

TEN CENTS A COPY

PUBLISHED TWENTY-THREE TIMES A YEAR

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

The Presbyterian GUARDIAN

J. GRESHAM MACHEN • EDITOR 1936-1937

More Deliberation on the Clark Case

A News Report

•

Shinto's Theology

Robert S. Marsden

•

An Interpretation of the Answer

Floyd E. Hamilton

•

Orthodox Presbyterian Church News

Of the making of gods, as of the making of books, there is no end. But, as for us Christians, with our Bibles before us, we turn from all such little gods of man's making, out toward the dread mystery of the infinite and eternal, and say, as Augustine said, with a holy fear: "Thou hast made us for thyself, and our heart is restless until it finds its rest in thee."

—J. Gresham Machen

April 25, 1945

VOLUME 14, NO. 8

“Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth.”



A WHOLE month has elapsed since the Philippians Contest was announced. That means you should be up to verse four of chapter two if you are aiming to complete the book by the deadline, June 25th. If you need an incentive, here are the prizes: First prize, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary on the *Whole Bible*; second and third prizes, Floyd E. Hamilton's *Basis of Christian Faith*. And any who complete the book will receive a year's subscription to the *GUARDIAN*. Remember, though, even if you memorize only a few verses, enter the contest anyway. Send me a post-card requesting the entry blank. It's not too late to catch up with the rest of the crowd.

Letters have been coming from the East and West Coasts and points in between. But as yet the mailman has not complained! So keep writing. Why don't you appoint someone from your society as G.Y.C. Reporter? Give him all your news and ideas and let him forward them to me. Then, too, let him be responsible for calling to your attention items of interest that appear on the page and suggestions that you might put into practice in your society. For instance, he would now be urging everyone to enter the Philippians Contest!

A suggestion comes from California that we have a corner for news items about our service boys and girls. If you like the idea send in the items and we'll try to print them. Here's another job for the Reporter!

Incidentally, how about some photographs of the boys and girls in the service? Of course you Californians wouldn't understand, but here in New Jersey spring has arrived and has set us all to gardening and given us all the wanderlust. Now's the time for your society to have a picnic or go bicycling or boating. Have a good time. I'll be thinking of you!

Norma R. Ellis

Director, *The Guardian*
Youth Center

Intimate Glimpses

IN THE valley below, oranges were being picked. Here in the mountains was snow! On the left is Philip Conard, President of the Santee, Cal., Young People's Society; in the center is Phil's cousin, Dean Browning, and on the right is their pastor, the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt. They were on their way home from the Blue Ridge Bible Conference, held last December.

Phil is a quiet but friendly fourteen-year-old boy who has big dreams of own-



ing a two-hundred-head thoroughbred Guernsey dairy. Although still in high school he has been, on the side, pin-boy in a bowling alley, milk hop, garden picker, paper boy and renovator helper!

This conference was a high spot in the lives of Phil and Dean. They thoroughly enjoyed skiing and fellowship, and they both made public confession of Christ. We may praise God for showing Phil how to live in Him. And we may praise God for showing Dean how to die in Him. For on March 1st Dean, a victim of leukemia, was taken to be with His newly-found Saviour. In his Bible was found a much-handled slip of paper on which were written what were probably his "year verses" chosen at the conference: Romans 3:22—"Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." Ephesians 1:6—"To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved." It was these two verses upon which Mr. Hunt preached at Dean's funeral.

"Straightway Forgetteth"

YOU'VE heard of the old lady who said, "I have a good memory except for three things: I can't remember names, and I can't remember faces, and—let me see—I forget what the third thing is."

In James 1:22-24, we read of the person who sees himself in the Word of God in all his sin, as one sees himself in a mirror and notes his imperfections. Then, instead of striving by God's grace to rid himself of the blemishes, the sins that so easily beset him, he, "being a forgetful hearer," goes his way and "straightway forgetteth what manner of man he is."

Who can deny that this is a picture of each of us? We read God's Word; we hear it preached. We are made to see ourselves in all our sin as we never realized we were. Then we go our way, forgetting God's estimate of us.

Not only would James have us remember the Word, but also he would have us do something about it. Not only must we remember that the minister read, "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called"; we must strive so to walk, praying God to give us grace.

THINK ON THESE THINGS:

1. What practical way can you think of for retaining the Bible messages you hear?
2. Why is the Youth Center sponsoring a contest for Bible memorization?
3. Look at yourselves in the following verses and see what manner of person you are: John 5:40; Matt. 5:48; Rom. 1:16; 9:20; II Cor. 6:14; Eph. 4:32.

OVERHEARD ON THE U. OF CALIF. CAMPUS

Bernice H.: Say there, Mary, talking to yourself is a sign of old age!

Mary E.: Not with me! It's a sign I'm memorizing Philippians for the G.Y.C. Contest.

More Deliberation on the Clark Case

NEWS

By THOMAS R. BIRCH

ON MARCH 29th the Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church met in an adjourned session at Mediator Church, Philadelphia, to continue consideration of matters growing out of the complaint filed last fall against actions of the presbytery relative to the licensure and ordination of the Rev. Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D.*

After prayer by Moderator Edward L. Kellogg, the Rev. Professor Paul Woolley moved that the proposed answer to the complaint, prepared by a committee of presbytery but not offered by that committee for adoption by the presbytery, be rejected and the committee be dismissed. A motion to lay this motion on the table failed to carry the presbytery.

The right of a ruling elder to represent a church of which he was a member but on whose session he did not serve was unsuccessfully challenged.

The Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton offered, as a substitute for the motion of Professor Woolley, that presbytery deny the plea of the complainants that the meeting of July 7, 1944, be found to have been illegally convened and that its acts and decisions are thus void.

Speaking against Mr. Hamilton's motion, Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse urged that the presbytery not consider the complaint in that fashion until it had first disposed of the proposed answer. Dr. Robert Strong then added as an amendment the words, "and adopt the legal section of the answer in justification of this denial."

Professor Woolley objected to this amendment. The answer, he asserted, cites the meeting to ordain the Rev. Eugene Bradford as a parallel to the July 7th meeting complained against. But in Mr. Bradford's case, said Professor Woolley, something happened to him between the last meeting and the special meeting which required that he be ordained at that time. No

such emergency had been proven in the case of Dr. Clark. He hailed as specious the argument of the answer that the chosen date was proven convenient by the fact that it had a large attendance. There is no evidence in the answer, said Professor Woolley, to show the existence of an emergency as that word is used in the dictionary or in The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. After further debate, the amendment was defeated.

The Rev. Edwin H. Rian then moved as a substitute "that the presbytery adopts the first conclusion of the answer which reads, 'the Presbytery denies that the meeting of July 7, 1944, was illegal and that its actions are thus void.'" This was an attempt to relate the motion to the answer rather than to the complaint, without changing the force or substance of it. Mr. Rian's substitute became the main motion, by a vote of 19 to 14.

Speaking to the motion, the Rev. Robert S. Marsden said that the complaint bases its attack upon its assertion that there was no emergency. But there were important elements, unknown at the time of the last regular meeting, which entered into Dr. Clark's life; there was an emergency at that time in Dr. Clark's own plans. Unless the matter of ordination were quickly settled, it would be impossible for him to arrange his next year's work. Moreover, said Mr. Marsden, even if illegal elements were found to have existed, that would not necessarily invalidate the actions of the meeting.

Professor Woolley replied that an emergency is something which emerges or is newly arisen. So far as Dr. Clark's contemplated teaching post at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary was concerned, he had taught there before ordination and presumably might just as easily do so again. The Rev. Leslie W. Sloat contended that the emergency for which a meeting is called is the business to be dealt with, not some related factor in the life or mind of an individual. He said that this was not a question of a few illegal elements, but whether or not

the calling of the meeting was illegal and therefore the entire existence of the meeting illegal.

A roll call vote on the motion showed that it carried 23 to 14.

Dr. Strong then moved that presbytery acknowledge that "the various views of Dr. Clark as set forth in the meeting of July 7, 1944, and with which the complaint is concerned, are in error and in conflict with the constitutional requirements for licensure and ordination, and that, therefore, the decision to sustain his theological examination, the decision to waive two years of study in a theological seminary, the decision to proceed to license Dr. Clark and the action of licensing him, the decision to deem the examination for licensure sufficient for ordination, and the decision to ordain Dr. Clark, were in error and unconstitutional, and are, therefore, null and void." Dr. Strong, who obviously would not have wanted his motion to be passed, explained that he had moved it for the purpose of showing that the complaint, in asking for this, was in reality pressing heresy charges "by indirection."

Mr. Rian said that such a motion would call for deposition, and that therefore the motion was out of order. The moderator ruled that the motion called for an unconstitutional method of making amends and was therefore out of order. On a roll call vote, the moderator was sustained in this ruling 22 to 16.

Dr. William E. Welmers moved "that sections 2 through 5 of the proposed answer be rejected and the committee be dismissed." Speaking to this motion, the Rev. Arthur W. Kuschke said that it has been urged that Dr. Clark has denied the charges of the complaint. He therefore had prepared a series of parallel columns which quoted first from the charges of the complaint and secondly from the proposed answer which Dr. Clark had signed. He read these quotations to prove that the answer supports and does not deny the charges of the complaint.

