

The Presbyterian Guardian

July 10, 1941

VOLUME 10, NO. 1

J. Gresham Machen
Editor 1936-1937

One Year—\$1.50

Published Twice Each Month—Ten Cents a Copy

Eight Months—\$1.00

1505 Race Street
Philadelphia, Penna.

John P. Clelland
Edwin H. Rian

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

John Patton Galbraith

R. B. Kuiper

Leslie W. Sloat

Thomas R. Birch
Managing Editor

Lest We Forget

An Account of the Events Leading to the Formation of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church

By the REV. EDWARD L. KELLOGG

Pastor of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Middletown, Pa.

Part I

THERE are more than two hundred denominations in the United States at the present time. This fact, coupled with the numerous and diligent efforts toward union which are abroad, makes the organization of a new denomination seem absurd. Furthermore, it makes the organizers themselves appear to be a rather cantankerous group of individuals. In the light of this prevalent attitude, some members of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church may be inclined at times to apologize for its very existence and to harbor doubts as to the wisdom and necessity of such a church as ours. To any who may be troubled in this way, I wish to suggest something which I believe is an excellent antidote. It is simply a consideration of the events which led to the formation of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Since most of us forget readily, I propose in these articles to review briefly some of those events.

When a great building crumbles and falls, it is obvious that, regardless of the outward appearance of the structure, inward decay has been in process for some time. The Presbyterian church in the U.S.A. was a great church established upon a solid foundation. The apparently sudden departure of that church from its foundation was not wrought in a moment, but was rather the result of a long undermining process. As early as 1801, when the General Association of Con-

necticut and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted a plan of union, a laxity was in evidence. This led to the infiltration of the New England theology of that day into the Presbyterian Church. Other unions, made or attempted during the closing years of the nineteenth and early years of the twentieth century, indicated a dying interest in doctrinal purity. Only in recent years, however, did the seriousness of this trend arouse, to the point of action, members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

In the winter of 1922 Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, well-known Modernist and member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in New York City, preached at the First Presbyterian Church of New York a notorious sermon, entitled "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" Dr. Fosdick was then stated supply of that Presbyterian church. The sermon aroused many slumbering conservatives to action and the Presbytery of Philadelphia overtured the general assembly to bring the preaching of the First Presbyterian Church of New York into harmony with the Confession of Faith. In response to this overture the assembly ordered the Presbytery of New York to "... take such action ... as will require the preaching and teaching in the First Presbyterian Church of New York to conform to the system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith. . . ." In addition, the assembly reaffirmed the deliverance regarding essential doctrines which had been issued by the assembly of 1910 and repeated by

the assembly of 1916. In brief, this deliverance set forth, as essential and necessary articles of faith, the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Christ to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, the resurrection of Christ, and the reality of the miracles of Christ.

Surely one might have expected all true Presbyterians to rejoice in the setting forth of such doctrines so clearly contained in the standards of the church. But no! Immediately there was an antagonistic reaction. Eighty-five persons at the assembly signed a protest. Following the adjournment of the assembly an affirmation (later known as the "Auburn Affirmation") was issued from Auburn, New York, by a committee of ministers. This affirmation in effect flatly repudiated the deliverance of the assembly and was signed by 1,293 of the approximately 10,000 ministers in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Concerning the inerrancy of the Bible it said: ". . . the doctrine of inerrancy, intended to enhance the authority of the Scriptures, in fact impairs their supreme authority for faith and life. . . ." Furthermore, the affirmation called the declarations of the 1923 assembly concerning the inerrancy of Scripture, the miracles of Christ, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, and the bodily resurrection, "theories" which might or might not be held by ministers in good standing in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The Presbytery of Cincinnati immediately sent an overture to the 1924 assembly asking that the assembly take action against the Auburn Affirmation, but the Committee on Bills and Overtures recommended "no action" and the assembly adopted its recommendation. A signal victory had been won by the liberals of the church, and their forward march continued. Affirmationists and others who sided with them rapidly gained important offices in the institutions and boards of the denomination.

There was one seminary, however, that had stood like a rock throughout all these stormy years. That seminary was Princeton. Princeton Seminary was known throughout the world for its unflinching stand upon the Word

of God. The names of Warfield, Hodge, Wilson and Machen had graced its faculty, and its contribution to the cause of conservative Christianity had been incalculable. But the opposition apparently was too great and, in 1929, that institution succumbed. Princeton was reorganized, and indicative of its policy for the future was the presence on its Board of Directors of two signers of the Auburn Affirmation—ministers who had taken ordination vows and declared their agreement with the constitution of the church but who now had affixed their names to a document which in effect denied that very constitution. Those who had known and loved the old Princeton were greatly disturbed. Conferences were held in New York and Philadelphia and, in July, 1929, a group of Presbyterian ministers and laymen decided that a new seminary should be founded. By the grace of God, Westminster Theological Seminary with a faculty of eight full-time professors and instructors first opened its doors to students on September 25, 1929.

The next important event leading to the organization of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church was the formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. At the close of the year 1932, a book entitled *Re-Thinking Missions* was published by the "Commission of Appraisal" of the "Laymen's Inquiry After One

Hundred Years." On this commission was a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Among the members of the original Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry which appointed the commission were two members of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Furthermore the book, *Re-Thinking Missions*, gained wide circulation. These facts, together with inquiries from individuals and missionary societies concerning the trustworthiness of the report, called for a statement by the board.

The situation was this: The Board of Foreign Missions had two members instrumental in the selection of the Appraisal Commission, and a minister of the denomination was a member of the commission, yet the report presented a view of the method and message of missions diametrically opposed to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Board of Foreign Missions was at the crossroads. Would it stand squarely and honestly upon the Confession of the church which it represented and, in unmistakable terms, declare its opposition to *Re-Thinking Missions*, or would it turn aside to a compromising position? The vague answer given by the board showed clearly that it had turned aside.

Again, some conservatives in the church were aroused. The late Dr. J. Gresham Machen, then Professor of New Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary, determined to investigate the work of the Board of Foreign Missions. At once he discovered that the candidate secretary of the board, who had the delicate task of interviewing candidates for the foreign field and of encouraging or discouraging them in their high ambition, was a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. A member of the board was also a signer of that document. The well-known novelist, Pearl Buck, was a missionary in good standing under the board, even though she was publishing in books and articles a view of the method and message of missions contrary to that of the Word of God.

