianity itself. Christians are the people of the *palingenesie*, the new-birth. This *palingenesie* is the *Todes-Linie* (to use an expression of Karl Barth, although not using it as he does),—the *palingenesie* is the *Todes-Linie* between the children of God and the children of the world. The world is dead in sins and trespasses; we are alive unto God. But after this has been said, then we add the analogy which we have made above, and say that the Christian Church, the Christian people, in view of the conformity to the world with which we all are afflicted, having, in our attempt to be merely *in* the world and not *of* it, yielded at several points and have become people who are both *in* and *of* the world,—I say that the Christian Church and the Christian people must begin again, even as in the first century, to draw the line of demarcation, the *palingenesie*, clearer and better, and live accordingly. Humanly speaking, we must do it to save our own Christian life in the world! Our thinking and acting has become gray. We need again the clear-cut differences of light and darkness, white and black, God and Satan. There is a great truth uttered

by Groen Van Prinsterer, the Dutch statesman of the middle of the last century, himself an Evangelical fighting the Modernism and Paganism of that day, when he said to his fellow Christians: In our isolation is our strength. That gives us both sides of the question. From God's point of view it is separation; from our point of view it is isolation. The act of God which separates,—the *palingenesie*,—is finished. Our part is not yet completed. Hence the call: Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.

By following this line of thought we come to the point where we must pass judgment upon such an organization as The League of Evangelical Students, either approving of it, or condemning it. If it is a separatistic movement, of course, it must be condemned. If, on the other hand, it is a movement of separation in line with God's own act of separation, then it must be approved, and believing Christians shall have to come to its support.

As an organization, we conclude that the League wishes to stand alone, cutting itself loose from those organizations which have hitherto represented the Christian life upon the campus of the American college and university. It has set up an organization upon its own basis, its own constitution, its own principle of life. Now the question is: Is the life of the present Christian Associations such that this new movement must of necessity be founded, since the other associations no longer fulfil their original purpose? Our answer is, "Yes." We need not go into a thousand details to prove the correctness of our decision. Just one point. When you compare the volume referred to above—*Religion on the Campus*—with that splendid book published some years ago—*Confronting Young Men with the Living Christ*—you see how far these two books lie apart. The latter contains the speeches delivered by Dr. Mott in many cities of the Union, calling back the Secretaries of the Y.M.C.A. to those spiritual and Christian truths which were at one time the genius of the movement. It almost makes one shed tears. Here is Dr. Mott, that great splendid leader of the movement, having put his life into it, a power of God in leading young men to Christ, going forth to give one last cry to the movement of which he is essentially a part, calling them back to the faith, actively and consciously, and yet in his very cry giving an outspoken prophecy of what must necessarily come, namely, the transformation in the constitution of the Y.M.C.A. from a religious organization established for the Kingdom of God, to a nation-wide social service organization, which in its very work will deny the sufficiency of the work of Christ as our Saviour.* Compare that, I say, with this other book which gives you the speeches delivered at the Milwaukee Conference, and a casual reading will show how many leagues they lie apart. The one is Chris-

* The February number of *Association Men* (page 288), makes announcement of the appointment of Francis P. Miller to succeed Dr. Mott as Chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation. It is difficult to say to what extent Dr. Mott, as Chairman of the movement during all these years, could have prevented the movement from taking the sad course which it has taken. From one point of view, it seems that

tian, the other is not. Even a magician cannot read into those pages the truth of historic Christianity. And when one goes from the platform meetings to the discussion groups, either at these great conventions or at the sectional student conferences, one sees in what a vicious circle the program continues to go. Every conference discussing all over again, and staring themselves blind upon the racial and international questions, having progressed not one step in the last ten years, since they give little or no attention to the great truths of the Christian religion. They see the Cross and shout, but in that shout a latent lie. Studdert-Kennedy at the Milwaukee convention, among some good things which he may have said, did much to help what convictions of the vicarious death of Christ any of the students may have had to evaporate into thin air and to disappear with the applause. The January number of THE EVANGELICAL STUDENT quotes Dr. Fosdick as doing the same thing. If the blind lead the blind you know what happens.

Will you notice that I am not questioning the right of these people and of these Associations to do what they are doing, but I do absolutely deny that they have any right to do that under the disguise of the Christian religion. Their action, it seems to me, is unethical, immoral, insincere.

