First of all, then, I urge that petitions, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be offered for all men; for sovereigns and all in high office, that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in full observance of religion and high standards of morality.

Such prayer is right, and approved by God our Saviour, whose will it is that all men should find salvation and come to know the truth. For there is one God, and also one mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus, himself man, who sacrificed himself to win freedom for all mankind, so providing, at the fitting time, proof of the divine purpose.

(I Timothy 2:1-6, NEB)
There is much talk about Christianity being on the threshold of a new Reformation. We hear of a revolutionary new Pentecost taking place, of a spiritual renewal, of a rebirth of the Christian church.

This excited talk comes on the background of the conviction of many that the institutional church has seen its day. "The existing pattern of church life is no longer in touch with real life," it is said. Here we are, in the middle of the twentieth century, and a record sixty-four percent of Americans claim status in some religious body. But thoughtful people are questioning the significance of this statistic. One leading churchman asked, "What is the use of getting more people into a church that is no church?"

Liberals and conservatives, of course, differ over the kind of institution the church should be. When you hear the slogan, "Let the church be the church," you must look to who is speaking. The liberal is unhappy with a conservative church, and vice versa. Be that as it may, it is good that the church is being critically evaluated. For one of the insights to emerge from the Reformation is that the Reformed church must ever be reforming itself.

Now there are those who want the reform to be revolutionary, like radical surgery. Men like Bishop Robinson of Honest to God fame want to recast the gospel by putting "our most cherished religious categories and moral absolutes" into the melting pot, in order to leave "the fundamental truth of the gospel unaffected." But how contradictory can the good bishop get? What is more fundamental than moral absolutes? How can you get rid of moral absolutes and still retain the fundamental truth of the gospel? How can you defend and proclaim the Christian faith "by abandoning its basic precepts"?

To the Romans Paul wrote this concerning the primary job of the church: "How beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news." God has been pleased through the foolishness of preaching to save those who believe. It is God's instrument to rescue men from certain destruction. Today there is a radically different view of what preaching is all about. We are told that God has already reconciled all men to himself through Christ, and that it is the church's job to inform men of this. The church's message, then, goes something like this: "Look, all you people, God has already reconciled you to himself in Christ. You are already saved; but you don't realize it as yet. We are here to inform you of the fact."

Is It True?

This new preaching of reconciliation is ingenious, but there is one thing wrong with it: it just isn't true. The apostle Paul was quoting from the prophecy of Nahum. The prophet is declaring God's judgment on all who sin against him. He asks, "Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierce heat of his anger? His fury is poured out like fire ... " Then Nahum explains: "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him who brings good tidings, who publishes peace!"

Don't you see from this that the preaching of the gospel is glorious, because it is God's saving invitation to men destined to die? This, then, is the first task of the minister — really his only task — to proclaim the Word of God: to proclaim the message of salvation through the crucified One, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of the living God. It is a message that calls for a change in the one who is a sinner and lost from God. It calls for repentance. On hearing the message men must call out, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

In the church, by and large, this approach is deemed to be irrelevant and inadequate. Our secular society is seen "without a God who plays the role of the . . . sovereign Controller of mankind, without whom we could have no bread, no health, no safety." Therefore, the church is turning to what it likes to think is spiritual renewal through the service concept. That is, the church must be the servant of society, after the pattern of Christ the Son of Man who came not to be served but to serve. And in serving, the church must enter every part of the world that is the life of modern man — his home, his work, his leisure, and his public life.

Is this approach valid? Is it complete? We are bound to ask, Is this all that Christianity is to become? To play the Good Samaritan? To devote itself to good works? To be just another humanitarian agency among the hundreds already at work? To be sure, our Lord requires us to be good Samaritans to everyone whom we are able to help. But is this all?

What of God's role? What of divine grace? Has God become expendable, now that the church has turned loose her army of good Samaritans? Isn't he permitted his saving acts among men, to enable them to do their good works? Indeed, doesn't the reality of human sin demand divine grace? Otherwise any decent person can live the Christian life without help from God. Look at the humanitarian agencies at work within the United Nations. What would make the church essentially different from them?

Doubtless much of the reason for the emergence of this new gospel is the view taken of the Bible within the church. An article in LIFE magazine stated that the Bible "is certainly not myth all the way through. It is on the whole a remarkably dependable history of the Hebrew people and of the early period of the Christian (concluded on page 101)
The Holy Human Empire

CORNELIUS VAN TIL

The substance of this address to the entering students was given at the opening exercises of Westminster Seminary. It gets to the heart of the issue between the two diverse messages heard in the church today.

"Thousands of cubic feet of air were required to vibrate the vocal chords of all who spoke from the rostrum and floor at Uppsala," said Dr. J. Robert Nelson, a Christian Century editor-at-large, as he reported on the meetings of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches held in that Swedish city in July.

The delegates spoke of Jesus and the resurrection. When the Assembly received the report on missions "the delegates demanded that a phrase such as 'for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved' (Acts 4:12) be put at the masthead of the statement." (So wrote Cecil Northcott, also a Century editor-at-large.)

