

April 10, 1937

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 1

The Presbyterian Guardian

One Dollar a Year

NED B. STONEHOUSE,
Editor

Published semi-monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

THOMAS R. BIRCH,
Managing Editor

THE CREED OF OUR FATHERS

OUR decision to publish the Confession of Faith, a chapter or two at a time, beginning with this issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, is indicative of the distinctiveness of our doctrinal point of view. Christendom today is, as a whole, not much interested in creeds, and particularly not in the great creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which were formulated as the result of the epochal revival of true Christianity which is generally known as the Protestant Reformation. We, however, are committed with all of our hearts to creedal Christianity, and specifically to that form of Christianity which according to our judgment has come to its purest and most consistent expression in the great Reformed or Calvinistic creeds. Of these creeds the Confession of Faith which was formulated by the divines at Westminster is, as few will deny, the greatest, if only by virtue of its grand comprehensiveness.

THE ATTITUDE OF MODERNISM

Modernism does not look favorably even upon the idea of creedal formulation. While its representatives sometimes express reverence for the historic creeds, it soon appears that such reverence does not really go beyond the respect which one generation may show for the intellectual accomplishments of another, or the regard which a person may have for an heirloom which is without any utility whatsoever. In other words, such reverence as Modernists may show toward the historic creeds evinces merely a respect for the fathers, not an approval of the faith of the fathers.

One reason that Modernists are unwilling to accept the historic creeds as an expression of their faith is simply that they have rejected the Bible as the Word of God. Since they do not believe the Bible, they cannot be expected to look with favor upon the basic purpose of

these creeds, which is that the church should make a corporate testimony to her faith in the system of truth which the Bible contains. The insistent demand, "No creed but Christ," is a phase of the modern attack upon the authority of the Bible.

But beyond the fact of unbelief as a reason for the Modernist's antipathy toward creeds, there is an even more ultimate explanation. And that is found in the dominant philosophy which denies that there is anything permanent about truth. Truth, instead of being viewed as unchangeable and eternally valid because God is truth, becomes merely a name for a principle of action which approves itself to man for however brief a season. The view of truth as eternal is, according to the prevailing philosophy, a heavy shackle upon man's freedom, and a serious deterrent to human progress. To the Modernist's: *I do not believe* is joined the affirmation: *Since truth changes, and doctrines are merely theories, belief does not really matter.* Here then is the real root of the doctrinal indifference of our times. The modern church repeats the creed, but under its breath it makes its ultimate confession: *I believe that belief doesn't really have anything to do with the essence of Christianity.* The step from the cry: "No creed but Christ" to a "creedless Christianity" is very short indeed.

FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE HISTORIC CREEDS

The Fundamentalism of our day is very often marked by a depreciation of the historic creeds. At this point it is necessary to guard against misunderstanding. Fundamentalism is a term that has come to stand for the antithesis of Modernism. It recognizes the authority of the Bible, and takes its stand upon the great truth that eternal destiny is bound up with belief in the gospel. In that sense we gladly take our stand on the side of Fundamentalism. However, among fundamentalists gen-

erally there is a readiness to allow the historic creeds to be relegated to the background. For example, fundamentalists sometimes declare that, since creeds are after all merely human documents, creed subscription must not be taken too seriously—that one may properly expect nothing beyond an affirmation of general agreement with a creed. Or they may seek to unite Christians simply on the basis of brief, skeletal creeds.

The emphatic reiteration of the great verities of the faith has been necessitated in our times by the attack of Modernism upon the foundations of Christianity. While expressing, therefore, our cordial agreement with Christians who take their stand upon the Bible, we confess that we do not sympathize with the widespread depreciation of creeds among fundamentalists. We believe that we should contemplate Christianity as a whole, and that we should confess our Christian faith not merely through a few detached utterances, but through a testimony to the great Biblical system of doctrine.

And when we actually compare the articles of the new, brief creeds with the old, we judge that the old is better. Let the reader carefully read that first great chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith, entitled "Of the Holy Scripture," which is printed in this issue, and observe how the necessity and extent of Holy Scripture, the authority, sufficiency, perspicuity, and other properties of Scripture are unfolded in precise and lucid fashion. Can we possibly be content with the creeds which dismiss this great article of our faith with a sentence or two?

DR. MACHEN'S VIEW

Those who followed closely the literary and other activities of Dr. Machen knew how dear to his heart our historic creed was. No one surpassed him in his zeal that the Westminster Standards should be adopted by The Presbyterian Church of America in their purity; no one was more deeply thankful at the happy decision of the Second General Assembly. At the time of his death he was engaged in carrying forward through his radio ministry the task of providing a popular exposition of the great system of doctrine which is expressed in these Standards. Not long before his death he expressed the hope that he might be able to round out this exposition by the completion of two other volumes which, with *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* and *The Christian View of Man*, would have provided an introduction to the Reformed Faith for many of God's little ones in this generation. Dr. Machen was often described by an unfriendly press as an "extreme fundamentalist." And while it is perhaps true that he did more than any one in his generation to combat Modernism, yet he never applied the term fundamentalist to himself. He was distinctly a Calvinist. An interesting sidelight on his position is found in *The American Lutheran* for March,

1937. The writer quotes as follows from a letter which he had received from Dr. Machen last summer:

What you tell me about the use of my little books in Lutheran circles gives me particular encouragement. It makes me feel anew—what I have already felt many times—that we stand closer to a real confessional church like the Lutheran, even though its confession differs from ours, than we do to those who are adherents of a mere vague "Fundamentalism" and have broken their connection with the great theological traditions of the Christian church.

THE FORM OF THE CONFESSION

The particular form of the Confession of Faith which we are making available for our readers is the form which was adopted by The Presbyterian Church of America. This particular form, following the Confession of Faith which has been in force in American Presbyterianism since 1788, differs from the original Westminster Confession of Faith, in XX:4; XXIII:3; and XXXI:1, through a limitation of the power of the civil magistrate. It also agrees in the elimination of a clause in XXIV:4 which forbids marriage with a deceased wife's sister. It differs notably from the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in that it does not contain substantial changes adopted by that body in 1903, changes which, as articles in this magazine have shown, seriously impair the testimony of the doctrinal standards of that body to the system of doctrine which is taught in Holy Scripture. On the other hand, the Confession of Faith of The Presbyterian Church of America agrees almost exactly with the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. In each case not a single word has been added to the Confession of Faith as it existed after 1788. But the Confession of Faith of The Presbyterian Church of America in addition has eliminated from XXII:3 the sentence: "Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority"; and from XXV:6 the words: "but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God."

Through the printing of the Confession of Faith the members of The Presbyterian Church of America will be supplied with the exact form of their Confession. Our hope is that the publication of a complete Constitution will not be long delayed. At all events this series may serve to promote a knowledge and love of our great creed. We do not want our creed to become a dead-letter. We hope it will never appear to shackle the life of the church. But as the church believes the Scriptures, and reflects upon their meaning, may it joyfully join, with increasing knowledge and faith, in the corporate testimony to our historic faith.

The Confession of Faith

As Adopted by The Presbyterian Church of America
At the Second General Assembly, November 13, 1936

CHAPTER I.

Of the Holy Scripture.

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable;¹ yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will, which is necessary unto salvation;² therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his Church;³ and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing:⁴ which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary;⁵ those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.⁶

II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these:

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis.	Ecclesiastes.
Exodus.	The Song of
Leviticus.	Songs.
Numbers.	Isaiah.
Deuteronomy.	Jeremiah.
Joshua.	Lamentations.
Judges.	Ezekiel.
Ruth.	Daniel.
I. Samuel	Hosea.
II. Samuel.	Joel.
I. Kings.	Amos.
II. Kings.	Obadiah.
I. Chronicles.	Jonah.
II. Chronicles.	Micah.
Ezra.	Nahum.
Nehemiah.	Habakkuk.
Esther.	Zephaniah.
Job.	Haggai.
Psalms.	Zechariah.
Proverbs.	Malachi.

I. ¹ Ps. 19: 1-4; Rom. 1: 32; 2: 1; 1: 19, 20. See Rom. 2: 14, 15.

² I Cor. 1: 21; 2: 13, 14.

³ Heb. 1: 1, 2.

⁴ Luke 1: 3, 4; Rom. 15: 4; Matt. 4: 4, 7, 10; Isa. 8: 20.

⁵ II Tim. 3: 15; II Pet. 1: 19.

⁶ Heb. 1: 1, 2.

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Gospels according to	II. Thessalonians.
Matthew.	I. Timothy
Mark.	II. Timothy.
Luke.	Titus.
John.	Philemon.
The Acts of the Apostles.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Paul's Epistles:	The Epistle of James.
Romans.	The first and second Epistles of Peter.
I. Corinthians.	The first, second, and third Epistles of John.
II. Corinthians.	The Epistle of Jude.
Galatians.	
Ephesians.	
Philippians.	
Colossians.	

I. Thessalonians. The Revelation.

All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.⁷

III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.⁸

IV. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, (who is truth itself,) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.⁹

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to a high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture;¹⁰ and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole, (which is to give all glory to God,) the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of

II. ⁷ Eph. 2: 20; Rev. 22: 18, 19; II Tim. 3: 16; Matt. 11: 27.

III. ⁸ Luke 24: 27, 44; Rom. 3: 2; II Pet. 1: 21.

IV. ⁹ II Tim. 3: 16; I. John 5: 9; I Thess. 2: 13.

V. ¹⁰ I Tim. 3: 15.

¹¹ I John 2: 20, 27; John 16: 13, 14;

God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.¹¹

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men.¹² Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word;¹³ and there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.¹⁴

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all;¹⁵ yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.¹⁶

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew, (which was the native language of the people of God of old,) and the New Testament in Greek, (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations,) being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic;¹⁷ so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to ap-

I Cor. 2: 10-12.

VI. ¹² II Tim. 3: 15-17; Gal. 1: 8; II Thess. 2: 2.

¹³ John 6: 45; I Cor. 2: 9, 10, 12.

¹⁴ I Cor. 11: 13, 14; 14: 26, 40.

VII. ¹⁵ II Pet. 3: 16.

¹⁶ Ps. 119: 105, 130. See Acts 17: 11.

VIII. ¹⁷ Matt. 5: 18.

peal unto them.¹⁸ But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them,¹⁹ therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come,²⁰ that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they

¹⁸ Isa. 8:20; Acts 15:15; John 5:46.

¹⁹ II Tim. 3:14, 15; Acts 17:11.

²⁰ I Cor. 14:6, 9, 11, 12, 24, 27, 28.

may worship him in an acceptable manner,²¹ and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.²²

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture, (which is not manifold, but one,) it may be searched and known by other places that speak

²¹ Col. 3:16.

²² Rom. 15:4.

IX. ²³ Acts 15:15; John 5:46. See

more clearly.²³

X. The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.²⁴

II Pet. 1:20, 21.

X. ²⁴ Matt. 22:29, 31; Acts 28:25; Gal. 1:10. See I John 4:1-6.

How Westminster Seminary Trains Men

By the REV. LESLIE W. SLOAT

Pastor of the Knox Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.
Westminster Seminary, Class of 1932



Mr. Sloat

THERE is probably no harder task in the world than teaching in a theological seminary. To many people religion is essentially emotional. The task of the seminary professor is to show and establish the intellectual and historical foundation upon which religious faith can rest. Christianity has such a foundation in historical fact and divine revelation. But while the teacher is instructing the student in this foundation, he is constantly encountering opposing views which are defended with more emotion than knowledge, and he is constantly being charged with a lack of spirituality—a lack of emotional vitality in his own religion. To maintain the highest standards of scholarship, and at the same time to make the Christian faith a living, practical religion for everyday, is not an easy task, but it is the task that faces the seminary professor.

I went to Westminster in 1929, the year it opened, fresh from Princeton University. At the seminary were students from many parts of the country. Some of them in their college courses had had preliminary religious instruction. Naturally there frequently arose differences of opinion between the students and the professors in their views of Scripture truth and interpretation. I remember how I was impressed with the way in which the professors invariably met such situations. With a completely sympathetic understanding of the opposing view,

they would go back to the Bible itself, and build up their argument on the basis of its plain and clear teachings, at the same time showing why they could not agree with the other view. Almost always, before the year was ended, those who had at times been the most active opponents of the professor, would have become most ardent enthusiasts for the position he had presented. They came to see that his position was both Scripturally and logically sound.