Dr. Clark, in rejoinder, said that if

* For a report of the preceding deliberations on this matter, see THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, April 10, 1945, pp. 108ff.

we have any truth at all it is God's truth and at that point we have the meaning that God has of that one proposition. Dr. Strong questioned Dr. Clark as to what occurs when a man is born again. He replied, in words similar to those of the answer, that regeneration did not necessarily involve a change in the understanding of the words, "Christ died for sinners," but that regeneration brings belief in the truth of those words where formerly there was denial of them. Asked by Dr. Strong about the paradox of divine sovereignty and human responsibility which Dr. Clark had claimed to have solved, Dr. Clark replied that it was legitimate to study Scripture "as much as you can" and to get as much out of it as possible. Asked again about his reluctance to use the word "sincere" in describing the universal offer of the gospel, Dr. Clark replied that he did not like the word, since it had been widely used by the enemies of Calvinism. He therefore avoided it, preferring the word "freely." He explained that the word "sincere" had not been defined at the July 7th meeting of presbytery, so he just avoided it in the interests of not being inadvertently misunderstood.

Elder H. Evan Runner delivered an address on the subject of analogy, in the course of which he declared that, since propositional knowledge was revelational knowledge, God's knowledge of man's knowledge would be the same as man's knowledge. But the uncreate knowledge possessed by God cannot be identified with man's knowledge and is not expressed propositionally. Mr. Runner quoted from theologians of the past to show that historic Calvinism has always held that even God's communicable attributes are incommunicable as they exist in God, since they are of His very essence and are therefore impossible of communication.

Dr. Clark quoted Charles Hodge and declared that he held Hodge's position on incomprehensibility. Professor Woolley declared that the proposed answer says that the essence of God's being is incomprehensible except as God reveals truths concerning His own nature, whereas the Reformed theology holds that the essence of God's being is incomprehensible, with no exceptions. Mr. Hamilton attempted some clarification, and Dr. Stonehouse said Dr. Clark is challenged not so much on his doctrine

of knowledge as on the question whether he accepts the doctrine of God's incomprehensibility. The issue is not whether or not God can be known, but what limits are placed on man's knowledge.

Dr. Cornelius Van Til, in commenting on the fact that Dr. Clark and his supporters had maintained that the proposed answer was in accord with the position held by Charles Hodge, said that Hodge argues that all of revelation is an accommodation to the limitations of man and that when man restates revelation as propositions he cannot have in his mind exactly that which God has in His mind. Dr. Clark had expressed a need for the complainants to define the qualitative distinction they claimed between the contents of man's and God's knowledge. If they were to be required to give such a definition, declared Dr. Van Til, then Dr. Clark should also be able to define and tell all about the mode of God's knowledge, since Dr. Clark admits there is a difference between the mode of man's knowledge and the mode of God's knowledge.

In reply Dr. Clark attacked Dr. Van Til's logic in arriving at implications drawn by Dr. Van Til from written statements of Dr. Clark. A test of orthodoxy must be clear, he said, and this matter of the qualitative distinctions in the contents of knowledge is unclear. But we can, he affirmed, describe the mode of God's knowledge and say some things about it.

At long last the motion to reject the doctrinal sections of the proposed answer and to dismiss the committee was laid on the table.

With no motion of any sort before the house, Dr. Strong began to direct a series of questions to certain of the complainants. He asked Dr. Welmers whether he wrote the charge in the complaint that Dr. Clark had "studiously avoided answering" a certain question. Dr. Welmers replied that he honestly didn't know. "Do the complainants accept the repudiation of that invidious statement?" asked Dr. Strong. Mr. Kuschke made vigorous objection to the question and Dr. Strong was instructed by the chair to "watch his language." The right of Dr. Strong to conduct this form of examination with no motion of any sort on the floor was challenged. The moderator-pro-tem, Mr. Marsden, ruled that the questioning was in order on the ground that it was germane to

the report of the committee elected to prepare the answer and that the report was before the house even though no motion about it was on the floor. The ruling was challenged and the moderator sustained.

Dr. Strong resumed by directing a question to Dr. Stonehouse who said that, while he would be glad to answer the question in private conversation, he objected so strenuously to the moderator's ruling and to the procedure being followed by Dr. Strong that he felt compelled to refuse to answer. Another question to Dr. Welmers elicited the same response. Dr. Strong then directed his inquiries to Dr. Clark, asking him how he felt about certain accusations of the complaint. Dr. Clark replied in detail, pointing out that he considered the complaint a personal affront.

After more of this type of unfortunate procedure, which many presbyters considered the low point of the day, Professor Woolley moved that the presbytery declare the decision of the July 7th, 1944, meeting to sustain the theological examination of Dr. Clark to have been in error. This motion was rather promptly tabled by a vote of 19 to 17.

Dr. Stonehouse then moved that the presbytery acknowledge that the various views of Dr. Clark as set forth in the July 7th meeting and the decisions relating to his licensure and ordination are in error and unconstitutional. When the motion was challenged as being the same in essence as a previous one that had been ruled out of order, Dr. Stonehouse replied that he had omitted the words to which objection had previously been made and had left open the question of what amends should be made. The moderator ruled the motion in order, his ruling was challenged, and he was not sustained by the presbytery. The Rev. John P. Clelland then moved the same motion with the deletion of the last two words "and unconstitutional." Again, the motion was challenged and again the moderator ruled it in order. Several of the complainants protested that not to sustain this ruling would be to deny elemental justice to a minority; the right to appeal from an act or decision of the presbytery, they said, was a fundamental right that the judicatory dare not deny. Mr. Hamilton cited as precedent the famous Van Dusen case in the Presbyterian (See "Birch," page 128)

Shinto's Theology

MISSIONS

"Faiths Men Die By"—PART 13

By the REV. ROBERT S. MARSDEN

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the second of two articles by a missionary who, for personal reasons, is compelled to remain anonymous. The articles were written almost in the form here reproduced, and Mr. Marsden has merely edited them for use in his series.)

THE pivotal point around which everything should revolve in a religious system is the idea of God. Shinto being a polytheism has many gods. Strange to say, the first three deities listed at the beginning of the Kojiki are seldom mentioned in subsequent chapters, and are little known in Japan. No great shrines have been built for them.

The Sun Goddess is the greatest deity of the Shinto pantheon. Her shrine is the Mecca of Japan. Near her shrine is the shrine of the Food Goddess and her shrine is also rebuilt every twenty years, thus perpetuating her worship.

To survey the entire field of Shinto deities would take volumes. There are nature gods, man deities (that is, deified men of old Japan), and many gods who have come into existence in strange ways. Some are more popular and more powerful than others, and some are seldom spoken of. The Shinto pantheon contains gods who are supposed to fulfill the desires of all kinds of worshippers. Japan contains thousands of shrines of various grades and the populace never needs to worry about running short of deities! On investigation we frequently find a number of gods in a shrine. Even in the Sun Goddess, the greatest deity in Japan, we fail to find a supreme deity. The attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, absolute independency, and self-existence are absolutely foreign to her.

The accounts given in the Kojiki, Nihongi and Kijiki concerning the creation of Japan are confusing and contradictory. The gods which preceded Izanagi and Izanami are of small account in producing the island of Japan. The Nihongi explains that "Izanagi and Izanami stood on the floating bridge of heaven, and held

council together, saying, 'Is there not a country beneath?' Thereupon they thrust down the jewel spear of heaven and groping about with it found the ocean. The brine which dripped from the point of the spear coagulated and formed an island which received the name of Onogoro-jima or the 'Self-coagulating Island.' The two deities thereupon descended and dwelt there. Accordingly they wished to be united as husband and wife and to produce countries. So they made Onogoro-jima the pillar of the centre of the land."

The accounts in these three old books set forth the idea of procreation in the usual manner by the sexes. Islands and countries are procreated, not created! The minds of the old myth-makers of Japan never conceived of creation from nothing, as outlined in the Scriptures, for that was a revelation by God to Moses and never originated in man's unaided intellect.

Twice a year, on July 31st and December 31st, the great ceremony of Purification is held, and the whole empire of Japan is purified by Shinto rites. In these rites there is no mention of all or nearly all the sins of the Hebrew Decalogue. "Incest, bestiality, wounding, witchcraft, and certain interferences with agricultural operations are the only offences against the moral law which it enumerates." The whole idea of guilt before a holy God is absolutely foreign to the Shintoist. The Shinto writings never speak of an apostasy and of an incurred guilt. Nothing is known of total depravity. "Uncleanness holds a far more important place in Shinto than moral guilt." The Hebrew conception of sin and guilt is thus entirely foreign to the Shinto theologians.

On certain stated occasions, offerings are placed before the gods in the Shinto shrines. The ritualistic ceremonies prescribed by the "Engishiki," the volume containing prayers and stated ceremonies to be used at the Shinto shrines, states that offerings are tokens of respect. The gods are to be shown proper respect for past favors bestowed and conciliated in the interest of blessings desired from them in the future. This is done according

to prescribed Shinto rites by the devotee presenting offerings on the Shinto altars. These offerings vary greatly. Fish, rice cakes, fruit, vegetables, cloth, clothing, farming implements and cut paper are some of the offerings presented to the gods. In these sacrifices there is no idea of substitution or the shedding of blood to cleanse the Japanese sinner. In fact, the idea of being guilty before the god and of being cleansed does not enter the picture. Sacrifice in the Hebrew sense is absolutely lacking in the Shinto offerings.