These words lead us back in thought to the period right after Pentecost when Peter and John were called before the "rulers, and elders, and scribes, and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest" to give an account of the "evil" they had done in preaching "through Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4:1, 2).

What a marvelous change for the better, you say. In Jerusalem the rulers in the church "denied the Holy One and the Just and desired a murderer to be granted" them (Acts 3:14); here, in Uppsala, some 2,000 Christians from more than 80 countries were "summoned to respond to the motto 'Behold! I make all things new'" and thus to confess the name of Jesus apparently in the way that Peter and John did.

Instead of repressing those who would preach Christ and the resurrection the great body of church leaders at Uppsala urged all the church to go forth to preach "the Resurrection Humanity of Jesus." Uppsala merely sought for new methods and new words to bring the message that Peter and John brought but, says Cecil Northcott, the message is still the same.

A Second Look

A second look at the "message" adopted soon forces the conclusion upon you that Uppsala did not proclaim Christ and the resurrection. On the contrary, the Assembly of Uppsala, virtually forbade the preaching of Jesus and the resurrection in the way that Peter and John preached it.

To be sure, Uppsala did not, in so many words, forbid men to preach Christ and the resurrection. On the contrary, as noted, as far as words are concerned, Uppsala would seem to have joined Peter and John in their proclamation of the name of Jesus as the only name given under heaven by which men must be saved. But the meanings of the words have changed. Uppsala does not mean by the name of Jesus what Peter and John meant by that name. Nor does Uppsala mean by the word "resurrection" what Peter and John meant by that word.

Uppsala means by the name "Jesus" what modern theology means by that name and Uppsala means by the word "resurrection" what modern theology means by that word. "The Message" of Uppsala echoes the message of modern theology and the message of modern theology is the message that man has within himself the power to lift himself by his own bootstraps toward the realization of his own ideals.

Modern theology does have a 'God', to be sure, but not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who is the creator of heaven and of earth. The 'God' of modern theology is made in the image of man; modern science and modern philosophy have persuaded modern theologians that, upon pain of exclusion from the circle of intelligent men, they dare not believe in the God in whom Peter and John believed.

Modern theology also has a 'Christ' but its Christ, as well as its God is made in the image of man. It is from modern science and philosophy that modern theology has taken its picture of man and then has "blown up" this picture of man and called it Jesus. This Jesus is then called the Son of God, but then, it also believes that all men have risen and are rising from the dead everywhere and all the time.

Modern Theology

Modern theology believes in Jesus as the Son of God who rose from the dead, but then, it also believes that all men have risen and are rising from the dead everywhere and all the time.
According to modern theology the message of the church to the world is not that men are creatures made in the image of God, that they are sinners because of their breaking of the law of the love of God and that as such the wrath of God abides upon them unless they repent and believe that Jesus, the only Son of God and Son of man, died for them on the cross of Calvary for their sin and rose again on the third day for their justification.

According to modern theology the message of the church to the world must be that there is some sort of God who somehow loves all men no matter what they have done or possibly may do in the way of breaking all the "laws" of God or man. This God does the best he can to give men rain and sunshine and fruitful seasons. But without the help of the church this God cannot expect to be too successful in his well-meant effort at relieving men from the burdens of war and poverty.

In strict agreement with modern theology's view of God and of Christ, Uppsala sends forth its message to the world. There is in this message no reference to the gospel of salvation by grace such as was proclaimed by Peter and Paul, by Augustine, Luther or Calvin, Wesley or Whitefield. There are, to be sure, a few words in the section on missions that might be interpreted that way if the context did not forbid it. But the message as a whole consists in saying that since as men we are neighbors of one another, we should learn to live together in peace in order then together to root out poverty, racism, and armaments; and as churches to promote union.

The Message of Uppsala

Says Cecil Northcott: "Uppsala, then, has given us some new marching orders—a seven-year mandate to go on—until the next Assembly, with the eternal mission of converting the whole life of man to the service of Christ as the Master of Humanity."6

Perhaps you think I have been unfair in my report on Uppsala. There was some time ago, you say, some such theology and some such program of church activity as you describe. In 1900 the great theologian, Adolph von Harnack, described the essence of Christianity as consisting of the universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man. But what of the theology of the Word? Surely the neo-orthodox theologians, and among them especially Karl Barth, reject with vehemence any such humanistic misinterpretation of the gospel as was propounded by the old modernists.

Well, here it is: the message of Uppsala. You may read it for yourself. Von Harnack might well have written it. The message is built around the idea of a "new humanity," a humanity in which all men love each other as God loves all men. It is the idea of universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man all over again, mit ein bischen andern Worten.

But perhaps you still object and say that Uppsala was not primarily a theological conference. It was a gathering called together largely for the purpose of constructing a program of action. We must therefore not look for a theological pronouncement in the message of Uppsala.

The Princeton Conference

Well, then, note what took place at the Gallahue Conference on Theology held this summer at Princeton, New Jersey. At this conference the theologians gathered did seek to hammer out a doctrine of God, of man, and of Christ that should be both Biblical and relevant to our time. Surely at this conference, held at Princeton, a center of neo-orthodoxy, we may expect to hear a message like to the message of Peter and Paul. But a brief look at some of the addresses given at the Gallahue Conference will convince you that its theology is in accord with the Uppsala program and that the Uppsala program is in accord with the Gallahue Conference at Princeton.