The one course in which most of these struggles took place was, of course, Systematic Theology. For two years I studied this subject under Professor John Murray. He was a young man, recently out of seminary, a Scotchman whose citizenship and church membership are still in his native land. He had to bear the brunt of these discussions. And how well he did it! I remember one day as I sat in his class, the thought came to me: if only everybody in the world could have the Christian faith presented to them in the logical, orderly system this man gives, they would be forced to believe. He showed the completeness and perfection of the Reformed Faith, establishing each point upon the Bible, so that one just had to accept it. Mr. Murray is still at the seminary, in the same way presenting in its perfect entirety that system of doctrine which is taught in Holy Scripture.

And this same could be said of the other men at the seminary. Mr. Kuiper was there the first year, and then left to become president of Calvin College.

He has since returned. His task was to teach us to preach. The beauty of his ability was that he taught us not to preach simply the so-called "practical" sermons. Rather he taught us to preach doctrine, the foundation stones of our faith, the thing people need if they are going to be fed with the Word and grow. But he taught us to preach doctrine so that it was most intensely practical. For really the doctrines of the Christian faith are the most practical thing in the world. Mr. Kuiper is also still at the seminary, teaching men to build their sermons on the Bible, make them rich in its glorious truths, and practical in their application to the lives of everyday people.

Dr. Van Til had, and still has, the field of philosophy and metaphysics. I had had practically no philosophical background whatever when I entered the seminary. Consequently these courses were among the most difficult for me. But the central theme of all Dr. Van Til's work did become impressed upon my mind and heart. It is, that, on the basis of pure logic and reasoning, this world is one kind of a world if the God of the Bible is its God, and it is an entirely different kind of a world if there is any other kind of a god, or no god at all. To hold any other philosophy of existence than that of Christian Theism is to make the universe an irrational and meaningless chaos. The Christian view of the world alone gives meaning to reality. On this foundation the courses in apologetics, evidences, metaphysics, and the like, were built. One came in-

evitably to see that the world's philosophies were built upon sinking sand. They were like Archimedes. He said, "Give me a lever long enough, and I will move the world." The trouble would have been that, when he had a lever long enough to move the world, he would himself have been off the world and would have had no place to stand while he worked it. World philosophies have no place to stand. Christian Theism has one, in the absolute and unchangeable God of the Bible.

And then at the seminary we had, through the courses in Church history, the opportunity of watching the march of the Christian Church through the centuries. It was Professor Paul Woolley who gave these courses. And as we watched the course of events, and retraced the pathway of the Church, we came to know certain things. We came to know that the Christian Church, loyal to the Word of God, is blessed of God and a blessing in the world. We came to know that when the Church turns from that Bible into paths of its own devisings, not only does the Church go down, but it carries the world along with it. We saw how, when Christian heroes stood out for the truth in the midst of encircling darkness, the light they cast went shining down to the dawn of a new day. We watched the opposition that was raised against the Church, by those without and by those within. And when in our own day we were faced with the question of our attitude toward a church organization that had turned aside from the truth, and toward men who started on the way and then turned back, we knew on the basis of history that we could expect the blessing of God only as we stood firm on His holy Word, come what might. The events of recent years do not seem so strange to those who have watched the panorama of history unfold, as we were privileged to watch it in seminary.

Of course, our study and appreciation of all these things was founded upon our knowledge of the Bible, Old and New Testament. The study of the Bible was central in our work. We did not receive at the seminary merely a large number of sermon studies and outlines. We learned to use the tools of study for ourselves. We learned the languages in which the Bible was originally written. We learned the principles of criticism and true exe-

gesis. We learned how to dig down and find out what a given text or passage means, which is more important than a hundred sermon outlines. In short, we learned to study the Bible. And as we studied it, we learned to love and honor it as indeed the very Word of God.

I had most of my Bible work with Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, Dr. Allis, and Dr. Machen. The Old Testament department is now conducted by Dr. MacRae and Mr. Young. I had several courses with Dr. MacRae. I believe he was fitted for the larger responsibilities which have since been given him. I knew Mr. Young as a student, but not as a teacher. I am glad that when they needed another man in the Old Testament department, they called on him. He is abundantly able to carry on the tradition of the institution. (Of the New Testament department I cannot speak more particularly, as it would involve a reference to the editor of this paper.)

The faculty of a theological seminary is continually subjected to criticism from people who have their own ideas about religion. Never have I admired the faculty of Westminster more than in recent months. For Christian character and courage, as well as for scholarship, I believe they stand at the top. They have taken their position upon the Scriptures. Regardless of persecution or opposition, they have held to that position. I pray they may never waver from it.

I hope many, many people read these words. People who are interested in the defense and the propagation of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour. And people who are so interested in it, that they will give to the work. I wish I had a million dollars. I would endow Westminster Seminary myself. And I sincerely hope that someone who has some money to give to the Lord will read this, and be led to give it for the needs of the seminary. For Westminster is training the men who are to be the Christian leaders in the coming generation.

May God bless the seminary,—its faculty, students, and trustees. And through its work, may God be pleased to send a rich blessing upon this sin-cursed world, in souls saved and saints edified in the teaching of the Word of God. And to Him will be the glory, forever and ever.

Mrs. George P. Pierson

IN THE death of Mrs. George P. Pierson on Friday, March 12th, the cause of evangelical missions has lost a tireless worker and a true friend. Her death followed an attack of pneumonia from which she seemed to have recovered, but which had left her greatly weakened. The service was held in the funeral parlors of Oliver H. Bair, in Philadelphia, on Saturday, March 13th, and was conducted by the Rev. John Grant Newman.

Ida Goepp Pierson was born in Easton, Pennsylvania, on April 21, 1862. In 1883 she was graduated from Normal College (now Hunter College), New York. Her early education also included studies in Germany and French Switzerland. In 1890 Miss Goepp was appointed by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was sent to Japan where she taught in St. Margaret's Girls' School and the Bancho Girls' School in Tokyo. On June 12, 1895, she was married to the Rev. George P. Pierson, D.D., a missionary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and, in the same year, was appointed a regular missionary of that Board.

Fearless, tireless and capable in all of her missionary enterprises, Mrs. Pierson was always ready to enter any field where there was need for vigorous, pioneer service. Both Dr. and Mrs. Pierson exerted a broad and abiding influence in the great northern island of Hokkaido. Mrs. Pierson was an able speaker, and the author of numerous articles and of the book, *How the Holy Spirit Came to the Hokkaido, Japan*.

After 38 years of service in Japan Dr. and Mrs. Pierson were honorably retired on August 10, 1928. During her recent residence in America Mrs. Pierson was an active worker in the home churches, promoting the cause of foreign missions whenever opportunity offered.

Since moving to Philadelphia Mrs. Pierson took a great interest in the class-rooms and life of Westminster Seminary. The warmth of her personality and the keenness of her participation in the activities of the seminary mean that her passing will be a heavy blow to graduates and students alike. In her death Westminster Seminary has lost a loyal friend and supporter.

The Creation of the Heaven and the Earth

A Study of the Opening Verses of Genesis

By the REV. EDWARD J. YOUNG

A Comprehensive Statement

IN RECENT issues of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN we discussed what we considered to be two erroneous interpretations of the early verses of Genesis. Having rejected these two views we can now the more easily present what seems to us to be the correct view. The correct view is, we believe, that which is the most natural, namely, that the first verse of Genesis is a universal, general, comprehensive statement of the fact of creation.

That this is the natural interpretation is shown by the fact that the ancient versions so interpret this verse. As the verse stands in our Hebrew Bibles, the Massorettes (those who provided vowel signs for the Hebrew consonants) have accented it to show that they also thus understood it. Indeed, not until the time of the Jewish commentator, Rashi (1040-1105 A. D.), was the view presented which was discussed in our first article (see THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, February 13, 1937).

If then the first verse in a comprehensive statement gives the general fact of creation, what is its relation to the following verses? This question we can answer by saying that the remaining verses of the chapter present a detailed account of the formation of the earth from the state of being "without form and void," described in verse two. Somewhere within the all-embracing work of creation, stated in verse one, "verse two takes up its position, at the point when the creation of this earth and its heaven begins" (Delitzsch).

The first verse, however, is not to be considered as a mere title or heading to the chapter. It is much more than that, for it states the fact of creation in a manner that is not in the least exhausted by the verses that follow. It prepares the way for the account of the second verse, which focuses the reader's attention upon the earth and which describes the condition of the earth when God said, "Let there be light." Let us thus paraphrase the thought: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

Now with regard to the earth, it was without form and void, and while it was in this condition, God said, 'Let there be light.' Thus, verse two does not carry us back as far as does verse one.

When God began to form this earth into the ordered world that it now is, the earth was in the condition described in verse two, namely: 1) It was without form and void; 2) darkness was upon the abyss; 3) the Spirit of God was brooding upon the waters. We very generally speak of the earth at that time as being in a state of chaos. Now, if we use the word "chaos" to describe the earth as pictured in verse two, we must be very careful to note that there is nothing in the Bible to imply that the earth was not just as God desired it. There is no suggestion in the Bible that the condition, "without form and void," was in any sense evil or other than as God willed it. The words "without form and void" refer to the earth in its primitive, unformed, incomplete state in contrast to the ordered world that we know today. This condition is made the foundation of God's creative and formative activity which, as the first chapter of Genesis describes, brought the earth from a condition of "desolation and waste" (literal translation) to the point where Scripture says, "And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1:31). Thus, the so-called chaos of verse two was a means to an end, a step on the way to the completed earth.

God, the Creator

Now that we know the proper relationship in which verse one stands to the remainder of the chapter, let us turn our attention again to the first verse for a more specific consideration of its meaning. What, actually, does this first verse mean? This can best be learned by a study of each word found in the verse.

In the beginning. By these words our author seems to mean not merely the beginning of the course of human history, nor the beginning of this world as such, but the absolute beginning of all created things, whether

visible or invisible. Beyond this we cannot go, but must say with the Psalmist, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God" (Psalm 90:2). It is the beginning of all that exists outside of and in dependence upon God. The word "beginning" is often used to denote the first or best part of a thing, and we agree that it is possible to refer it to a relative beginning. Such, however, does not seem to be the intention of the author. Is it not rather trivial to think that Moses merely meant the beginning of our solar or sidereal system or of the order of things which we see? Was not his great purpose to show that all things have their origin because of a creative act of God?

God created. The first subject mentioned in the Bible is God. In the Hebrew the word "create" follows immediately after the word "beginning," and the two together form an alliteration. The word "create," in the form here used, is always employed exclusively of the activity of God, and refers to the origination of something absolutely new. The material from which something is created is never stated, and so, while this word does not necessarily mean "creation out of nothing," it is by far the most suitable word to express the idea of absolute creation.

If such is the case, is not the word "beginning" superfluous, for the very thought of absolute creation includes a beginning? It is true that the thought of absolute creation does include a beginning, yet the word is not without purpose here. Let us paraphrase the thought as follows: "The beginning of the heaven and the earth was due to the absolute creative activity of God." The word "beginning" serves to show more strongly that the temporal universe had a beginning. We freely grant that the doctrine of a "creation out of nothing" cannot be established from this verse alone, but the remainder of Scripture shows that we have correctly interpreted this verse when it is so understood.

The heaven and the earth. These words usually describe the ordered universe. Such would seem to be the meaning in this verse, but by the universe is apparently meant all that exists outside of and in dependence upon God. This expression, referring to all that has been created, immediately focuses the attention upon this earth, as created by God.

Historically, Christians have believed that the purpose of this verse is to ascribe the origin of all things to a creative act of God. In these present

days there are those who, for one reason or another, would tone down the doctrine of an absolute creation. But, when this doctrine is given up, in reality there is also given up belief in an absolute God. From time to time men will seek to take from the first verse of Genesis its distinctive doctrine of absolute creation, but the soul "that on Jesus hath leaned for repose" will ever turn to this verse and read its stately word, knowing that here alone is found the true account of the origin of all things.

God? We may think we are worthy of much from God, but we shall not be reckoned worthy of anything unless it be counted a joy to suffer for Jesus' sake (II Thess. 1:3-5). Oh, for a faith that will count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Lord! Such a faith was manifest among Christians in New Testament times, but how rare it is today.

