

The Presbyterian Guardian

February 27, 1937

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 10

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

GODLINESS AND CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

QUESTIONS like those as to the propriety of a Christian's use of tobacco or of wine have often been raised by Christians in America, and, as only a little knowledge of church history shows, the answers have been far from unanimous. Notably in the tradition of Methodism the answers have been in the negative while Presbyterians have generally recognized that such practices are permissible. Among Presbyterians, even where there has been a strong inclination, for one reason or another, to the practice of total abstinence, commonly there has been a free recognition of the rights of other Christians to follow the dictates of their own consciences in matters where the Bible has not pronounced judgment.

In recent months our attention has been attracted to a number of utterances, both public and private, which, appealing for "the separated life," seem to advocate the historic position of Methodism rather than that of Presbyterianism. One may recognize in these statements, and be enthusiastically thankful for, a zeal for holiness and godly living. If there is one matter on which we ought to be agreed, it is that there shall be an earnest concern for purity of life as well as of doctrine. No one can exaggerate the importance of adorning our confession of Christ with a life which shall not dishonor Him. Moreover, there is cause for rejoicing in the evidence of a recognition of the fact that the Scriptures are a rule of life as well as of faith, and that, consequently, no one may profess to love the Word who does not love its precepts and warnings as well as its promises and manifestations of grace. Nevertheless, it is our conviction that in some very important particulars the plea for a "separated life" errs seriously in its understanding and application of the Word of God. The purpose of this editorial is not to

discuss or criticize any one of the utterances which have been referred to, nor to review them as a whole, but only to set forth some of the principles of the Bible which, in our opinion, seem to be widely neglected or misunderstood.

OUR STANDARD OF APPEAL

The only standard of our judgment in these matters must be the Holy Scriptures. Not by way of appeal to tradition, whether to Pietism or Methodism, nor to the particular characteristics of any temporary situation, but only by appeal to the unchanging truth of God's Word can one hope to arrive at the correct view. As Protestants we have gloried in the liberty from the doctrines and commandments of men which is grounded in recognition of and obedience to the unique authority of the Bible. At the very heart of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, as of every true reformation, there has been the recognition of the supreme authority of the Bible:

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 (*Confession of Faith*, I: 10).

On some matters the Bible is very plain. No one can have any doubts as to the terrible implications of the following characteristic statement of the Bible:

Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God (I Cor. 6: 9f.).

Other judgments, or positive calls to duty, while not expressed in a "Thus saith the Lord," may be deduced "by good and necessary consequence" from the Scriptures, and we insist that such principles of conduct are

absolutely binding. Where the will of God is "clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other," the Christian's only choice and the way of true liberty is to obey. There can be no doubt that sinful practices engaged in under pretence of Christian liberty are an abomination in the sight of God. (See *Confession of Faith*, I: 6 and 7; XX: 2 and 3.)

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

On the other hand, if God alone is Lord of the conscience, it is a matter of grave consequence for any one to judge a brother in a matter where the Scriptures give liberty either expressly or through silence. Paul warns the Christians in Corinth against going beyond the things that are written (I Cor. 4:6). Where God has not spoken, it is utter presumption for one Christian to legislate for another. Accordingly, in recognition of an area of liberty in matters which the Bible does not determine, Reformed teachers of ethics have historically recognized certain practices as belonging to the *adiaphora*, that is, the things which are not sinful in themselves. If a thing is not sinful in itself, it is a grievous fault for a Christian to insist that his own course of action in this particular is the only proper course of action or that it represents a higher kind of morality. While the Scriptures do recognize various degrees of sanctification, they give no support to the notion, which has been particularly influential in Roman Catholicism, that above the ordinary morality there is a higher "religiousness" or "perfection" which only a few can be expected to attain.

WORLDLINESS

In illustration of our thesis, the matter of worldliness may be considered. The Bible condemns worldliness in no uncertain terms, and sets over against it the claims of godliness.

I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service. And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God (Romans 12:1f.).

But is it possible for one Christian, or for any group of Christians, to sum up under three or four heads the practices which a Christian must refrain from in order to show that he is living a separated life? In view of the complex nature of our relations to the world, is not great caution demanded lest we set up our own practices as the will of God for others?

World-flight, monasticism, asceticism do not provide escape from worldliness. Paul demands that God's gifts be received with gratitude, and shows his impatience with the ascetics who came with their human ordinances: "Touch not, taste not, handle not!" (cf. Col. 2:20ff.: I Tim. 4:1-5). We are in the world, and obviously must

have much in common with the life of the world. We depend on the world's newspapers and radios; we read the world's books and hear the world's music. At this point we would not be understood as defending the sanctity of worldly institutions. Rather our thought is that the multiplicity of our contacts with the world constantly presents the challenge of walking circumspectly and with fear and trembling lest we who are properly not of the world, and have been delivered from this present evil world, should fail in our spiritual service. Our principal objection to "the separated life," defined as the refraining from three or four worldly practices, is not that it sets too high a goal but that it falls far short of the Biblical conception of godliness as a complete devotion to the service of God, which is set forth, for example, in the verses which have been quoted from Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

THE USE OF WINE

With regard to the use of wine, it appears to us that many Christians of our day have not read their Bibles aright. The Bible is severe in its condemnation of excess. No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God. *Very evidently the Bible was written in a time when men were wont to go to excess as well as today.* Consequently we do well to observe closely what the Bible teaches as to man's duty in the presence of excess. The important thing to note in this connection is that the Bible nowhere teaches us to refrain from the use of wine. Its warnings are exclusively against excess. Paul tells the Ephesians not to be drunk with wine (5:18), but does not even hint that the way to avoid excess is the way of total abstinence. Our Lord certainly knew of the excess of His day. Indeed He was charged with excess himself.

John the Baptist is come eating no bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, he hath a demon. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! (Luke 7:33f.).

And our Lord turned large quantities of water into wine at the wedding in Cana of Galilee. Consequently, it is a serious reflection on our Lord to hold that moderate drinking inevitably leads men into a life of drunkenness, as Dr. Buswell seems to do in his recent book on *The Christian Life*, p. 88. Is it not enough that a disciple be as his teacher, and a servant as his Lord?

Appeal is sometimes made to the order of the Nazirite (Numbers 6) and to the approval of the Rechabites (Jer. 35) as evidence of a divine disapproval of the use of wine. Indeed, in the work which has just been cited we read that these instances of abstinence "are evidently intended to prepare for a fuller teaching on the subject" (p. 85). In view of the complete absence of such "fuller teaching" in the Bible, and the clear teaching and example of our Lord, are we to suppose that this fuller

teaching is something beyond the teaching of our Lord and that of the rest of the Bible? Moreover, the appeal to these specific instances of abstinence as representing a higher standard of conduct is only as plausible as the conclusion that the Nazirite vow not to use a razor and the Rechabite practice of not building houses present higher ideals of morality.

Let no one conclude that we hold a brief for the modern liquor traffic, or that we have a light view of drunkenness. Nor are we concerned to encourage any one to drink wine to vindicate his Christian liberty. Nor are we arguing against abstinence, if any one prefers abstinence. It is quite possible too that some individuals may have to abstain entirely if they are easily led to excess. Our times certainly call for serious warning, as the Bible seriously warns, against the perils of drinking. On the other hand, we cannot express too emphatically our deep concern to oppose the judgment that it is a sin under every condition today for Christians to drink wine moderately. As we are zealous to guard the honor of our Lord, we cannot fail to oppose any judgment of the use of wine which would make our Saviour responsible for leading men into a life of sin.

THE USE OF LIBERTY

The Bible condemns intemperance, therefore, but clearly allows a use of things which are not sinful in themselves. But of course the last word has not been said when this phase of Christian liberty has been set forth. The question that remains to be discussed is the question of the significance of Paul's teaching concerning expediency and the need of edification. We are keenly aware of the great significance of passages like Romans 14 and I Corinthians 8 and 10. In these chapters the principle is clearly laid down that we must always walk in love with a view to edification, not wounding the conscience of a weaker brother, and so causing him to stumble, through an inexpedient use of our rights.

In various ways, however, this principle is often misunderstood in part or misapplied. For example, there is often confusion as to what Paul means by causing a brother to stumble. We have heard men call upon a Christian to restrict his use of liberty in a particular way merely on the ground that they were offended by their brother's conduct. This interpretation of Paul can result only in the exaltation of selfishness and pride. By giving offense or causing to stumble the Bible does not mean to characterize an action which happens to displease another, but rather such an action as shall directly be the occasion of a brother's fall into sin. That clearly is Jesus' meaning when He taught that no price is too great to pay—not even an eye or a hand—if eternal issues are at stake (Matt. 5:29f.; 18:6f.). In the foreground therefore is a concern for the salvation of souls. Denying

emphatically that he was a menpleaser, Paul nevertheless teaches that he subordinated his own personal interests that men might be saved (Gal. 1:10; I Cor. 10:33).