Speaking negatively, not one of the speakers at the conference showed any desire to present anything like the gospel as it was taught in Princeton Seminary by such men as Charles Hodge, B. B. Warfield and Gerhardus Vos, as these men followed the example of Peter and Paul.

For the speakers at the Gallahue Conference, the God of Peter and Paul, the God of Luther and Calvin, is dead. This God has now been dead so long that he scarcely comes to mind. If he comes to mind at all it is when you think back to the early days of mankind's evolutionary development when our ancestors thought metaphysically and when the disciples of Jesus expressed the gospel in the language of myth.

We all know now that we cannot intelligently think of a God who is transcendent above the world and who works out a plan that he had from eternity for the world in the history of the world. If we are to use the word God at all we must use it to represent the principle of unity and love in the world that in some unknown fashion brings order out of chaos in the world.

The initial address at the Gallahue Conference was given by Bishop J. A. T. Robinson, who wrote Honest to God a few years ago. "How do we remain theologians after 'the death of God'? How do we remain Christians after the death of the church.' These, I believe, are the two questions that will underline most of the discussion of the days and years immediately ahead of us."

Bishop Robinson

With these words Bishop Robinson set the tone of the conference. What if God is dead? Didn't Sir Julian Huxley say that 'those aspects of nature and those experiences which are usually described as divine' will always remain? Said Huxley: 'A humanist evolution-centered religion too needs divinity, but divinity without God. It must strip the divine of the theistic qualities which man has anth-

2. Ibid., p. 1040.
3. Ibid., p. 1032.
4. Ibid., p. 1044.
5. Ibid., p. 1044.
6. Ibid., p. 1044.
8. Ibid., p. 50.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 150.
11. Ibid., p. 151.
12. Ibid., p. 169.
13. Ibid., p. 169.
ropomorphically projected into it, search for its habitations in every aspect of existence, elicit it, and establish fruitful contact with its manifestations. Divinity is the chief raw material out of which gods have been fashioned."

Agreeing with and restating these words of Huxley's, Bishop Robinson adds: "In other words, that dimension of reality which caused men to create gods remains valid, but the theistic mold has been shattered. The shaping of the stuff of that experience into gods existing as beings, or into a God existing as a Being, in another realm above or beyond this one, is no longer credible."9

Humanism within Mystery

Here we are in this world. We are surrounded by ultimate mystery. Let us agree with James Hemming when he says that 'each may wish to put something different into that mystery. One group may put a personal God there; the other a question mark; but each will agree that the ground of man's being is humanism within mystery.'10 Or again, let us agree with the French Marxist, Roger Garandy, who says that what makes him an atheist is the fact that he can know nothing transcendent and because the most beautiful and exalted name that he can give to what people speak of as ultimate, is man.

Such statements, says Bishop Robinson, "point to a new and exciting situation." Theists and atheists will soon be brothers. Feuerbach and Teilhard de Chardin will be friends.11 God-language and man-language will be seen to be aspects of the one great language event of the future.

In Position Paper 205, Daniel Callahan, Executive Editor of the Catholic weekly Commonweal,12 assured the theologians at the conference on purely non-biblical grounds that "man needs and can have hope that the cosmos (of which he is a part) has a potential direction and goal; his ultimate self-identity requires the capacity to envision his own future as co-herent with that of a meaningful universe."13

Theology of the Princeton Conference may therefore, so far as we are able to trace it, be taken as a proper theological foundation for the purely humanist program of action promulgated at the Conference at Uppsala.

Your Preparation

It is in such a situation as this that you have come to this Seminary to prepare yourselves for Christian preaching or teaching the only name given under heaven by which man must be saved. The world about you is writhing in sin and pollution; it loves darkness rather than light. The natural man holds under inunrighteousness the light and truth of God his creator that shines in and around him. And now the church, by and large, is placing the light of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ under a bushel.

But thanks be unto God who always causes us to triumph in Christ, and makes manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place.

There are still seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal. With them we would place the gospel of Christ and the resurrection once more on a candlestick. We would help you to prepare yourselves to join with Peter and Paul, with Luther and Calvin, to proclaim Jesus Christ, who died for sinners on the cross and rose for their justification, to a lost and dying generation.

Come and humble yourselves with us before the face of Almighty God and then, in the power of the Holy Spirit, ask the rulers of the church again: 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye' (Acts 4:19).

May the God and Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ grant you his grace to learn to witness with all boldness and humility to him through whose death and resurrection men must be saved.

TAMPERING

(continued from page 98)

church." Now this view is an improvement on the old liberal position that saw almost nothing historically worthwhile in the Bible. Nevertheless, who decides what parts of the Bible are mythical and what parts are historical? Are we going to decide only after we have polled the experts and then accept the majority opinion? No, the Christian believer who accepts the Bible as the Word of God is ready to listen to God's word as the Bible bears witness to itself.