Shinto is a well-organized religion and is centrally controlled by the government. There is a shrine bureau which has catalogued all the shrines in the nation. There is a Shinto theological seminary which trains priests in the methods of rightly conducting Shinto services. New shrines are continually being built at government expense. As soon as possible, shrines are erected in Japanese-controlled territory and the natives are taught the meaning of the shrines. Furthermore, the conquered people are compelled to worship the Shinto gods, as they were in Korea, Manchuria and Formosa. Back of State Shinto is the powerful army and navy. State Shinto has the full support of an authoritarian state.

Besides the state system, there are thirteen sects of Shinto which have had individual founders. These sects do not receive government aid but are recognized by the government in the bureau of religions. Some are larger than others and have more buildings for worship. The deities worshiped in these sects are about the same as those of State Shinto, and their names are found in the Kojiki.

One of these sects, Tenri Kyo, has much in common with Christian Science. It too was founded by a woman with strange and distorted ideas. It is truly missionary and boasts a membership of five million. State Shinto includes all the members of these sects and insists that every soul in Japan is its member. It is said that no Japanese, by his very nature, can cease to be a devotee of State Shinto!

Some of the large government shrines are fine specimens of chaste architecture and truly impress the student of Shinto as being monuments of refined elegance. In spite of this beauty, however, the buildings are devoted to idolatry and are under the wrath and curse of God!

As the student delves deeper into the doctrines of Shinto, he is amazed at the vague and hazy utterances of the Shinto theologians. The greatest of them speaks haltingly concerning the future existence of the human soul. "Ame" and "Ten" both refer to some place in the heavens, and the Shintoist teaches that it is the abode of the gods. The whole body of Shinto scriptures is silent in relation to the texture and scenery of the future world. Anything concrete taught today has been imported from Buddhism or some other religion. The idea of a physical resurrection and a judgment for sins done while in the body is absent from the Shinto scriptures. The term "Ame," heaven, is not clearly defined in Shinto, and the Shintoist when confronted with an explanation of his hope in the "Ame" of Shinto is given to vague conjecture. "Yomi," darkness, in some phases corresponds to the Greek Hades. According to the Shinto writing, "Yomi" does not seem to be peopled by men or anything else. The same characteristic vagueness applies to the term "Yomi" as to "Ame."

All the Shinto records set forth a hazy outlook for the Japanese soul as it leaves the body. The Japanese is certainly "without God and without hope in the world."



Your FAMILY ALTAR

MAY 5TH. JOHN 16:1-14 (27)*

WHO ever would believe that it could be expedient for Christ to leave His disciples? Yet that is what He said. Does not this exalt the office and place of the Holy Spirit in our Christian lives? Every Christian should seek to "be filled with the Spirit," for it was to send Him unto us that Christ departed into heaven. The Spirit convicts, convinces, comforts, strengthens and imparts truth. Pray to be filled.

6TH. JOHN 17:11-21 (15)

In Christ's great high priestly prayer, offered just before His death and ascension to heaven, He prayed earnestly for His disciples. Christ prayed that they might be kept from evil while they were in this world—

* Verses printed in the headings in parentheses are to be memorized.

kept from sin, kept through temptation and trial, kept so that the evil may turn to their good. Christ did not pray that they might be immediately taken away from the world upon conversion, but enabled to live in the world though not like the world.

7TH. JOHN 18:28-40 (36)

Compare verses 28 and 31 to behold the hardness of men's hearts. Observing the external form of ceremonial purity to celebrate the Passover (when their own firstborn sons were spared), they demanded the death of God's only begotten Son. Perhaps some of us today are guilty likewise—supposedly keeping our skirts from defilement but denying the One who bought us with His precious blood.

8TH. JOHN 19:31-42 (37)

When the apostle Paul put the emphasis of his ministry on the fact of Jesus Christ and Him crucified, he hit the very core of our religion. We must look upon Him whom they pierced. We must remember that He was pierced for us, that the blood and water which flowed from Christ's side is the cleansing stream in which we must bathe to be freed from our sin. "There is a fountain filled with blood
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

9TH. JOHN 20:11-18 (31)

Unto Mary Magdalene was granted the first glimpse of Christ after the resurrection. "Master!" Her faithful response ought to be echoed with equal fervor from our own lips. Jesus Christ must be Master of our lives. His must be the Lordship, ours the humble position of willing servitude. He must have complete sway in every part of our life. Our heavenly Father, help us to make Jesus "Master" in deed as well as in word.

10TH. JOHN 21:1-14 (6a)

In this third appearance of the Lord to His disciples since the resurrection, there is a lesson for our meditation. "Cast thy net on the right side and thou shalt find." Man's schemes, though performed with utmost devotion and energy, seldom accomplish the desired end. But adherence to divine direction carries with it the divine guarantee. Let us be obedient to the divine commission and God will give the increase.

11TH. PSALM 61 (2)

There is never a generation which does not, sometime or other, feel it-

self overwhelmed. Well might we say that there is seldom an individual who escapes this feeling. Upon whom may we call? Unto whom must we turn? To that Rock which is higher than all. To the heaven-sent Son, described in Hebrews as higher than all created things. There is no surer, safer place than that Rock, Christ Jesus.

12TH. II COR. 9 (8)

The memory verse is an all-embracing promise of God with an all-embracing purpose. God's all-sufficient grace supplies all our need. We lack no good thing. His supernatural power and ability are the ground of His promise. But His purpose is to promote liberality in our hearts. It is easier to receive than to give, but it is more blessed to give than receive. May God's all-embracing purpose come to full expression in your heart!

13TH. JER. 33:1-14 (3)

Upon the dark background of Jeremiah's messages of warning and woe are occasional splashes of glorious color, among them the promise of our memory verse. Our prayer-answering God has promised to reveal wonders. One of these, yet to be revealed in all its fullness, is a restoration of His chosen people Israel. Pray earnestly for the Jews as they pass through a more fearful time than the seventy years captivity.

14TH. MATT. 22:34-46 (37)

Sometimes proud thoughts arise in our hearts and the sin of self-satisfaction takes hold upon us. There is no more humbling thought than our memory verse. When so tempted, ask yourself this question, "Do I truly love the Lord God with all my heart, and with all my soul, and with all my mind?" Immediately we are humbled by seeing how far short we fall.

"More love to Thee, O Christ, More love to Thee!

Hear Thou the prayer I make on bended knee;

This is my earnest plea: More love, O Christ, to Thee,

More love to Thee, More love to Thee!"

15TH. II CHRON. 32:1-8 (8a)

When leaders speak comfortably unto their people, tension is often eased. How often is the relief short-lived. It is based on a false assurance. Self-confidence, reliance upon power and numbers, purposely falsified propaganda, all prove futile ultimately. But the comfort of Hezekiah's words ring true, "With him [Assyria's king]

is an arm of flesh; but with us is the Lord our God to help us, and to fight our battles." Rely upon Him!

16TH. PHIL. 3:1-11 (3)

True religion is not manifested by outward ceremony; rather, by a spiritual worship of God and a confident joy in His Son Jesus Christ. In fact, the man of faith repudiates fleshly confidence, even as did Hezekiah in yesterday's portion. Waste not your energies on external show, but zealously foster the flame of the spirit within.

17TH. ACTS 17:16-34 (16)

Many of us are living in cities which might be described as Athens, "wholly given to idolatry." Are we content to see things continue so? If not, have

we made any personal effort to right the situation? Paul's spirit was stirred in him and he taught both in the synagogue and in the more public market place. Surely the churches should be aroused to their responsibility and the effort should be made to snatch some from the flame by our personal approaches to those we meet.

18TH. LUKE 12:13-28 (15)

In this day of easy money, it is difficult to fight covetousness. God has given us many inducements to withstand the temptation. He has taught us that life consists not in the things possessed. God has shown us the evil end of him who covets. He has commanded us not to covet. God holds

before us far higher and more enduring treasures than the temporal things after which men grasp. We know that riches are often a great burden. Seek His righteousness and all things will be added.

19TH. II SAM. 12:1-10 (7a)

God's mercy ever reaches us when we need it most and deserve it least. In His mercy God showed David his sin. God forgave him. Yet David did feel the effects of his sin long years after. The child of his sin died, his sons plotted against him, and one even followed in his father's immoral footsteps. God mercifully retained His covenant with David and sustained him in his old age.

—HENRY D. PHILLIPS

An Interpretation of The Answer

THE OPC

By the REV. FLOYD E. HAMILTON

IN CONSIDERING the committee's answer to the complaint in the Clark case, one must bear in mind its specific purpose. That purpose was not to reply to the position held by the complainants as that position was understood by the committee preparing the answer. The purpose of those who prepared the answer was to reply to the document known as the Complaint against the Presbytery of Philadelphia in licensing and ordaining Gordon H. Clark, for that was what the committee was instructed to do. It has since appeared that some of the complainants held that the answer misinterprets the position of the complainants and naïvely fails to understand the main points at issue. It is conceivable that that is the case, but the answer deals only with the complaint, not with the true position of the complainants in whatever points that position differs from the statements found in the complaint.