Concerning the candidate department, Dr. Machen found that an official letter dated July 15, 1932, and (Please Turn to Page 8)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

July 10, 1941

Lest We Forget	1
Edward L. Kellogg	
Westminster Seminary and Its Needs	3
Edwin H. Rian	
Literal or Spiritual?	4
Edward J. Young	
Words Sweet and Bitter	6
Burton L. Goddard	
Does James Contradict Paul?	7
Robert Strong	
Editorial	9
Rethinking Revivals	10
John C. Hills, Jr., and William E. Welmers	
Christianity and Shintoism—Part III	12
By a Qualified Observer	
Today in the Religious World	14
Thomas R. Birch	

Westminster Seminary and Its Needs

An Appeal by the REV. EDWIN H. RIAN
President of the Board of Trustees

FIVE years ago next January our beloved, intrepid and brilliant leader, Dr. Machen, laid down his armor after having fought a good fight, kept the faith, and given to us a trusteeship to preach, to teach, and to defend the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. We can still hear his encouraging words, uttered in the heat of the battle when all seemed hopeless, "Remember that the battle is the Lord's!" That battle against Satan and all his hosts is still raging and Westminster Theological Seminary is in the thick of it.

An examination of the progress of the battle compels us to ask two questions: Have we at Westminster Seminary been faithful to the heritage which Dr. Machen committed to us? Has the Lord honored the confidence which He has enabled us to place in His Word? In the answering of these two questions we believe there will well up in our souls the refrain, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

Have we at Westminster Seminary been faithful to the heritage which Dr. Machen committed to us? That spiritual possession, described succinctly, is a belief that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. In such a conviction we have the most powerful weapon that the army of the Lord can wield, namely, the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Nothing else about the army—its size, its soldiers, its training—is as important, for in this battle we fight "not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of the world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

By the grace of God the seminary has been true to that inheritance. Every professor believes and teaches that the Bible is the very Word of God, the infallible rule of faith and practice. Each member of the Board of Trustees likewise holds to that persuasion. The students leave these halls of learning convinced in their minds and hearts that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the only hope for mankind. In the face of many temptations to yield to sin and to appease the world

just a little that great good may come, the seminary has been given the courage and the strength to resist the appeasement road to destruction. In these days when the world is being shaken to its depths, the Word of the living God is the only foundation that cannot be moved.

Has the Lord honored the confidence which He has enabled us to place in His Word? When Dr. Machen died, a Machen Memorial Fund was launched with two goals in view, a new campus and the power to grant theological degrees. Both of these objectives have been attained, and due to an unexpected gift through a legacy the mortgage on the property will be lifted as soon as the legacy is paid. In 1939 the State Council of Education of Pennsylvania gave the seminary degree-granting power. These two rewards of faith, a beautiful twenty-three acre campus free of debt, and the power to grant the Th.B. degree, make us all rejoice.

Besides these manifestations of God's blessing, we can point to such others as the establishment of the James H. Montgomery Scholarship Fund, the Frank H. Stevenson Library Fund, the Harry A. Worcester Lectureship, the launching of *The Westminster Theological Journal*, the Ministerial Institute during each summer, the leaves of absence for each professor in order to do research work and begin the task of making a contribution to theological literature, the addition of the Rev. John H. Skilton to the faculty, and the Rev. Leslie W. Sloat as Librarian. We believe that these major achievements during the past five years are a source of joy and

encouragement to every one of you who are friends and supporters of Westminster. They point to the fact that the seminary is determined under God to become a great center of Christian learning.

But with these accomplishments we cannot rest. Our greatest opportunities and tasks lie ahead. We must widen the influence of the seminary, increase the number of students, add to the faculty and make a greater impact upon life today. These are the spiritual and scholastic goals.

What is our most pressing material need? The most urgent requirement right now is to secure a sufficient income from living donors to equal the budget. Our budget is \$45,000 or 33 per cent. less than the \$65,000 of 1936. During the last calendar year we received \$30,000, or \$15,000 less than necessary. The seminary has been maintained in spite of these deficits because of unexpected bequests. For this we thank God and take courage, but everyone will recognize that if the institution is to be sound financially, and if it is to survive, the income must equal the budget.

We ask your earnest and prayerful support in this most serious situation. We have two suggestions. (1) Will you help us to secure at least two hundred and fifty new contributors? (2) Will you try to increase your gift 10 per cent. this year? These two suggestions alone may not enable us to reach our goal of \$45,000 this year, but if they are pursued enthusiastically and persistently, we shall have made progress in our endeavor to maintain Westminster Seminary.

When we consider the large advances which have been made in the past five years and in the face of almost insurmountable difficulties, we have the conviction that God will honor our faith still more and bless us all in the great responsibility of keeping radiant this lighthouse of theological learning. The battle is the Lord's, as Dr. Machen reminded us, and in that knowledge we shall be led to victory.

Will you respond now to our urgent appeal for help?

Where to Send Gifts

YOUR gifts in response to this appeal should be addressed to Westminster Seminary, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.

Literal or Spiritual?

The Concluding Article in a Series of Studies in Prophecy

By the REV. EDWARD J. YOUNG

Assistant Professor of Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary

THE devout student of the Bible is often confronted with a very practical question, "What is the meaning of a given prophecy? Should it be interpreted in a literal or in a figurative manner?" This question is a natural one. Where, however, may one discover its answer? It will be the purpose of this article to discuss the question and to present the Biblical answer.

Literal or Spiritual?

It may be that there are some who would assert that every prophecy is to be interpreted in a figurative manner or, in other words, is to be spiritualized. If there are such people, however, they are very few in number, and we may dismiss their view as having no Biblical support. Nowhere does the Bible teach, either by direct statement or by implication, that every prophecy is to be interpreted figuratively or is to be spiritualized.