Even the godly act as though God had forgotten to be gracious and as though He remembered not any more His promises. What a wrong view they have of the God of Salvation! The truth is that even though there remain but one good man alive in the world, yet will God preserve him by His grace and protection. He will defend His own, even though they be few, against the malice and machinations of the whole world. God knows the wheat from the chaff and He is pledged to preserve them continually. The truly pious should be confident of this one thing: That He which hath begun a good work in them will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.

Men generally will not blaspheme by saying that God's promises are untrue, but how many will still praise God for His words when the billows of adversity roll over them. In the shade and quiet of the day they liberally and vociferously sing God's praises, but when there comes a serious struggle, they turn from His promises, which is the same as charging Him with being a breaker of His word.

Why should God make promises? Is it because He is rash as unstable men are, or is it His purpose to beguile us? What deceitful and wicked hearts we have, that God should even have to assure us that He is not deceitful; that He does not speak empty words; and that He does not boast of power and goodness which He does not possess! Is it possible that men should think of Him as One who offers in word that which He will not perform in very deed?

What Shall the Righteous Do?

What shall the righteous do in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation? Shall they conform themselves to the ways of the world that is in the grasp of Satan? Or shall they ever abide by godly principles? To ask is to answer. The righteous do

Spurious Godliness

A Meditation on Psalm Twelve

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

IF DAVID were here today, he could say of the state of affairs in the world what he said of the conditions which prevailed when he lived. Today it can be said that wickedness and depravity are everywhere. There is no more any regard for right and truth in the hearts of men.

Even among those who profess the name of God iniquity and false dealing abound. There are conspiracies among them to destroy the guiltless and helpless. It is horrible to think that righteousness is trodden under foot among professors of religion, but is it not so? There are numbers of high professors that are set against a good cause.

Those on whom reliance was placed for the cause of the Lord, now fail. Promises are made only to be broken. Lightly they break solemn oaths because they took them lightly. Easily enough they assume sacred obligations. Yet never do they put forth a hand to fulfill one of them.

There is deceit and flattery. They cover their words with the varnish of hypocrisy. No one is ever certain what they mean. Their smooth and fair speech is only to spread a net for the feet of the guileless.

Profession Not Enough

Profession of piety is not enough to lead men to have confidence in their statements. They deal falsely and

speak vainly. What hope is there for the upbuilding of true faith in the world, when men's words are as sounding brass and tinkling cymbal! They rely upon their very gift of speech to influence and persuade others to fall in with their dishonorable plans.

Having been found out they seek protection in lies, rather than suffer rebuke as a Christian. They will not swear to their own hurt but turn like a sail to take advantage of every favorable wind that blows. They go on to distort all things and pervert all right and conscience. Their darkness is so great that it is no exaggeration to say that they almost cover the brightness of the sun.

Who Are Worthy of the Kingdom?

These are indeed days when the true children of God should seek their help from God alone. They should follow the Psalmist's example and flee to God in the extremity of their despair. There is no discouragement in God's embrace, for He tenderly succors those who flee to Him.

There were Christians in Thessalonica who found themselves in a similar corrupt state of affairs, yet their faith grew exceedingly and their charity abounded toward one another. The Apostle Paul gloried in them for their patience and faith in all their persecutions and tribulations which they endured.

Are we worthy of the Kingdom of

righteously. In their conversion they have been turned from darkness to light. As children of the light what communion can they have with the deceitful works of darkness? "If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." These are strong words, but is there one who walks not uprightly according to God's Word, and thinks that these words do not apply to him? Then his wickedness is greater still, for he has made God to be a liar.

If we are among God's elect then our conversation should be according to fidelity and strict honor, and never in our relationships to one another should we tolerate what is wrong. Neither, when others howl like wolves, should we howl with them.

As we have received mercy, let us "renounce the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

LESSON 26 Man's Inability

QUESTION 18. *Wherein consists the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell?*

ANSWER. *The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consists in, the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin; together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it.*



Mr. Skilton

MAN in his fallen estate is, as we have seen, totally corrupt (lesson 25). In his corruption he is "utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good" (Confession of Faith 6:4). Not only are the souls of men rendered by the fall totally depraved; but men are totally unable to change their depraved estate, or to perform any works spiritually meritorious. The Confession of Faith says that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto" (9:3).

A Free Agent

Fallen man, though marred in the rational image of God, has, of course, not lost that image (see lesson 19).

He still possesses a spirit which distinguishes him from the animal creation. He can freely will to act in conformity with his nature. And, through God's common grace, he is still capable of performing deeds and entertaining sentiments that may be in a sense good or "moral."

Works of Death

Nevertheless all the works of fallen man are works of death. The Confession of Faith says concerning them that "although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from an heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful, and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing unto God" (16:7).

Will and Nature

The human will is not something absolute, independent of all else, able to settle upon any object in any way. Free it may be, but it cannot go beyond man's nature. God's will is, of course, free. It is determined by nothing outside of God Himself. But God cannot will something contrary to His nature. He cannot will to do evil. The wills of angels, whether good or evil, are free; but they are certain to settle upon that which accords with their natures. The good cannot determine to sin; the evil cannot will righteousness. Likewise man freely wills that which is in accordance with his nature

—evil. Never can he will to change his nature, to obtain spiritual discernment, or to develop love to the living and true God. Being spiritually dead, he wills the way of spiritual death. And unless life is given him from without he must remain forever "of his own nature incapable of an effort, or even an aspiration, towards that which is good" (Calvin).

Scriptural Proof

The Scriptures support the doctrine of total inability by their express statements concerning man's lost condition, their refusal to encourage man to think that he can deliver himself, and their teaching that only God can rescue man from sin.

The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God (Rom. 8:7, 8).

The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (I Cor. 2:14).

No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him (John 6:44).

So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy (Rom. 9:16).

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1).

As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me . . . without me ye can do nothing (John 15:4, 5).

See also Job 14:14; Prov. 21:4; Jer. 13:23; Matt. 11:27; 12:33-35; John 3:3, 14, 19; 5:40; 6:33, 65; 8:34, 43-44; Romans 2:1; 5:6; 6:20; I Cor. 1:18-20; 2:9, 10; II Cor. 4:3, 4; 5:17; Gal. 5:22, 23; Eph. 1:18-20; 2:5, 10, 12; 4:17, 18, 22, 23, 24; Phil. 1:6; 2:13; Col. 2:13; II Tim. 2:26; Heb. 11:6; and I John 5:18.

SUBJECTS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. *Can Satan will to do that which is spiritual?*
2. *Can fallen men of themselves see the truth of God? love God? obtain fellowship with Him? change their natures?*
3. *Can a man's will be free and yet the man unable to do works of righteousness, pleasing to God? Are there some non-Christians who appear to do "good" deeds? Can they be saved by their deeds?*
4. *What should be the effect on us of the teaching of the Word of God concerning man's inability?*
5. *Do some hold that no more will be required of men than to do the*

"best they can" on this earth? What do the Scriptures say on this subject? Review the recent lessons on sin.

6. If we accept the doctrine of man's inability, can we logically hold that some are saved because of any merits of their own?

7. How is it that not all are lost? See Question 20 of the Catechism.

8. Is God obliged to men to offer any one an "opportunity" of salvation?

9. Should the Scriptural call to repent be interpreted to mean that fallen man in himself can turn to God? Do the Scriptures teach that God must move man to repentance? Which would come first logically: God's work in man's soul or man's awareness of faith and repentance?

LESSON 27

The Misery of Man's Fallen Estate

QUESTION 19. *What is the misery of that estate whereinto man fell?*

ANSWER. *All mankind, by their fall, lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell for ever.*

A Lost Communion

THE Catechism, after having dealt with the sinfulness of the estate whereinto man fell (Question 18) calls our attention to the misery of that estate (Question 19). It indicates to us that man in his fallen estate is exposed to the misery that proceeds from sin and that attends upon every type of death. In his original estate before the fall man had enjoyed fellowship with God. But all mankind by the fall—their fall—lost communion with God. When Adam and Eve exalted themselves and Satan above God and severed themselves from the Source of all blessings they, of course, found their separation from God one of misery. A sense of shame and guilt disturbed them (lesson 23). When they "heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day," they did not joyfully hasten to meet Him, but "hid themselves from the presence of the Lord amongst the trees of the garden" (Genesis 3:8). In their sin they did not desire to come to the Light—they preferred to shun it (see John 3:20).

The Wrath and Curse of God

With sinful man, separated from fellowship with Him, the holy God is sorely displeased and, being righteous, He visits His wrath and places His curse upon him.

God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men (Romans 1:18).

Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them (Galatians 3:10).

"And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Ephesians 2:3). An expression of the divine wrath is found in the third chapter of Genesis. Read carefully verses 9 to 24.

Temporal Misery

Man no longer in communion with God, under His displeasure, His wrath, and His curse, is justly liable to all punishments in this world and that which is to come (Larger Catechism 27). In this world man is liable, the Larger Catechism, Question 28, informs us, to such inward punishments as blindness of mind (Ephesians 4:18), a reprobate sense (Romans 1:28), strong delusions (II Thessalonians 2:11), hardness of heart (Romans 2:5), horror of conscience (Isaiah 33:14), and vile affections (Romans 1:26); and such outward punishments as the curse of God upon the rest of creation (Genesis 3:17); and all other evils that befall us in our bodies, names, estates, relations, and employments (see Deuteronomy 28:15).

God, according to His own good pleasure, metes out the miseries of this life to which fallen men are liable. The type of misery visited and the time of its visitation are under His control (see Psalm 73:3-5; 49:16-17; and Luke 16:25).

Death

Not only are men subject to miseries in this life, but they must face greater woe in the world to come. Death comes to them. The body, because of sin, returns to the dust whence it was derived (Genesis 3:19; Acts 13:36) and the soul goes to a place of conscious suffering. The Confession of Faith (32:1) says: "The souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day." (See Luke 16:23, 24, and consider Jude 6, 7.)

"In Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments" (Luke 16:23).

Judgment

At the last day the bodies of the dead shall be raised (Acts 24:15; Daniel 12:2; John 5:29) and united to their souls forever. Then "immediately after the resurrection," the Larger Catechism says (Q. 88) "shall follow the general and final judgment of angels and men," and it continues (Q. 89) to say that "the wicked shall be set on Christ's left hand (Matt. 25:33), and, upon clear evidences and conviction of their own consciences, shall have the fearful but just sentence of condemnation pronounced against them (Matt. 25:41, 42); and thereupon shall be cast out from the favorable presence of God, and the glorious fellowship with Christ, his saints, and all his holy angels into hell to be punished with unspeakable torments both of body and soul, with the devil and his angels for ever."

The wicked are judged according to their sinfulness in this life. (II Cor. 5:10; Prov. 1:28; 14:32; Isa. 55:6; Rev. 22:11.) The Bible nowhere teaches that an opportunity is given them to escape condemnation after the separation of soul and body. The punishments of the wicked are justly varied in intensity. (See Matt. 10:15; 11:20-24; Lk. 10:12-15.)

The Pains of Hell Forever

The wicked will be eternally separated from God and forced to abide in hell with the devil and the other fallen angels. The word Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom, translated "hell" is used in Matthew 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5; and James 3:6 to designate the "place of eternal punishment of the wicked." Fire is mentioned in connection with it. The history of that valley of Hinnom (II Chronicles 28:3; 33:6; II Kings 23:10; Jer. 7:32) and the practice of heaping the filth of Jerusalem there made its name a suitable term to employ of the last abode of the lost.

With great awe we must read the statements of our Lord Jesus Christ and other declarations that the Holy Spirit has given us concerning the wretched eternity of the lost. Consider a few:

Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41).

And these shall go away into everlasting punishment (Matt. 25:46).

Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire (Matt. 18:8).

Sinful men might well tremble as they read in many other passages, of "unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:12), of "their worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched" (Mk. 9:48), of the furnace of fire (Matt. 13:42), of the "torment in fire and brimstone" (Rev. 14:10), of the "smoke of their torment that goeth up for ever and ever and they have no rest day nor night" (Rev. 14:11), of the "torment that is day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10), of the "lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8), of the bottomless pit (Rev. 9:2), of the outer darkness, the "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 8:12), of the blackness of darkness (Jude 13), and of the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power" (II Thess. 1:7-9). See also John 3:36; Jude 12, 13; Isaiah 33:14; 66:24. See Dr. A. A. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology*, chapter 40.