Or, to give another example. The organ of the Student Volunteer Movement has, in its January 1928 number, an article entitled "The New Idea in Missions—World Service." To quote: "The ideal of the man who wants to see the Kingdom of Christ advance is not primarily theological but social. He is not out on a 'Paul Revere's ride through the universe,' simply announcing the Gospel and then moving on with the assumption that his duty has been discharged whether the 'heathen' see fit to adopt it or not. *He is seeking the development of a kind of social relation which will make possible human life at its best.*" Without charging the executive committee of the Movement with hearty approval of this article, is it not a very dangerous, undiplomatic, and deceiving policy to permit such a message to go out to young students who have given their lives for the propagation of the Gospel of Christ? The writer wants a development of social relations. The Gospel demands the new birth. If such a spirit gets into the Movement more and more, I cannot see how the believing Christian, who abides by the historic faith of the Church and the Scriptures, can continue to be a part of that Movement. Something drastic must be done if the Student Volunteer Movement is to keep that fine Christian note and quality which characterized it at its founding and through all these years. The difference here is so deep and so unbridgeable that a new organization alone can conserve the Christian spirit with its loyalty to the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom, even as Christ

he has been fighting a losing fight. But from another point of view,—and both can be maintained together—it does seem as if Dr. Mott has not raised his voice positively enough against the unscriptural tendencies which have marked the Student Christian movement during the last decade. If this is true, then we have here at least one point of Dr. Mott's policy as past-leader of the movement, which does not deserve our praise, since it cannot carry our approval.

preached it, not in terms of social relations, but in terms of repentance.

It seems to me, therefore, that if the evangelical faith is to be preserved in the Christian young men and women in our colleges, they shall have to organize themselves into a band which, upon its own foundation, builds up its own superstructure according to the pattern given it on the mount.

Of course, the critical student, and the unbelieving professor will mark such Christian students as being hopelessly behind the times, and will accuse them of ignorance of the progress and the results of modern research. And I do not suppose that there is very much that we can say against this, for the simple reason that the accuser will go right on thinking the same things about us, even though we should give him evidence to the contrary. But then, the antithesis here is not a matter of ignorance and wisdom or knowledge, but between faith and unbelief. And whereas the professor will throw out his sarcastic remarks about ignorance, the best thing to do is to let him talk, meanwhile making him admit that while we may be ignorant, he will at least have to credit us with having faith. And that is the thing about which we are concerned just now. We shall be known as believers in the Name, as walkers of the Way. We shall be different because God has "differentiated" us.

We must consciously and gladly accept the fact of the antithesis between Christianity and paganism, and draw out the logical conclusions of this antithesis in our lives. Two questions are raised here which I will not answer. First, what must our attitude be toward the world of culture; are we not called upon by God to live all of life to His glory? Can we do that when we accept the antithesis and live our lives on a different plane from the world? And secondly, what must our relations be to the unbelieving scholastic world? In how far must we take notice of their work and results, and in how far must we attempt to make a system of knowledge in all the departments, based upon our own principle of the Lordship of Christ as Saviour,—a Lordship which extends to all of life, hence also to the life of the intellect? So the article runs off into many loose strings which we cannot possibly follow and weave into a whole cloth in just a few moments of time. But we must gather them up, just the same. And we do that in giving you the answer to the possible question as to *why* we must be separate, *why* we must live by the lines which God draws, *why* we must recognize and live in the sign of the antithesis. Here it is:

"But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; *that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light . . .*"
(1 Peter 2:9).

NEWS AND NOTES

THE latest additions to the League fellowship are chapters at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary in Philadelphia and at Oberlin. Will you remember them and their individual members in prayer that their progress may be that of increasing service for the Lord?

During recent weeks the General Secretary has been visiting universities and seminaries in New England in order to make the League known to student circles not yet connected with it. The League wishes to be a bond of fellowship between every circle of evangelical, witnessing students in the United States and Canada. What are you, student reader, doing to further that ideal? It will only be possible as you invite those in your neighborhood to join, and as you take an active part in spreading the news of the League and an invitation to membership to other colleges and seminaries. It is impossible for the officers alone to accomplish the task. Every League chapter is a collective witness to the truth and saving power of the Gospel, made up of individual witnesses. Are you doing your part?

Philadelphia is the scene of the second regional Conference of the League. It is to be held at the University of Pennsylvania on March 23, so will be a part of history before this issue of THE EVANGELICAL STUDENT reaches its readers. The colleges and seminaries of New Jersey, eastern Pennsylvania, Delaware, and eastern Maryland are being cordially invited to send their delegates in order that they may become acquainted with the League at first-hand and go back to spread the gospel testimony through organized centers in their own schools.

Some excerpts from the conference announcement follow:

"On to Philadelphia!—At the Fourth Annual Convention of The League of Evangelical Students, which met in Chicago in December, it was suggested that sectional conferences be held by the various chapters in their own respective parts of the United States. The first sectional conference was held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and was so helpful, that the members of the chapters located at Princeton Theological Seminary and the University of Pennsylvania decided to invite about fifty of the colleges, universities and seminaries of eastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland, to be their guests at a similar conference to be held at the UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA on MARCH 23, 1929.