LIFE confidently asserted that in the Bible "God seems to develop from one kind of deity to another . . ." But this kind of statement cannot be supported when you take into account the overall message of the Bible. Whether you read in Genesis, or in the Psalms, or in the Gospels, God is both a just God whose wrath comes on the wicked and a merciful God to those who come to him in penitence. He is both of holier eyes than to be held iniquity and the gracious One who assures his children that he removes their sins from them as far as the east is from the west. Let us be alert against oversimplifications about God!

Again, LIFE said that the Genesis account of creation appeared a thousand years after the Babylonian epic of creation and was simply a reworking and purification of an old myth. This means, of course, that Moses cannot have been the author of the Book of Genesis. And why is it desirable to remove Moses as author of the Pentateuch? For this reason: if these documents came from a time long after Moses, they cannot be relied upon to present genuine history.

But there is one difficulty with this approach. In the Gospels Jesus Christ asserted: "Moses spoke of me." Whom shall we believe? Christ or the critics? Did this man Moses write about Christ or not? My friends, I do not know how you answer, but as for me, I would rather listen to the voice of the Son of God than to the supposed insights of contemporary scholars. Jesus Christ cannot be dissected. You cannot look up to his example, you cannot look to him as the Redeemer, and you cannot listen to his teachings, if at the same time you play a game of sorting out his teachings — accepting what strikes you as valuable while rejecting the rest.

This can boomerang: you might meet someone who accepts your rejected passages and rejects what you accept. And if you put enough such people together, how much of a Bible will you have left? Recall Thomas Jefferson's "scissors-and-paste" Bible and multiply Jefferson many times over.

No, we must take our position with Jesus Christ for whom all the words of Moses and the prophets were the Word of God. And when he places his sanction on Holy Writ by saying, "The Scripture cannot be broken," who are we proud but poor mortals to say that it can be broken?

October, 1968
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The Controversialist

HENRY W. CORAY

Dr. Gordon A. MacLennan once said publicly of J. Gresham Machen, "What is it in Dr. Machen that stands out above everything else? I have given much thought to my own question. To me the answer does not lie in his scholarship, or in his teaching ability, or in his literary skill, great as all these are. In my opinion the one feature about him that overshadows everything else is this: his burning passion to see the Lordship of Christ exercised in His church."

In the book Valiant for Truth (Lippincott Publishing Co.) there is a paragraph following Dr. MacLennan’s tribute which is explanatory:

Unless one understands this, he will never understand J. Gresham Machen, his moves and his moods. But for that one increasing passion he would have been content to lodge in the quiet eye of the hurricane undisturbed by the fury of the storm that howled about him. How good and how pleasant it would have been to stay out of theological controversy, quietly confine all his efforts to classroom instruction and scholarly writing! But historic Christianity was in conflict, and Machen was of sterner stuff than to sit at rest and disregard the frontal attack on his Lord.

In many respects theological dispute in our age of anemic spirituality has become the Great Bore. We have gone out to see churchmen clothe in soft raiment reclining in the kings’ houses of complacency, as indifferent to the assaults on Christ and his Word as were some thirty witnesses to a brutal New York murder a few years ago — when these same witnesses lifted not a foot to rush to the defense of the victim; nor did they so much as alert the police. A modern existentialist, E. I. Cioran, might well be expressing the attitude of multitudes of church leaders when he said, “Already we yawn over the Cross.”

The Exclusive Gospel

Machen reasoned that Galatians 1:8 — “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” — summarized all that the Bible has to say about the exclusive character of the gospel of God in contra-distinction from false teaching. Few propositions are easier to prove. For large segments of the Old Testament are devoted to the separation of true and false religion. The plaintive cry of Jeremiah, the weeping prophet, “Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast born me a man of strife and a man of contention,” could be the watchword of the major as well as the minor prophets.

Whether we like it or not, John’s precious Gospel records long passages in which our Savior debates militantly with the theological spokesmen of his day. Paul and the other New Testament writers meet head-on those errors which were designed to subvert the testimony to Jesus Christ. Take away the controversial portions of Scripture and you have, in principle, followed the example of a wicked king named Jehoiakim who, on hearing certain distasteful texts in the divine scroll, took a penknife, cut out a number of sections, and dropped them into the fire.

In his stirring sermon, “The Good Fight of Faith,” Machen claimed that the true instruments which God uses in great triumphs of faith are no pacifists, but great fighters like Paul himself. Little affinity for the great apostle has the whole tribe of considerers of consequences, the whole tribe of compromisers ancient and modern. The real companions of Paul are the great heroes of the faith. But who are these heroes? Are they not the true fighters, one and all?

Tertullian fought a mighty battle against Marcion; Athanasius fought against the Arians; Augustine fought against the Pelagians; and as for Luther, he fought a brave battle against kings and princes and popes for the liberty of the (concluded on page 104)
On Being a Reformed Church

What is really distinctive about a Presbyterian or Reformed church? Such a church is:

1) Christian, or founded upon Christ, the eternal Son of God, manifested in the flesh as the Savior and Mediator.

2) Evangelical, or dedicated to the gospel of Jesus Christ as that which must be both believed and proclaimed in its entirety.

3) Scriptural, or holding that the revelation of God in the 66 books of the Bible is the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule which determines our faith and practice.