Far more numerous are those who assert that prophecy is to be interpreted literally whenever such interpretation is possible. This view is often set forth in popular books which treat of prophecy. In the words of a scholar, the late R. B. Girdlestone, in his little book, *The Grammar of Prophecy*, "Literal, if possible, is, I believe, the only maxim that will carry you right through the Word of God from Genesis to Revelation" (p. 179). Oftentimes the argument is stated somewhat as follows, "Since most of the prophecies which have already been fulfilled have been fulfilled in a literal manner, we may therefore reasonably expect that the prophecies whose accomplishment we have not yet seen will also be fulfilled literally." To support this argument, it is sometimes said, "If we spiritualize prophecy, why should we not also spiritualize the virgin birth, the resurrection, the second coming and other doctrines of our faith?"

Before discussing the question whether most fulfilled prophecies have been literally fulfilled, and before examining more closely the words "literal" and "spiritual" as applied to

prophetic interpretation, we must ask whether we are indeed justified in employing the rule laid down by Girdlestone. It will not take long to discover that this rule is not derived from the teaching of Scripture. There is not a verse in the Bible which teaches that the proper method of interpreting prophecy is "literal—if possible." Nor can that maxim be inferred or deduced from the teaching of Holy Scripture. Let it therefore be said with all plainness that those who employ that rule—and this seems to apply to most of the Bible teachers and prophetic students of our day—are guilty of imposing upon prophecy a man-made rule of interpretation. We challenge those Bible teachers and prophetic students to prove that the Bible teaches that "literal—if possible" is the correct method of interpreting prophecy.

When, therefore, we engage in the interpretation of prophecy, we are not to say, "I must interpret this prophecy spiritually, if at all possible," nor are we to say, "I must interpret this prophecy literally, if possible." Neither of these is the Scriptural method.

What do we mean by the words "literal" and "spiritual"? In what manner, also, does the New Testament interpret prophecy?

The word "literal" means "according to the letter," and when one speaks of the literal meaning of a passage, he refers to the ordinary and apparent sense of the words as opposed to an allegorical or metaphorical sense. Thus, if we are to use the word in its strict meaning with regard to Genesis 3:15, we should say that this passage teaches that God will put enmity between a certain serpent and the woman and between their respective seeds. Further, it teaches, we should be forced to say, that at some time a man will bruise the head of the serpent, and the serpent will bruise his heel. Indeed, some critics of the Bible have interpreted this passage as referring only to the enmity that exists between women and snakes.

Again, if we are to insist upon the strict use of the word "literal" in in-

terpreting the prophecy, "and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands" (Isa. 55:12b), it would seem that we were justified in saying that this prophecy teaches that trees actually have hands, and that they will clap them.

When we speak of "spiritualizing," we mean the opposite of "literalizing." Thus, it might be said that the prophecy of Isaiah is to be taken in a spiritual, rather than in a literal sense. It does not teach, we might say, that trees have hands which they will clap, but it uses this figure of speech to proclaim the truth that the blessings of Christ's redemptive work will affect all creation.

New Testament Fulfillment

With these thoughts in mind, it will soon become apparent that the words "literal" and "spiritual" are used in a very loose and inaccurate manner by many Bible students. One of the prophecies which is claimed to be fulfilled literally is Isaiah 7:14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." But can we say that this prophecy was literally fulfilled, if we use the word "literally" in the strict sense? When we read the fulfillment in Matthew 1:21, we note that it says, "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus." Mary did not call the Saviour's name Immanuel, but Jesus. Hence, it would seem that this prophecy was not fulfilled in a strictly literal sense.

Again, in Isaiah 9:2 we read, "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light." Matthew, however (4:13-16), refers the fulfillment of this prophecy to Christ's presence in Capernaum by the sea. It is obvious, therefore, that although this prophecy was fulfilled, it was not fulfilled in a strictly literal sense.

Another prophecy which is sometimes set forth as being literally fulfilled is Hosea 11:1. The fulfillment is given in Matthew 2:13-15, in which a part of the prophecy is referred to the flight of Mary and Joseph and the Christ-child into Egypt. Of course, a strictly literal fulfillment of the prophecy could only be discovered in a calling of Israel from Egypt.

These few examples will serve to point out that we must be very careful in talking about the literal or spiritual fulfillment of prophecy. Men speak very glibly and freely about

prophecy being literally fulfilled, without apparently pausing to define the meanings of the words which they are employing.

If the reader is interested in ascertaining what has been the nature of the accomplishment of prophecy, we would suggest the following plan. Let him take his Bible in hand and begin to read the Gospel of Matthew, working through the whole New Testament. Whenever he meets a reference to the fulfillment of an Old Testament prophecy, such as, for example, Matthew 1:22, let him copy on a piece of paper the exact words of the New Testament which quote or refer to the Old Testament prophecy. Next, let him copy the exact words of the Old Testament prophecy itself. The marginal references will indicate where the prophecy in question is to be found. Now, with the two passages before him, let him make a careful study of them. Let him note whether the New Testament refers only to the heart of the Old Testament passage, or whether the Old Testament passage is fulfilled in all its details. He will be well repaid for whatever time and effort he may expend upon this exercise. One thing it will certainly accomplish; it will reveal to the reader the beauty of God's Word in a way which he had not realized before. It will also make clear to him that much which is being said today about the fulfillment of prophecy is without foundation in fact.

An Objection Considered

Let us now proceed to discuss an objection which was raised earlier in this article. This objection may be stated as follows: If the New Testament does spiritualize some of the Old Testament prophecies, why may not we therefore be justified in spiritualizing the resurrection or the virgin birth, for example? The answer to this question is really very simple. We may not spiritualize these great facts because the Bible does not intend us to spiritualize them. The very first rule to be employed in the interpretation of the Bible is that the Bible's language must be interpreted in the sense in which it is intended. Thus, for example, when the Bible tells us, "I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Ex. 20:2a), we are dealing with straightforward prose, and we are compelled so to interpret it.

We are not at liberty to put upon it any other interpretation than that intended by the author. When, however, we read in Exodus 19:4b, "and how I bare you on eagles' wings . . .", we must also interpret this language as it is intended. It is obviously poetical and figurative, and should only be so understood. If these simple rules are not adhered to, all language becomes meaningless.