"It is hoped that this day of Conference will gather together men and women students from many schools, for a time of real inspirational Christian fellowship. Campus problems will be discussed, and it will be the purpose of the League Committee to present speakers, and a program which will strengthen and help everyone to return home with a new desire to make their witness for Christ and the Bible a reality.

"There is no restriction upon the number of delegates from any school,

and there will be no registration fee, as the entire expense of the Conference will be provided for by the cooperating chapters.

"May we meet you in Philadelphia!"

SPEAKERS

"The leaders at the Eastern League Conference are to be:

"Rev. Thomas L. Coyle, A.M., one of the founders of The League of Evangelical Students, and one who is thoroughly acquainted with its inception, purpose and possibilities. He is at present the Assistant Pastor of the Mount Airy Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia.

"President Walter B. Greenway, D.D., of Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania. Dr. Greenway is an enthusiastic college executive in the prime of life. He is fully alive to the problems of student life and thought and will bring a message of Christ and the Bible as the solution to these problems.

"Rev. Paul Woolley, Th.M., the traveling General Secretary of The League of Evangelical Students. Mr. Woolley is in full-time service for the League, and he will come to this Conference to lead the group discussions on campus problems confronted in witnessing effectually for Christ and the entire Bible as the Word of God.

PROGRAM

(The following program will be subject to additions.)

"All meetings will be held in the Christian Association Building, University of Pennsylvania.

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1:00—2:45 p.m. | Registration of Delegates and Fellowship. |
| 2:45—3:15 p.m. | Song Service, led by Mr. William Blackstone, National President of The League of Evangelical Students. |
| 3:15 p.m. | Address of Welcome.
Address by Rev. Thomas Coyle, A.M. (Followed by group discussions, led by Rev. Paul Woolley.) |
| 6:00 p.m. | Informal Dinner and Fellowship. |
| 7:30 p.m. | Song Service and Special Music. |
| 7:45 p.m. | Address by President Walter B. Greenway, D.D." |

This regional Conference has been arranged by the University of Pennsylvania and the Princeton chapters. Which district will hold the next one?

PRAISE AND PRAYER

BRITISH COLUMBIA

"The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad." (Psalm 126:3.) We can all testify with hearts full of praise and thanksgiving that God has given us the most successful year in our history.

Praise:

- 1) For the happy and mutually profitable fellowship that we have had during the past session.

- 2) For the increased interest in our daily prayer meetings, and for the burden of souls that has been bestowed upon us.
- 3) For the recent presentation, by several of our members, of their bodies as "a living sacrifice . . . unto God."
- 4) For the growing interest, on the part of unsaved students, in our weekly gospel meetings.

Prayer:

- 1) That God will remove any hindrance that prevents His Spirit from operating effectively through our Union.
- 2) That God will make each one of us "to become fishers of men."
- 3) That our membership may grow.—At present we have only about twenty members.
- 4) That the many unconverted students, who have come under the sound of the gospel, and who have discovered that there is more in Jesus Christ than they first thought, may find that He is the only one who can satisfy.

JOHN BROWN COLLEGE

We hold preaching services in the country churches and schoolhouses and fill temporary vacancies in town pulpits. We organize Sunday schools and maintain them if necessary, and in most cases it is necessary, for we find that this country needs leadership more than anything else. We have visiting groups who visit the aged and infirm in the town; and most of our own (college) religious services are conducted by members of this organization.

BUCKNELL

During the current year the League at Bucknell has been interesting itself generally through participation, and particularly through prayer, in a number of activities. Chief of these just now is the drive for a thousand dollars (which sounds like a "lot" on this campus), for a Bucknell alumnus in Brazil. The drive was entirely successful despite a great and very disheartening opposition. We praise Him!

We ask particularly for prayer for the "Morning Watch" that is conducted for ten minutes each day in the Women's college; and also for the Vesper service that takes place each Sunday evening. These services which have been deeply inspirational and helpful to a number of girls have been "dropping off" in attendance. We know that the only way in which this condition may be remedied is through prayer-believing.

The League itself has a weekly prayer group in which devotions, discussion and business occupy part of the time, and the last hour of which is given to intercession. We find it a happy privilege to remember the League not only in this group meeting, but in our private devotions as well. His shall be the glory.