Some of the statements of Scripture concerning the misery of the lost may be figurative, but the severity of the suffering they depict should not be minimized. To be eternally separated from God, without hope, tormented by conscience, without anything good, experiencing the horrible issues of sin unchecked, in the company of other lost men and of devils, in unutterable discomfort: such is the misery of the lost!

Objections

Many have endeavored to remove the doctrine of eternal punishment from the Scriptures. (1) Some have held that the Greek word translated "eternal" or "everlasting" and applied to the sufferings of the unrighteous in the final state designates—as it does in some other connections—only a limited time—age long. But when it is used in the Scriptures of the age to come, which is recognized to be unending, it must logically be held to

The Radio Contest

AWARDS in the Prize Letter Contest, conducted in connection with the recent radio broadcast of "The Presbyterian Guardian," will be announced in the next issue. We wish to thank all the entrants, and to assure them that the judges are giving the most careful consideration to each letter submitted.

mean everlasting. Furthermore, the word that is translated "eternal" in the phrase "eternal life"—which is universally admitted to designate that which never ends—is the very same word used in the phrase "everlasting or eternal punishment."

And these go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal (Matt. 25:46). (See also John 6:57, 58; II Cor. 9:9; Matt. 19:29; Mk. 10:30; Rom. 2:7; John 3:15.)

(2) In the interests of the theory that the wicked are eventually annihilated it has been said that words applied to their misery like "perdition," "corruption," "destruction," and "death" would indicate that at some time they absolutely cease to be. But such designations in the Scriptures reveal the horrible nature of the state of men, not the cessation of men themselves. A man may be said to be dead in one way and not in another. See Hos. 13:9; Eph. 2:1; and I Tim. 5:6. Consider other ways of overthrowing this objection.

(3) Some have maintained that the Scriptures teach that all men will be saved eventually; but the evidence they advance is merely a misinterpretation of certain statements. They fail to grasp the meaning of certain contexts and are guilty of not comparing Scripture with Scripture. See Acts 3:21; Romans 5:18, 19; I Cor. 15:22-28; Eph. 1:18; and Col. 1:20.

It makes a great deal of difference whether the "all" in a given passage refers to all men, including both lost and saved, or to "all in Christ." See I Tim. 2:4. This verse does not teach that God wills, in the sense of decrees, or has an eternal purpose that all men are to be saved.

(4) Men may raise foolish objections to the teaching of the Bible about eternal punishment. They may attempt to tell God what His justice should require; and, in their ignorance, they may declare what they think His goodness should accomplish: but they can never remove the fact of hell. Whether they like the doctrine of eternal punishment or not—and we should hardly expect it to be popular with lost men—the fact remains that the absolute, all-glorious God, the only Source of Truth, has graciously revealed that the pains of hell await those on whom His wrath abides. If we are wise we will praise our perfect God for His perfect manner of dealing with sinful men, and seek to laud Him with unflinching fervency if He has chosen to save us from that which we deserve—the pains of hell forever.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Do the wicked, in this life, suffer all that they deserve?

2. What is the difference between punishment and chastisement?

3. Is the death of the body to be recognized in the same light in the case of believers and unbelievers? See I Cor. 15:55-57; Rom. 8:1; and Phil. 1:21.

4. Does the Bible anywhere teach that there is a Purgatory? What happens to the souls of believers upon death of the body? of unbelievers? Are the dead conscious? See Lk. 16:23; 23:43; John 11:25, 26; Acts 7:59; I Cor. 15:8; Phil. 1:23; Rev. 6:9-11.

5. Does the Bible condone the practice of seeking to communicate with the dead? See Deuteronomy 18.

6. What considerations support the view that the suffering of the wicked will be without end? What did the Lord Jesus teach about everlasting punishment? Is it logical to accept what He says about one subject and not about another? If we do so, who is our authority on any subject?

7. How should we reply to those who hold that the doctrine of eternal punishment is untrue because God is just or because God is love? How should we reason with those who hold that there is no hell beyond this world?

8. Could any suffering after death procure forgiveness for the lost? Compare Isa. 1:56; and Heb. 12:14.

The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. EDWARD J. YOUNG

Instructor in Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

April 18th, The Promise of Redemption. Genesis 3: 7-24.

THE act of transgression of Adam and Eve was fraught with far-reaching consequences. Biblical students are correct in saying that the covenant of works made with Adam was not only for himself but also for his posterity. Adam was the representative of the human race, and in violating the covenant he affected not only himself but also all his posterity, descending from him by natural generation. Tremendous indeed was the result of this transgression. Our Shorter Catechism asks the question, "Into what estate did the fall bring mankind?" and answers it by saying, "The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery."

This dreadful fact becomes immediately apparent. Adam and Eve are no longer the same. "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons" (v. 7). Thus appears the pollution of man's nature. He recognizes that he is not as he should be; shame seizes him, and an attempt is made to cover up his nakedness.

Immediately appears also the guilt of Adam's nature. "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden" (v. 8). It thus becomes apparent that Adam does not stand in a right relationship to God. He is indeed guilty, that is, he is liable to punishment. Adam, himself, is also, of course, liable to blame for his deed. The estate into which Adam had fallen was truly a sinful one.

Likewise it was an estate of misery. Adam had lost communion with God. No longer was the sound of God's voice a delight. Broken was the bond of sweet communion which once had existed between God and Adam. Adam knew that he was indeed subject to God's wrath, and attempted to find an escape from God's displeasure by hiding among the trees of the garden.

Thus Adam was a being whose na-

ture was totally depraved. No mercy could he longer expect from God. In him was no merit nor righteousness which he could plead to secure God's favor. In the truest sense of the word, Adam was lost. If there was to be any reconciliation between God and man, the initiative must indeed come from God. Man could do nothing. He was helpless. The grace of God alone was needed.

The grace of God was manifested to sinful man. In the councils of eternity the Father had entered into covenant with the eternal Son. To the Son He had given a people to be redeemed by Him (cf. John 10: 29; 17: 6-24; Heb. 2: 13; Isa. 8: 18). Thus the parties to this gracious covenant were the Father and the Son. The conditions of the covenant were that the Son should assume human nature, be made under the Law and redeem His people who were under the Law (cf. Heb. 10: 7; Heb. 2: 14, 15; John 6: 38, 39; 4: 34). Thus we read in the Scripture: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2: 14, 15). The promises of this covenant were the glorification of Christ and the eternal salvation of all His people, given to Him by the Father.

Adam had disobeyed the covenant of works and so had plunged mankind into an estate of sin and misery. Christ fulfilled the conditions of the covenant of grace and so obtained salvation for His people. It was thus the plan of God to save the fallen race.

God calls to Adam, "Adam, where art thou?" The questions addressed to Adam are of course not asked for the purpose of obtaining information. Rather, in loving and tender fashion, God would draw from Adam the confession of his sin. Both Adam and Eve seek to place the blame on someone else. God denounces the sin but gives a promise of salvation.

This promise appears in verse fifteen. "And I will put enmity between

thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The promise of salvation and the plan of salvation appear here. Four things at least are to be noticed.

The initiative in the matter of redemption is taken by God, not by man. "I will put enmity," says God. Man could not take the initiative; this must be done by God. The plan of salvation is of God's devising, not of man's.

Secondly, there is to be a reversal of man's attitude toward God and toward the serpent. This reversal of attitude will be due to a deliverance from sin. Hitherto, Adam had believed God to be a liar, for he had followed the serpent's suggestion. Now, however, he is to be at enmity with the serpent. He will understand that the serpent has deceived him, and that God does not deceive him.

Thirdly, the enmity is to exist not only between the serpent and the woman, but also between the respective seeds. Thus the enmity will be continuous.

Lastly, the issue of the enmity is foretold. This issue is to be one of true victory for the seed of the woman. He shall bruise the head of the serpent. This means a complete subjugation. In this victory he shall also be wounded in a lesser way. Rightly has this verse been called the "Proto-Evangel," for it points forward to the time when, by His substitutionary death, Christ destroyed "him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and delivered them who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

April 25th, The Obedience of Noah. Genesis 8: 20-22; 9: 8-17.

AFTER the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden sin takes its course rapidly. We read the story of Cain and Abel, and are shocked at Cain's brutality. In the fourth chapter of Genesis a list is given of some of the descendants of Cain, and one purpose of this list is to show how far sin had run its course. In the "swan song" of Lamech we read of intense hatred. There are ten names given in this list, which is the last that we hear of the Cainites.

The purpose of the book of Genesis, however, is to trace the line through which the promised seed will come. It is probably for this reason

that we hear no more of the Cainites. In the fifth chapter, however, a genealogy of the Sethites is given. In this genealogy also there are ten names. The question thus arises why each of the lists has ten names. Various answers may be given to this question, but the present writer is inclined to feel that the purpose of the author of Genesis is to give representative names. On such a view it would be impossible to construct a chronology. Thus, we could not say how long after Seth Noah lived. One fact stands out clearly as though to mock the words of the serpent when he told Eve that she would not die. Of each person in the genealogy except Enoch it is said, "And he died." Sin is thus taking its toll in the human race.

At the birth of Noah Lamech gives a prophecy, "This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Possibly there is here a reflection upon the promise which God had given in the garden. Perhaps Lamech was expecting Noah to be the one who would bruise the head of the serpent. The meaning of the word is interesting. It means to rest. It is instructive to compare what is said of the Lamech in chapter five with what is said of the Lamech in chapter four.

Noah was indeed in the line of the chosen people. He is described as a man who was just and perfect in his generations, and who walked with God. However, "the earth also was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence." God saw the corruption of the earth and determined to destroy it.

Of Noah it is said that he "found grace in the eyes of the Lord." This of course was not due to any inherent merit or righteousness, but was due to the fact that God had chosen Noah. While God determined to destroy the race, yet Noah was to be a remnant. The plan of God had not changed. Sinful mankind would be wiped out, but a representative remnant would be preserved through which, in the fullness of time, would come He who was to bruise the serpent's head.

The method of destruction chosen by God was a flood. Noah was commanded to make an ark of gopher wood, the length of which was to be six times longer than the width. If it be remembered that the cubit is about

eighteen inches, it will be seen that the ark was indeed a large vessel. The purpose of the command is made abundantly clear (5:17). God intends to destroy all flesh. Noah believes God and obeys Him. "Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he" (5:22).

There are three things which may be mentioned with regard to the flood. In the first place its purpose was to destroy all flesh (cf. Gen. 6:7, 13, 17; 7:4, 21-23; and I Peter 3:20). The flood did not merely happen by chance; it was ordained of God for a specific purpose. God does punish sin through calamities. This flood was sent to destroy evil mankind.

Secondly, it must be stressed that the cause of the flood was the sinfulness of mankind (cf. Gen. 6:5, 11, 12, 13). Man had brought this punishment upon himself.

Thirdly, a thoroughly representative remnant was saved. This, as has been indicated before, makes clear that God does not change His purpose.

Questions arise as to the extent of the flood. Was it merely a local inundation, or did it cover the whole earth? The language used to describe the flood is indeed the same comprehensive language which describes creation in the first chapter of Genesis.

Two Communications from Dr. Buswell

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are publishing at Dr. Buswell's request a brief statement which refers to the editorial in the issue of February 27th, and a reply to Mr. Murray's review of his book entitled *Unfulfilled Prophecies*, which appeared in the same issue.

The brief communication requires little comment. Those who care to examine the question of interpretation may compare our references with Dr. Buswell's book. While it seems to us that the argument in his book goes beyond an appeal to inexpediency, we are content to leave the final judgment in the matter to discriminating readers.

The reply to the review, in the mimeographed form in which it reached us, contained a final section, consisting of four brief paragraphs, which we are unwilling to publish since, in our opinion, the section impugns the motives of the reviewer, and is misleading in certain respects.

There are those who feel that the flood offers the explanation of many of the difficult problems of geology.

The story of the flood itself is well known, and we shall not dwell upon it here. The New Testament describes Noah as a "preacher of righteousness." Doubtless Noah, depending upon the promise of God, sought to convince an evil world of impending doom. But, like Amos the prophet, he met with little success.