THE WEAKER BROTHER

Further, greater attention needs to be given than often appears to be the case to the kind of person Paul has in view when he speaks of a weaker brother. In neither of these great passages from Romans and I Corinthians is Paul dealing directly with the question of excess in the matter of eating and drinking. Rather he is dealing with the situations which developed in the early Christian communities in connection with the use of "unclean" food and "things offered to idols." Through faith in Christ the believer has been delivered from the bondage of the ceremonial law and from the powerless and beggarly elements of heathenism (cf. Gal. 4:8-11). But there were babes in Christ who had not come to a true knowledge of the liberty which belonged to them in Christ, and they were in danger of looking upon the eating of certain foods as involving disobedience to the Old Testament or as a compromise with heathen idolatry. So when they saw other Christians exercising their liberties, they might be induced to "defile their conscience" and so fall into sin. Their consciences are described as "weak," that is, as uninformed as to the liberty in Christ (I Cor. 8:7). Obviously Paul is not commending a weaker brother for his weakness. No one dare therefore make his own weakness the basis for the judgment of another. Nevertheless, the strong must consider the weak who are in danger of falling.

In dealing with weaker brethren Paul does not *in every instance* call upon Christians to sacrifice their liberty. To the Galatians he wrote that they should stand fast in the liberty with which Christ had set them free, and this whole epistle is concerned to show that to have yielded to the Judaizing Christians in their demands that all Christians be circumcized would have resulted in the destruction of true Christianity. Clearly there are times when it would be a sin not to exercise one's rights. In this situation at least it was expedient and edifying not to yield for a moment.

But Paul, on the other hand, does clearly teach that a Christian *in certain circumstances* must be ready to refrain from the use of his rights if that use imperils the salvation of his brother, and that in these circumstances the precise course of action adopted must be the course that will result in the edification of the brother. Since expediency can be appealed to only with respect to matters with regard to which the Bible permits liberty of choice, there can be no law of expediency. That is to say, no general rule can be established as to what love for one's brother may determine as wise and edifying. In the absence of a divine commandment, the responsibility for

the use which a Christian makes of his rights belongs not to the church nor to any other person but only to himself. Otherwise, love for one's neighbor loses its essential character through the introduction of the element of compulsion.

The burden of our plea then is not for an indiscriminate assertion of one's rights nor for any one particular course of action rather than another. Let love prevail! Through the power of the Holy Spirit and in the light of the Word love will dictate what use shall be made of

one's liberty. Oftentimes, the situation will demand that we refrain from the exercise of our rights. At other times, it may call for immediate instruction of our brother in the truth in order that his conscience may be informed and strengthened. In every instance we must keep before us the goal of the salvation and the edification of men's souls through our testimony to Christ. And let us take care that our testimony to Christ be to the Christ of the Bible. Jesus said, "Blessed is he, whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me" (Luke 7:23).

Karl Barth on Creation

By the REV. CORNELIUS VAN TIL, Ph.D.



Dr. Van Til

WE have seen in a previous issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN (Jan. 9, 1937), that though Karl Barth calls men back to the *Word of God*, he does not call men back to the Bible as Protestants are wont to think of the Bible. In the present article we shall see that Barth cannot believe in the Bible as the completed revelation of God because he cannot fully believe the doctrine of creation.

The story has frequently been told how the philosophy of Hegel and the theology of Schleiermacher has largely controlled the modern church. The sovereign God of the Reformers was eclipsed by a God who is *necessarily* instead of *freely* related to the universe. God was well-nigh identified with ideal principles in the universe. The immanence of God within the universe was stressed at the expense of His transcendence above the universe.

Now Barth launched a fearless attack on this immanentistic theology which we usually speak of as Modernism. He set fire to the whole structure of modern theology. He called upon men to return to the transcendent God, to the sovereign Lord, to God as the "absolutely Other." He called upon men to forget their pride, to cast away their schemes of interpretation, and to fall prostrate before the face of the "Lord of life and death."

Shall we not rejoice in this work of Barth? We certainly shall. We do not seek to save even the least bit of the house of Modernism. Yet we are once

more afraid that Barth thinks he cannot burn down the house of Modernism unless he also burns down the house of orthodoxy.

The Importance of the Creation Doctrine

It requires little argument to show that without such a doctrine as creation the house of Protestant theology falls to the ground. Man is dependent upon and responsible to God just because God has created all things and by His providence controls all things. If there is any ultimate power or principle beside God, man's final responsibility is no longer to God alone. If there is any ultimate power or principle beside God, the definition of sin can no longer be "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." If there is any ultimate power or principle beside God, Christ cannot execute His office as a prophet because in that case He does not know all things; He cannot execute His office of a priest because, even if He reconciled us to God, there would be other powers to be reconciled; and He cannot perform His office of a King because He does not control all things. In short, historic Christianity falls to the ground without the doctrine of creation.

What Barth Says About Creation

Yet Barth virtually rejects the Biblical doctrine of creation. In saying this we are aware of the fact that it is quite possible to quote Barth to the effect that he believes in creation. If we should go to Barth, notebook in hand, and ask him whether he believes in creation he might say, "Certainly I do." He could quote from one of his latest books saying: "Again heaven

and earth are not God's work in the sense that God created them according to some *ideas* in themselves given and true, or out of some *material* already existing, or by means of some *instrument* apt in itself for that purpose. Creation in the Bible sense means: Creation solely on the basis of God's own wisdom. It means, *creatio ex nihilo* (Rom. 4:17)." Or again: "The world having once been created by God (apart from sin!) cannot obviously cease to be determined by this decisive act" (*Credo*, pp. 32, 33).

Limitations on the Doctrine of Creation

Now these quotations would seem to indicate plainly that Barth is thoroughly Biblical, as far as the creation doctrine is concerned. How then dare we say that Barth has virtually rejected the Biblical doctrine of creation? The answer is that we are compelled to do so because Barth, by certain qualifications that he makes, in effect takes back everything that we have just heard him say. "But," says Barth, "the doctrine of Creation has its definite *limits* which have got to be known if that doctrine is to be rightly understood" (*Credo*, p. 35). A little further he adds: "There are definite and necessary *questions* of faith which are not to be answered from the doctrine of creation, or at least not unequivocally and completely" (*Credo*, p. 36). These "questions of faith" include "the possibility of" sin, evil and death. Barth concludes this section by saying: "In order to keep true to the facts, Dogmatics has here, as in other places, to be logically inconsequent. Therefore in spite of the *omnipotence* of God—or rather on the score of the

rightly understood omnipotence of God, Dogmatics must not at this place carry the Creation-thought right to the end of the line. It must rather explain these possibilities as being such that we have indeed to reckon most definitely with their reality, but are unable better to describe their real nature and character than by forbearing to ask for their *raison d'être* either in the will of God the Creator or even with Marcion and the Manicheans in the will of a wicked Anti-God. These possibilities are to be taken seriously as the *mysterium iniquitatis*" (*Credo*, p. 37). To this we must add Barth's words: "Projecting our thought 'consequently' along the line of the creation dogma, we should have in one way or another to deny the Incarnation, Miracle, prayer, the Church" (*Credo*, p. 38).

The Significance of These Limitations

From these quotations it appears that Barth, in order to protect God from being the author of sin, thinks it necessary to *limit* the creation doctrine. He says not merely that we, as human beings, cannot *understand* how a creature of God, wholly dependent upon God, can become a sinner, without God being involved in sin, but he says definitely that the idea of sin is *in reality* inconsistent with the idea of creation. So too he does not hesitate to say that the Incarnation is *inconsistent* with the idea of creation. Orthodox theology says that a creature became a sinner, without God becoming involved in sin. Barth says, in effect, that this is not possible and therefore we must hold that there is an original evil independent of God.

The Paradox-concept

At this point some one may object by saying that though Barth considers "creation" and "incarnation" inconsistent with one another, he can and does believe both because he thinks it quite possible to believe the inconsistent as the "paradoxical." But this escape, granted it were an escape, is not open to Barth since he himself says we must *limit* the creation doctrine in order to believe in the Incarnation. Often enough Barth says you can both have your cake and eat it, but at this point he says you *cannot* have your cake and eat it. If you wish to believe in the Incarnation, says Barth, you must *limit* your creation doctrine. We are compelled to affirm therefore that Barth has virtually rejected the doctrine of creation.

Other Emphases in Barth

This interpretation of Barth is in accord with the fact that Barth constantly connects the "Lordship" of God with redemption. Apparently Barth thinks that God was not "Lord" of man by virtue of creation.

In accord with this interpretation, too, is Barth's constant insistence, par-

ticularly in *Romans*, that the world as such is inherently evil. Barth refuses to take the Genesis account of an originally perfect creation and of the fall of man as being simple narration of fact (*Credo*, p. 190). Orthodox theology holds that man as such, and the whole of the universe as such, was originally made perfect but that sin entered as the willful disobedience of man. In opposition to this Barth holds that no one historical event can be of basic importance for all following historical events, and therefore, in effect, denies the fall. For the fall he substitutes some original "mystery of iniquity."

It will readily be seen now why Barth cannot accept the Protestant doctrine of Scripture. According to his philosophy man was not originally created perfect. Man and the universe that surrounds him are, for Barth, inherently evil. Accordingly, even God Himself, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, could not use the human mind as a medium for the expression of His truth. The "human factor" in the Bible must always and of necessity indicate error and sin. There could never be a completed revelation of God to man.