Now it is very clear that when the Bible speaks of our Lord's resurrection, for example, it intends us to understand, not that Christ's example and ideals and teachings live on forever, but rather that the body of the Lord actually emerged from the tomb in which it had been placed. If we spiritualize the language, we are violating a fundamental canon of interpretation.

It should be noted, however, as we have sought to point out in this series of articles, that the language of prophecy stands in a class by itself. Not all the canons of interpretation which would apply to other language apply to the language of prophecy. We have seen how God told Moses that to the prophets He would reveal Himself in dark speeches, in dreams and in visions (cf. Num. 12:1-8). We have further seen that evidences of this mode of revelation appear in the fact that the language in which prophecy is couched is often obscure and ambiguous. Consequently, all we can do is to turn to the New Testament to discover the correct interpretation. Let it be said again with all emphasis, *prophecy is not detailed history written in advance, nor was it given to man in order to enable him to prophesy.*

The Value of Prophecy

What, then, is the value of prophecy? We shall answer this question first with respect to those who lived before the coming of the Saviour and secondly with respect to ourselves. To those who lived before the advent of our Lord, prophecy brought a message of comfort. Its great central burden was that the Lord would visit His people and bless them and in turn make them a blessing to the Gentiles. Of course, as to details, there was much that could not be understood, but the great central meaning of prophecy was clear.

There were many among the Jews who applied a wrong method to the

interpretation of prophecy. They were wise above that which was written in that they in effect forced upon prophecy the "literal—if possible" principle. Hence, when the great Fulfiller of prophecy appeared, they did not recognize Him, but crucified Him. They did not know Him, because they did not rightly interpret those things which had been written concerning Him. With regard to the literal method of interpretation, we do well to listen to the learned Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg: "But the strongest argument that can be brought is this, it was this very method of interpretation which led to the crucifixion of Christ."

There were some among the Jews, however, who rightly understood the nature of prophecy. They were God's own, and they devoutly looked for the "consolation of Israel." Such an one was the aged Simeon, whose beautiful prayer (Luke 2:29-32) breathes forth the very heart of Old Testament prophecy. "Now lettest thou thy servant depart, O Lord, according to thy word, in peace; For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples; A light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." Such also were Mary and Elizabeth and, doubtless, many, many others, humble in spirit, who rightly believed in the promises of God.

We who live in this present dispensation will receive much help and benefit from the right study of prophecy. We shall ever be reminded of God's faithfulness; we shall stand in awe at the wonder of God's redeeming love; we shall better understand the plan of salvation; we shall be strengthened in spirit and comforted in heart; we shall be preserved from the errors of interpretation that are about us on every hand.

Before us lies the whole Word of God—the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. As devout, Bible-believing Christians, let us earnestly turn to the study of the prophecies of the Old Testament in the light of the New. Let us look at God's revelation to the prophets, as did the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

Words Sweet and Bitter

A Meditation by the REV. BURTON L. GODDARD

Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O Lord God of hosts (Jeremiah 15:16).

HOW sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." How beautiful a description of divine revelation are these words of the psalmist! One contemplates the majestic glory of his Maker, whose throne is heaven; whose footstool is the earth, before whom the cherubim hide their faces and lift aloud their voices in adoration, saying, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." He thinks of God's plan of salvation through the substitutionary atonement of Christ, the knowledge that God loved us and gave Himself for us. He meditates on the matchless love, the amazing grace and the unbounded mercy which found expression in the Saviour's humiliation and suffering that sinners might be restored to fellowship with God. He remembers the promises of God which are ever faithful and true, more precious than fine stones or silver or gold. Yes, the words of the living God are sweet beyond measure.

The Bitter

Perhaps the Psalmist had in mind only one aspect of God's revelation. It would be strange, indeed, if God's word to men were unmixed sweetness. Life itself is different. The bitter is strangely mingled with the sweet. Joy is tempered by sorrow. Victory is often but a prelude to final, catastrophic defeat. Even the Christian knows conflict within, and is sometimes led to exclaim, "The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do."

The root of bitterness is sin, and so long as sin continues it will produce that which is bitter. And because God's word to man is especially concerned with sin, its heinousness in His sight and its awful dominion over man, it must surely be expected that here, also, the bitter will accompany the sweet.

Jeremiah found it so. Moreover, his prophetic messages were not to a faithful congregation, but to an apostate

people. Wanting in good tidings, they were filled with condemnation. Like Amos, Jeremiah was a prophet of judgment. His task was not an easy one. It was not pleasant to have to prophesy the doom of his own nation. There was no joy in acquainting his fellowmen with a knowledge of the coming captivity and the terrible punishments to be visited upon them for their sins.

With a feeling of timidity and an aching heart, the prophet addressed the people. Sometimes the performance of his commission was almost more than he could bear. If only he could have been the pastor of an obedient flock! But no, the word of God which he must speak was bitter beyond compare.

When God came to dwell among men, His words were not all of comfort and tranquility. Many of them were words of judgment against unrighteousness: "I came not to send peace, but a sword." "Woe unto the world because of offences!" "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you." "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" "These shall go away into everlasting punishment."

Some of His words were prophetic of trouble and hardship for believers: "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake."

Bitter words, these!

The divine message is not of a different nature today. The faithful Christian witness must declare God's judgment against sin. He must publish the fact, that the one who rejects Christ and refuses to repent is lost. He must make plain that "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

There are many hard sayings of God which it is not easy to set forth. To a world at war, a world which has long talked so glibly of enduring peace to be achieved through human mechanisms, it is certainly unpopular to say that wars and rumors of war will continue until the end of time. To the young Christian, it is perhaps discour-

aging to learn of the struggle against sin which is in store for him and of the difficulties of witnessing and living for Christ.

The Sweet

How surprising, in the face of all this, to turn to the Book of Jeremiah and consider the prophet's testimony regarding the prophetic messages he had received from God: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart." Nor was he thinking of the brighter side of God's revelation. Rather, as the following verse shows, he spoke of the woes God had pronounced through him upon Judah. Why such a witness? Why was it not like that of John in his vision on the Isle of Patmos? For the scroll of condemnatory prophecy was for John sweet only to the taste and exceedingly bitter thereafter.