CALVIN SEMINARY

At a recent business meeting the Calvin branch decided to separate their organization from that of the Seminary Corps. We feel certain that

this will be conducive to the stimulation of greater interest among our students, and it will give opportunity for a more active program in the interests of the branch and of the League as a whole. We have, further, decided to conduct a local financial campaign to boost the national treasury. The campaign will probably be carried on during the latter part of March, and the goal is \$2,500. A committee is devising ways and means, and the drive will be backed by both prayer and earnest effort.

CLEVELAND

Our attention is turned to assisting in the organization of chapters in near-by universities. We plan one evening devotional hour each week. Members will have full charge of the meeting and we expect to see genuine prayer results.

HAMPDEN-SYDNEY

Activities:

- 1) A weekly devotional service.
- 2) A colored mission with regular Sunday school, and services twice a month.
- 3) Two outpost Sunday schools.
- 4) One outpost mid-week prayer service.

Praise:

For a number of years we have been looking forward to the time when we might have a suitable place for holding our meetings and to which we might retreat for prayer or Christian fellowship. Our hopes first began to be realized last spring, and now we have a little log cabin down on the edge of the woods. We wish to praise God for this special blessing of His. We feel much encouraged over the added interest taken by the students on our campus in our Christian purposes and work; for this we praise God.

Prayer:

Our earnest desire is that we may be of greater service to God among our fellow students. We ask you to join us in praying that:

- 1) We may be more completely surrendered to His will.
- 2) We may be endued with witnessing power.

MARION

The Christian activities of Marion College were in charge of the Students' Conference before we became a chapter of the League. Since then the Conference and the League have functioned as one organization in relation to local needs.

There are three student services held each week. Two are for prayer and praise, and the third is a preaching service. A revival spirit has been manifest, and at the Thursday evening preaching service many have received the fulness of the Spirit. The Conference sponsors work at the County Jail and the County Infirmary. These services have been signally

owned and blessed of God. A number of our students have lately felt led to engage in house-to-house visitation with a definite evangelistic objective. God has graciously sealed this work with some very marked results. Other doors are opening for further and more effective service just as fast as the students heed the call to the harvest.

WESTERN SEMINARY (HOLLAND, MICHIGAN)

The position of Western Theological Seminary is unusual in its relation to The League of Evangelical Students. The school, as a student body and faculty, unanimously voted to become a branch of the League, so there are not the problems to face here that there are in other schools. The institution has for years had an organization, called the Adelpic Society, at which papers are read, and discussions held, pertaining to the subjects which would ordinarily be discussed at the meetings of a League chapter or branch. The branch of the League is now identical with this Adelpic Society. Our prayer is that the true value of the League may be more fully realized, and that there may be a greater spiritual fellowship among the students at Western.

XENIA

Since the Xenia branch of the League includes all the students at Xenia, we have no separate meetings as a group, but continue our weekly prayer meetings, weekly discussion meetings, and meetings for prayer in the rooms of the different men of the seminary. We do some preaching in one of the city missions, in addition to the work that the men are doing all of the time in supplying churches on the Sabbath.

Praise:

For the men of the Word God has given us to lead us into His truth.
For power in the work.

Prayer:

That God may enlarge the work of our seminary in its influence over students.

That He will give us greater power in bearing direct personal testimony for Him among our fellow men.

WHO ARE THESE WRITERS?

A. Z. Conrad, Ph.D., D.D., is Pastor of Park Street Church (Congregational), Boston, Massachusetts. In this, one of America's best-known pulpits, he has proclaimed the gospel of Christ, championed civic righteousness in the Commonwealth and nation, and expounded the inspired Word for more than twenty years. Among his books are: *Jesus Christ at the Crossroads*; *Comrades of the Carpenter*; *The Seven Finalities of Faith*; *The Gospel for an Age of Thought*.

J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., is Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary, and is one of the outstanding conservative theologians of the present time. Among his books are: *Christianity and Liberalism*; *What is Faith?*; *The Origin of Paul's Religion*.

Winfield Burggraaff, Th.D., is Pastor of the First Reformed Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Following study in this country, he continued his work in Holland and received his doctor's degree from the Free University of Amsterdam. Dr. Burggraaff is a young man whose words to young men and young women thus come from one of their own generation. He has written: *The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America*.

A short time ago the League office received an envelope containing old coins, none minted later than 1880, totalling eighty-four cents in face value. These coins were left in his wallet by a fourteen-year-old high school student who died in 1880, and one of his sisters had carefully kept them all these years. Feeling that there was nothing to which her brother, if he had lived, would rather have preferred to devote the money, the sister sent these coins to be applied to the League's work. If you feel that her judgment was wise, the Treasurer would be glad to have your contribution for the same purpose. The need is great. Address John H. De Groot, Treasurer, 25 Edwards Place, Princeton, New Jersey.