And this leads us in conclusion to observe that with all of Barth's best intentions to call men back to the sovereign God of the Reformers he has in reality no "sovereign" God to offer us. Barth's "sovereign" God is severely limited by an original something that exists independently of Him, and works independently of Him. Barth frequently appeals to the Reformers and to such Reformation documents as the Heidelberg Catechism. But Barth could not preach, for example, on the first question of the Lord's day of that catechism without twisting it completely out of its natural and historical meaning. If his sermons do not flagrantly depart from the Reformed Faith, it is because, by a happy inconsistency, they do not reflect and apply Barth's theological principles fully. Only Reformed theology, based upon the doctrine of a really sovereign God, creator of heaven and earth, whose decrees include "whatsoever comes to pass," can bring men to a real *Entscheidung* (decision). Against Barth, as against modern theology which he seeks to oppose, we must once more raise the banner of a sovereign God and of His complete revelation in Scripture.

The Machen Memorial Fund

ON TUESDAY, February 16th, the Machen Memorial Fund Committee set as its goal the sum of at least one million dollars, to be used to provide funds for buildings and endowment for Westminster Theological Seminary.

The committee elected the following officers: Chairman, the Rev. Edwin H. Rian, President of the Board of Trustees of Westminster Seminary; and Secretary, the Rev. A. K. Davison, Pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church, Vineland, N. J., and alumnus of the class of 1931. The chairman was given power to appoint a sub-committee of three to five members, of which he himself should be one, to prepare plans for raising this fund and to report to the committee at its next meeting on Monday, March 8th.

The faculty, the Board of Trustees, the alumni, the student body and the friends of the seminary are represented on the Machen Memorial Fund Committee.

Said Mr. Rian: "The Machen Memorial Committee is appealing to everyone who believes in the Bible as the Word of God to help to establish an enduring memorial to Dr. Machen and to the gospel which he preached, defended and loved."

Dr. Buswell's Premillennialism

A Review by JOHN MURRAY

UNFULFILLED PROPHECIES by J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., President, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 95 pages.



Mr. Murray

THIS is the last of a series of five volumes on the general theme, "The Lamb of God." As the title suggests, the theme of this volume in the series is eschatology. Dr. Buswell's thesis is, however, largely devoted to the establishment of the premillennial advent of our Lord, in other words, the millennial reign of Christ over this earth after His second advent. The volume is therefore to a large extent polemic, and being polemic is to a very considerable extent taken up with the refutation, as Dr. Buswell conceives it, of both the postmillennial and amillennial views of our Lord's return. In a volume of this size, accordingly, he could not fairly be blamed for the omission of certain topics on which issues might not, at least directly, be joined.

As a polemic in favor of the premillennial view there are some things that are to be said by way of commendation. Many of the fantasies frequently associated with presentations of premillennialism are conspicuous by their absence. Furthermore, to Dr. Buswell belongs the credit of recognizing that belief in and the hope of the personal visible return of our Lord is not the peculiar property of premillennialists. Too often premillennialist writers give the impression that belief in the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ is to be identified with the premillennialist construction of the blessed hope. They have sometimes in their statistics included in their lists of premillennialist advocates those who were not premillennialist at all but who, nevertheless, in truly Christian fashion thrust the hope of our Lord's coming into the foreground of their teaching. Dr. Buswell is too well-informed to fall into such misrepresentation.

Again on some details of particular exegesis it is gratifying to find him

much more careful and less dogmatic than many others who believe in the millennial reign. For example, in his interpretation of the parable of the leaven, though he himself rather strenuously argues that the evidence warrants us in regarding leaven here as the symbol of evil, nevertheless he is at least willing to "admit that we are on debatable ground" (p. 25). 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. We are also gratified to find that he takes Rev. 21 as a vision in symbolic terms of the consummate state—the new heavens and the new earth. Several other details might be mentioned. But these few will serve to illustrate.

After all that we might sincerely say by way of commendation the distressing fact remains that our review will very largely have to be adversely critical. In general Dr. Buswell's polemic is for premillennialism; ours must be against it. But our criticism in this particular case is forced to take on a peculiar form. We have in mind some of the methods by which Dr. Buswell tries to advance and establish his thesis.

Misrepresentations of Opponents

Dr. Buswell says in his preface that "when one attempts to disagree with such distinguished scholars as Warfield and Vos, one must realize that he is on dangerous ground." To Dr. Buswell must be conceded the right to criticize any other man but we wish that in using this right he had followed his own warning. The first virtue of a controversialist is to be fair to his opponent. Dr. Buswell grossly misrepresents both Dr. Warfield and Dr. Vos but particularly the latter.

On pp. 52f. he quotes from Dr. Vos' *Pauline Eschatology*, which reads: "Of Jesus Himself it is said that He was 'raised' ('waked') implying the same relationship of activity on God's part. The creative aspect of the act standing in the foreground, this is

what we should naturally expect. Nowhere is it said of Jesus that He contributed towards His own resurrection." And then in answer to Dr. Vos, Dr. Buswell proceeds to say, "And yet our Lord said, '... I have power to lay [my life] down, and I have power to take it again.'"

Now this represents Dr. Vos as saying something directly in conflict with a word of our Lord, and that would surely be calculated drastically to prejudice Dr. Vos' reputation as a Bible believer and therefore by direct implication his reputation as an exponent of Biblical eschatology.

But what has Dr. Buswell done? He has wrenched part of Dr. Vos' footnote on pages 146ff. out of its context and makes Dr. Vos appear to say something he never said at all. What Dr. Vos is doing in that footnote is to make "a few linguistic remarks on the Pauline usage of speech concerning the resurrection" (*italics* ours). In other words, he is discussing *Paul's usage* with respect to the two Greek words *anistanai* and *egeirein* as applied to the resurrection of Christ. Dr. Vos no more than the Apostle Paul even suggests any denial of the other truth expressed by our Lord (John 10:17, 18) and quoted by Dr. Buswell.

Then Dr. Buswell proceeds to attribute to Dr. Vos sentiment that is almost Arian in its flavor. "Sentiment which is almost Arian in its flavor is also found in this same work on pages 73, 74, 79, and 237" (p. 53). This may appear a very effective way of showing the unreliability of his opponent. But let us see what the facts are.

As we turn to page 237 in the work of Dr. Vos cited we find that the whole of this page is devoted to an exposition of the premillennial construction of I Cor. 15:23, 24. If this page then contains sentiment that is almost Arian in its flavor, it is the view that Dr. Buswell himself espouses that must be Arian in its flavor. We wish we had space in which to quote the whole page in order to show the complete falsity of the allegation.

The only part of page 79 to which Dr. Buswell can possibly be referring is that which occurs at the bottom of the page with reference to "the day of

the Lord" in the Pauline Epistles. It is a rendering, Dr. Vos observes, of the Old Testament phrase, "the day of Jehovah." He concludes that there is doubt in some passages whether "the Lord" in the phrase be meant as the Greek translation of Jehovah or signifies the Lord Jesus. Of course, where the name "Jesus" stands in apposition or the pronoun "our" is appended doubt is eliminated. When Dr. Vos says there is doubt in connection with some passages he is not in the least suggesting that the attributes of Deity are not to be predicated of our Lord. It is simply a question of personal designation.

It is common knowledge to every student of Paul that the name "God" is sometimes used absolutely to designate the Godhead, sometimes it is used as the personal name of the Father in distinction from the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the title "Lord" is often used as the personal name of Jesus the second person. This usage of Paul in no way detracts from the essential Deity of the second person of the Trinity.

It is just a very similar observation that Dr. Vos is making here in connection with the title "Lord." It is a question whether in the phrase, "the day of the Lord," the title "Lord" is a personal designation of the person Jesus or whether the title "Lord" is used more absolutely to designate what we call "the Godhead." Arian flavor is simply out of the question.

We come finally to pages 73 and 74 on which sentiment "almost Arian in its flavor" is again alleged to be found. In this very passage Dr. Vos alludes to "the attribution of the Kyrios-title to Jesus," and anyone aware of Dr. Vos' masterly contributions to Christology, especially his *opus magnum*, *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, knows what significance, for Dr. Vos as for all orthodox interpreters, this attribution bears. What Dr. Vos (on pp. 73f.) is doing is to show that the whole complex of ideas associated with the coming of Jehovah-God in the Old Testament is in the teaching of Jesus and particularly of Paul predicated of the coming of Jesus. Dr. Vos indeed is not dealing here directly with the establishment of the Deity of Jesus, but he is nevertheless in thoroughly characteristic fashion drawing to our attention one of the most momentous pieces of evidence that to the mind of Paul, saturated as it was with the Old Testa-

ment concept of the coming of Jehovah, all the prerogatives and attributes of Jehovah are recognized as present in Jesus. We think that a little careful reading of Dr. Vos at this point and some appreciation of the principle of progressive revelation that underlies his treatment of Biblical Theology as well as of the momentous facts with which he is dealing will show that, so far from the sentiment being almost Arian, the whole drive of the argument just as of the evidence is in the totally opposite direction.