It is acknowledged by nearly all that the main point at issue is the question of the incomprehensibility of God. No complete definition was given by the complaint of this doctrine, but the nearest to it was found in the words, "God because of his very nature must remain incomprehensible to man" (p. 2, column 3) and it was denied that it was "the doctrine that God can be known only if he makes

himself known, and insofar as he makes himself known" (p. 2, 3). It was asserted that "because of his very nature as infinite and absolute the knowledge which God possesses of himself and of all things must remain a mystery which the finite mind of man cannot penetrate" (p. 3, 1). This did not mean that man cannot reason himself into the knowledge God possesses, nor does it mean that apart from revelation man cannot know God for "The question of the power of God to reveal himself to man does not enter into the elements of this doctrine" (p. 3, 1). It apparently means that God wouldn't and probably couldn't reveal to man the mystery of His own knowledge regarding His own nature and the universe, and that even if He did reveal anything about it to man (which apparently, judging by the context, He has not) man with his finite mind could not understand such a revelation. It is evident at once that this is a nebulous and vague explanation of incomprehensibility, but since it speaks of the "knowledge which God possesses," it seems to refer to the content of God's knowledge as being incomprehensible to man and not even partially revealable by God. Apparently here we are faced with a paradox, for while it asserted that knowledge of God is "possible for

men, possible because of the fact of divine revelation," it is denied that this can ever "become comprehension of God." (p. 2, 1)

In view of these explanations of the doctrine of incomprehensibility, the writers of the answer were justified in concluding from the complaint that there must exist in the mind of God "some truth that God cannot put into propositional form" so that it can be revealed to man. This is evident both from the fact that the complaint asserts that "the mode of divine knowledge is not a part of the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of his knowledge. The latter is concerned only with the contents of the divine knowledge," (p. 6, 2) and from the fact that "the knowledge which God possesses of himself and of all things must remain a mystery which the finite mind of man cannot penetrate" (p. 3, 1). It may be doubtful whether the complainants really meant that, but the passages above quoted would seem to indicate that this is what the complaint teaches. Such a teaching that the contents of the knowledge of God is incomprehensible to man would seem to mean that God could not be known at all by man and would be open to the charge of skepticism, as the answer asserts. If God's knowledge which He "possesses of himself and of all things must remain

a mystery which the finite mind of man cannot penetrate" (p. 3, 1) then it would seem that man could not know God at all, in spite of the assertion of the complaint that God can be known through revelation. The charge of a skeptical philosophy regarding this point would seem to be justified.

Charles Hodge's definition of "comprehend" is "to have a complete and exhaustive knowledge of an object. It is to understand its nature and relations. . . . God is past finding out. We cannot understand the Almighty to perfection. To comprehend is (1) To know the essence as well as the attributes of an object. (2) It is to know not some only, but all its attributes. (3) To know the relation in which these attributes stand to each other and to the substance to which they belong. (4) To know the relation in which the object known stands to all other objects" (*Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, 337). Comparison with the explanation of incomprehensibility given in the complaint shows that Hodge is talking about complete and exhaustive knowledge of God which of course is impossible to man, though partial knowledge can be gained through revelation, while the complaint is talking about a mysterious area of God's knowledge that God Himself cannot reveal to man. The phrase in the answer (p. 9), "The essence of God's being is incomprehensible to man except as God reveals truths concerning his own nature," is in harmony with Hodge's definition of the word "comprehend," but of course not in harmony with the complaint's explanation.

The charge that the complaint itself teaches skeptical views in its doctrine of incomprehensibility (though of course none of the committee which prepared the answer really believes that such is the position which the complainants actually hold) is further borne out by what the complaint teaches regarding the knowledge possible for man. It is true that the complaint declares that God is knowable (p. 2, 3) and that He has given a knowledge of Himself through His words and works (p. 2, 3). Though this is asserted at the beginning of the discussion, when the complaint comes to a discussion of the knowledge which man possesses, it is declared that "we dare not maintain that his [i.e., God's] knowledge and

our knowledge coincide at any single point" (p. 5, 3). It is likewise asserted that there is a qualitative distinction between the contents of the knowledge of God and the contents of the knowledge possible to man, but no definition of "qualitative distinction" has ever been given by the complainants. Doubtless what the complainants really intended to teach was that since the knowledge of God is perfect, infinite, all-penetrating and all-comprehensive, while man's knowledge is imperfect, finite, non-penetrating and uncomprehensive, there is an essential qualitative difference between God's and man's knowledge of the same truths and this would be so at every single point. If that is all that the complaint meant by "qualitative distinction," it would be unobjectionable, but when the complaint goes on to teach that propositions do not "mean the same, to God and man" (p. 7, 3), coupled with the assertion that God's knowledge and man's knowledge do not coincide at any single point(!) the complaint would seem to teach that there is no point of contact between God's knowledge and man's knowledge, so that God would be essentially unknowable. This would teach skepticism in spite of the complaint's assertion to the contrary at the beginning of their discussion.

The answer states that Dr. Clark holds that the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God includes the following points: 1. The essence of God's being is incomprehensible to man except as God reveals truths concerning his own nature; 2. The manner of God's knowing, an eternal intuition, is impossible for man; 3. Man can never know exhaustively and completely God's knowledge of any truth in all its relationships and implications, and since each of these implications in turn has other infinite implications, these must ever, even in heaven, remain inexhaustible for man; 4. But, Dr. Clark maintains, the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God does not mean that a proposition, e.g., two times two are four, has one meaning for man and a qualitatively different meaning for God, or that some truth is conceptual and other truth is non-conceptual in nature.

At the meeting of Philadelphia Presbytery on March 19th attack was centered on the first of these points. It was asserted that by including the word "except" the answer was really

denying the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God *in toto*. As an illustration, if one were to say "God is unchangeable except . . .", one would really be denying that God was unchangeable. There is, however, an essential difference between unchangeable and incomprehensible in the sense in which the answer is using the term. The answer is using the term "incomprehensible" not as an absolute, unchangeable attribute of God, but in the sense of "not understandable by man." The definition in the answer may not please the complainants, but as long as our definition is understood we have a perfect right to use it. What the answer is asserting at this point is that man cannot know God's essence apart from what God chooses to reveal to man about it, and that that feature of the unknowability of God is the first element of the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. It is not *all* of that doctrine, but it is an element in the doctrine. In other words, God's essence is inviolable by man, but God can tell man facts about His nature, and has told man facts about His nature in revelation. Of course this is not to say that God can make man experience God's own self-consciousness, or make him know the creation as God knows it, namely, as an eternal now, with all knowledge present at the same instant in God's consciousness.

Now there is a sense in which God has to accommodate Himself to man in revelation, for His revelation has to be given on the creaturely level if man is to understand it at all. He does this, however, by telling man what is true about God's own knowledge. He does not tell man *all* about any item of God's knowledge (though perhaps it would be more accurate not to use the term "item" regarding God's knowledge, since God does not think in items or propositions). Nor does God make man know any proposition as God knows it, for not only does God know it intuitively; He knows it through and through, in an all-penetrating way as creator and controller. But whatever knowledge man may grasp about any truth that he understands truly, is true knowledge, true for both God and man. God knows infinitely more about it than man can ever know, but what God enables man to understand is true for God and man. God's knowing and man's knowing (See "Hamilton," page 127)

The Presbyterian
GUARDIAN

1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

John P. Clelland
John Patton Galbraith
Leslie W. Sloat
Ned B. Stonehouse

Thomas R. Birch, *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL

**Doctrine and
the Clark Case**

IN its issue of December 10, 1944, THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN took a definite stand on the question that had been raised by the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church in licensing and ordaining Dr. Gordon H. Clark to the ministry. Since that editorial appeared we have had little to say on this issue in our columns. Nevertheless, the circulation of the complaint and of an answer, prepared by a committee of presbytery which included Dr. Clark in its membership, served to keep the discussion alive. In recent weeks these documents have been the subject of prolonged debate in the presbytery, and our news columns have conveyed to our readers reports of these meetings. In the present issue, moreover, we are publishing an article by the Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton in which he undertakes to speak in defense of the committee's answer and to discuss certain of the doctrinal questions in the light of later discussion and debate. It is timely, we believe, to comment further upon the issues involved in this whole matter.

In the present situation it is imperative that all concerned should devote themselves to a study of these doctrinal questions. Great blessing may ensue for the church. Christianity cannot be too doctrinal. Dead orthodoxy is not an orthodoxy that has become too concerned with doctrine. It is an orthodoxy which regards doctrine as an academic matter rather than as charged with life and as requiring constant application to life. The true antidote to dead orthodoxy, therefore, is not less doctrine. It is rather such a

cleaving to the truth with all of one's faculties that all of life may stand and be established upon the foundation of the truth.

In this situation we ought to devote ourselves to the study of the Scriptures and to the great works of theology of our fathers. We ought to examine the evidence in their light. The record of the examination of Dr. Clark is unfortunately unintelligible at many points due to faulty stenography and, in any case, is not available for distribution. Hence in this case we are dependent largely upon the complaint and the committee's answer. Since the latter was signed by Dr. Clark, it may be presumed to provide the best formulation of his views that is available.

Readers of this journal and of the principal documents in this case will have gathered that the doctrine around which most of the discussion has centered has been the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. This doctrine is by no means the only doctrine at stake. But clearly it is of decisive importance. Dr. Clark has been charged with denying or with not maintaining this doctrine as taught in the Scriptures and in the Confession of Faith.

What is involved in this doctrine? The question, as we see it, is not whether God is knowable. It is not whether God may truly be known because of the fact of creation and because of the reality of a special revelation to men. It is rather the question as to the limits imposed upon the knowledge which man may possess of God, limits imposed by the finiteness or creaturehood of man. This doctrine teaches that, although God gives a

knowledge of Himself unto man and man may, accordingly, have an actual knowledge of God, God cannot, without denying Himself, exhaustively reveal Himself unto man. Likewise, it implies that man cannot, without transcending the limits of human nature, arrive at an exhaustive knowledge of God or of divine truth. How is this to be understood?