Perhaps the answer is to be found in the common experience of life. Bitter as it is sometimes, we welcome the medicine which promises to make us well. The performance of a disagreeable task is, on occasion, rendered joyous, either as one considers the end or thinks of the one for whom it is being done. Again, it may be that he somehow receives satisfaction, knowing that he is doing that which it is his duty to do. Truly, there are many things which are able to make sweet that which is bitter.

The secret of Jeremiah's witness is to be found in the words which follow those quoted above, "For I am called by thy name, O Lord God of hosts." Jeremiah knew God. He worshiped God. He loved God. He had learned that man does not live by bread alone but by every word that issueth out of the mouth of God. Like Enoch, he walked with God. Moreover, God had chosen him as a special vessel to make known His will unto men, and the office of a prophet was glorious, indeed. Therefore, bitter or sweet, hard or gentle, understood or veiled in mystery, the words of God were to Jeremiah true, enduring and of pure delight. They burned like a fire within him, and as Paul later cried, "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel," so Jeremiah might have spoken of the impelling constraint which the words of God placed upon him. However unpleasant it might be to declare them, they were the words of God, therefore wonderful

words, precious and sweet to Jeremiah, who thought only of Him who spoke them.

Are there hard sayings in the Scripture? Do not be rebellious. Do not fear. Do not sorrow. The God who has spoken through the inspired writers is the same God who works all things after the counsel of His own will—and He is a God of truth and love! Whatsoever God does is surely good. He knows best. His chastisement is both wise and necessary.

But as in the case of Jeremiah, the bitter can be made sweet only if the God of heaven is your God. If He is your God, the bitterness is removed from His words. His judgment against sin shall not come nigh you, for there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. Persecution and tribulation may be your lot, but the Lord has sent the Comforter to dwell in your heart. That which is bitter is become for you sweet.

May you trust in Jeremiah's God!

Does James Contradict Paul?

By the REV. ROBERT STRONG, S.T.D.

Pastor of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Willow Grove, Pa.

ONE of the most interesting questions raised in the mind of a reader of the Epistle of James is that of the relation of James to Paul: Do they contradict each other?

The prevailing opinion, until the time of the Reformation, was that the teaching of James could be readily harmonized with Paul's doctrine of grace. Luther, however, thought that James contradicted Paul, and in his zeal for the doctrine of justification by faith alone, he relegated the Epistle of James to the appendix of his Bible. "James," said Luther, "has aimed to refute those who relied on faith without works, and is too weak for his task in mind, understanding, and words, mutilates the Scriptures, and thus directly contradicts Paul and all Scriptures, seeking to accomplish by enforcing the law what the apostles successfully effect by love. Therefore I will not place his epistle in my Bible among the proper leading books." As compared to Romans and Galatians, the Epistle of James was to Luther a downright "straw" epistle and without real evangelical character.

In vindication of the canonical standing of James, it is perhaps sufficient to quote the judicious words of Alford: "On the whole, on any intelligent principles of canonical reception of early writings, we cannot refuse this epistle a place in the canon. That that place was given it from the first in some part of the church; that, in spite of many adverse circumstances, it gradually won that place in other parts; that when thoroughly consid-

ered, it is so consistent with and worthy of his character and standing whose name it bears; that it is marked off by so strong a line of distinction from the writings and epistles which have not attained a place in the canon: all these are considerations which, though they do not in this, any more than in other cases, amount to demonstration, yet furnish when combined a proof hardly to be resisted, that the place where we now find it in the New Testament canon is that which it ought to have, and which God in His providence has guided His church to assign to it."

Now if James rightfully belongs in the canon of Holy Scripture, the judgment of Luther was most hasty and deplorable, for it could not be that

Young People's Topics

THE article on this page will be an aid in studying the young people's lessons published by the Committee on Christian Education of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which may be secured from the Rev. Burton L. Goddard, Box 73, Carlisle, Massachusetts. Topics now being studied are:

July 6th—THE SOURCE OF TEMPTATION (James 1:1-15).

July 13th—PURE RELIGION (James 1:16-27).

July 20th—RESPECT OF PERSONS (James 2:1-13).

July 27th—FAITH WITHOUT WORKS (James 2:14-26).

one inspired writer would contradict another. In the Word of God we expect to find, and we do find, a "consent of all the parts," a self-consistent body of teaching.

It is James 2:14-26 that has been pointed to by Luther and others as in opposition to Paul. Here, for example, we read: "Faith without works is dead. . . . Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." How are we to understand such statements?

A helpful approach to this question is a consideration of the probable date of the epistle. Quickly to be dismissed is the view that the Epistle of James is a late writing to which an unknown author has attached a great name in order to gain a wider audience. James is certainly not a forgery.

But what about the view that the epistle was written toward the close of its author's life, say 61 A.D.? In that event the coincidences between James 2 and Romans 4 could be explained, for the apostle could have been acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans, as also with that to the Galatians. Is James 2 a formal refutation of Paul's doctrine of justification? It does not read like one. Neither does it seem, as some have suggested, a correction of a current misunderstanding of Paul's teaching. If it were that, James surely would have said so and have made it clear that he was not attacking the apostle to the Gentiles. Moreover, James makes no reference to the question of the admission of Gentiles into the church, a question over which there had formerly been much controversy. At the time when James, on this view, is supposed to have written, he could hardly have discussed the topic of faith and works and not also have referred to the Jerusalem council (Acts 15) and its decision on the controversy over Gentile converts to Christianity.

Only one theory fits all the facts. It is that James was written before the Judaistic controversy had become a major issue in the church. The epistle, then, came from the hand of James several years before the council at Jerusalem in 51 A.D. His use of terms that became prominent in the controversy over the circumcision of Gentile believers is thus not to be cited as evidence that he wrote to take sides in the dispute. James was not contending with Paul. Indeed, as Acts 15 shows, James fully agreed with

Paul on that issue. James in this earliest of the canonical epistles was refuting a practical error that had appeared in the church which, at the time he wrote, was still almost entirely Jewish. It was an error which plagues the church still, the error of thinking that an intellectual assent to the teachings of the church is all that is necessary.