So we see what becomes of Dr. Buswell's allegation that "Vos' amillenarianism appears confused because of his failure to recognize that our Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah is 'God in the flesh' and may be addressed in terms of deity" (p. 51). Dr. Buswell is guilty of pitiable distortion and misrepresentation of a scholar who has done more than perhaps any other now living in the defense of the essential Deity of our Lord, and that upon the basis of the most exact and penetrating exegesis and apologetic. We do not accuse Dr. Buswell of deliberate distortion. He has, however, shown himself seriously incompetent to deal carefully and fairly with his opponent.

On page 52 Dr. Buswell quotes from Dr. Vos' *Pauline Eschatology* (p. 230) with the purpose of showing that Dr. Vos suggests that the idea of a millennial kingdom is the result of "a compromise between two heterogeneous eschatological ideas." Here Dr. Vos is again wrested from his context. What he (Dr. Vos) says is that "it has been suggested by recent writers" that the conception of a provisional Messianic Kingdom "should be looked upon as a compromise between two heterogeneous eschatological ideals." And besides Dr. Vos in the context is dealing with apocryphal literature, not with the Old Testament or with the New. However much of heterogeneous eschatological ideal might be found in apocryphal literature Dr. Vos does not argue that there is inconsistency or contradiction in canonical prophetism. There is indeed diversity, but that diversity is in reality, especially when the light of New Testament event and interpretation shines upon it, a marvellous harmony. The quotation given by Dr. Buswell on pages 51f. from *Pauline Eschatology* (p. 232) is part of an argument by Dr. Vos in defense of premillennialism against the

allegation of Bousset that Chiliasm is derived from pagan sources.

The Final State and Sequence

Under the caption "The Final State not Timeless" (p. 48-51) he accuses Dr. Vos of inconsistency and avers that "it is only when arguing against the doctrine of the millennium that Vos is inconsistent with his view of 'vistas of realization within the final state.'" We are at a loss to know what Dr. Buswell includes within the "Final State," whether it includes for him the millennium or whether it begins with the final judgment and consummation. But in any case he accuses the amillenarianist of being likely to hold the view that the final state must be timeless without sequence. What amillenarianist, we ask, holds that the final state will be without sequence? Dr. Vos, in the very quotations he (Dr. Buswell) has given, makes it abundantly clear that "Paul clearly . . . projects the idea of perceptible duration into the life beyond,"* and that the word hope "becomes suggestive of still ulterior vistas of realization within the final state" (cf. p. 49). There is no incompatibility between this and Dr. Vos' insistence, on the other hand, on the basis of exact exegesis of Paul that the *parousia* of Christ is coincident with the end and with the realization of what, in terms of I Cor. 15: 50, is the eschatological Kingdom of God. What Dr. Vos is denying is the possibility of intruding a temporal millennium provisional and preparatory to the final state subsequent to the second coming of Christ. He does not make this denial at all on the basis that there is to be no succession or that there are to be no vistas of realization subsequent to the Lord's advent, but on the basis that the second coming and the complex of events which accompanies it introduce us to the consummate state, a state the terms of which a provisional Kingdom cannot satisfy. What Dr. Vos is emphasizing is the properly eschatological character of the advent-complex of events. There will be no later eschatological finale, an eschatological finale such as the premillennarian must, in the

*Dr. Vos is, however, very careful to remind us at this point of the distinction that would have to be drawn between time in the terrestrial form, inseparably connected as it is with the great astral movements, and the perceptible duration that may be projected into the life beyond (cf. pp. 290f.).

nature of the case, introduce after the millennium. Dr. Buswell appears to have failed to get the point of the amillenarian (and for that matter of the postmillenarian) in this debate. May we repeat that no amillenarian we know nor Dr. Vos in particular suspends an attack upon the premillenarian on the ground that the final state must be a state of abstraction without sequence. What the amillenarian in common with the postmillenarian affirms is that it is impossible to interject into "the age to come" any eschatological crisis such as the premillenarian postulates after the millennium. This the amillenarian affirms on the basis of the consummatory character of the second advent and of the complex of events bound up and concomitant with it, as well as on the basis of the finality and consummateness of "the age to come."

Under this same caption Dr. Buswell tries very summarily to dismiss Dr. Warfield's cogent argument (*Biblical Doctrines*, pp. 621ff.) that the term "the end" is a perfectly definite one with a set and distinct meaning . . . the standing designation of the 'end of the ages' or the 'end of the world.'" Dr. Buswell says in reply that "a simple concordance study of the words 'the end' in their eschatological use in the New Testament would show the fallacy of this assumption. See for example Heb. 1:2; 9:26; I Cor. 10:11." (p. 50, footnote.)

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. Apparently Dr. Buswell was using his English concordance and so fell into the unscholarly error of thinking that a citation of passages in which the word "end" or "ends" occurs in English constitutes a refutation of Dr. Warfield's contention. The fact is that none of the passages cited by Dr. Buswell is relevant to the question. No! 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. In none of these passages cited by him does the phrase in question (Greek *to telos*) occur. We still think Dr. Warfield has argued with "the stringency of a syllogism." Dr. Buswell has not answered the argu-

ment. He has simply created the impression on the minds of the uninformed that he has very summarily demolished Warfield's contention. The impression is, however, entirely contrary to fact.

Dr. Buswell appears to be seriously mistaken as to what supernaturalistic postmillenarians believe as to the nature of the second coming of Christ. On page 43 he very distinctly creates the impression that only the premillenarians and amillenarians believe in the "cataclysmic catastrophic nature" of our Lord's return. This is not fair to the postmillenarian. What he quotes with approval from Dr. Machen's book, "What is Faith," Dr. Warfield and all supernaturalistic postmillenarians would wholeheartedly endorse. Every such postmillenarian as well as amillenarian believes that at Christ's return II Pet. 3:10-12, for example, will be fulfilled, and surely that is cataclysmic and catastrophic.

Dr. Buswell's Exegesis

We have space left for only one example of the exegesis by which Dr. Buswell supports his chiliastic scheme. It is his treatment of I Cor. 15:23, 24. As mentioned already he feels the force of the argument that the "all in Christ" of verse 22 can refer only to believers. He himself indeed feels that Paul here referred to the total resurrection of all who have died. Nevertheless he concludes by saying: "Whichever interpretation of I Cor. 15:22 the reader may feel led to adopt, the fact is very plain that Paul is referring to the future resurrection of some or of all who have died because of Adam's sin" (p. 67). But he proceeds with his discussion on the basis of three orders of resurrection. We wonder how he can do this if uncertainty remains as to the scope of the phrase, "all in Christ shall be made alive." The third order of the resurrection must surely on his own scheme be the resurrection of the wicked after the millennium. How can he have this third order of resurrection unless he is sure that those affected by that resurrection are included in the "all" mentioned in the second part of verse 22? The premillenarian who insists that the "all in Christ" is all-embracing is, we think, much more consistent here than is Dr. Buswell.

He does not appear to have grasped the force of the arguments of both Dr. Warfield and Dr. Vos in his treatment

of the whole passage in I Cor. 15. Their central argument in the refutation of the chiliastic exegesis is that in I Cor. 15:23-28 the subjugation of the last enemy death is coincident with or immediately prior to "the end," when Christ shall deliver over the Kingdom to God. Then again in I Cor. 15:50-58 this same victory over death, when the saying that is written "Death is swallowed up in victory" shall have been fulfilled, is coincident with the resurrection of the just. If, therefore, in the one passage the subjugation of the last enemy, death, is coincident with "the end" and in the other coincident with the resurrection of the just, "the end" and the resurrection of the just must also be coincident. This surely follows on the principle that two things coincident with the same thing must be coincident with one another. In this way "the coming of the Lord" and "the end" are brought into the closest conjunction with one another, and it becomes impossible to intrude a millennium between "the coming of the Lord" and "the end." The reign of Christ spoken of then in I Cor. 15:24-26 must cover the period prior to the second advent, and must therefore be conceived of as having begun with the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Dr. Vos appeals to passages like Col. 2:15; Rom. 8:38, 39; Phil. 2:9-11 as demonstrating that Christ is now as a result of His resurrection and exaltation invested with the Lordship and dominion that thoroughly satisfies the terms of the reign spoken of in I Cor. 15:24-26.

Dr. Buswell's answer to the last mentioned interpretation of Dr. Vos is quite inconsequential. He says that the victories spoken of in Colossians and Romans are victories already accomplished, whereas the victories spoken of in I Cor. 15:25, 26 are still in the future. They cannot therefore, he says, be the same. But the assumption that the victories spoken of in I Cor. 15:25, 26 are *all* in the future is purely gratuitous. Some of them, of course, are. One at least is—the victory over death. But that Paul has only future subjugations in view in that passage is not so certain. What he says is that Christ must reign till he hath put *all* enemies under His feet; till He will have put down *all* rule and *all* authority and power. And again can we be certain that in Rom. 8:38, 39 there is no reference to victories that Christ is even yet to secure for His people, the

guarantee and pledge of which is enclosed in the victory already secured in His resurrection?