This doctrine involves nothing less than the doctrines of God and of man and the entire question of the relation of God to man. As the knowledge which God possesses of Himself and of all truth cannot be separated from His being or nature as the infinite God, so the knowledge which is possible and actual for man cannot be separated from man's finite nature. As there is a qualitative difference, and not merely a difference in degree, between the nature of God and the nature of man, there must also be a qualitative difference between the knowledge which God possesses and the knowledge which man acquires. Truth is one and there is real knowledge of the truth for man in virtue of his creation in the divine image and because of the fact of divine revelation to man. But man's knowledge cannot be on the level of the divine knowledge. What then is its character, if it is true knowledge and yet not identical knowledge of the truth? The Reformed theology has commonly expressed this in terms of analogy. Man created in the divine image, though qualitatively different from God, yet in a definite sense is like God or analogical to God; similarly, man's knowledge, though qualitatively different from God's knowledge, is analogical to God's knowledge. Now obviously this distinction requires us to conclude that the difference between the divine knowledge of the truth and human knowledge of the same truth is not merely a difference in quantity. It would not be adequately expressed by stating that man cannot attain to the level of divine knowledge because of the infinite number of implications which any aspect of truth possesses for God. It is, of course, not wrong to say that God possesses more truth than man has or can possibly ever acquire, but such a formulation is far from adequate as a statement of the differences between the divine knowledge and human knowledge of truth. We must insist, therefore, that since God's knowledge of a truth, or of the

COPIES of the complaint against the actions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia relative to the ordination of Dr. Clark may now be had free of charge, upon application to the office of The Presbyterian Guardian, 1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Copies of the answer prepared by presbytery's committee are available free upon request to Dr. Robert Strong, 707 Lincoln Avenue, Willow Grove, Pa.

truth, transcends the knowledge possible to the creature, we dare not say that the divine and human knowledge of any aspect of truth, or of any single proposition, are identical.

It is our judgment that exactly this is involved in the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. Because man is man, he cannot possibly reach the level of divine knowledge, not merely concerning reality as a whole but concerning any detail or proposition whatsoever. That which God can reveal to us concerning His knowledge of Himself or of His works is as nothing compared with His own knowledge of the same. That which God can reveal concerning His own knowledge of a particular proposition, as that "Christ died for sinners," is as nothing compared to His own knowledge of that proposition. The content of the divine knowledge of that proposition may not be equated with the knowledge which man may come to possess of it. Man may come to a knowledge of it in the sense of apprehending it, but he cannot know it in the sense of knowing it exhaustively. The content of God's knowledge of it is necessarily all-penetrating and all-comprehensive, whereas man's knowledge of it necessarily remains non-penetrating and uncomprehensive. Thus, because of His very nature as infinite and absolute, as the complaint states, the knowledge which God possesses of Himself and of all things must remain a mystery which the finite mind of man cannot penetrate.

It is clear that Dr. Clark, neither in his examination before the presbytery nor in the formulation of the answer, ever arrived at the doctrine as outlined above. There was indeed a constant interest to maintain the knowability of God, and Scripture is appealed to in the interest of establishing this doctrine securely, but his exposition of his views displayed a quite inadequate estimate of the limits imposed by human finitude upon the knowledge possible to man. In short, he never arrived at the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. According to the record of the examination, Dr. Clark defined this doctrine as the doctrine "that God knows every proposition and that those propositions are infinite in number and that we shall not exhaust them when he reveals them to us one at a time." And the formulation in the answer sums up the subject as follows:

1. The essence of God is incomprehensible to man except as God reveals truths concerning his own nature; 2. The manner of God's knowing, an eternal intuition, is impossible for man; 3. Man can never know exhaustively and completely God's knowledge of any truth in all of its relationships and implications because every truth has an infinite number of relationships and implications and since each of these implications in turn has other infinite implications, these must ever, even in heaven, remain inexhaustible for man; 4. But, Dr. Clark maintains, the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God does not mean that a proposition, e.g., two times two are four, has one meaning for man and a qualitatively different meaning for God, or that some truth is conceptual and other truth is non-conceptual in nature.

The first statement in this formulation displays a basic error because of the manner in which it qualifies the incomprehensibility of God. The doctrine certainly means that the essence of God is incomprehensible. But this does not properly allow of the qualification or exception taken in Dr. Clark's formulation any more than the doctrine of the divine omnipotence would allow of the formulation that God is omnipotent except as he gives power unto men. It is clear that in Dr. Clark's statement that "the essence of God is incomprehensible to man," he cannot mean that the divine essence cannot be known exhaustively by man. It must mean, in his qualified statement, that it is non-understandable by men—that man cannot have an understanding or knowledge of God. Otherwise the qualification introduced by "except as" would be unintelligible. But this latter meaning of incomprehensible is obviously not the meaning of the Confession of Faith when it states, without qualification, that God is incomprehensible. If the Confession meant that God is non-understandable by men, it would be expressing, not a mere heresy, but a complete break with Christianity, for it would be avowing agnosticism pure and simple.

And that the second statement in Dr. Clark's formulation does not rise to the doctrine of incomprehensibility is also clear. It is indeed true that "the manner of God's knowing, an eternal intuition, is impossible for man." God is eternal. He does not develop. Hence He cannot acquire knowledge. Now the reason that God's manner of knowing must be denied to men is that God is a different kind of being. This is so fundamental, in

our view of the matter, that for the same reason, it should be recognized that the content of man's knowledge of a single proposition cannot be identical with God's knowledge of the same proposition. But merely to state that the mode of God's knowing differs is not to say that God cannot be exhaustively known by man. So far as this point goes, man could acquire as exhaustive a knowledge of any proposition, or series of propositions, as God possesses intuitively.

But, to be sure, in the third formulation, Dr. Clark recognizes that in God's knowledge there is not merely the knowledge of particular propositions but also of an infinite number of relationships and implications of the same proposition. Here, then, he recognizes the factor of infinity. But infinity seems to be reckoned with only in a quantitative fashion. It is only the infinite "number" of relationships and implications of propositions in the divine mind that stands between man and the possibility of an exhaustive knowledge of divine truth. And if no limit may be placed upon the power of God to reveal propositions to man, there is no reason why any limit would need to be placed upon His power to reveal their implications to men except that their number is infinite.

One comes then, finally, to the fact that, in insisting upon identity of the divine and human knowledge of a proposition which man comes to know, Dr. Clark is basically in error. The reason that he insists upon such identity is bound up with his theory of knowledge. This theory does not allow for the distinction between the object of knowledge, say a proposition, and the content of knowledge of that object. The answer indicates this clearly enough, for example on p. 20, when it states that "God's knowledge of a proposition" must be understood as referring to the mode of His knowing a proposition. Only two possibilities exist, it is said: either knowledge must refer to the object known or to the mode of knowing it. And since to consider it as referring to the object known would not make sense—it would then mean "the proposition of a proposition"—to speak of "God's knowledge of a proposition" must refer to mode. In short, Dr. Clark's conception of knowledge does not allow for a distinction between the object of knowledge, namely, a particular

truth or proposition which is known, and the content of one's knowledge of that truth or proposition. Dr. Clark frankly stated that the proposition that there is a qualitative distinction between the content of the divine knowledge of a proposition and man's knowledge of the same proposition was nothing more than a series of nonsense syllables, so far as he was concerned. And there can be no doubt that, because of this basic assumption as to the character of knowledge, the answer so consistently characterizes the theology of the complaint as agnosticism or skepticism. If the content of the knowledge of the truth, or of a truth, and the truth itself may not be distinguished, then indeed one would have to insist upon identity of content or land in skepticism. On Dr. Clark's definitions of knowledge, the position of the complaint is indeed an absurdity. But, in our judgment, this is to make certain philosophical conceptions of knowledge—conceptions which are not Christian—determinative of one's theology, and it is exactly here that rationalism enters in at the very foundations.

The limits of our space forbid our entering upon any further discussion of this and the other doctrines at this time. We conclude by commenting briefly upon Mr. Hamilton's article. We appreciate very highly his sincere effort to find a common ground in this dispute and to resolve the problems that have emerged. His article clearly does not remain on the ground of the answer. It includes many elements presented in the arguments offered in refutation of Dr. Clark's views. But we must insist that Mr. Hamilton does not really succeed in his effort. He does not succeed because he is trying to reconcile irreconcilable positions. He has not deserted the formulations of the answer and yet at points takes his stand on the position of the complainants. This appears when he objects to the statement that the knowledge which God "possesses of himself and of all things must remain a mystery which the finite mind of man cannot penetrate." If this were true, he says, "it would seem that man could not know God at all . . ." Yet only a little later he says it would be unobjectionable to hold that God's knowledge is "all penetrating" while man's knowledge is "non-penetrating" and that "there is an essential quali-

tative difference between God's and man's knowledge of the same truths, and this would be so at every single point." Mr. Hamilton here is adopting a formulation of the question which really grants the position of the complainants, but in our opinion it is a formulation which Dr. Clark, on the basis of his theory of knowledge, does not and cannot accept. Again two entirely different definitions of "incomprehensible" are introduced. At times comprehend is taken in the sense of "understand"; at other times in the sense "to have a complete and exhaustive knowledge of an object." In common parlance, to be sure, both definitions are current and unobjectionable, but the same cannot be said with reference to the employment of both meanings in expounding the meaning of the doctrine of the divine incomprehensibility. Rather than clarifying matters, this process leaves them worse confounded.