4) Covenant-conscious, or putting full emphasis upon God’s covenant action in dealing with the children of men (Adam, Abraham et al) and their descendants; and resulting in an appreciation of the family relation, children being a part of the covenant and so baptized as children of believers.

5) Grace-conscious, or dedicated to the Biblical teaching that the believer’s total salvation is a gift of God’s pure grace, implying that the gift of faith is savingly exercised only upon God’s exclusive, regenerative, quickening power in the soul of the sinner who is dead in sin.

6) Gratitude-conscious, or mindful that all the redeemed must show themselves thankful by obedience to the commands of Christ, noting that all who fail are subject to discipline.

7) Theo-centric, or ready to recognize God’s sovereignty in all matters — relating man’s responsibility to God who controls all. Thus difficult passages of Scripture are accepted and dealt with in the light of God’s total revelation.

Many groups may claim these same characteristics. But a truly Reformed or Presbyterian church is distinguished by consistency in the application of God’s Word to the total man.

— Melvin Nonhof

(quoted in Santee “Valley Views and News”)

Stewardship

The idea of Christian stewardship is by no means restricted to the proper use of possessions. Paul regarded himself as a steward of the mysteries of God. Peter wrote that we should use our gifts “as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.” The Christian then is to consider all that he has as a trust from his Lord. As a steward he is accountable for wise management.

A basic requirement of good stewardship is faithfulness (I Cor. 4:2). Nowhere does this become more evident than in the disposition of my money. I am responsible for what I spend, for what I keep, for what I give, and for what I leave.

Do I exercise restraint in my purchases? Or does one ‘thing’ lead to another on a continual merry-go-round of wanting more? Paul thought it important to have learned contentment whatever his state. Have I experienced the satisfaction of doing without—for Christ?

Do I hoard money or put it wisely to use? There are such practical means as the several loan funds of the Orthodox Presbyterian Committees, whereby my investment helps advance the cause of the gospel while at the same time providing a modest return.

Even closer to the heart of good stewardship is my willingness to give a portion of my income to God’s kingdom: the first portion, gladly and generously — not grudgingly or of necessity. The test may come not so much on special occasions such as the annual thank offering, but in my regular, systematic, week-by-week desire to abound in this grace of giving also.

“It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.”

— R. E. N.
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dom to be able to apply his will in my life situation—all of this in order to please God first of all.

Prayer and Work
I'll be praying also for the Christians with whom I regularly worship and work, that they too might have this knowledge, understanding and wisdom. I'll pray likewise for the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, that as a body and also as individuals in this world, we might all be pleasing to the Lord as we meet and come to know people of other races.

I want to remember to pray also for the leaders of my community, state and nation, as Paul reminded Timothy in his first letter to him (2:1, 2). Other lines of prayer will follow if I do this, I'm sure.

4) I ought to get into some activity that will, by the grace of God, result in improved race relations or a better opportunity for the oppressed of our society. It could be in improving community relationships and open housing opportunities in my neighborhood. Or I might try to help the local schools improve their programs for children whose past educational experience has crippled them. I can also seek to help fellow Christians—within the local congregation or in other groups—to open up our fellowship as James demands that we do without partiality (see the second chapter of his letter). Probably I should do more, but if I really do one thing well, that will be more than I'm doing now.

5) I want to form a friendship—not just an acquaintance but a really personal relationship—with a Negro: so that we can share our thoughts and feelings; so that I can appreciate God's image as it is found in him—this is what makes black, as well as white, beautiful. And so that I may share Jesus Christ with him and, if he be a believer too, he may share the Savior with me. Paul's desire (across racial or cultural lines) recorded in Romans 1:11-14 is what I would like to see realized in my experience.

I haven't mentioned repentance in so many words. However, if I move with this program it will be a turn around for me, motivated by sorrow for past and present sin and by a desire for God's glory. That's what the Bible and the Shorter Catechism say repentance is all about, so maybe I've decided on a penitential course of action after all.

Will you join me in a similar program? We've all got to stop being part of the problem and become part of the solution.

LAURENCE C. SIBLEY, JR.
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter and for the good work in putting out the Guardian. All of us Reformed Presbyterian ministers have deeply appreciated getting it for the last two years. I am enclosing my check for a two-year subscription, and I want you to know that I will do all I can to encourage others to do likewise.

ROBERT G. RAYBURN
St. Louis, Missouri

(Ed. note: For the past two years we have continued courtesy subscriptions to most RP/ES ministers. The arrangement was begun five years back through a gift from a Reformed Presbyterian elder. We must now go to a paid subscription basis, but hope to widen our coverage of mutual interests.)

MACHEN (continued from page 102)

people of God. Luther was a great fighter; and we love him for it. So was Calvin; and I love John Knox and all the rest. It is impossible to be a true soldier of Jesus Christ and not fight.

Real Revival

There were in Machen's day, and are now, Christians who disagreed with his approach to the problem of unbelief in the high and low councils of the church. The answer, they argued, and still argue, is in revival. Recently an article appeared in an evangelical magazine titled "Revival, not Reformation." The writer labored hard to make his point. It would almost seem that Machen had anticipated the argument. In his personal monograph in Christianity in Conflict (Round Table Press, Inc.) he has this to say:

One thing that is clear about revivals—a revival that does not stir up controversy is sure to be a sham revival, not a real one. That has been clear ever since our Lord came not to bring peace upon the earth but a sword. A man who is really on fire with a message never thinks of decrying controversy but speaks the truth that God has given him to speak without thought of the favor of men.