But suppose we allow that the victories in Colossians and Romans are victories already accomplished and also that the victories of I Cor. 15:25, 26 are still in the future, this in no way interferes with the main point of Dr. Vos' argument. He appeals to these passages in Colossians, Romans and Philipians (he might, we think, have cited others also) to show that Christ is represented as reigning now, and the reign that he exercises now in virtue of victories already secured, a reign to be consummated in the subjugation of all rule and authority and power at his *parousia* (advent), satisfies all the requirements of the reign of Christ spoken of in the Corinthians passage. Yea, more! In view of the close conjunction and concatenation of the victory over death and the *parousia* it is the only reign that can satisfy. In Dr. Vos' words, "The last enemy that is brought to nought is death. The conquering of the other enemies, and consequently the reign of Christ consisting in this, precedes the conquest of death. Now Paul makes the conquest of death coincide with the *parousia* and the resurrection of believers. According to vs. 50-58, when the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are changed (*i.e.*, according to vs. 23 at the *parousia*), Death is swallowed up in victory. And still further, apart from this specific argument, a more general argument can be built on vs. 50-58, because it is there implied that the resurrection of the righteous and the very last 'end' fall together. The apostle here speaks throughout in terms of absolute consummation" (Vos, *Pauline Eschatology*, p. 245).

Dr. Buswell's eschatological position is much saner and therefore more defensible than that of many premillennarians. We are sorry to say, however, that the little book by which he has set it forth is exceedingly disappointing. It is characterized by gross unfairness and misrepresentation, and his exegetical argumentation is frequently very inconsequential. Looseness and carelessness are, we fear, the rule rather than the exception.

We should have hoped that we might be able to recommend this booklet as a fair and reasonably scholarly presentation of the premillennial view. We do not have the happiness to be able to do so.

Hitherto the Lord Hath Helped

A Meditation on the Ninth Psalm

By the REV. DAVID FREEMAN



Mr. Freeman

GOD'S goodness and deliverance in the past furnishes occasion for praising Him. With what assurance do they come to the throne of grace, who rejoice in what He has done for them!

And what child of God is there who cannot say, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped me"? They are indeed as dead who do not praise God.

There are many for whom God has worked bountifully. They are ashamed not to acknowledge God, but it is not long before they are singing their own praise and personal triumph. Yea, they may be seeming to praise God, since His name is upon their lips, but if they rob God of a portion of it, they are only pretending to give it to Him. How easy it is to extol our own policies and ways with the name of the Lord Most High! Do men not know that with their sacrilegious arrogance they are defacing God's glory?

Sincere praise looks for its all in God's grace. It will rejoice only in what God does. It knows that there is no such thing as *chance* with the Lord. All things are before His presence, and because He is pleased to intervene in our behalf we are victorious.

God a Defender

The Lord is a mighty Vindicator of those who love His cause and ways. His judgments are not partial, but He has pledged Himself to execute judgment upon all those who oppose the righteous. God, without waiting, takes the side of those who hold steadfastly to His Word. Let this be a warning to all who are given to misrepresentation and falsehood. God is set against all such. If they take God to be their ally, they should know that He helps only those who fight under His standard. A good cause only will He defend.

His Arm Not Short

When all is black before us and only destruction seems to be ahead, then are the faithful to look up to the throne of grace. But suppose the Lord does not let us see His hand in our distress. Then are the godly to take hold, with

the hand of faith, of God's revealed will and purpose as it concerns them. He will not be lacking regarding His promises to them. God rules in righteousness and cannot deny Himself.

Are you tempted to forsake God, when Heaven is silent? Be assured that God is only waiting His own time to show Himself strong in your behalf. With God a thousand years is as one day. He is never behind in helping His children, but only permits us to know grief that we may the more readily acknowledge His help. God often purposely puts us into the position of making our crying unto Him seem vain. But in the end it will be His delight to show how precious the righteous are to Him by a mighty deliverance. Only let us not measure God's help by our own understanding, for then are we hopeless and miserable creatures.

What more can a believer desire than God's fatherly favor? Of this he is amply assured in His Word. Can it be grievous for a child of so gracious a Father to be counted as poor and needy in the eyes of the world? Has he not, by his profession of God, renounced the world and its hidden things of darkness, and taken God for his sole portion?

"Only Trust Him Now"

Yea, God is not far off from those who call upon Him. He is the more ready to help when affliction is at its height. And He does help, as all of God's children witness in every age. Having come through our distresses with patience, He has taught us the more to trust His grace. Who are the humble in God's sight, but those who, through many trials and afflictions, bear patiently the cross laid upon them? These know nought of presumption.

All men should thus trust God and adore their Maker who has revealed Himself in His beloved Son. But they do not choose to retain Him in their knowledge. Because they do not know Him as their Saviour, they do not confide in Him.

Men may forsake Him; He never will forsake those who love their Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. LESLIE W. SLOAT

March 7th, Life Here and Hereafter Through Christ. John 14:1-15.



Mr. Sloat

LET not your heart be troubled. Ye believe in God. Believe in me also.

In this discourse in the upper room, Jesus more plainly reveals His true nature than He has ever done before. In the opening verse, probably spoken after a brief silence following His statement about Peter, Jesus states the meaning of His being "Son of God." The disciples are to put their trust in Him in exactly the same fashion as they trust in God. Since God is one, and there is none who can claim equality with Him, Jesus here asserts His own participation in the Godhead in the plainest of terms. They are to look upon Him as they look upon God. Whatever may happen in the near future, their faith is to rest in Him personally. Only in such a recognition of His true nature, and in such a faith, would they be able to endure the period of His death, and more definitely the period after He would be taken from them. He was in all things equal to God. Their hearts need not be troubled.

In the house of my Father are many abiding places. If it were not so, I would have told you, for I go to prepare a place for you.

Having raised their thoughts to a consideration of His true deity, Jesus now proceeds to a contemplation of the future heavenly home. The Father's house refers to Heaven in general. We are not to think of localities but of conditions. When one is with God in the fullest sense, one is in the Father's house. This is the condition of believers after death, though the principle is already true even before death. The significant thing is the very multiplicity of places. There will be plenty of room there for us. There was no room at the inn for Him, when He came here. But though there are many places, there is only one place for each of us. Heaven will be no mere mass of individuals, but a condition

of perfect order, each in his own place, fitted and prepared for him. The task of ordering the arrangements of heaven, and preparing the place for those who shall come, belongs to Jesus. His participation in the Godhead is the necessary condition of His doing this. Notice how Jesus passes over the question of His approaching death, and looks beyond to the end of these things. He is simply going back to the Father's home,—where He naturally belongs.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again and will receive you unto myself, that where I am, there you may be also.

After preparing a place for His own, Jesus will see to it that they arrive at the appointed "mansion." Notice that Jesus centers everything in Himself. He goes, He prepares the place, He receives unto Himself, and the goal is that they may be where He is. And as Jesus looked beyond the experiences on this earth to His home, so His disciples were to look beyond the tribulations that would affect them, to that haven beyond the stars. His going there was the guarantee of their safe arrival. Their hearts need not be troubled. His coming to receive them, as mentioned here, refers as well to the death of the believer, as to the yet future second advent. Both are in view.

And where I go, ye know the way. Thomas saith to Him, We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?

Jesus emphasizes the way to the goal. Thomas desires information about the goal itself. Normally human beings have to know where they are going, in order to know the way to get there.

I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life. No one cometh to the Father except through me.

Of all persons who have ever walked this earth, Jesus alone could constantly speak of Himself, and be justified. And the frequency with which He does so, indicates that the religion Jesus gave to His disciples was from the very beginning a religion about Himself. The person of Jesus consti-

tutes the heart of the Christian faith, according to Jesus Himself. The present verse abundantly illustrates this, as does this entire section.

In Jesus Christ the Divine Son of God dwelt among men in a full human nature. Only so could men, who are human beings, see and know the Son of God. His assumed humanity was therefore the visible manifestation, in as far as there could be a visible manifestation, of His real divine nature. This human nature—this flesh—was thus the means to the divine. In the death He experienced, salvation was obtained for us. Jesus thereby became the "way" into the presence of the Father. All persons approach God only through that sacrifice. Likewise, as His human nature set forth the divine Person in visible form, He was the Truth. And further, as it is only through our union with Him that we receive that Life which enables us to experience the fellowship with God, He is the Life. And, finally, since the Persons of the Trinity are the same in substance, and equal in power and glory, through the Son we come to the Father. And there is no other way to the Father than this.

If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also. From henceforth ye do know Him, and have seen Him.

A true knowledge of the Son of God manifest in human form carries with it a knowledge of His divine nature and a knowledge of the very Godhead itself. The Persons of the Trinity are not to be thought of as so separated that one can be known apart from the others. The Trinity exists in unity. On the basis of the clearer revelation that Jesus is now giving, the disciples are henceforth to understand this, and in Jesus they are to see the Father.

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.

Philip's request for an appearance of God is met by a rebuke based on the very thing of which we have been speaking. In such a real sense are the Father and the Son one that the seeing of Jesus is the seeing of the Father. Proof of this, if the mere statement of it from this Man is not enough, is provided by the works He has done. If for no other reason, at least on the basis of the works let us believe in the Son.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, he also shall do the works that I do, and greater works

than these shall he do, because I go to the Father.

As the Father and the Son are one so, through faith, the individual becomes one with the Son. As evidence of this there is manifest in and through that believer the power of God in doing those things which the Son did. But, as many believers constitute a much larger "body" of the Son of God than our Lord Himself possessed, so the extent and field of workings of the believers are that much greater than the field and work of the Son while He was here. These greater works are not material, as miracles, but spiritual; in releasing the dynamite of the gospel over all the world. But once again these works are wrought out really by the power of the Son, in whose name alone we can ask anything of God. And being done by the Son, they are to the glory of the Father who is in the Son, which is the end of all creation.