On the background of what has been said above on the doctrine of incomprehensibility, it will appear that we regard many of Mr. Hamilton's characterizations of the teaching of the complaint as quite unjustifiable. A curious feature of this article is the recurrence of statements to the effect that those who prepared the answer knew well enough that the complainants did not really hold to the agnosticism which the complaint was said to teach. If this is so, why does the answer force upon the language of the complaint such interpretations? And why, for example, does Mr. Hamilton assert again that the statement that God's knowledge and our knowledge do not "coincide at any single point" teaches that there is no point of contact between God's knowledge and man's knowledge, so that God would be essentially unknowable. Of course, He would be stated to be unknowable if "coincide" meant "to have a point of contact." But, as the dictionaries indicate clearly enough, to coincide means "to correspond exactly." It should have been obvious that the complainants were using it in that sense.

In his discussion of the other theological points, we believe that Mr. Hamilton either admits our basic contention, as in his reference to Dr. Clark's conception of regeneration, or that he does not set forth the matters in as full a context as is required for the understanding of the issues in-

involved. On these matters, therefore, we can only urge that these subjects be studied in the light of the available evidence. Upon further deliberation, Mr. Hamilton will recognize, we believe, the insufficiency of his defense. When he reflects upon the incongruity of the various features of his discussion, we cannot doubt that he will make the right choices. Thus also we cannot doubt that the church as a whole, when it faces these issues in the full light of the truth of the Scriptures, will not swerve from the truth.

—N. B. S.

Increase Noted in Gifts to Missions

ON April 12th the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, general secretary of the missions committee of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, sent the following informative and encouraging letter to the churches of the denomination:

Throughout the fiscal year just closed the churches of our denomination have supported the missions committees with unprecedented generosity. The churches increased their contributions by more than fifteen per cent. during the past church year! This is the largest increase during recent years. . . .

While the churches gave over \$32,000 to the missions committees, this represented no more than fifty-five per cent. of their total budgets. The other forty-five per cent. was received from individual donors who have given faithfully over a period of years. . . .

During the year, of the seventy-two Orthodox Presbyterian churches that contributed, no less than twenty-nine gave more than 15¢ a week per communicant member, while an additional thirteen contributed more than 10¢ a week per communicant member.

The leaders in contributions were: Calvary, Willow Grove; Kirkwood; Covenant, Vineland; Calvary, Middletown, Pa.; Eastlake, Wilmington; Faith, Harrisville; Calvary, Cedar Grove; Calvary, Volga, S. D.; Covenant, East Orange, and Westminster, Bend, Ore. These ten churches gave more than \$14,500 or forty-five per cent. of the total contributed by the churches.

A number of churches that are not among the largest in communicant membership also gave very sacrificially. These, in order of their per capita contributions, were: Knox, Silver Spring, Md.; First, Waterloo, Ia.; St. Andrew's, Baltimore; Grace, Westfield; Atonement, Philadelphia; Covenant, East Orange; Calvary, Middletown, Pa.; Faith, Harrisville; Calvary, Volga, S. D., and Cornville, Maine. . . .

Orthodox Presbyterian Church News

NEWS

Presbytery of California

THE new mission work under the auspices of the presbytery in the Pacific Northwest has started encouragingly. On March 9th, prayer was offered throughout the churches of the presbytery for the success of the work which has now been launched in Seattle by Dr. James B. Brown. On the following day Dr. Brown succeeded in finding a hall at a very reasonable rental. It is located at 8534 Phinney Avenue and is surrounded by hundreds of homes. Fourteen persons attended the morning service on the first Sunday and a Bible class is meeting every Friday evening at the home of a member of the group. A hundred calls have already yielded good results and nine persons attended the first Friday evening class. One young wife has confessed Christ as her Saviour and wants to be baptized.

A record crowd of sixty-three persons was present at the Easter service of the Orthodox Presbyterian Mission in National City, which is under the leadership of the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt. The children of the Sunday school presented the Easter story in the language of the Scriptures and Mr. Hunt spoke on the subject "He is Risen." . . . The National City group contributed \$45.50 toward the fund to send missionaries to Eritrea. . . . On April 3rd seven members of the Orthodox Presbyterian mission group in Santee met with Mr. and Mrs. Hunt to take the first steps toward organizing a church. Calling themselves the "Independent Presbyterian Church of Santee," they voted to adopt the standards of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church and are hoping to secure the temporary services of a Westminster Seminary graduate. . . . The Santee group is saddened by the death on March 1st of Connie Dean Browning, who made public confession of his faith last winter. Further details concerning this will be found on the Young People's Page of this issue of the GUARDIAN. . . . Elder Bert Roeber of Westfield, N. J., addressed the newly-formed young people's group at Santee.

Westminster Church, Bend, Oregon: The Westminster "Well-Wisher" is a monthly bulletin now being pub-

lished as a joint project of the Fidelis Class and the Quest Club. Made up of local news, a page about Westminster wanderers, a pastor's paragraph, and a few short features, it is mailed to all absent members of the church, with the particular intention of keeping in closer touch with all those in the service. The first issue went out in February and enthusiastic replies have come from points as distant as France and the far Pacific. A sample copy will be sent to anyone requesting it.

First Church, Portland, Oregon: On March 25th three communicant members were added to the roll, bringing the communicant membership to seventeen, with thirteen covenant children. The Women's Missionary Society has an enrollment of thirteen; the Young Women's Chapel Guild eleven; and the Sunday school enrollment is seventy, with average attendance between forty and fifty. . . . At the annual congregational meeting Mr. David Munroe was elected a ruling elder. . . . The Rev. and Mrs. Lawrence Eyres are receiving congratulations on the birth of Priscilla Jane on March 9th.

Covenant Church, Berkeley: At the congregational meeting on April 4th the church made two weighty decisions: To become fully self-supporting as of April 1st, and to purchase a property and building for the church. . . . Last month a large audience witnessed the Missouri Synod Lutheran sound motion picture entitled "The Power of God."

First Church, San Francisco: March 11th marked the first services in the new building which was dedicated during the spring meeting of presbytery on April 11th and 12th. . . . On Easter Sunday evening the choir rendered the cantata "Immortal Life," by Lorenz. . . . On March 11th Mrs. Herbert Ashman, a missionary to Mexico under the Wycliffe Bible Translators, spoke to the Machen League. The Machen League conducts the service one Saturday evening each month at the Welcome Mission, and has now undertaken one Sunday afternoon service each month at a large home for the aged.

First Church, Long Beach: Seven new communicant members were re-

ceived on Easter Sunday, five by letter and two on reaffirmation of faith. The Rev. and Mrs. Paul Lovik have moved to Pasadena and Mr. Lovik is taking graduate work at the University of Southern California. He will continue to function as stated supply of the church.

Grace Chapel, Long Beach: The Sunday school has established a new record of 153. Three delegates attended the spring meeting of presbytery at San Francisco. . . . At a union service of both Long Beach churches, the chapel mortgage was burned. Ninety-four persons attended this service, despite rain. Special music was supplied by Chaplain and Mrs. William T. Strong and Mrs. Walter Strong, and the pastor of Grace Chapel, the Rev. Henry W. Coray, spoke on Psalm 127:1.

Grace Church, Los Angeles: The first three months of this year have seen a sensational growth in both church and Sunday school attendance. For three Sundays the attendance has been well over one hundred in the Sunday school, which is more than double the former average. A year ago the morning worship service had an average attendance between eighteen and thirty-two, but for the past three months it has averaged more than fifty. . . . On Easter Sunday 110 persons were present. . . . The ladies of the Guild have presented the church with two new silk Christian and American Flags. The building fund received more than \$200 in March and a similar amount on Easter Sunday, and the Sunday school, in its "Mile of Pennies" contest, has raised about \$300 for the same purpose. . . . Two signs, ten feet square, have been placed on the new lot purchased by the church. One proclaims a Scripture text and the other advertises the church services at the present location.

Beverly Church, Los Angeles: Eighteen new communicant members were received last month, bringing the total received during the year to thirty-three. At the congregational meeting on March 29th, mimeographed reports of the various organizations were distributed and a program of music by the Wheaton College Women's Glee Club highlighted the evening. About seventy-five persons attended the dinner and others came later for the evening program. . . . The Easter services in the Sunday school and

church enjoyed the largest attendance in several years.

Westminster Church, Los Angeles: Seven persons were received into communicant membership on Easter Sunday and attendance at Sunday school on that day was fifty-three, which is exactly equal to the present church membership. . . . Elder Robert Sander expects to apply to be taken under care of presbytery at its spring meeting.

Presbytery of the Dakotas

WESTMINSTER Church, Hamill, S. D.: The church has lost two of its members who have recently been inducted into the armed forces. Both were engaged in farming.

Calvary Church, Volga, S. D.: At the annual congregational meeting on April 4th three elders were elected, bringing the session to a total membership of four. All of the societies of the church reported good progress during the year and gifts for missions amounted to \$1,156.85 for the year. The total receipts for all organizations was \$4,770.11. The meeting was moderated by the Rev. Melvin B. Nonhof of Bancroft. Stated supply is Mr. Louis Knowles. . . . An Easter sunrise service was held in the church and addressed by the Rev. Menzo Dombush of the Christian Reformed Church in Volga, and special music was rendered by the men's quartet of the Christian Reformed church and the choir of Calvary Church. . . . Twenty-one ladies took part in a special service conducted by the missionary society on the Friday before Easter. . . . The church is grieved over the loss of elder Lewis Haag who died on March 17th after a brief illness. Memorial services were held for him on March 21st. Mr. Haag was seventy-three years old and the caretaker of the church.