After the flood Noah established an altar to the Lord, and from every clean beast and every clean bird he offered burnt offerings to the Lord. God looked with favor upon the sacrifice and promised never again to curse the ground. Man is by nature a child of wrath, and the imagination of his heart is evil from his youth. By means of a judgment such as the flood his evil heart cannot be changed. From this time forth there would be regularity in the course of nature.

God established His covenant with Noah. This is a new administration of the covenant of grace, by which it is declared that the earth shall never again be destroyed by a flood. The token of the covenant was the bow, ever to be a reminder of the grace of God that the "waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh."

Dr. Buswell has been informed, of course, as to this decision, and has expressed the desire to have us publish the rest of the statement with our explanation. With the publication of this statement, and of Mr. Murray's own reply, we are closing this discussion.

The Brief Communication

I wish to protest against the misconstruction of my book "The Christian Life" in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for February 27, 1937, page 202, column 2b. If the reader will turn to chapter three in this book he will find that the argument is based squarely upon the scriptural doctrine of inexpediency. "All things are lawful for me; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any." (I Cor. 6:12) "All things are lawful; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful; but not all things edify." (I Cor. 10:23)

In Reply to Mr. Murray

Professor Murray's article in review and criticism of my booklet, "Unfulfilled Prophecies" (PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, February 27, 1937), begins with a little

more than a column of courteous or complimentary remarks. This I appreciate. I think it should illustrate for the reader the fact that differences between us are within the bounds of Christian comity. This has always been true in private correspondence and conversation as well as in public statements. Although we differ sharply on questions of theology (eschatology) and of ethics (the separated life), I should not for the world say anything that might call in question Mr. Murray's able and courageous defense of the fundamentals of the system of doctrine taught in the Scripture.

I would not have it understood that I accept that part of Mr. Murray's words which might seem to deny that a great many premillenarians pursue the same sober and straightforward methods of exegesis which I have sought to pursue.

Now in regard to Vos and Warfield, I not only recognized that any criticism of them is on dangerous ground, but I also said, "Indeed, when one points out an inconsistency in any author one must hold himself ready to be shown that the inconsistency is really resolved in some way."

I am still waiting to be shown. I do not wish to say anything to undermine anyone's confidence in them. My whole point is that even such orthodox scholars, including Mr. Murray, do not argue against the millennium without involving themselves in contradictions and inconsistencies.

In columns two and three Mr. Murray objects to my interpretation (p. 52 f.) of Vos (p. 146 ff.)* My point indeed would have been clearer if I had included an explicit statement of the fact that Vos is here referring to Pauline vocabulary. I should also have included the following sentence from the same passage,—“His [Christ's] role is throughout that of the *terminus* upon which God's resurrective action works. . . .” Vos follows this by a list of Pauline references in which the passive of the verb “egeirein” is used of Jesus, the active of God the Father. The point is not that Vos says something contrary to a word of our Lord, but that he seems to imply that Paul does, which is far worse. Vos in the same context says, “The creative aspect of the act [resurrection] standing in the foreground, this is what we should naturally expect.” Vos does not expect Paul to ascribe creative activity to Christ, in spite of John 1:3 and Hebrews 1:2. The sentence “Nowhere is it said of Jesus that he contributed towards his own resurrection, far less that He raised himself,” stands as an unguarded and almost unqualified description of Pauline usage. I know that Vos also believes the word of Christ recorded in John 10:17, 18. My point is that his view of the person and the role of the Messiah is disjointed and inconsistent.

My inclusion of Vos' p. 237 in the list of references near the top of p. 53 was an error due to a blunder of my own in handling my reading notes. I am surprised that this is the only real error in my booklet Mr. Murray mentioned. There must be

*Page references to Vos are all in “The Pauline Eschatology.” Italics within quotations are usually mine.

others. I discovered this one some time before I saw Mr. Murray's review. The list of references should have included instead p. 113 and p. 118. Here Vos argues that we cannot regard the “man of sin” (II Thessalonians, chapter 2) as claiming to be or acting as a Satanic Messiah, not only because the Messianic *office* is a subordinate one, but because claiming to be a Messiah “would involve abdication of his pretension to *being* God.” This can only be understood as meaning that Vos is not consistently clear on the fact that the Messiah is God in the flesh.

Mr. Murray (columns three and four) objects to my intentional reference to Vos' pp. 73, 74, and 79. It is the “whether . . . or” to which I object on Vos' page 79. One would conclude from Vos' statement that if “the Lord” is intended as a translation of “Jahweh,” it could not at the same time refer to Jesus.

The material to which I object on Vos' pp. 73, 74, is of the same nature. Vos is discussing the “coming of the Lord.” He refers to “the Lord's (God's) coming” and then informs us, “In the teaching of Jesus and particularly with Paul the terminology undergoes a *deep change* in this respect. While the description of the end-crisis as a signal *interposition* of God is never entirely in abeyance, . . . on the whole it *gives way* to that of the *coming of Christ*.” This is a “change” a “giving way,” not merely in “terminology” but in meaning and thought content, for Vos continues, “. . . this whole complex was *bodily shifted* from Jehovah-God to the Messianic circle of thought.”

Vos does proceed to say that this “. . . transference was facilitated by the attribution of the Kyrios-title to Jesus, which made it *almost unavoidable* to identify the “coming” of Jehovah-Kyrios with the advent of the Messiah.” Thus his own words ought to have reminded Dr. Vos that not only was the Kyrios-title attributed to Jesus but also the Kyrios-title *when used to translate “Jahweh”* is attributed to Jesus. Thus in Jesus as Messiah dwells all the fulness of deity. Thus the ‘deep change,’ the ‘giving way,’ the ‘bodily shift,’ the “transference” is unreal; for the coming of Christ and the coming of God, the Messianic and the Jehovah-God circles of thought with reference to the “coming,” are identical. Mr. Murray is so conscious of the nucleus of this truth that he thinks that Vos states it “on pp. 73 f.” It is interesting to hear Mr. Murray (column five) suggesting “a little careful reading of Vos at this point.”

But the accurate reader has no way of knowing by this passage that Vos admits this identity as real. Vos says “nevertheless the significance of the phenomenon [the bodily shift of the circle of thought] remains. Etc.” He then continues to argue as though the coming of Jehovah-God and the coming of Christ were two different concepts.

Mr. Murray (column five) takes exception to my remarks (p. 52) on Vos' pp. 230-232, but his summary of Vos' material is quite inaccurate. Vos introduces, as a suggestion from “recent writers,” the idea that the “provisional Messianic kingdom ‘should be looked upon as a compromise

between two heterogeneous eschatological ideas.” That Vos himself accepts this idea is indicated in what follows. Vos does reject Bousset's teaching that the “higher [non-chilastic] eschatology of Judaism is not a native growth on the soil of the Old Testament, but an importation from Babylonian (ultimately Persian) sources.” But in fighting the robbers he burns down the house. Vos says (p. 231) “This peculiar assumption [Bousset's] . . . is by no means essential to the theory [introduced on p. 230 as a suggestion from recent writers]. The *cleavage* and *heterogeneity* which mark the Jewish eschatology would invite reduction to a system quite as much if the disharmony were due to *indigenous development*, as if due to a foreign influence.” Vos in the last quoted sentence is speaking of the total Jewish eschatology including the apocrypha and pseudopigrapha. But he then proceeds to derive and explain the “cleavage . . . heterogeneity . . . disharmony” from “canonical prophetism,” in which he says, “we find a *twofold* representation, on the one hand . . . a Messianic King, and on the other hand . . . God himself, so that the *two conceptions* [,] . . . a Messianic Kingdom [,] and a Kingdom of God [,] appear at this early stage [canonical prophetism] side by side *without any attempt at harmonizing*, . . . it would seem that in this ancient [canonical] prophetic diversity, we have a *fully adequate explanation* of the origin of the two successive kingdoms.” Mr. Murray says “Dr. Vos does not argue that there is inconsistency or contradiction in canonical prophetism.” Although Vos does not use the actual word “contradiction,” I think I was justified in saying that he “apparently regards” the matter as such. “Unharmonized diversity” in the *Old Testament* (p. 232 line 34) as the source of “cleavage and heterogeneity” is expressly taught.

Let it be made clear that I would not charge Dr. Vos with being Arian in his theology viewed as a whole. I am told by those who have studied under him that the total effect of his teaching is orthodox trinitarianism. However, there is a confusion in Vos' teaching concerning our Lord in his writings on eschatology, which is very near to the heart of the amillennial error.

Mr. Murray (column six) says “We are at a loss to know what Dr. Buswell includes within the ‘Final State.’” On pages 13 to 16 I discussed this matter briefly. See especially the footnote on page 14. The content of that period described as “the end” “the day of the Lord” “the final state” “eschatological events,” depends upon the point of view.

Thayer's lexicon (p. 620) says “What ‘end’ is intended the reader must determine by the context; thus, to telos denotes the end of the Messianic pangs (dolores Messiae; see odin) in Matthew 24:6, 14, (opp. to arche odinon); Mark 13:7 (cf. 9); Luke 21:9; to telos in I Co. 15:24 denotes either the end of the eschatological events, or the end of the resurrection i.e. the last or third act of the resurrection (to include those who had not belonged to the number of oi tou

christou en te parousia autou), I Co. 15:24 cf. 23; . . ."

The phrases designating the end apart from their context should be regarded as interchangeable in extent though not necessarily so in emphasis. From the usual Old Testament point of view eventualities began when Jesus came. From the usual New Testament viewpoint, eventualities begin when Jesus comes again. See Vos' diagram p. 38. When once it is recognized that the viewpoint must be ascertained from the Scriptural context, many difficulties are avoided. "The end," or any of the several phrases used to denote that idea in the original languages of Scripture, indicates a process of logical resolution of whatever is under discussion. Thus to argue that two things which are said to occur at "the end" of something, must occur at the same point of time, is absurd unless eschatology is timeless.

Mr. Murray (column six) says, "What amillennialist, we ask, holds that the final state will be without sequence?" The answer is that no rational mind could consistently hold this view. They hold it here and they deny it there. Mr. Murray's own article illustrates the point. Just below the middle of column six (cf. column nine) he argues from Vos that the parousia is "coincident with the end" as though there is to be an end absolutely, as though the eschatological kingdom of God could not possibly contain a millennium. Toward the end of the same column he says, "What Dr. Vos is emphasizing is the properly eschatological character of the advent-complex of events." This means to me that it is Mr. Murray's idea of finality, not any "exact exegesis" which excludes the millennium from the advent-complex of events.

There is in the circle of amillennial teachers to which Mr. Murray belongs (men whom on other points I greatly respect and admire) a non-Scriptural teaching in regard to time and eternity which they admit to be a paradox, but which I declare to be an algebraic contradiction. I am supremely interested in the opinions of young men who go out from this teaching to shepherd the Lord's flock. Several of these very well educated amillennialists have argued with me that to admit that there could be a thousand years within the advent-complex of events,—that "the end" may be a logical resolution including what the plain man finds on eschatology in his Bible,—this would be "to mix eternity and time." This is not merely the opinion of graduate students, but, brethren, I find it in your writings.

I deny that Vos' exclusion of the millennium in the passages cited from pp. 316 and 246 depends solely on what Mr. Murray calls "exact exegesis." It depends very largely upon a non-Scriptural idea of finality.

This idea of absolute finality is so strong in Mr. Murray's mind that he actually refers to the events which John says (Revelation 20:7 ff. cf. also Ezekiel 38) follow the millennium, as a *postulate* of the premillennialist. Now one thing that this is *not*, is a postulate. The Bible teaches it; we believe it. It harmonizes with all the Bible has to say and with all

that we believe. But to call this teaching a *postulate* of anybody, reveals how far a priori considerations have driven a scholarly mind away from valid methods of exegesis.

Mr. Murray objects (column seven) to my comment (p. 50 footnote) on Warfield's argument with reference to the phrase "the end" (Biblical Doctrines, pp. 621 ff.) Mr. Murray says, "Now what Dr. Warfield is dealing with is not the words that may be translated by our English word 'the end' in our English version, but with the term 'the end' (Greek to telos) in its eschatological use . . . Dr. Warfield is dealing simply with the eschatological use of the Greek word to telos—singular in number and *absolute* in construction—not at all with the expressions used in the passages cited by Dr. Buswell."

There is nothing in the context to indicate that Mr. Murray is correct in saying that Dr. Warfield meant to deal with "the Greek word 'to telos'—singular in number and absolute in construction." There are several perfectly obvious reasons for stating that Mr. Murray is mistaken.