A study of church history as well as apostolic history will bear this out. (Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones has shown clearly that historic Christianity was in fact the greatest of all revivals.) All one has to do is read the Book of Acts.

One important reason why Dr. Machen assumed the stance he did goes back to his ordination vows. On June 23, 1914, he was ordained to the gospel ministry by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, New Jersey, in the (then) Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. A question he was required to answer affirmatively was: "Do you promise to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel, and the purity and peace of the church, whatever persecution or opposition may arise unto you on that account?" (In the newly structured Confession of 1967 this vow would be meaningless, since the terms of subscription for ordination have been so watered down that Unitarians can say, "I do.")

Machen would be the first to confess that he failed to carry out his promises with perfect consistency. (Which of us does?) Nevertheless, when the issues in his church became increasingly clear and as the lines were drawn more tightly, he tried with deadly earnestness to be true to his vow. For his convictions he suffered as few modern believers have.

We are now at the point in his history where we shall begin to develop the details of the momentous struggle which would project Machen into the vortex of controversy that was to affect the whole course of American Presbyterianism and the lives of many of his fellow-believers.
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The Presbyterian Guardian
A Proposed New Translation of the Bible

By scholars with a high view of Scripture for churches of that same conviction

Some one hundred Bible scholars, working under sponsorship of the 158 year-old New York Bible Society, have begun a new translation of the Scriptures. It is anticipated that many more will in time be involved in the project.

The scholars, in the words of one of their number, Dr. Burton L. Goddard of Gordon Divinity School, "are those who have a high view of Scripture and have long felt the need of a faithful translation."

The group, working under the direction of the 15-member Committee on Bible Translation, has as its aim the provision of the Scriptures in modern English, doing for our day that which the King James Version did for its day. Every effort will be made to employ language which will communicate to the man on the street but which at the same time will be well chosen from a literary point of view. Translators will stress faithfulness to the text and the unity of the parts of Scripture. They will strive to avoid theological and ecclesiastical bias, and through cooperative effort produce a translation which will be widely accepted by the Christian public and used as a standard version in churches throughout America and many English-speaking churches abroad, according to Dr. Goddard, who is vice-chairman of the Translation Committee.

Gospel of John First

First portion of the new translation, the Gospel of John, is expected to be ready for publication in the near future. The entire New Testament may take at least three years to complete, Dr. Goddard believes. The scholars, drawn from every section of the country and from many segments of Protestant Christianity, will do their work of translation in twenty teams. Ten of the teams are already in operation. Dr. Goddard emphasized the fact that "the work will not be a revision of another version, but a fresh translation from the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts. The translators will have available to them not only the old texts but such new archeological findings as the Dead Sea scrolls and other source materials having relevancy for their work."

The project will be guided by a 15-member Committee on Bible Translation. In announcing the new translation, the committee set these guidelines:

1. At every point the translation shall be faithful to the Word of God as represented by the most accurate text of the original languages of Scripture.
2. The translation shall reflect clearly the unity and harmony of the Spirit-inspired writings.
3. The aim shall be to make the translation represent as clearly as possible only what the original says and not to inject additional elements by unwarranted paraphrasing.
4. The translation shall be designed to communicate the truth of God's revelation as effectively as possible to English readers in the language of the people—to do for our own time that which the King James version did for its day.
5. It shall be suitable for use in public worship, in the study of the Word, and in devotional reading.
6. The translators will attempt to provide the Scriptures as free as possible from the individual theological biases of the translators and will solicit constructive criticism from many sources.
7. The translators will look upon their labor as a sacred trust, honoring the Bible as the inspired Word of God. Though acknowledging that many new translations of Scriptures have been published in recent years, the committee pointed out that none had achieved anywhere near universal acceptance. It added: "Only with one version in common use in our churches will Bible memorization flourish; will those in the pew follow in their own Bibles the reading of Scripture; will union readings be possible; will Bible teachers be able to interpret with maximum success the Biblical text, word by word and phrase by phrase, to their students. We acknowledge freely that there are benefits to be derived by the individual as he refers to other translations in his study of the Bible, but this could still be done in situations in which a common Bible was in general use."

Palmer Executive Secretary

The members of the supervisory Committee on Bible Translation are on the faculties of nine conservative theological seminaries and two colleges and represent at least ten denominations. Five hold degrees from Westminster Seminary, Dr. Stephen W. Paine of Houghton College is chairman of the committee; and Dr. Martin H. Woudstra of Calvin Seminary is its secretary-treasurer. Dr. Edwin H. Palmer, theologian, author, and pastor in the Christian Reformed Church, has been named executive secretary of the committee and is now devoting his full time to serving and coordinating the work on this new translation of the Bible.

When the translation work is at its height, approximately twenty teams of five scholars each will be active, each laboring on one section of the Scripture. The teams will be geographically cohesive, so that the members may meet regularly together. Each team will consist of two co-translators, two translation consultants, and one English stylist. Their work is only the beginning of a long and arduous system of checking, criticism and rechecking.