Orthodox Presbyterian Church and Logan-Fontenelle Chapel, Omaha, Nebr.: Three new communicant members were received last month, and two of them received the sacrament of baptism. The annual congregational meeting was held on March 30th and was preceded by a supper prepared by the women of the church. Reports revealed a healthy and growing congregation. On Easter Sunday an impressive program was presented by the Sunday school at the vesper hour. The Women's Missionary Society has elected a new group of officers, headed

by Mrs. Leslie Nelsen. . . . The Logan-Fontenelle Chapel celebrated Easter with a special program. Miss Mary Roberts, who is conducting missionary work for the presbytery, has adopted the practice of going out an hour before Sunday school to round up the children and to bring in new ones. This has proven successful, in increasing attendance.

First Church, Denver, Colo.: Special services were conducted from March 18th to 23rd by the Rev. Walter J. Magee of Aurora, Nebr. Mr. Magee's messages were well received and many strangers were attracted to the services. "I consider Mr. Magee one of the best evangelists in our church," said the Rev. W. Benson Male, pastor of the Denver church.

Presbytery of New Jersey

GRACE Church, Westfield: On the first Sunday of April, attendance at the morning service, which was 114, considerably exceeded the seating capacity of the church. The building was again full in the evening to hear Chaplain E. Lynne Wade tell of God's blessing upon his work and of the opportunities in the immediate future.

Grace Church, Trenton: A capacity congregation attended the morning worship service on Easter Sunday, and the young people assisted in the music. . . . On April 8th the Rev. Robert S. Marsden was the speaker at both services. On the preceding Saturday evening he was a guest at the annual congregational fellowship supper and showed motion pictures of the home missions work of the denomination.

Covenant Church, Vineland: A successful missionary conference was held from March 11th through 18th, with Mr. and Mrs. John E. Phillips of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and Mr. and Mrs. George M. Steed of Central China as the speakers. Both couples have recently returned from their fields of labor. Delegations from Bridgeton and Pittsgrove attended the Tuesday meeting. . . . The congregation is rejoicing in the fact that on March 4th it was able to make the final payment on its mortgage and the \$20,000 property is now free of debt. The mortgage will be burned on May 6th, which is the eighth anniversary of the dedication of the building. Pastor of Covenant Church is the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde.

Immanuel Church, West Collings-

wood: On March 16th the Christian School Association of Camden County was addressed by Mr. Mark Fakkema, general secretary of the National Union of Christian Schools. Members of other churches interested in Christian education were invited to the meeting. Mr. Fakkema also addressed a morning worship service on March 18th. . . . At a special service on March 20th the Rev. Professor John Murray of Westminster Seminary was the guest speaker. . . . Following a survey conducted by the Rev. Charles H. Ellis, stated supply of the church, and the Rev. George W. Marston, a Sunday school was begun last month in Crescent Park, a new development not far from West Collingswood. One portable organ was borrowed from Mediator Church, Philadelphia, another was purchased, and the school meets in two basements offered by families in the community. The teaching staff is formed from Immanuel Sunday school. On Easter Sunday thirty-eight pupils were in attendance. . . . William Gooch, a member of the church who is now serving the hospital department of one of the Navy's largest carriers, recently was awarded a citation for outstanding service under fire.

Presbytery of New York and New England

FRANKLIN Square Church, Franklin Square, N. Y.: The Rev. Bruce A. Coie, pastor of the church, is recovering from an appendectomy and conducted a brief Easter service from his hospital bed. . . . Dr. Albert B. Dodd of the National Bible Institute, New York, conducted the communion service on the Thursday before Easter and the worship services on Easter day. There was a capacity congregation on Easter morning and a record attendance of eighty-one in Sunday school. An increase in the amount being paid toward the pastor's salary was recently voted by the trustees.

Presbytery of Ohio

THE smallest presbytery of the denomination had its spring meeting on April 3rd at First Church in Cincinnati. Three ministers and Elder Maurice R. Rooker of Indianapolis were present. The presbytery concurred in the overture of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the Twelfth General Assembly to appoint a committee to investigate the possibility

of union with the Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod). Another presbyterial matter is that of planning a young people's conference this summer. Every effort is being put forth to make that plan a reality.

The personnel of the presbytery is also that of the session of First Church, Cincinnati. As such, it met in the evening and accepted the resignation of Elder C. D. Garrard from the session of the church. Mr. Garrard has served for five years. It also voted to ask the Home Missions Committee to send a Westminster Seminary student to become the temporary assistant to Dr. Lawrence B. Gilmore, pastor of the church.

Trinity Chapel, Newport, Ky.: On March 25th eight covenant children and three adults were baptized and four other persons were received into communicant membership on profession of faith. "The mission seems to be entering a new era," says Dr. J. Lyle Shaw, "which during more than eight years has been the prayer of Mrs. Shaw and me and the prayer of the presbytery and the church. When the audience begins gathering one hour before the hour of services, with services well under way by the appointed time so that there can be more time for prayer—well, there is a reason."

First Church, Cincinnati: The Rev. Edwin H. Rian was guest preacher at a special service on the Friday before Easter and also spoke to an encouraging group of sixty people at the morning service on Easter Sunday.

Covenant Church, Indianapolis: The Rev. George W. Marston conducted an evangelistic program during the week before Easter. As a result of these meetings, four persons professed faith in Christ. Just preceding the meetings, four groups canvassed the community to invite the people to attend. On Easter Sunday more than one hundred people were present at Covenant and Trinity Sunday schools, and more than two hundred attended all the meetings. . . . In the recent Sunday school contest between Covenant and Trinity schools, Covenant surged ahead during the last three Sundays to emerge the victor.

Presbytery of Philadelphia

KNOX Church, Silver Spring, Md.: Average attendance in the Bible school has risen in three months from seventy-three to 101 and the morning

CHAPLAIN William A. McIlwaine, U. S. Army, will give the commencement address at Westminster Theological Seminary, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, on Wednesday, May 9th, at 3 P. M. His subject will be "Faith as an Organism."

service from fifty-three to sixty-five. Attendance on Easter reached 128 at Bible school, 130 at morning worship, and sixty at the evening musical service presented by the choir under the direction of PFC Edwin Feller, a member of Covenant Church, Rochester. . . . The Rev. Robert S. Marsden was guest preacher on March 18th.

Eastlake Church, Wilmington, Delaware: PFC Howard T. Black, a member of the church, was killed in action in Germany March 26th. He served with the 513th Parachute Infantry, 17th Airborne Division. He had been an active member of the congregation and had attended the Young People's Conference at Quarryville. . . . The Women's Missionary Society recently sponsored an all-day meeting. About forty ladies attended a luncheon, after which the Rev. Robert S. Marsden talked and showed pictures of some of the churches in the denomination. At the evening session, attended by about sixty persons, Chaplain John W. Betzold discussed the chaplaincy; a "trophy show" of souvenirs from the service men of the congregation was displayed.

St. Andrew's Church, Baltimore, Md.: The Sunday school has been growing lately and attendance is held at a high level by a contest between two groups. Another teacher is being secured, since twenty small youngsters are too many for Mrs. Edwards E. Elliott, wife of the pastor, to teach. A regular catechism class is held on Friday afternoons and attendance at mid-week prayer meeting has increased since holding it in different neighborhood homes. Applications for catechumen status have been handed to the non-members who stayed for communion service.

Calvary Church, Middletown: Twenty persons were received into communicant church membership at the spring communion service on March 25th. Two more persons were received Easter Sunday and also on

that day five covenant children were baptized. . . . Mr. Mark Fakkema was the guest speaker at the March meeting of the Middletown Christian School Association. He also spoke to the children of the day school and to a class of high school young people. . . . The Olmsted Community Sunday school, which formerly met Sunday afternoons, now meets at 9:30 each Sunday morning. Mr. Thomas Kay superintends and is assisted by an able corps of teachers. The average attendance recently has been fifty.

Calvary Church, Willow Grove: The Rev. Clifford S. Smith and the Rev. Edward L. Kellogg were speakers at pre-Easter services, and on Easter morning church attendance was a record 350. Easter giving was \$950. . . . Giving for the fiscal year just ended was more than \$16,000, and of this amount more than \$6,500 was distributed among missionary and benevolent causes. . . . A memorial service was held on Easter for Private Ellwood F. Mars, who died of wounds in Germany on March 16th. . . . The Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton led a Christian Education conference on April 15th.

Mediator Chapel, Philadelphia: A farewell party for the four missionaries to Eritrea was held at Mediator Chapel last month and about sixty members and friends of the denomination gathered to bid them farewell. . . . "Olivet to Calvary," a cantata, was given at the church on Thursday evening before Easter and at the chapel on the following evening. . . . Three persons were received into communicant membership at the chapel on Easter Sunday.

Knox Church, Philadelphia: The church session and the Sunday school voted to send THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN to every member of the church to acquaint them with the magazine and with the ministry of the denomination. Missionary giving for the year just past has shown an improvement over preceding years.