(1) Dr. Warfield as a scholar probably knew that the Greek word "to telos" does not occur in the entire New Testament in any absolute grammatical construction.

(2) Dr. Warfield as a scholar must have known that two of the passages which he cites in this context employ "telos" in the genitive with a preposition "eos telous" (I Cor. 1:8, II Cor. 1:13, 14). This is certainly no absolute grammatical construction.

(3) Dr. Warfield as a scholar would have been expected to cite his word in Greek if he had had any precise form in mind. There are many Greek words in Greek letters with correct accent marks in the pages preceding and following this passage. But he simply says "the end" in English.

(4) Dr. Warfield plainly tells us that it is "the end" as "the standing designation of the 'end of the ages' or the 'end of the world,'" which he has in mind. As a scholar he probably knew that "telos" is used only once with the word "world" in the sense of "age" or "ages," and in that case the plural is used, not the singular as Mr. Murray says, "ta tele ton aionon."

(5) Dr. Warfield as a scholar probably knew that the usual word for "end" in conjunction with "ages" or "world," is not "to telos," but "e sunteleia."

It was the idea contained in the English words which Dr. Warfield has in mind. Although I have at my elbow in my study an exhaustive Greek concordance of the New Testament which I have been using for about twenty years, it was much better to refer the reader to his concordance by citing the words "the end" in English as Warfield used them. The three passages which I cited employ three different Greek words for "end," used significantly with two words, "ages" and "days," denoting periods of time.

Mr. Murray might say that in the sentence I have quoted above he did not intend to use the word "construction." In

fact the grammatical context in his sentence may have caused him psychologically to use the word "construction" inadvertently. He might have meant to say that apart from the question of grammatical construction, Warfield used the word "the end" in an absolute sense with reference to time as a whole.

This is of course the point which I have discussed above. I feel that amillennialists inadvertently and inconsistently use the word "the end," and other such phrases, in a sense to imply an absolute end beyond which there can be no sequence. It is my contention that this use of the word begs the entire question. Not only does the New Testament actually contain no instance of the word "to telos" in an absolute grammatical construction, but I deny that the Bible anywhere uses any phrase referring to the end in any absolute sense or in any sense which legitimately rules out the millennium as a part of the eschatological complex.

It is precisely here that Dr. Warfield's syllogism breaks down. He assumes that the end is a point of time in such a sense that events which are said to take place at "the end" must be simultaneous. (See Romans 6:22 where the end "to de telos" is said to be "eternal life.")

With reference to Mr. Murray's argument at the top of column eight, let me briefly say that it seems to me the post-millennial view that the world will be entirely Christianized before the return of Christ decidedly weakens, if it does not exclude, the definitely cataclysmic, catastrophic feature of the Lord's return. Dr. Machen believed that Christ would return "and be the instrument in judging the world." Dr. Warfield would agree of course that Christ will return to judge the dead, but he would have to say that there will be very little to judge upon this world, since he argues that the world will be Christianized before Christ comes again.

In column eight (see also column two) of Mr. Murray's article I find a compliment which I cannot accept. "In his interpretation of the scope of the reference in the phrase 'all in Christ shall be made alive' in I Cor. 15:22, he feels the force of the argument for the restricted usage, that is to say that the resurrection referred to here is that of the righteous."

I cannot accept this compliment for the reason that in the passage cited Paul did not say "All in Christ shall be made alive," but Paul said, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." A scholar like Vos does not favor the inversion of the order of the words, and would not presume to change it without an explanation. He refers (p. 240) to Charles' opinion that the passage should be rendered, "As all *who are in Adam* die, so all *who are in Christ* shall be made alive," as "a possible view." On theological grounds (p. 238) Vos feels that the "all" does not refer to all mankind. I too feel the force of this theological argument, but I cannot on that account violate my sense of the obvious syntax (Vos *ibid.* p. 241 "the more usual construction") to change the order of the words. As the sentence stands the phrases "in Adam" and

"in Christ" modify the verbs and not the nouns "all," unless strong reasons to the contrary can be produced. I cannot justify as a scholarly procedure Mr. Murray's inversion of the syntactical order of the words, without informing the reader that the citation of the passage is an interpretative paraphrase and not a quotation. But this he does *four times* (columns two and eight) in full quotation marks.

Mr. Murray's argument in columns eight and nine assumes that in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians the three orders "aparache" "epeita" "eita" must be contained within the subjects of resurrection described in verse twenty-two in the words "In Christ shall all be made alive." Since I admit that verse twenty-three does not necessarily include the resurrection of the unrighteous dead, therefore he argues, the third order is excluded.

Now my point is simply that in verse twenty-two Paul introduces the subject of resurrection. Can there be any possible doubt that when he says, "Christ the first-fruits," he means the first in resurrection? But now most obviously Christ himself is not included in verse twenty-two, "In Christ all." In fact it seems rather obvious to me that verse twenty-two is not the point to which we must look for the inclusive phrase in which the three orders are to be found. This inclusive phrase is found in verse twenty-three itself. "But each in his own order." The word "ekastos" includes the three orders, not the phrase "en to Christo."

In column nine Mr. Murray again argues upon the basis of the familiar amillenarian assumption that "the end" is an absolute end beyond which there could not conceivably be a thousand years.

Paul specifically applies the victory over death described in I Corinthians 15: 50-58, to believers. This is a matter of comfort and admonition. It is indeed a great victory over death when all God's elect are alive in the presence of Christ, but it is not at all legitimate to assume that this means the last and final victory over death.

It would not be reasonable for me to argue at greater length on Mr. Murray's last criticism. I seriously believe that what he calls "inconsequential" is of considerable consequence but Mr. Murray has not grasped the consequences. In all such matters I shall merely refer the reader to the book itself.

There remains one question which I think I ought to discuss. Mr. Murray has accused me of 'gross misrepresentation' 'not deliberate distortion but serious incompetence to deal carefully and fairly with an opponent,' "gross unfairness and misrepresentation."

I have proved that in every point I have correctly and truthfully represented the opinions of those whom I have quoted.

J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR.

A Reply by Mr. Murray

Limitations of space prevent us from making as full a reply to Dr. Buswell as we had contemplated. Furthermore, it does not appear necessary, nor edifying to our readers, to enter upon a detailed an-

swer to all of Dr. Buswell's defence. We shall content ourselves with a few remarks on some salient points and leave the remainder to the judgment of informed and discriminating readers.

With respect to my criticism of his misrepresentation of Dr. Vos on p. 52f., it is not sufficient for Dr. Buswell to say, "My point indeed would have been clearer if I had included an explicit statement of the fact that Vos is here referring to Pauline usage." It was indispensable that he should have told the reader just that. He made Dr. Vos appear to say something he never said at all.

We must deny that Dr. Vos in the footnote concerned "seems to imply" that Paul "says something contrary to a word of our Lord." He is simply taking cognizance of a feature of Pauline usage, and he thinks that that is accordant with the creative character of the resurrection. Dr. Buswell may disagree with Dr. Vos in this latter suggestion, but if this is the point of his disagreement it is just precisely this that ought to have been made clear in his book. Instead something very different was done.

In the allegation with respect to sentiment almost Arian in its flavor (p. 53) Dr. Buswell acknowledges that p. 237 was an error and substitutes pp. 113 and 118. We must say a word on this new charge against Dr. Vos.

Dr. Vos is dealing there with the Man-of-Sin of II Thess. 2, and he argues against the possibility of regarding the Man-of-Sin as a pseudo-Messiah. His reason is that the Man-of-Sin is represented by Paul as assuming a role wholly inconsistent with the idea of subordination inherent in the office of Messiahship—he opposes and exalts himself against every one called God or worship. That means, in Dr. Vos' language, an "openly irreligious, antichristian state of mind." He is the "anti-religious and anti-Messianic subject *par excellence*" (p. 118).

Messiahship, on the other hand, implies a "subordinationistic function," the economic subordination every orthodox interpreter recognizes (cf. John 14: 28). So, Dr. Vos concludes, "the Antichrist-idea and the Messianic idea are at this point mutually exclusive" (p. 113). Now it is in that light that Dr. Vos' statement to the effect that the Man-of-Sin "cannot pretend to be the Messiah because that would involve abdication of his pretension to being God" is to be understood. The context determines the sense. It is, that Messiahship as such necessarily excludes the claim and pretension to the exclusive supremacy and Godship the Man-of-Sin arrogates to himself.

With respect to the discussion of Dr. Vos' pp. 230-232, we insistently remind Dr. Buswell and readers what the main point of our criticism was. It was that no intimation was given to the reader that, when Dr. Vos speaks of "compromise between two heterogeneous eschatological ideals," he is dealing with apocryphal literature. Dr. Vos does not even suggest—we say it emphatically—that "the cleavage and heterogeneity" which mark the

*Dr. Buswell in his reply has a wrong page reference. It should be p. 231, lines 30 and 31.

Jewish eschatology" is resident in "canonical prophetism." He does say that in "the ancient prophetic diversity, we have a fully adequate explanation of the origin of the two successive kingdoms" (p. 232). But Dr. Vos as an amillenarian rejects the solution offered by "the early Jewish Theology" of "this ancient prophetic diversity."* Indeed it is to the thesis that the New Testament does not place the stamp of its approval upon this solution that his book *The Pauline Eschatology* is devoted. It was a false solution, he thinks. But it was an attempt at solution of diversity. Now since a solution in terms of "cleavage and heterogeneity" was, in his judgment, false, how conceivably can Dr. Buswell continue to allege that Dr. Vos "apparently regards" "cleavage and heterogeneity" or contradiction as inherent in the "prophetic diversity"? The charge is unreasonable.

Dr. Buswell seems to be fully persuaded that our eschatology is bound up with *a priori* and unscriptural notions of finality.

Now our point with respect to finality is simply that exegesis requires us to exclude an earthly millennium after our Lord's advent. And why? Because we believe that the coming of Christ brings us to the end, that is, to the final judgment and the introduction of the new heavens and the new earth. What possible preconceived notions of finality can be bound up with that insistence? Dr. Buswell himself as a premillenarian surely believes that there will be no earthly millennium, no judgment, no cataclysmic catastrophic event, no eschatological finale after "the end," that is to say, after the complex of events bound up coincidentally with "the end" spoken of in I Cor. 15: 24. Even on premillenarian presuppositions, then, there is surely some kind of finality attaching to the events that come at "the end" when Christ delivers up the Kingdom to God and to the order of things introduced by them—some kind of finality such as, for the premillenarian, is not true of the events and order of things introduced by Christ's coming. May we not use the term "final consummation" to express it?

Now when we speak of finality and consummateness as attaching to the advent-complex of events, or when we speak of the properly eschatological character of our Lord's coming, we mean that the finality and consummateness which premillenarians themselves attach to "the end" (I Cor. 15: 24) and to the order of things ushered in by it is brought with the coming of the Lord rather than at the end of the millennium. We think so just for the reason that, in our judgment, these consummatory events are brought, in the teaching of Scripture, into coincidence with the coming of the Lord. What we mean by "coincidence" is simply what the premillenarian would mean when he would say that the resurrection of the just and their judgment is coincident with the coming of the Lord, or that the beginning of the millennium is coincident with the advent. Coincidence does not exclude sequence either on premillenarian or amillenarian or postmillenarian premises. Paul says, for example, that the dead in Christ

*For phrases in quotation marks cf. p. 232.

shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air.

We can respect much of the chiliastic exegesis but we cannot understand why Dr. Buswell hurls against us charges of "algebraic contradiction," of *a priori* and unscriptural notions of finality. Neither can we be in the least disturbed by them.

In connection with the word "the end" Dr. Buswell says that there is nothing in the context to indicate that "Dr. Warfield meant to deal with the 'Greek word *to telos*—singular in number and absolute in construction," and he proceeds to give several reasons. Well, the answer is that there is everything in the context to indicate that that is precisely what Dr. Warfield is dealing with in the passage referred to in Dr. Buswell's footnote. Dr. Warfield is dealing with I Cor. 15: 24 and its context. It is *to telos* that occurs in that passage. Dr. Warfield says, "The term (the end) is a perfectly definite one with a set and distinct meaning and from Matthew (e. g. XXIV. 6, cf. 14) throughout the New Testament, and in these very epistles (I Cor. 1: 8; II Cor. 1: 13, 14), is the standing designation of the 'end of the ages,' or the 'end of the world.'" (p. 621 f.) He is dealing with the term "the end" that occurs in the passage of which he is treating as well as in every other citation given to illustrate its use, the Greek term *to telos*—singular in number and absolute in construction.