Origin of Project

The start of the project in its present form dates back to August 1965, when evangelical scholars were invited by a number of outstanding Christian leaders to meet at Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, Illinois, and evaluate the need for a new translation. Among those issuing the call for the Palos Heights meeting were: Dr. John Alexander of the Intervarsity Christian Fellowship; Dean W. Gordon Brown of the Central Baptist Seminary in Toronto; Dr. Gordon H. Clark of Butler University; Robert DeMoss of DeMoss Associates; the late Dr. Peter H. Eldersveld of the Back to God Hour; Dr. Carl F. H. Henry of Christianity Today; Dr. Harold John Ockenga of Park Street Congregational Church of Boston; Dr. W. Stanford Reid of the University of Guelph; Dr. Roger Voskuyl of Westminster College; Dr. John Walvoord of Dallas Seminary; Dr. J. C. Wenger of Goshen Biblical Seminary; and Dr. Stephen W. Paine of Houghton College. It was at Palos Heights that
As Jesus Christ is active in procuring our salvation, the Holy Spirit is active in applying our salvation in its entire range. As he breathes out his regenerating power, as he calls the sinner out of darkness into light, as he progressively sanctifies the believer until he presents him glorified to the Father, the Spirit is active in salvation. Throughout he stands in the most intimate relation to the life of the believer. It is the Spirit who witnesses with our spirit that we are the sons of God (Rom. 8:16). Likewise it is the Spirit who knows and who supports us in our weakness, interceding for us with the Father (Rom. 8:26).

In his work the Spirit effects salvation in its fullest sense. This salvation is nothing else than the realization in us of the meaning of true religion, which is union and fellowship with God through Jesus Christ.

Objective Redemption

Notwithstanding the intimate connection of the work of the Spirit with salvation, neither salvation nor the work of the Spirit in effecting it may be divorced from the objective work of God. Modern unbelief attempts to focus attention on the meaning of salvation, understood for example as the reintegration of personality, in distinction from the events of redemptive history as they have their source in...
the divine counsel and as they take place independently of the subjective life of the believer.

The person and work of the Holy Spirit apart from the experience of salvation are declared to be mythical projections onto the screen of objective fact of inner, so-called existential experience. In this fashion the objective drama of redemption is interpreted as being only an expression of the meaning of salvation. It can be delivered over to a process of de-mythologization without disturbing what is supposed to be the gospel, the divine answer to man in his own self-interpretation.

The person and work of the Spirit are indeed mysterious. That it is the Spirit who effects salvation is not discovered by human reason or experience. It is by the authority of the Word of God alone that we can say that the experience of salvation depends upon an operation of the Spirit of God that precedes it and in some fashion that must remain hidden to us transcends it.

**Mysterious**

Notwithstanding its mysterious and incomprehensible character, the objectivity of the person and work of the Spirit can be denied only by opposing what the Spirit himself witnesses in the Word. Such opposition is believing arrogance. Human reason cannot be allowed to elevate itself as a judge, independent of the Scriptures, and declare that the message concerning the person and work of the Holy Spirit is a false supernaturalism which clothes the meaning of salvation in mythical garb. Instead, our minds must themselves be illumined by the Spirit and must respect those mysteries which only he is able to reveal, because it is he who is able to fathom even the deep things of God (1 Cor. 2:10-11).

In addition, the operation of the Spirit must be viewed in connection with the application of redemption in all of its parts. It may not be restricted, as many would have it, to making actual what is given in salvation. The objection to the givensness of the work of redemption can extend to any part of it, both to the work of Christ and to the work of the Holy Spirit. The finality of the redemptive work of Christ is often said to require the operation of the Holy Spirit to make it contemporaneous. The work of the Holy Spirit, in turn, has been held to establish a given state of salvation which must be made dynamic by the corrective of justification.

Such dichotomies, e.g., between Christ and life and the Spirit and life, are false. What is given in salvation has been given by the Spirit of God. The life that has been given is an expression of his living power. We need not think, for example, that the actuality of the work of the Holy Spirit needs as a corrective the critical influence of the doctrine of justification by faith. Even the fact that the Spirit works brings with it the demand that the believer work, for it is God who works within him through his Spirit (Phil. 2:12).

**The Entire Man**

Even as we may not restrict the work of the Spirit to a part of the application of redemption, so we may not restrict it to part of the believer. It includes his entire person. God's law and his command to obedience are all-pervasive. Transgression of the law is an act of the entire man. We should therefore also view the work of redemption, including the work of the Holy Spirit as it pertains to redemption, in connection with the entire man.