Presbytery of Wisconsin

CALVARY Church, Cedar Grove: The congregation has purchased a house to be used as a manse and the indebtedness on the church building was reduced by more than \$2,000 during the past year. . . . The Rev. Dean W. Adair of Hamill, S. D., has received a call to the pastorate of Calvary Church.

Hamilton

(Concluded from page 120)

ing meet in the sense that they concentrate on the same truth.

The answer points out a great many misinterpretations of Dr. Clark's position found in the complaint. It also points out the lack of accuracy in the use of terms that is characteristic throughout the complaint, such as "knowledge," "meaning" and "analogy." In regard to the use of the latter term, the answer shows the absurd conclusion to which one would be forced if that term is used as it is used on page 5, column 3, of the complaint. Though it has since been insisted upon by the complainants that they were speaking of "knowing truth analogically," not "knowing analogical truth," the context of its use on page 5 shows that it was there used, possibly inadvertently, of the truth itself, so that the term must be taken in that place as "knowing analogical truth," and the answer was therefore justified in showing by *reductio ad absurdum* that if we know only an analogy of the truth we can never know the truth, and that such a position would be that of skepticism.

In the second section on "Intellect, Will and Emotions," the answer shows that Dr. Clark classifies the love of God and the wrath of God as a part of the volitional activities of God, and that these volitional activities themselves might be classified under the head of intellection as far as God is concerned. He denies emotion of God in the sense of agitation and change which are included in the concept of passion. When the Confession of Faith denies passion to God, Dr. Clark holds that that includes emotions as he defines them. Dr. Clark agrees with Dabney in saying that while God must feel, such feeling is a settled state that never changes. Thus God eternally loves His people and eternally is wrathful with sin. Dr. Clark holds that emotions would imply a change in God by way of fluctuation as from hot to cold or from perturbation to calmness. God's feelings never change as do human emotions.

The section also takes up the matter of the "primacy of the intellect." Dr. Clark holds that in the functional realm the intellect is supreme over the will and the emotions. It evaluates the various emotions and dictates to the will. He is not using the idea

found in Greek philosophy which identifies the intellect with the divine nature nor does he say that the rational nature of man is divine and sinless. He agrees with Calvin that the understanding is "the guide and governor of the soul; the will always respects its authority and waits for its judgment" (*Institutes*, I, xv, 6-8).

In connection with this section, the subject of the position of the intellect in regeneration arises. The answer holds that while regeneration does not necessarily produce a change in the understanding of propositions, sin may keep men from reasoning logically. Dr. Clark holds that certain propositions are not understood by unregenerate man on account of sin. The change that takes place in regeneration is that the regenerate believes the truth of the propositions in the Bible, acknowledges the Lordship of Christ and becomes His willing subject, while the unregenerate is a rebel, though he may understand the sense of many of the sentences of Scripture intellectually, but does not spiritually discern their excellence and apply them to himself. Dr. Clark holds that the unbeliever may have what has been known as "historical faith," a faith such as the demons had when they trembled (James 2:19), and when they said to Jesus Christ, "We know thee, thou Son of God!" (Matt. 8:29).

On the subject of sovereignty and responsibility, the answer holds that Dr. Clark agrees with the Confession of Faith. God is sovereign and man is a free moral agent, responsible for his sins. Dr. Clark holds that one should believe in both God's sovereignty and man's responsibility, but that Romans 9:20 contains a hint toward the solution of what may seem to be a paradox to some people. He in no way denies the truth of man's responsibility for sin. It is possible that Dr. Clark may be mistaken as to his solution of this particular paradox, and there are many other problems regarding these subjects that he does not pretend to have solved, but to attempt to solve a paradox by exegesis is not heresy.

On the question of the free offer of the gospel, the answer again holds that Dr. Clark is right in insisting that no one should seek to require him to go beyond the statement of the Confession of Faith on this point. The complainants insist that Dr. Clark should be willing to use the term

VACATION WITH PAY!

Nurses and Nurses Aides

Enjoy your vacation amid Christian environment, at one of New Jersey's most beautifully located Sanatoriums, situated in the Ramapo mountains.

A great opportunity for those willing to help the needy.

Apply Director of Nurses

CHRISTIAN SANATORIUM

Wyckoff, New Jersey

"sincere" of God in His offer of the gospel to the reprobate. Dr. Clark holds that everything God does is sincere, and yet that since the Arminians use the term in trying to distinguish their doctrine from ours it is better not to use that term. Dr. Clark holds that God "freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ" (Confession, VII, iii). No candidates for our ministry should be required to subscribe to anything outside the Confession of Faith. Dr. Clark does not deny that God was sincere in offering the gospel to the non-elect, but he wishes to guard carefully the assertion of such sincerity lest it be confused with the use of the term by Arminians. For that reason he approved the statement quoted in the answer from Dabney. Certainly Dabney used the term "sincere" of God's offer of salvation in the paragraphs preceding the one quoted, but Dabney carefully guarded his own position on this point by restating his position in the paragraph quoted.

Again it must be repeated that the argument of the answer is directed against the complaint as written and signed, not against the position of the complainants where that position differs from the statements of the complaint. It has since appeared that their true position is somewhat different from the position of the complaint, but that position could not be dealt with in the answer. It is the contention of the answer that Dr. Clark holds views which are allowable under the Confession of Faith, even though one may differ with him on details of his system of thought. It is to be hoped that the complainants will recognize that they have misinterpreted Dr. Clark's position and drop the whole matter.

HEADQUARTERS
for CHOIR GOWNS
PULPIT ROBES
 Vestments • Hangings • Sortes
 Embroideries, Etc.
 NEW CATALOG on Request
NATIONAL ACADEMIC CAP & GOWN CO.
 PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Money for Your Treasury
Over 2,000,000
SUNFLOWER DISH CLOTHS
 were sold during 1942 by Ladies' Aids, and members of Sunday schools and Young People's Groups. Finest quality cloths. An easy, pleasant way to raise funds for your treasury or for the purchase of WAR BONDS.
 Sample Free to Official Sangamon Mills—Est. 1915
 Cohoes, N. Y.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS
 Edited by Reformed Bible Teachers
 Bible Lessons in Bible Order
 Beautiful Colored Pictures for the Primary Classes
 Large Amount of Help for the Teachers
 Ask for samples
CHRISTIAN REFORMED PUBLISHING HOUSE
 Grand Rapids, Mich.

Seven Books by Dr. B. B. Warfield
At \$1.50 per Volume

Studies in Theology	Tertullian and Augustine
Christology and Criticism	Critical Reviews
The Westminster Assembly and its Work	Perfectionism, Volume 1
	Perfectionism, Volume 2

To The Presbyterian Guardian,
 1505 Race Street,
 Philadelphia 2, Pa.

I enclose \$1.50 per volume for the books checked above.

Your Name.....

Address.....

City and Zone.....

Child Evangelism

By Dean W. Adair

ABOUT half of the pupils in the public school at Hamill, South Dakota, come to Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church each Monday afternoon for an hour's instruction by the pastor. This is a part of the public school's released time religious education program. The course during this second year includes the study of the ten commandments, sin and the Saviour. It consists of memorizing songs, choruses, catechism and Bible verses concerned with these truths, and hand-work illustrating them in practice.

Orville L. Wolcott, a member of the church, has opened his home for a similar class for the pupils of North Black Dog School. All of the pupils attend, coming more than a mile, some on foot and some on horseback. The class is taught by Mrs. Wolcott, superintendent of the lower school of the Sunday school and teacher of the primary class.

Here, then, is an open door for child evangelism, especially in the rural schools on the great Dakotan plains. It is an opportunity for our members to throw open their homes to the children, and for our elders and deacons and Sunday school teachers to increase their usefulness in the Word of God. "For of such [little children] is the kingdom of God."

Birch

(Concluded from page 116)

Church in the U.S.A., and Professor Woolley said he was sorry to see the day in The Orthodox Presbyterian Church when appeal was made to a case in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in which two men who denied the virgin birth were allowed to remain in the church and their presbytery went scot-free. The moderator was sustained.

Much other debate filled the late hours of the evening, all of it no doubt profitable but much of it contributing little new light to the problems facing the presbytery. The high point of the meeting was an unexpected speech by Mr. Kellogg. He said that he had previously been one of those who had championed Dr. Clark but that he no longer felt able to do so. "If knowledge of a proposition is the same for God and man," said Mr. Kellogg, "then you must have a perfect and exhaustive knowledge of each word of the proposition." He felt that this was a serious and central flaw in Dr. Clark's position, and was therefore forced to retreat from his earlier support of Dr. Clark.

Mr. Clelland's motion was defeated by a roll call vote of 16 to 20. The full text of this final defeated motion is as follows:

That the presbytery acknowledge that various views of Dr. Clark as set forth in the meeting of July 7, 1944, are in error and that therefore the decision to sustain his theological examination, the decision to waive two years of study in a theological seminary, the decision to proceed to license Dr. Clark and the action of licensing him, the decision to deem the examination for licensure sufficient for ordination and the decision to ordain Dr. Clark were in error.

The presbytery thus clearly demonstrated to the complainants that even their mildest request would be refused and that there was, in effect, no use in making further attempts to gain recognition for their position.

The presbytery adjourned at approximately 12.55 A.M.

In the course of the day, Mr. Rian gave notice that he expected to propose an overture to be sent up to the general assembly, requesting that body to elect a committee to study the various doctrinal questions which had been involved in the Clark case.