Now what I mean by absolute in construction is what should be familiar to those acquainted with grammatical terminology, namely, that it is not construed with a genitive. It stands absolutely, grammatically speaking, not as the end of the resurrection or of the millennium or the end of anything else. It is significant that in every instance of its use as a precisely eschatological designation* with one exception (I Pet. 4:7) it stands in this construction that we may grammatically speak of as "absolute in construction."

I said also "singular in number" just because I was aware that in one passage that has eschatological significance the plural occurs (I Cor. 10: 11)—"the ends of the ages." This passage Dr. Warfield would not consider as having the same signification. That was precisely why I said "singular in number." The one instance of the occurrence of the plural belongs to a different category.

Now Dr. Warfield says that it designates the "end of the ages" or the "end of the world." When he said just that he knew well that he was not giving a translation of the use of *to telos* in construction with "the ages" or "the world" for it never occurs in that construction. Dr. Warfield was apparently using these expressions—the "end of the ages," the "end of the world"—to point out what he understood its significance or reference to be.

Dr. Warfield as a postmillenarian would believe that in this respect it is synonymous with the phrase "the consummation of the age" that occurs five times in the Gospel of Matthew. But there is in this

*As a term of eschatological destination it does occur with a genitive in construction.

discussion of Warfield no reference to the occurrence of this other phrase. The phrase "the end of the ages" is indeed a good translation of Heb. 9: 26 which Dr. Buswell cites, but there is no evidence that Dr. Warfield was alluding to that phrase as synonymous with *to telos*. The expression in Heb. 9: 26 has surely different significance even in premillennial eschatology.

The reader can now judge how much force there is in Dr. Buswell's reasons and argument.

Dr. Buswell takes me to task for the inversion of the words occurring in I Cor. 15: 22 in the clause, "so also in Christ shall all be made alive." I spoke twice of the phrase "all in Christ shall be made alive" and twice of the phrase "all in Christ." I am thoroughly aware that the phrase "in Christ" modifies the verb and is to be construed with it rather than with the "all." The latter rendering would be indefensible as translation whatever the precise meaning or reference of the clause is. I had no intention, therefore, of foisting such a construction upon the reader. I think that the reason why I rendered the

phrase in this way was considerations of euphony in English composition. If my discussion is read carefully, as also the discussion by Dr. Vos, it will be observed that the argument for the restricted reference of the clause does not rest upon the paraphrase Dr. Buswell regards me as adopting. I do regret now, however, that I rendered the phrase in this way because I do see that it is liable to create the impression that I was adopting this construction. But let me also disavow any intention of so doing.

Dr. Buswell takes umbrage at some of my characterizations of his book as a whole as well as of some of his specific arguments. He may have thought I was indulging in a personal attack and so may some readers. May I disabuse all concerned of such a notion. I am not without admiration for many excellent qualities in Dr. Buswell. But I was reviewing his book, and all that I have said has been dictated by considerations of scientific evaluation of its character. It is surely by forthright criticism, where such is necessary, that the cause of truth is to be advanced.

A SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS NEWS

Germany

THE current issue of *Der Blitz*, official publication of the neopagan movement known as "German Action," contains a striking compari-

son between the tenets of National Socialism and those of Christianity. Twenty-five contrasting teachings are presented in this graphic and highly prejudiced manner:

- | NAZI | CHRISTIAN |
|---|---|
| 1. A positive attitude toward life. | A negative attitude. |
| 2. Awareness of self. | Consciousness of guilt. |
| 3. Pride. | Humility. |
| 4. Physical culture. | Self-castigation. |
| 5. Wrestling for new knowledge. | Reliance on opinions as old as mankind. |
| 6. The seeing mind. | Blind faith. |
| 7. Devotion to race and people. | Reverence for the idea of mankind. |
| 8. Mastery of earthly life. | Absolute priority for religious ideas. |
| 9. Devotion to the "people's community." | Devotion to the hereafter. |
| 10. Vigorous fulfillment of professional duties. | Absolute submission to the Church. |
| 11. Self-reliance. | Dependence on divine grace. |
| 12. Readiness to fight. | Peace at any price. |
| 13. Energetic rejection of all that is bad. | Unconditional tolerance. |
| 14. Revering of blood and soil. | Denial of blood and soil. |
| 15. Standing up wholly for people, pride and family. | Predominance of Church interests over all ideas. |
| 16. Unity of people. | Doubt in faith. |
| 17. Culture of race. | Muddling of race. |
| 18. Elimination of the eugenically unsound. | Equal rights for the eugenically unsound. |
| 19. Birth increase of eugenically valuable elements. | A fight, through celibacy, against an increase in these. |
| 20. Rejection of Jewry as hostile to the people. | Recognition of the Jews as the chosen people. |
| 21. Rejection of the ancient Hebrew tribal god Yahweh. | Adoration of Him as the Supreme Being. |
| 22. Freedom of creed. | A coercive creed. |
| 23. Reliance upon the senses. | Religious speculations. |
| 24. Joy in living. | Fear of life. |
| 25. Confidence in mastering life through one's own efforts. | Distrust of the man in one's self, because of the burden of original sin. |

The anti-Semitism of the Nazi creed is forcefully demonstrated by a recent issue of Julius Streicher's Jew-baiting journal, *Stuermer*. In it the editor asserts categorically that Christ was not a Jew, that He spent His active life fighting the Jews, and that His fundamental purpose was to prevent a Jewish world revolution. "Jesus was born into this world full of Jewish deviltry, hatred and lust for blood," the article declares. "He created a religious movement mild to non-Jews, but ruthless against the Jews." Adolf Hitler appeared at a crucial moment, the paper adds, to prevent another Jewish attempt to seize world mastery through revolution.

On March 23rd the Nazi government declared a truce in its battle with evangelical Protestants. Apparently the quarrel with Roman Catholics was occupying all of Minister Hans Kerrl's thoughts, and he felt it necessary to free himself from further controversy with the confessional church. Accordingly he issued a decree reconstituting evangelical church governments as they existed prior to February 15th, when Chancellor Hitler ordered a general synodical election. In spite of the decree the nine imprisoned pastors of Luebeck were not released and confessional synod leaders viewed the plan with skepticism.

That their fears were well founded is shown by the fact that, on the day before Easter, the secret police raided the Berlin business offices of the confessional synod and confiscated thousands of pamphlets containing a message that was to have been read after Easter services in the evangelical churches. The message contained particular reference to the persecution that Christians are suffering at the hands of the Nazis, and mentioned pastors and other supporters of the confessional movement who have been sent to prison. A warning concerning the forthcoming election was implied but not specifically stated, and the gag imposed by the government on the religious activities of the laity was roundly denounced.

Russia

EMELYAN YAROSLAVSKY, president of the League of Militant Godless, has demanded intensification of anti-religious propaganda to halt the new drive of the church,

which has received its impetus from the adoption of the new constitution which guarantees a certain type of freedom of religious worship. Frankly admitting that his anti-religious campaign is losing ground in many places, President Yaroslavsky outlines, in the official magazine, *Bolshevik*, a four-point program to be immediately adopted: 1) Publication and distribution of mass anti-religious literature must be intensified; 2) newspapers and magazines must devote more attention to anti-religious propaganda; 3) anti-religious museums and libraries must be supported by all; and 4) new anti-religious propagandists must be trained.

According to Yaroslavsky's statistics about 50 per cent. of the adult population of the Soviet Union is still under the influence of the church, while 30,000 churches still remain open. Christians may well question these highly desirable but very improbable figures.

In the new Soviet Constitution many have seen in good faith the end of the struggle against church and worship, for protection of religious conviction is expressly guaranteed in the new project. This in no sense means that a change has come about in the attitude of official circles towards church and religion, or that the time of persecution is past. This explanation cannot be supported either by the facts or by the official interpretation of the law. The attitude of the Soviet Union remains completely the same as before. Religious conviction has always been officially protected by the law. The object of the new policy can therefore be rendered thus: Those responsible must carry on with the eradication of church and religious life, though they must not thereby injure too greatly the religious conviction of the people. Stalin has said "Why should one be actively unmerciful? One must explain the harmfulness of religion to the young with patience, and supply them with propaganda for a materialistic outlook as the only scientific one!" Communist patience will, in the future, be set against Christian and religious patience. But the extirpation of church and religion is still the purpose.

In this connection it is interesting to note that, in the last century, several evangelical movements existed in Russia. These were partly brought

together in the All-Russian Band of Evangelical Christians by the engineer, I. S. Prochanow, and in 1926 numbered 6,000 parishes in Soviet Russia. This movement sends traveling preachers out and has a great publishing establishment. The preaching goes under the motto: "From town to town, from village to village, and from man to man." Most of the preachers are working-men and peasants who go forth in their free time, namely, in the long winter months. The Prochanow group has been heard in wide circles and also among the clergy of the Orthodox church, and hence the movement obtained its character of an evangelical reformation, influencing the whole people. Prochanow, who continually sought contact with the Western Church, died in 1935. He entrusted the carrying on of his work to five people, to which Pastors Kroeker and Jack, directors of "Light in the East," also belong. This League has at present organized departments in ten countries and scattered groups in eighteen more. Periodicals are published in Russian, Polish, Bulgarian and English.

France

WHAT is tantamount to the establishing of an Orthodox Church of the Western Rite has just taken place in Paris with the reception of the body known as the Catholic Evangelical Church of France into the Orthodox fold under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The result is to achieve almost the exact counterpart of the Roman Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite by means of which Rome has established its jurisdiction over Slavonic peoples who have tenaciously held to their form of worship while agreeing to accept the papal jurisdiction.

Of greatest significance are the terms of the reception. It is not required that these parishes adopt the Eastern Orthodox form of worship, but they may retain their own, with certain specific adjustments required by doctrine rather than formal liturgical considerations. Thus the general structure of the Mass remains essentially as in the Roman Church although celebrated in the vernacular of the parish (French, Dutch, Italian), communion is given the laity in both elements, and the Head of the Russian Church is given the place of

primary mention in the prayers for the Church.

The newly received body will not have a bishop of its own for the present but will be under the administration of the Metropolitan Elevation who, while Orthodox Bishop of Lithuania, retains his connection with Moscow and is the representative in Europe of the Moscow Patriarchate.

NEW CHURCH ORGANIZED AT YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Cincinnati Congregation Aids Kentucky Mission Chapel

THE first regular service of the Providence Presbyterian Church of Youngstown, Ohio, was held on Sunday, March 14th, at the home of the Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell, 808 Delaware Avenue. The church was formally constituted on the Sunday preceding the first service, and was received into the Presbytery of Ohio on March 9th. This is the fifth church to be admitted to Ohio Presbytery.

At the organizational meeting ten persons signified their desire to join the church. Mr. L. W. Shaw was elected an elder by the group. Until a suitable building can be procured the members plan to meet regularly each Sunday in the home of Mr. Mitchell.

In order that those unfamiliar with recent actions in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. might gain a better understanding of the doctrinal position of the new church the following statement was issued to the local press:

Our group of Presbyterians just organized in Youngstown as Providence Presbyterian Church of The Presbyterian Church of America is one of a steadily growing number over the country to take similar action for similar convictions. Our convictions are, first, that the orthodox Presbyterianism of the Westminster standards is just as valid today as it has always been. Second, that those standards, though still the professed constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., have been fundamentally rejected by that church.

The whole foundation of that constitution is an unqualified acceptance of the Bible as the infallible Word of God. The U.S.A. Church has rejected this foundation doctrine and thus nullified its solemn constitutional engagements in its amazing actions and decisions of recent months.

Trinity Presbyterian Church of Cincinnati is now assuming responsibility for half of the salary of the Rev. J. L. Shaw, who directs the Trinity Chapel in Newport, Kentucky. The chapel is located in a district hard hit by the recent flood devastation, and Mr. Shaw is actively engaged in the vital work of rehabilitation. Contributions in money and wearing apparel are still being received and used to great advantage. The refugees are returning to their homes but the process of restoration is long and difficult.