Man was made to be the temple of the Holy Spirit. His natural condition, that in which he was created, was under the influence of the Spirit. His spirit was in the most intimate communion with the Holy Spirit. Completely under the sway of the Spirit, his life in all of its parts was spiritual, Man's spirituality, therefore, is not one aspect of his being over against another; it is his entire being as it is under the sway of the Holy Spirit. Likewise, the flesh in Biblical usage is not the lower passions in contradistinction to a higher, spiritual part of man (Gal. 5:19-21). It is a set of mind, an attitude of the entire person, in which he is no longer subject to the guidance of the Spirit and therefore acts contrary to nature. The fleshly mind is a mind that is not under the influence or control of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:5; II Cor. 1:12), a mind that spurns the revelation of God which itself is breathed out by the Spirit of God. Thus the fleshly mind has no appetite for the things which pertain to God and his kingdom. It seeks to establish its own way of salvation, its own righteousness, instead of subjecting itself to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10:3).

As one is regenerated, this fleshly mind is replaced by the spiritual mind. As he is sanctified, the believer is brought more and more into the orbit of the Spirit's influence and into conformity to the image of Christ which the Spirit imparts.

**V. THE FREEDOM OF THE SPIRIT**

In his activity the Spirit of God is sovereign. This we have already observed with reference to his dispensation of spiritual gifts in the church. It is also true of his activity in every respect. Christ himself taught this truth about the Spirit when he compared his activity to that of the wind. Like the wind, which blows as it wills, the activity of the Spirit is mysterious and incomprehensible to the human mind (John 3:8). Far from being under the control of man, he is one upon whom man depends. The believer must perform everything with the awareness that he is ultimately dependent in the full range of his capabilities on the empowering and guidance of the Spirit of God.

That is especially the case in this New Testament age, because it is preeminently the age of the Spirit. Even though the contrast between the old and new dispensations is not absolute in this regard, the new dispensation is set forth in Scripture as being an age in which the Spirit of God has a dominant role.

**Mosaic Economy**

In the Old Testament as well as the New Testament dispensations the fundamental note is that of the covenant of grace. Nevertheless the Scriptures themselves teach that especially the period of the Mosaic law represents a different administration of that covenant from what we discover in the New Testament. The apostle Paul writes that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul the promise which had been given to Abraham (Gal. 3:17).

The Mosaic economy is represented in the New Testament as being a particular dispensation of the covenant of grace, with a particular purpose and limitation. It had the function, like that of the household slave who led the children to school, of leading the children of Israel to Christ (Gal. 3:24-25). It also had a restraining force,
shutting up the people of God unto the coming of Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:23). A careful analysis of the Mosaic dispensation shows that it is detailed in its legal prescriptions concerning the duties of the believer, and that it prescribes severe punishments for even minute transgressions of these laws.

Even though its ministry and the symbolism attached to it portrayed the truth of salvation by grace through faith, it clearly witnessed to its own preparatory and limited character (Heb. 8:7). Its sacrifices of bulls and of goats could only be anticipatory of the complete sacrifice of Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:1-10). Its mortal priesthood, with the restrictions on its ministration, could only be anticipatory of Christ's eternal priesthood (Heb. 7:11-17). The fact that the believer had to approach God through a temporal priesthood at all, thus being excluded from direct access into the very presence of God, was a severe limitation inherent in the Mosaic economy.

Restrictions Lifted

In the New Testament dispensation this type of restriction is lifted. The perfect sacrifice has now been made (Heb. 9:11-12). There is now an eternal priest, according to the order of Melchizedek, interceding for us in the heavens (Heb. 6:20). The veil of the temple has been torn, opening the way for the believer, without the intercession of any human priest, into the very presence of God (Matt. 27:51; Heb. 6:19; 10:19-22).

Consequently the New Testament can portray the new dispensation as being one of the freedom of the Spirit in contrast to the restrictiveness of the law. The believer is no longer in the position of the servant or slave, who belonged to the sphere of the family in the broader sense but who always had to remain at its periphery. He is now able to enter boldly into the very center of the family of God, calling God Father with the familiarity proper to a son (Gal. 4:1-7). In this family he now has Christ as his elder brother.

Agreeable to this new order, the duties of the believer are not prescribed as fully in detail. The description of these duties has less the character of a juridical prescription and more the character of an inducement to a free and spontaneous response to the call of Jesus Christ out of gratitude for what he has done. The New Testament prescriptions are not accompanied by such severe earthly sanctions; nevertheless they more clearly reflect the inner meaning of the divine law.

Law Is Spiritual

According to the Scriptures, the law is spiritual (Rom. 7:14, 12). It is the expression of the divine will. It was given as a way of life (Rom. 7:10). Its weakness did not reside in the law itself but in the sinfulness of man. Through sin which had been intended to be a way of life became an instrument of death (Rom. 7:10). From its curse Christ has redeemed us, having offered himself as a perfect satisfaction of its demands (Gal. 3:13). Through him we have the freedom of fellowship with God that the law was unable to give.

To Christ the Old Testament ordinances and service pointed. The meaning of the restrictions of the Old Testament dispensation can be grasped only if they are understood as a propaedeutic, looking forward to the complete salvation in Jesus Christ. Now that it has come the oppressive limitations of the Old Testament dispensation have been done away and the believer experiences the freedom of the communion with God through the Spirit, in a way that was not possible before.

That this is preeminently the age of the Spirit should remind the New Testament believer that he, even more than his Old Testament counterpart, must be aware of the presence and of the communion of the Holy Spirit. It is he who was sent by Christ to represent him. It is through him that the believer has fellowship with his exalted Lord.