We call this error dead orthodoxy, or better, "orthodoxism." James warned of it, and so must we.

Thus when James speaks of faith, we see that he means such a faith as the demons have when they, believing that God is, only tremble at the thought; a faith that is not accompanied by practical obedience and righteousness in life. Faith as Paul uses the terms affects the whole man and leads him into vital union with Christ; it is a faith that is rested unreservedly on Christ and, having bound the soul to Him, serves in everyday life His cause out of love to Him.

The works meant by Paul are the dead works of legalism; they can never give life. The works meant by James are the works of a believer, evidencing that true faith and love which are in him. They are not the source of his spiritual life, but its fruit.

The justification meant by Paul is that declaration of God, given once for all, that the believing sinner is accounted righteous for the sake of Christ, on the basis of His merit alone. The justification meant by James is the proof, at any time rendered in the Christian's life by his obedience to God, that he is a true Christian. The justification of which James speaks may even be said also to comprehend the last judgment when, by the test of good works, the people of God will be shown indeed to belong to His kingdom. The same idea appears in Paul in Romans 2:6-10. And it is of this that Jesus speaks in Matthew 25:31-46. Good works are an essential part of the Christian life. Without them we can have no proper assurance that a saving work has been done in us.

Let us sum up the comparison of Paul and James in D. A. Hayes' well-considered words:

"Paul is looking at the root; James is looking at the fruit. Paul is talking about the beginning of the Christian life; James is talking about its continuance and consummation. With Paul, the works he renounces precede

faith and are dead works. With James, the faith he renounces is apart from works and is a dead faith."

The doctrine of inspiration gives assurance that James could not contradict Paul. This brief study shows, it is hoped, that James does not contradict Paul.

Lest We Forget

(Continued From Page 2)

sent, according to its own testimony, to over a thousand students and others contemplating foreign service, recommended certain devotional books saying, ". . . there are books like 'The Devotional Diary' by Oldham; 'Today,' an outline of Bible readings; 'The Meaning of Faith' and others by Fosdick; 'Marks of a World Christian' by Fleming." Thus the only books recommended, besides the series called "Today," were books by outstanding liberals—books the content of which was undeniably antithetical to the doctrines contained in the constitution of the church. The views of Fosdick and his book need little comment. Dr. Daniel Johnson Fleming was a signer of the Auburn Affirmation and Professor of Missions at Union Theological Seminary, New York. His book, *Marks of a World Christian*, presents a theology of human experience as opposed to a theology based on the Word of God. It speaks of a perpetual incarnation of God in humanity rather than one incarnation when the second person of the blessed Trinity partook of flesh. A brief quotation from Dr. J. H. Oldham's *Devotional Diary* gives an idea of its content: "Those alone understand the teaching of Jesus who know that it is not teaching at all, but simply the living utterance of one who had achieved rebirth in a new condition of life." Such were the books which the candidate committee of the Board of Foreign Missions was recommending to prospective missionaries.

What should be done about such practices? There was one thing that could be done, and that was to follow the constitutional method of over-turing the general assembly. This Dr. Machen did. An overture was prepared which, in effect, asked the general assembly to bring the practices and policies of the Board of Foreign

Missions into harmony with the constitution of the church. To this overture were appended one hundred and six pages of well-documented evidence, proving the need for such action on the part of the assembly.

Now the assembly was at the crossroads. Would it abide by its standards and see that the boards and agencies of the church conformed their practices to the constitution under which they were laboring, or would it step aside? The assembly chose the latter course and, having exonerated the Board of Foreign Missions and commended its work to the church, it rejected the overture which had been presented.

(To Be Concluded)

JERSEY CHURCH WITHDRAWS FROM U.S.A. PRESBYTERY

ELDERS and trustees of Grace Presbyterian Church, Camden, N. J., renounced the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. on Saturday, June 21st, and promised to lead the congregation in filing from the church building during the morning worship service on the following day. The decision thus to withdraw from the denomination was the result of an exhibit of tyranny by the Presbytery of West Jersey.

At a recent meeting of the presbytery, the Rev. Samuel Warren, stated supply of the church, witnessed the examination of candidates for the ministry. At that time, Mr. Warren charged, one candidate was asked: "Do you believe in the resurrection?" The candidate replied, "I don't know that the Bible teaches it or that St. Paul believed it." But despite the answer, Mr. Warren declared, the candidate was ordained, and was not even rebuked for his bold denial.

As a result of the ensuing differences between Mr. Warren and the presbytery, that organization revoked his license on the charge that he was no longer loyal to the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. When the congregation learned of this, most of its members voted to withdraw and to turn over the church buildings and furnishings to the presbytery. The congregation will meet until further notice in a funeral parlor in Camden.

The Presbyterian Guardian

EDITORIAL

Going to Church

THE true Christian loves to go to church. He loves to go because he recognizes the church as a divine institution established by God for the advancement of His kingdom. The church is "the pillar and ground of the truth"; it is the body of Christ. In the church, the Christian worships the true and living God. There he hears the Word of God proclaimed. There the sacraments are administered. Within her walls the blessed fellowship of the saints is found. Accordingly the words of the psalmist, "I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the house of the Lord," mirror the feeling of every child of God. The natural tendency, therefore, is for devout Christians to applaud every attempt to encourage church attendance, but here, as always, we must "try the spirits whether they be of God."

The Reader's Digest for May, 1941, contains an article, condensed from the *Christian Herald*, entitled "Quincy Goes To Church," narrating with considerable enthusiasm the results of a church attendance campaign in Quincy, Massachusetts. A Church Attendance Council was formed by various service and business clubs which secured the endorsement of three hundred other organizations in a dual program of increasing church attendance and promoting coöperation among different sects. In the furtherance of this program, noon-day meetings were held in theatres, with messages by ministers, priests and rabbis. Coöperation among Protestants, Romanists and Jews was stressed. The Sunday after Easter was designated as "Walk to Church Sunday," with Seth Parker's slogan, "You go to your church and I'll go to mine, but let's walk along together." The support of the entire community was obtained and there has been a decided increase in church attendance. The promoters feel their crusade has been a real suc-

cess because it has raised moral and spiritual values so sorely needed in these critical days. The article states that not a single criticism has been leveled against the idea and adds, "None can be."