So, throughout this whole passage, Jesus is showing His disciples what it means that He is Son of God, and on the basis of that arousing their faith in Him for time and eternity.

March 14th, Jesus Praying for the Disciples. John 16:5-7; 17:14-26.

BUT now I go to Him who sent me, and none of you asks me, Where are you going? But because I have spoken these things to you, grief has filled your heart. But I tell you the truth, it is better for you that I go away, for if I go not, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you.

Jesus has just told the disciples of the trials which will face them after His departure. It was not a pleasant picture — persecutions, hatred, even death at the hands of those who think to do God service. Thus it has frequently been true that the worst persecution of believers has been carried on by those who claimed to be serving God. This outlook naturally caused sorrow to the disciples. But Jesus urges them to look beyond these things to the future. They are to think of Him as He will be in glory, overruling the world to the accomplishment of His purposes. They are to think of the glorious fact that they will share this blessedness with Him. They are to think of the glorious fact that His going away will mean the coming of

the "Paraclete," or Advocate, the One who is called alongside to comfort, strengthen, and defend — the Holy Spirit of whom mention has already been made. The disciples are to lift their eyes up to things above, not fearing the wrath of man or the wiles of Satan, but living in straightforward loyalty to their Saviour and Lord.

17:14-26. This passage forms the concluding part of the so-called "high priestly prayer" of our Lord. In it Jesus intercedes for the disciples, and for all who shall believe on Him. It might almost be called "a study in prepositional phrases," for certain brief phrases, identical as to wording but differing in meaning according to the context, are frequently repeated.

I have given them thy word, and the world hated them, because they are not of the world, as I am not of the world (14).

It is the Word of God which reveals the relationship of men to the world. Those who abide in the Word are separated from the world. And as men abide in the Word, they are hated of the world, for the world is at enmity with God and all that comes from God. For our salvation Christ gave Himself. For our sanctification He gave the Word. The relation of the believer, who according to his spiritual nature has been begotten of God, is the same in respect of the world as that of Christ, who was likewise the only begotten of God, but with human nature.

I ask not that thou wouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shalt keep them from the evil (One) (15).

Here we have a description of the true separation of the Christian. He is not separated from the world with respect to space, but with respect to moral relationship. As a ship he sails upon the sea of the world, doing his business in that medium which is his present dwelling place, but so controlling himself that the sea which is the world does not get into him, which would make shipwreck of his life.

Sanctify them with thy truth. Thy Word is truth (17).

Here Jesus establishes the standard which governs the separated life. Sanctification is by the truth, which is the Word of God. To say that the Word of God is not a sufficient standard, to set up other standards of holiness than those it gives, is to establish man rather than God as the rule of

life. Likewise to fail to go the whole way with the Word is to repudiate the Word that has been given. Here the Reformed Faith holds absolutely to the teaching of our Lord, in its declaration that the Scriptures are the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Here is the standard of conduct. Of some things it speaks in particular. Of some things it speaks only by inference or through the establishment of principle. But God will sanctify His people not according to what they think is right, but according to what He has determined to be right. It is this for which our Lord prays.

And on behalf of them I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified by truth (19).

The high priest must himself be sanctified and cleansed before he can make offering for the sin of the people. The Lord Jesus had no sin from which He needed to be cleansed, so that His whole life of righteousness was a preparation for the offering of the one sacrifice for the sins of many. Here again is an exceeding great principle. Too often ministers, Sunday School teachers, and others are careless about their own conduct while claiming to be interested in the conduct of their people. Thus ministers stay in apostate churches or denominations because they fear what would happen to their churches if they left. Far better that they look to their own sanctification according to His Word, and let the care of their congregations rest in His hand. God will honor the congregation of whom the minister seeks first to honor Him. Christ said, For their sakes I sanctify myself.

And not for these only do I ask, but also concerning those who shall believe on me through their word, that all may be one. . . .

Now Jesus lifts His eyes to the wider realms of the Church that is to be, the entire group of those who are to believe. And His prayer is for absolute and essential unity among true believers. He is not urging unity between believers and the world, nor is He urging any organizational unity, but He is urging the higher unity of the faithful in spiritual fellowship. That unity of believers is comparable to the unity which exists between the Father and the Son—two Persons, yet of the same substance and equal in power and glory. So the believers all having been begotten of God, are members of the one family of His,

members of the Body of Christ. The outward evidence of this union will be love one to another. By this shall all men know that believers are disciples of Christ and children of God.

Father, that which thou hast given me,—I will that where I am they also may be with me, in order that they may behold my glory, which thou gavest me because thou didst love me before the foundation of the world (24).

Finally Jesus pierces the future, and expresses to the Father His will for the believers with respect to their ultimate glorification. But this He describes from the point of view of their

looking upon His own eternal glory. In that time we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. That which the Son possesses, and that which He asks, are based upon the Father's love for Him, an eternal love apart from the existence of the world.

25-26. The closing part of the prayer illustrates the perfect harmony between the Father and the Son—a fellowship of knowledge which the world did not understand. This knowledge, imparted to and received by the disciples, will result in the love of God dwelling in them, and through that Christ Himself.

cattle, and herb for the service of man; that he may bring forth food out of the earth" (Psalm 104: 14).

See also Matthew 6: 30; 10: 29; Job 37: 6-13; Chapters 38-41; Psalm 135: 5-7; Psalm 147: 8-18; and Job 9: 5, 6.

God's control, according to the Bible, extends over the animal creation. In His hand is the soul or life of every living thing (Job 12: 20).

"Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them" (Matthew 6: 26).

See also Acts 17: 25; Psalm 104: 21-29; Psalm 147: 9; and Matthew 10: 29.

The Scriptures further teach that God controls nations.

"He ruleth by his power forever; his eyes behold the nations; let not the rebellious exalt themselves" (Psalm 66: 7).

"He changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings and setteth up kings" (Daniel 2: 21).

"The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Daniel 4: 25).

See also Isaiah 10: 5-7, 12-15; Daniel 4: 35; Job 12: 23; I Chronicles 16: 31; Psalm 47: 7.

The Bible also makes it clear that God controls history. It would be profitable for us to make a brief review of Biblical history to note God's government. See Acts 17: 26; Romans 9; 13: 1.

God, so His Word tells us, controls even that which might seem to be subject to "chance." "The lot is cast in the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord" (Proverbs 16: 33).

MATTERS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. *What attitude toward God should be induced by the doctrine of providence? Should it make us humble, reverent and devoted to Him? What influence should it have on us in our joys and sorrows, in all our difficulties?*

2. *Give examples of God's control of history, sacred and profane. Do predictive prophecy and its fulfillment indicate anything about God's government?*

3. *Assign to various members of the Young People's Society periods of Biblical and profane history for their study in connection with the doctrine of providence.*

4. *Does the fact that many do not recognize God's rule of the world indicate that He does not rule? Is it beneficial to recognize His rule?*

5. *Could a "limited God" perform the works of providence that the Bible*

Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

LESSON 20

God's Works of Providence

QUESTION 11. *What are God's works of providence?*

ANSWER. *God's works of providence are, his most holy, wise, and powerful preserving and governing all his creatures, and all their actions.*

GOD executes His decrees not only in His work of creation, but also in His works of providence, whereby, as the Westminster Confession of Faith tells us, He "doth uphold, direct, dispose, and govern all creatures, actions, and things, from the greatest event to the least" (Chapter 5, section 1). God's works of providence may conveniently be regarded, as the Shorter Catechism makes clear, as (1) preserving and (2) governing.

Preservation

That which God has created can no more endure without Him than it could have come into being without Him. The universe would pass away if God did not uphold it by the word of His power. He neither withdraws Himself from the creation nor does He constantly create all things anew—views that some have held—but He preserves all things in their being and with their endowed properties and powers by His unceasing exercise of His always present power.

Some verses bearing on preservation are the following:

"Thou, even thou art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens,

with all their hosts, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all" (Nehemiah 9: 6).

"Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power" (Hebrews 1: 3).

"By him all things consist" (Colossians 1: 17).

See also Psalm 36: 6; 63: 8; 66: 8, 9; and 104; Isaiah 40: 26; Acts 17: 28; and Romans 11: 36.

Government

God governs as well as preserves that which He has created. Having a wise and holy purpose in His creation, He directs and rules all things that His purpose may be achieved. That God governs all things might be inferred from the fact that He is the living and true God, infinite in all His attributes. He could not, because of the perfection of His being, permit His creation to escape His control and attain some lesser end than that He had wisely planned. Indications of His intelligent control can be found in the universe, in history, and in the lives of men.

The Bible indisputably teaches the fact of God's universal government. It reveals God to be the absolute ruler over nature, on whose will what we call the "laws of nature" are dependent.

God "left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14: 17).

He "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matthew 5: 45).

"He causeth the grass to grow for the

attributes to the living and true God? Why not?