On March 8th the Cincinnati church organized a missionary society which expects to promote an aggressive campaign for the arousal of missionary interest during the coming months.

FEDERAL COUNCIL PREPARES FOR NEW PREACHING MISSION

PLANS for a return engagement of the National Preaching Mission, duplicating or even surpassing the super-colossal demonstration of the past season, are now being mapped by the modernist-dominated Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. To reach areas thus far spared it is planned to visit 22 additional cities.

The new Mission will open in Denver April 15-18 and will visit Minneapolis, St. Paul, Oklahoma City, Cincinnati, Shreveport, La., Nashville, Richmond, Quincy, Ill., Jacksonville, Fla., and other cities during the year.

Many of the missionaries used last Autumn will participate this year in these additional missions. Among the preachers will be Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones, Detroit, President of the Federal Council; Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, New York, Vice-President of the Federal Council; Bishop William Scarlett, St. Louis, Mo.; Bishop Ralph Cushman, Denver, Colo.; Mrs. Grace Sloan Overton, Harlan, Ind.; Mr. George Irving, New York City; Dr. D. W. Kurtz, Chicago; Dr. Douglas Horton, Chicago; Dr. Oscar Blackwelder, Washington, D. C.

Several internationally-known clergymen will participate, including Dr. Adolf Keller, Geneva, Director of the Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid and leader in Protestant Church movements in Europe.

Meanwhile, plans for a Canadian

federation of all Protestant churches, as drafted recently by the Ministerial Association of St. Thomas, have been sent to the heads of the Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and United Churches, the Salvation Army and the Church of Christ (Disciples).

Fashioned somewhat after the plan of the Federal Council of Churches in the United States, the proposed union would provide for "the setting up of some coordinating council, so that in matters of common interest we may have the means of expressing ourselves, through one voice, which could speak for the Protestant Church of our country."

The proposed federation is viewed by some as a means to formulating a united front of all Protestant bodies on social questions, such as war and temperance, and for national evangelical work. By others, who recognize its anti-Christian character, it is viewed with alarm.

WESTMINSTER GRADUATES GREATLY APPRECIATED ON FOREIGN MISSION FIELD

Southern Baptist Missionary Praises Work of Appointees Under Independent Board

FRRIENDS of Westminster Seminary and The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions will be gratified to learn of the hearty appreciation expressed by a missionary of the Southern Baptist Church for the work of the Independent Board missionaries in Manchoukuo, two of whom are graduates of Westminster Seminary. Writing from Harbin, Manchoukuo, this missionary says:

"Our missionary community has grown greatly in the past few months. The seven sent out by the new board (the Independent Board) are at present living in Harbin, and they are truly God's gift to this great mission field at this time. We welcome them with all our hearts, and sympathize with them in the passing of their great leader, Dr. Machen. The seven are all working together for the three peoples so closely related here: Manchurians, Japanese, and Koreans. God is already blessing their work, which greatly encourages them."

ROCKEFELLER PLAN FOR COMMUNITY CHURCH IS BACKED BY MINISTERS

A PLAN for the unification of eleven Tarrytown (N. Y.) churches, proposed on March 7th by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was tentatively endorsed two weeks later by nine of the ministers who would be involved in the merger. The plan as proposed by Mr. Rockefeller, chief financier of the notorious Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, would unite the stronger churches of the vicinity and absorb the weaker. To some it seemed strangely reminiscent of the methods that pyramided the Rockefeller oil interests.

In offering his plan Mr. Rockefeller said:

"If it were the wish of the majority of congregations here represented, could not experts be called in to whom there might be put this question: 'Suppose there were no organized churches in the Tarrytowns today, but that there were large numbers of Christian people of various denominations who were ready to give up the non-essentials which have divided them in the past and unite in a single fundamental belief in God's love and Christ's living spirit. How could these Christian forces best be organized and made cooperatively effective, so that the church might become a vital force in the lives of all those who live in these communities?'"

Referring to the "experts", Mr. Rockefeller added:

"They would then select from among the various church plants now in existence those most modern and best adapted to present-day needs. They would suggest that the religious work of the communities be carried forward in those churches by the cooperative efforts of the various denominations.

"They would recommend that the other properties be disposed of and the proceeds used for the financing of the new projects."

On March 23rd a general theory of church unity was endorsed by nine Protestant clergymen of the Tarrytown vicinity, but they avoided taking definite action on the Rockefeller proposal. "We pledge ourselves," they

said, "to continue not to allow any personal interest to stand in the way of church unity in the Tarrytowns. We believe that any real church unity must come from the people and we pledge ourselves to give any leadership which our churches may desire."

Christians realized that it is a foregone conclusion that Biblical Christianity would have no place in the merger.

PROGRESS AND BLESSING REPORTED BY FAITH CHURCH OF TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

The Rev. Bruce A. Coie to Be
Installed as Pastor

THE recently organized Faith Presbyterian Church of Trenton (N.J.), although only a few weeks old, has already taken its place among the most active and enthusiastic congregations in The Presbyterian Church of America. After completing an eminently successful week of pre-Easter evangelistic services those who had previously signified their desire to join the church were received into membership on Easter morning. A recently inaugurated prayer meeting service boasts the attendance of almost every member of the church, and the entire congregation has consistently manifested a spirit of true Christian devotion and loyalty.

At a congregational meeting held on Monday, March 15th, the members voted to call the Rev. Bruce A. Coie to the pastorate of the church. Mr. Coie was prominent in the organization of the group and has been supplying the pulpit regularly. The church was received into the Presbytery of New Jersey on March 19th and the pastoral call was placed in the hands of Mr. Coie. The installation service will be held on Friday, April 2nd, at 8 p.m. in the church building at 159 East Front Street, Trenton. The Rev. William T. Strong, of West Collingswood, is expected to give the charge to the pastor, and the Rev. Leslie A. Dunn, of Columbus, will deliver the charge to the congregation. The Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper, of Westminster Seminary, has been asked to preach the sermon.

Three elders have been chosen by

the congregation: Mr. Milton A. Campbell, formerly of Princeton's Second Church; Mr. Hugh M. Reed, octogenarian elder who formerly served in the Second Church of Trenton; and Mr. William Hoogstrate, of Morrisville, Pennsylvania.

Excellent publicity and wide propaganda have been secured for the church through the publication in the Trenton *Times* of a series of illuminating and cogent articles written by Ruling Elder Milton A. Campbell. The corporate curiosity of Trenton's churchgoing population is thus being effectively aroused.

PRESBYTERY OFFICIALS TRY TO BREAK UP MEETING IN CHURCH DECLARED "EXTINCT"

EMULATING the tactics of the Hitler Elite Guard eight representatives of the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. swooped down on the congregation of the Susquehanna Avenue Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia on Wednesday, March 17th. On January 27th the church had renounced the jurisdiction of the old denomination.

In the van of the attack were Auburn Affirmationists George Emerson Barnes (moderator of the presbytery) and Edward B. Shaw.

By adopting the simple tactics of running faster and shouting more loudly than could the pastor, the Rev. James W. Price, the presbyterial representatives managed to gain the pulpit and drown out the protests of gentlemanly, soft-spoken Mr. Price. Apparently the fact that they were disrupting a service for the worship of God meant nothing to them. The congregation refused to listen and protested vigorously against the continued annoyance of the intruders' presence. The protests, however, were entirely ineffective. Moderator Barnes merely spoke in a louder voice. Finally, in desperation, the young people grouped themselves at the piano and began to sing. The entire congregation joined them, and at long last the presbyterial double quartet was drowned out. Mr. Price was then able to persuade them to leave the platform. To the credit of these representatives of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. it must

be pointed out that neither machine guns nor tear gas were used at any time.

Apparently this surprise attack was the outcome of a meeting held by the Presbytery of Philadelphia on March 15th, at which time the Susquehanna Avenue church was ordered to appear and show reason why it should not be immediately dissolved. Since the church was no longer under the jurisdiction of that body it, of course, ignored the order. Presbytery thereupon adopted a series of resolutions declaring that the church was dissolved and had "thus become extinct." Full power to carry out all the resolutions was vested in the Presbyterial Council which, being a recently created and thoroughly un-Presbyterian monstrosity, did not hesitate to act promptly.

NEW JERSEY PRESBYTERY RECEIVES TWO CHURCHES AND ELECTS OFFICERS

MEETING on March 19th in the Borough Hall, Barrington, church home of the Grace Presbyterian Church, the Presbytery of New Jersey of The Presbyterian Church of America elected its officers for the coming year. The Rev. Alexander K. Davison, of Vineland, was chosen moderator; the Rev. J. U. Selwyn Toms, already serving as stated clerk was held to continue under the three-year rule recently adopted; and Mr. Ralph Ellis was elected treasurer.

The Calvary Presbyterian Church of Amwell and the Faith Presbyterian Church of Trenton were welcomed into the presbytery, and the pastor of the latter church, the Rev. Bruce A. Coie, was received by letter from the Presbytery of Philadelphia. A pastoral call from the Faith Church was placed in Mr. Coie's hands by the moderator.

In response to a request from the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Wildwood and its former pastor, the Rev. Leonard S. Pitcher, the relation between them was dissolved and a letter was issued transferring Mr. Pitcher to the Presbytery of the Northwest. Mr. Pitcher will assume charge of a church in Seattle, Washington. Mr. Davison was appointed to declare the Wildwood pulpit vacant and to moderate the session of the vacant church.

E. STANLEY JONES CALLS FOR UNITED CHURCH ON EVE OF EMBARKING FOR INDIA

DR. E. STANLEY JONES, prominent Modernist missionary and exponent of church unity, stated that he wanted his "last word to be one of unity" before he left the United States on his return trip to India. "How," he asked with a naïve irrelevance, "can we expect the nations of the world to get together when we denominations have no unity?" Dr. Jones spoke at the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas at a farewell meeting tendered him by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Dr. Jones, who had just returned from a cross-country tour as end-man of the National Preaching Mission, declared that "a united impact of the churches is needed to bring about a spiritual re-awakening in this country and throughout the world."

The type of pseudo-Christianity which Dr. Jones' united church would promote would, of necessity, be a kind of test-tube Christianity, compounded of the forced fusion of irreconcilable and mutually exclusive concepts. An assertion of belief in the divinity, not the deity, of Christ might reasonably be expected to be the sole doctrinal statement upon which the protagonists of this monstrosity would be able to agree.

"The belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, is what united us; it would be the basic doc-

trine of the Church of Christ in America."

Dr. Jones said obscurely that the chief obstacle to church unity is that "we have apparently a God-given separatism in the divine inspiration of God to the founders of the various denominations."

But this, he continued, is not enough. The hour has come for a synthesis of these scattered truths.

"When we drop below the level of church organization," he said, "to the level of experience the Christian Church is united. The Christian Church is at once the most united and the most divided institution, the most united at the center and the most divided at the margins.

"God sometimes works through the denominations; sometimes despite them but always for the good of all of them. The theory of denominational superiority is as dead as Queen Anne. We are one; we should act as one. We should outwardly express through some corporate unity the message of united Christendom."

Dr. Jones summed up his plan in three words: unity, equality and diversity; unity of the Protestant denominations in the Church of Christ in America, equality of all the denominations as branches in the United Church and the right of diversity of thought by the component branches.

True Christians see in Dr. Jones' proposals nothing that even remotely resembles Biblical Christianity.

APPOINT NEW MISSIONARIES UNDER INDEPENDENT BOARD

THE Executive Committee of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, meeting in Philadelphia on March 22nd, appointed Mr. Cary Nelson Weisiger, 3rd, and his fiancée, Miss Elizabeth W. Forbes, for missionary service in India. They expect to sail in August. Mr. Weisiger is a member of the Senior Class in Westminster Theological Seminary.

At the same meeting the Executive Committee, at his own request, removed the name of the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., from the membership of the Board. Dr. Smith, in a letter addressed to the General Secretary, declined the re-election which was voted at the last annual meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Creed of Our Fathers	1
AN EDITORIAL	
The Confession of Faith	3
Chapter I	
How Westminster Seminary Trains Men	4
Leslie W. Sloat	
The Creation of the Heaven and the Earth	6
Edward J. Young	
Spurious Godliness	7
David Freeman	
Studies in the Shorter Catechism	8
John H. Skilton	
The Sunday School Lessons	11
Edward J. Young	
Two Communications from Dr. Buswell ..	12
A SURVEY OF NEWS	16