In the face of this *ipse dixit*, we might hesitate to voice our criticism, but nothing is to hinder us from judging all things by the Word of God. The Quincy movement is unscriptural primarily because it denies the exclusive character of Christianity. Jesus said, "I am the way . . . no man cometh unto the Father but by me." The Jew worshiping in his synagogue does not draw nigh unto God, because he does not approach God through Jesus Christ. The rabbi leads a congregation in the worship of a false deity, not in the worship of the triune God. The Romish priest, with his doctrines of merit, image worship and an infallible church, does not teach New Testament doctrine. The modernist Protestant preacher proclaims "another gospel which is not another."

There is only one way to come before God and that is through the blood of Jesus Christ. The Scriptures teach only one truth and the only true church is the church which sets forth that truth. The Quincy crusaders have completely failed to grasp this fact with their emphasis upon going to church—any church. When the Jew, Romanist and Modernist go to their churches and I go to mine, we cannot walk along together. The difference between us is the difference between night and day, between heaven and hell. The fact that a statement that such a program is above criticism can confidently be made shows how completely ignorant men are today of the true character of Christianity. One wonders if they have ever read the New Testament.

A secondary criticism is that the whole point of the campaign is not to bring men in touch with God but to elevate the tone or morale of the community. Now, going to church does help a community, but that is not the reason for going to church. We go that we may enter into the presence of the most high God. Our religion, yea, all our life, is God-centered, and to center it anywhere else is to worship the creature rather than the Creator. Here again the Quincy movement is in error, for its emphasis is on man, not on God. Go to church because it will help you and it will

help Quincy is their plea, and so God becomes an instrument for the attainment of human goals. The psalmist fainted for the courts of the Lord. How many of the Rotarized multitudes who throng the churches of Quincy know this deep hunger of the soul for the living God?

—J. P. C.

Phylacteries

MAN loves to worship idols. He should desire only to worship God in spirit and in truth but because of his fallen nature he constantly turns from the true God to images of his own making. The Pharisees of Jesus' day did not worship idols of gold or silver; they would have been horrified at the very thought. Nevertheless, they carried idols around with them on their arms and foreheads. They wore little leather boxes called phylacteries, containing minute scrolls of the law. The reason for this was the injunction of the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy to bind the law as a sign upon the hand and as frontlets between the eyes. Of course the command was meant to be taken spiritually. They were so to love and live the law that it would be ever before them. But the Pharisees externalized the command and made themselves these phylacteries. By so doing they made idols for themselves. Then they made broad their phylacteries that men might see how religious they were.

We smile rather scornfully at their folly, but do not men still make broad their phylacteries? Do we not have the same sinful tendency to turn from spiritual truth to some visible symbol of that truth? To partake of the Lord's Supper worthily is truly to feed upon Christ, but how many make it a point of pride never to miss a communion service and by fixing their attention merely on the outward form of the service make of it a phylactery? We cannot grow in grace unless we go to church, but to go to church on the Quincy basis is to make church-going an end in itself, and thus make of it also a phylactery. And so illustrations might be multiplied. We all naturally make phylacteries. Formalism is a natural product of the sinful human heart. May God so fill us with His Spirit that no symbol or form shall ever come between us and Him!

—J. P. C.

Rethinking Revivals

The Sixth in a Series of Articles on the Crisis in Evangelism

By JOHN C. HILLS, JR., and WILLIAM E. WELMERS

THIS summer a great many Americans are going to spend a lot of time in tents. Thousands of vacationers will pitch their camp tents in state parks and tourist camps. More thousands of our young men between the ages of 21 and 35 will sleep under government-owned canvas in army camps and on training maneuvers. The circus tent will attract many others, young and old, who will temporarily forget the war and the defense program while they laugh at the clowns and the performing animals, between sips of pink lemonade and handfuls of popcorn. We, however, are more directly and vitally interested in the summer revival tent. Under this tent we can see, in its most striking form, the frantic attempt of the pietistic wing of the church to meet the growing pressure of unbelief.

Right at this point we want to make clear that all that we shall say in the rest of this article is for the purpose of pointing out the failure of the church to follow the methods of evangelism which God would have it use. We freely and thankfully acknowledge that God has many times been pleased to honor to some degree the type of preaching that we shall here criticize. But it is a dangerous mistake to assume that, because such honor is sometimes granted, the church is justified in employing unscriptural methods of evangelism or that, by continuing to neglect Biblical principles, unbelief can be blasted from its strongholds.

The pietistic wing of the church has endeavored to stem the advance of armored unbelief by stepped-up evangelistic campaigns. To the intelligent unbeliever these seem to consist solely of special services, big name and high-pressure evangelists, spirited song leaders equipped with brass instruments, hysteria-producing song services as preludes to the knockout blow of the sensational sermon, and teary and oft-repeated altar calls. That this type of evangelism, despite its scattered successes, has failed miserably to overthrow the foundations of increasing unbelief is obvious; the halcyon days

of religious emotionalism have passed, and unbelief marches on undaunted. In our treatment of the evangelistic warfare of the various branches of the church, we deal with this unsuccessful pietistic evangelism simply because so many people still hopefully cling to it, looking pathetically for future success. It is our solemn duty on behalf of these people to show why this approach has failed in the past and why it can never succeed to any great extent.

We pass over the unhealthy emotionalism which has too frequently attached itself to pietistic evangelism in the form of the excesses listed above. These are but symptoms of a fundamentally wrong sort of evangelism. It is better to go to the very heart of the matter by analyzing the preaching connected with these mass revivals. How has this preaching attacked unbelief and paganism; how has it defended the Bible? Pietistic preaching has, in its attack and defense, usually assumed one of three forms.