6. Distinguish between preservation and government.

7. Distinguish between creation and providence.

8. Is there any relationship between the decrees of God and His works of creation and providence?

9. Explain several verses bearing on the doctrine of the preservation of all things.

10. In what ways does God manifest His glory in His preservation and government of nature?

LESSON 21

God's Government of His Creatures

QUESTION 11. What are God's works of providence?

ANSWER. God's works of providence are, his most holy, wise, and powerful preserving and governing all his creatures, and all their actions.

WE HAVE seen in Lesson 20 that God's works of providence consist in (1) His upholding or preserving and (2) His governing all creatures, actions, and things. We considered some of the Scripture statements bearing on God's control of nature and nations. We are now to deal with some of the Biblical evidence that God controls not only nations, but also individuals and their actions.

Individuals

The conditions of our birth, life, and death are all arranged by God.

"The Lord killeth and maketh alive: He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up. The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich, He bringeth low and lifteth up. He raiseth up the poor out of the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory: for the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and he hath set the world upon them." (I Samuel 2: 6-8.)

"I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me." (Isaiah 45: 5.)

See also Proverbs 16: 9; Psalm 75: 6, 7; 31: 15; Acts 17: 26; James 4: 13-15; and Luke 1: 53.

Free Actions Controlled

God's control extends to the free actions of men.

"The preparations of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue is from the Lord" (Proverbs 16: 1).

"Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the

king's heart, to beautify the house of the Lord" (Ezra 7: 27).

"For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Philippians 2: 13).

See also Psalm 119: 36; Proverbs 20: 24; 21: 1; Jeremiah 10: 23; Philippians 4: 13; II Corinthians 12: 9, 10; Ephesians 2: 10; and Galatians 5: 22-25.

Evil Actions Governed

Even the evil acts of men are governed by God. Although Saul is declared to have taken his own life, the Lord is said to have put him to death (I Chronicles 10: 4-14). Consider also the hardening of the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians (Exodus 7: 13; 14: 17; and I Sam. 6: 6).

In Revelation 17: 17 we read that "God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled."

See also II Thessalonians 2: 11; and Isaiah 66: 4.

God sets limits to the evil of men:

"Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain" (Psalm 76: 10).

See also II Kings 19: 38; and Isaiah 10: 15.

God can cause good to come from evil deeds, such as in the case of the sinful actions of Joseph's brethren (Gen. 50: 20) and the crucifixion of Christ (Acts 2: 23; 3: 13, 18; and 4: 27, 28).

In no way is God responsible for the sins of men. Note the clear statement of the Westminster Confession of Faith on this point:

"The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God, so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifold dispensation, to his own holy ends; yet so, as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God; who being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author or approver of sin" (Chapter 5, Section 4).

"For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (I John 2: 16).

See also Psalm 50: 21; James 1: 13, 14; and Jeremiah 7: 9.

Providence or Chaos

As we indicated at the beginning of our study of God's government, if God did not control all things, including the evil actions of men, grave disorder would prevail. He could not be said to rule His creation; His knowledge of

outcomes would be limited; His plan would not be all-embracing; His wisdom, veracity, justice, and goodness could be properly disputed; and He would by no means be what He truly is. He would not be God.

It is apparent that we cannot agree with those who hold that God has withdrawn Himself from His creation and permits the universe to govern itself; but we must be careful not to go to the other extremes of supposing that men have no intelligence and will of their own, that there are no second causes, and no responsible agents in the universe, that God, the first cause, is the only cause. The Christian will believe that natural law and second causes do exist, but that they are not independent of God. There must be, he will hold, a "preceding, simultaneous, and immediate concurrence of God's power in the power of nature." Man, although dependent on God and preserved and governed by Him, is nevertheless a free and responsible agent. That his nature is evil and that he wills iniquity place guilt solely on himself. Difficult and mysterious these truths may be to us: but we cannot deny them without logically casting ourselves at the feet of chaos. We know that these truths are reconcilable and have been eternally in harmony in God.

Miracles

The Christian will recognize the fact that, as the Westminster Confession of Faith says, God "in ordinary providence maketh use of means, yet is free to work without, above, or against them at pleasure." He is no slave to "natural law," but law is dependent on His will. See Hosea 1: 7; Romans 4: 20, 21; Daniel 3: 27; John 11: 43-45; and Romans 1: 4.

One who has accepted the Biblical teaching about providence will not hesitate to accept the Biblical teaching concerning miracles.

The Excellency of God

God's works of providence reflect the excellency of His being. The Shorter Catechism terms them holy, wise, and powerful.

"The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein.

"His work is honourable and glorious: and his righteousness endureth for ever . . .

"The works of his hands are verity and judgment: all his commandments are sure.

"They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.

"He sent redemption unto his people; he hath commanded his covenant for ever: holy and reverend is his name" (Psalm 111: 2-9).

See also Daniel 5: 18; and Revelation 15: 3, 4.

Such praise as we must give God because of the excellency of His eternal purpose we must give Him also because of the excellency of His working out of that purpose. Compare Ephesians 1: 11; Isaiah 28: 29; and Acts 15: 18.

God's supreme end in His decrees and in His works of creation is likewise the supreme end of His providence — the highest end — His own glory.

"For of him; and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen" (Romans 11: 36).

See also Romans 9: 17.

MATTERS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. Does God know even the smallest things and control them?

2. Can you give instances of God's ordering the circumstances of your life?

3. Make a study of the prayers of the Bible. Do they indicate and even state the doctrine of God's government?

4. Can you find any instances in Scripture of God's being said to "turn the hearts of the heathen to hate his people" to send men "strong delusion that they may believe a lie," to stir "the nations to war?" How do you explain these passages? Do they make God responsible for sin? Do they indicate that He controls sinful men?

5. Can you cite instances from history or from your own experience of God's causing good to come from evil deeds?

6. What do you understand Romans 11: 7-8 to mean?

7. In what way does God control sinful actions?

8. Does God take special care of His people?

9. How may God's providence be said to be wise? powerful? holy?

10. Assign the sections of Chapter 5 of the Westminster Confession of Faith to members of the Young People's Society to be reported on at the meeting.

11. Compare the estate of believers and unbelievers under God's providence.

12. Does the doctrine of providence in any way excuse our sins?

13. Ask some one to give an exposition of the 73rd Psalm.

14. Why do believers have afflictions? Consult the Scriptures.

15. Does the fact that evildoers sometimes seem to prosper and that the righteous appear at times to suffer indicate that God's providence is unjust?

16. What is the relationship between miracles and "natural law"?

17. Is God subject to nature? Should it be hard for a Christian to believe in miracles?

18. Does the occurrence of miracles in any way indicate that the Creation was not "very good"?

19. Can we devise any comfort and feeling of security from the doctrine of providence?

20. In the light of the doctrine of providence what must we say concerning "chance," "luck," "fortune," "fate"?

21. What light does the doctrine of providence throw on the wisdom and goodness of God?

22. Study Deuteronomy 33: 26-29. Does it have any bearing on the doctrine of providence?

23. Select hymns expressing truths involved in the doctrine of providence.

PREMILLENNIALISM ADOPTED CONSTITUTIONALLY BY PHILADELPHIA FUNDAMENTALIST GROUP

Several Premillennialist Members Raise Protests

MEETING in LuLu Temple on Thursday, February 4th, the organization known as the Philadelphia Fundamentalists adopted the following amendment to its constitution: "We believe in 'that blessed hope,' the personal, premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

A number of members of the association raised vigorous objection to constitutional inclusion of what is popularly known as Premillennialism. Two members who spoke strongly against the amendment were the Rev. Paul Woolley of Westminster Theological Seminary, and Mr. James C. Curnow, a student in the seminary. Both hold what is commonly known as the premillennial view.

Mr. Woolley pointed out that the basis of fellowship upon which the Philadelphia Fundamentalists had been founded was a common loyalty to the full inspiration and trustworthiness of the Bible. All Christian believers who accept the Bible as trustworthy and hold the cardinal evangelical teachings should, he said, be welcome as members of the "Fundamentalists." The genius of the opposition to modernism is the opposition to the view that the Bible is not throughout a divine book, and is not in all its parts completely accurate and trustworthy. It is on this point that the dividing line between fundamentalists and modernists should be drawn.

Mr. Woolley indicated that in his opinion the adoption of this amendment would change the primary pur-

pose and testimony of the organization as it had existed hitherto and he hoped that the Philadelphia Fundamentalists would remain true to their original purpose.

Mr. Curnow asked the president, the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, whether or not the inclusion of the amendment would exclude from fellowship all who were not premillennialists. When informed that it would, he presented cogent arguments against the passage of the amendment. He pointed out that the millennial question was in no sense a "fundamental," and that there were other doctrinal differences of a far more serious nature. He attempted to argue that, before legislating on the millennial question, the group should attack such heresies as Arminianism, but with the mention of the word, "Arminianism," he was stopped by Mr. MacPherson, who claimed that he was wandering afield from the question. Mr. Curnow apologized.

Toward the end of the discussion one member arose and passionately demanded, "Whom are we trying to please, God or man?" He insisted the members should pass the amendment and thereby please God. Mr. Curnow promptly pointed out that there were only two Biblical reasons for refusing fellowship — proven and unconfessed immorality or heresy — and that in his estimation they were contemplating passing the amendment *only to please themselves*, certainly not to please their Lord and Saviour.

The amendment was passed by a sweeping majority.

RELIGIOUS CENSORSHIP BILL TO BE INTRODUCED IN SENATE BY WASHINGTON RADICALS

Another Capital Foundation Attempts Rigid Censorship of All Radio Broadcasts

BAKER RALLIES CLERGYMEN

COMMENTATORS in the nation's capital, according to a Washington correspondent, are gasping with amazement over a proposal slated for early introduction in the Senate to set up a censorship of all the religious literature that ministers deposit in the mails. This scheme to gag the religious press is so shocking that keen observers, accustomed as they are to witnessing radical stratagems, are wondering if the well-laid plot really will be carried through. Authoritative sources affirm that the bill has been prepared by lawyers outside of Washington, and is now practically ready to be dropped in the legislative hopper. The sponsors of the bill are reported ready to make a real fight for its passage, and a number of senatorial OK's are said to be already assured.

Some experts believe that this censorship of religious literature in the mails is the first step toward the regimentation of religious worship in accord with the Fascist plan. Others believe it is intended as a step toward complete suppression and tyranny in accord with the plans of worldwide atheist-communist coalitions.

From another source comes the threat of another gag on freedom of religious expression, this time through censorship of radio broadcasts.

The self-styled "Bible Foundation," with offices in the Nation's capital, has set itself up as the supreme arbiter of what should and what should not be broadcast, as far as religious programs are concerned. A recent form letter signed by the Chairman of the Broadcasting Council declares: "The Bible Foundation is strongly opposed to the broadcasting of any alleged religious program by any broadcasting station unless the script of the program has been written, or carefully scrutinized and edited by a committee of ecclesiastics or educators."

The Bible Foundation's aim is, apparently, to obtain the consent of every broadcasting station in the country to this un-Christian, un-American tyranny by its Broadcasting Council of fifty hand-picked members. The names of the active members and trustees of the foundation are jealously guarded, so that it is impossible to discover what ecclesiastical or national bigwigs are behind the movement.

Most Christians agree that any agency that would stifle the free and unimpeded proclamation of the gospel under the guise of piety is dangerous, and the piety, if such it be, is seriously misguided.

Perhaps some foreknowledge of these two threats inspired the Hon. Newton D. Baker, General Chairman of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, to circulate among 100,000 Protestant, Catholic and Jewish clergymen, a pronouncement reaffirming what the Constitution calls the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The pronouncement, which invites the signatures of all clergymen of the three faiths in America, declares significantly that "civil liberties and religious rights that derive from this truth are today being assailed."

The pronouncement goes on to say that "We of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, therefore, believing that these liberties and rights are based upon the principles of religion and are dependent for their perpetuation upon the cultivation of those principles, affirm our loyalty to these fundamentals of all just government, and express our confidence in the traditions of American life that have championed and applied them.

"In America we have and must maintain a land wherein people of different religious convictions and contrasting cultural traditions may live together in amity and mutual respect. The nation can rely upon the mobilized spiritual forces of Catholics, Protestants and Jews to support and defend this truly American ideal."

So ends the pronouncement. And Newton D. Baker is on the inside in Washington's affairs. Perhaps this is the firing of the first answering gun in the battle soon to be waged between civil and religious liberty and the united forces of despotism.

BENNET TRIAL REFERRED TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY AFTER STORMY SESSION IN NEW YORK

THE trial of James E. Bennet, Esq., New York lawyer and elder in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., reached an abrupt impasse on February 2nd when Mr. Bennet walked out of his trial after filing formal objection that the General Assembly had attempted a gross usurpation of power. At first the special judicial commission, appointed by the Synod of New York to try the case, was inclined to attempt, by further citation, to prepare for conduct of the trial in Mr. Bennet's absence. When noisy opposition greeted this proposal the commission went into executive session for almost an hour. Announcement was then made by the moderator, Dr. George A. Crapullo, that the commission had decided "to refer the case back to the General Assembly, which meets in Columbus in May, for trial and ultimate decision."

With a kind of New Deal asperity the moderator at one point stated, "You may as well stop all this reference to the General Assembly. Any deliverance that they made is not reviewable by us." Whereupon Mr. Bennet replied, "Inasmuch as the commission have sustained the position that when the General Assembly makes a direction no commission can hold anything to the opposite side, it does not seem to us that our physical presence here is of any particular benefit, and therefore we withdraw."

A beautiful confession of bewilderment was put in the form of a motion by one member of the commission. "I move," he said, "that the matter of the prosecution of the charges against Mr. James E. Bennet, as amended, be referred to the General Assembly for trial and ultimate decision on the ground that the present status of the proceedings presents new, important, and difficult questions, namely: The declaration by the defendant of the withdrawal of his waiver of the service of citation and special appearance (no citation having been served upon him as a preliminary to the exercise of jurisdiction over said defendant); that upon denial of motions made by the defendant, said defendant and his counsel withdrew from the session of

the commission; that the atmosphere surrounding the sessions of the commission was such as to be prejudicial to the orderly process of trial; that the commission are convinced that the best interests of the church require a removal of the matter to the General Assembly; further, that the members of the commission are divided on the propriety of trying the defendant in his absence in a manner so affecting the whole church; and finally, that the members of the commission are uncertain how to proceed under the present circumstances."

And in a dense fog the three-day attempt at a trial ended abruptly.

CORRECTIONS IN MINUTES OF SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Cost of Publication Not Yet Entirely Defrayed

THE Rev. Leslie W. Sloat, Clerk of the Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, has reported the following *errata* in the printing of the Minutes of the Assembly: On Page 17, in the paragraph beginning, "The following amendment was moved and seconded . . ." a comma should be placed after the word, "reading," followed by quotation marks enclosing the balance of the paragraph. Also on Page 17, in the third paragraph below the previous correction, and the second line of the paragraph, the word, "not," should be changed to the word "now," so that this portion of the sentence begins, "We do now adopt the 1934 form of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms."

Mr. Sloat, as treasurer of the committee of the General Assembly for the publication of the Minutes, has announced that the cost of printing and distributing the Minutes has not yet been completely met. In order that the funds of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension need not be used to make up the deficit, he requests that individuals and churches, willing to help in this matter, send their contributions to him at Kensington, Maryland, as soon as possible. The total cost of printing and mailing will be approximately \$160, of which about \$100 has already been subscribed. A limited

number of additional copies are available at the offices of the Home Missions Committee. The charge is 25c each, postpaid.

THE REV. R. B. KUIPER RECEIVED AT MEETING OF PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERY

AT THE regular meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia on Tuesday, February 9th, the Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper of Westminster Theological Seminary was received as a minister of The Presbyterian Church of America. Professor Kuiper was formerly a minister of the Christian Reformed Church, and his reception into the Presbytery of Philadelphia was the cause of hearty thanksgiving on the part of many members of that body.

At the same meeting the following students of Westminster Seminary were taken under care of presbytery: William C. Floge, Leland C. Jorgensen, and Harvey K. McArthur. A call from the Bethany Presbyterian Church of Nottingham (Penna.) to the Rev. Peter DeRuiter was placed in the hands of Mr. DeRuiter. The Rev. Robert Moody Holmes, who has recently been placed in charge of the work in Rochester, New York, was dismissed to the Presbytery of New York and New England, and his pastoral relation with the Gethsemane Church of Philadelphia was dissolved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Godliness and Christian Liberty	201
AN EDITORIAL	
Karl Barth on Creation	204
Cornelius Van Til	
Dr. Buswell's Premillennialism	206
A Review by John Murray	
Hitherto the Lord Hath Helped	209
David Freeman	
The Sunday School Lessons	210
Leslie W. Sloat	
Studies in the Shorter Catechism	212
John H. Skilton	
A SURVEY OF NEWS	214

IOWA CHURCH TO WAGE BATTLE FOR PROPERTY

THE Princeton Presbyterian Church of Princeton, Iowa, which withdrew from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. last July, now faces a serious possibility of losing its property through court action of the Presbytery of Iowa City. Since the church building was originally the result of the sacrificial giving of the members, and since the cost of replacing it would be at least \$10,000, the congregation is planning to wage a vigorous fight to retain it. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., however, is reported to have given the local presbytery \$2,000 for expenses incurred in ousting this little band of true Christians.

The pastor of the church, the Rev. V. V. Wortman, has appealed for contributions to enable the church successfully to combat the actions of the presbytery. Although the members have given generously in a valiant effort to save the property, additional help is needed.

NEW CHURCH TO BE FORMED FOR PHILADELPHIA NEGROES

A PRESBYTERIAN rally for the colored people of Philadelphia will be held on Friday, March 5th, at 8.30 P.M., in King's Hall, 509 North 41st Street. The speaker of the evening will be the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, whose subject will be, "The Everlasting Gospel." Special music will be furnished by the Westminster Seminary Quartet.

This rally is being held for the purpose of establishing a particular church of The Presbyterian Church of America among the large negro population of this district of West Philadelphia. The work has been begun under the auspices of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and Westminster Seminary students Lawrence Eyres and Robert Brown are in charge.

Sunday services will be held in King's Hall beginning March 7th, at 11 A.M.