First, there are those who say that if we are to argue with unbelievers at all, we should do so only by quoting the words of Scripture. A world-renowned evangelist of the last generation said, in substance, "I never argue with the unbeliever about the Bible. I simply quote the Bible to him. At first, he continues to object, but finally, as I keep on quoting Scripture, he breaks down in tears and is converted." This same sort of sentiment was once expressed to one of the authors by an energetic young evangelist about as follows: "Whenever I meet a man who doesn't believe the Bible to be the Word of God, I just go down into the valley of humiliation, and there I select five smooth Bible verses which I proceed to sling against the forehead of this modern unbelieving Goliath." We quite agree with these people when they say that no one is ever converted to Christ by argument. We are going to go one step farther, however, and point out also that no one is ever converted to Christ merely by having Scripture texts flung at him with the rapidity

and accuracy of Garand rifle fire. When all is said and done, it is neither argument nor Scripture quotations alone which convert; it is the Holy Spirit applying Scripture to the hearts of men. All of this, however, fails to answer our question. What we want to know is this: granting that the success of our evangelistic efforts depends entirely on the working of God's Spirit, what is the best *method* for us to use in our evangelism? To ask the same question in different words, what method of evangelism does the Bible set forth? Let us not be misunderstood. When we say that the evangelist must do more than merely quote the words of Scripture, we are not belittling the Bible. We insist, and insist again and again, that the Bible *must* be the foundation of all evangelism; and, strange as it may seem, the method of evangelism which is found in the Bible consists of a great deal more than simply quoting the Bible. Let us prove our contention from the Bible itself.

When Peter preached to thousands on the day of Pentecost, a large part of his audience was made up of Jews and proselytes. The importance of that fact cannot be exaggerated. Peter's hearers knew the Scriptures, and believed them to be the Word of God. Please do not overlook this fact. Most of Peter's hearers were *willing to listen* to the Word of God. That is a condition which does not exist for the modern evangelist. In view of this, how can we for a single moment maintain that because Peter quoted the Bible, modern evangelists should do nothing but quote Scripture? In addition to this, please notice that when Peter quoted the Old Testament he did not toss out to his audience a few glibly-recited verses snatched out of their connection with the rest of God's Word, as is a common practice of the pietist. Peter not only quoted Scripture, but he explained it as well; and his explanations are strongly flavored with doctrines that pietists have despised and deserted. When we point to Peter's sermon as an example of good evangelism, let us by all

means remember the nature of his audience and the way in which he quoted Scripture.

However, in order to get a true picture of New Testament evangelism, we must consider also a sermon of Paul—the one he preached on Mars Hill in the ancient Greek capital of Athens. This brings us very close to modern America, for the Athenians were intelligent, educated unbelievers, and their unbelief had all the logic and power of Greek philosophy behind it. The paganism of Mars Hill was probably the most consistent paganism of New Testament times. Now, it follows from this that when we face modern paganism, we should employ the evangelism of Mars Hill. Did Paul try to overthrow his opponents with “five smooth Bible verses” from the “valley of humiliation”? On the contrary, Paul began by talking about the paganism of Athens, and he even quoted a Greek poet in his sermon. In fact, the whole force of Paul’s sermon was devoted first of all to smashing down the paganism which he was opposing. Before Paul quoted a word of Scripture, he first showed that men need Scripture to explain life; then, and only then, he presented the gospel. In other words, Paul prepared the ground by gaining a hearing for the Bible. Before he stated the gospel, he badly damaged the confidence of his hearers in their own unbelief. If we simply quote Scripture and nothing more, the unbeliever will pay no attention to it. He will interpret it exactly as he pleases, and he will not please to interpret it as the Word of the living God. Our evangelism must not be confined to quoting Scripture; we must also *defend* the Bible, and we must overthrow the fortifications of unbelief by actual *argument*. If we do that, our evangelism will be truly Biblical.

Not all fundamentalists, of course, are so blindly optimistic as to think that the mere recital of Bible verses will bring unbelievers to their knees in penitent tears. There are those who sincerely try to defend the authority of the Bible as they preach the gospel, by pointing to certain facts which are purported to prove that the Bible is the Word of God. The second form of evangelism commonly practiced today is represented in the many sermons on “Archæology and the Bible” to which the American public is constantly exposed. Having read about

some of the fascinating and significant discoveries of the diligent diggers of the past century, the evangelist triumphantly “demonstrates” to his audience that these findings “conclusively prove the inspiration of the Bible.” A typical argument of this type in behalf of the Bible would run something like this: “In digging up the ground of ancient Palestine, archæologists have discovered that the walls of Jericho fell in a mysterious way. The Bible tells us that God caused the walls to fall after the Hebrews had marched around the city for seven days. Consequently we would conclude that the Bible is true and that it is God’s Word.”

Now, although this reasoning is erroneous, we would do well to encourage interest in the important and profitable study of archæology. The science of archæology has thrown floods of light on the significance of certain Biblical words and events. Archæology has also told us much about the history and social conditions of Bible times, for nations and individuals that are but names if we know only the Bible become living realities through the excavations and researches of experts. All of that is fine. Furthermore, archæology has never been able to prove that the Bible is mistaken, and has often succeeded in silencing the scoffer. That is splendid. Yet the big question remains unanswered: Can archæology prove that the Bible is the Word of God? To that question, there is but one answer—a strong and emphatic No. Let us not be deceived by the apparent scholarliness of this type of evangelism. By the study of archæology, we who believe the Bible to be God’s Word can be encouraged, our faith can be strengthened. However, it can never be definitely established on the basis of archæology that the Bible is the inspired Word of God. If any group ought to be converted en masse by the “conclusive evidence” of archæology, it should be the archæologists themselves, for they know the evidence the best. They know the facts at first hand, which is more than can be said for most preachers who claim to be authorities on the subject. Yet the vast majority of archæologists were unbelievers when they first sank their spades into the Syrian sands—and they are still unbelievers! If the consistent unbeliever challenges the truth of a specific Biblical statement,

we may perhaps refute him by appealing to archæology; but even if we have proved to him the *truth* of that Biblical statement, we have not proved that that statement is God’s Word. The point is simply this: archæology can prove that the walls of Jericho fell, but it can never prove that this catastrophe was a miracle; and it can never prove that the Biblical record of this event was inspired by God. The consistent unbeliever with whom we must deal today will interpret the facts of archæology exactly as he pleases, and will even incorporate them into the very foundations of his pagan stronghold. Our conclusion is obvious: We must do a great deal more than cite archaeological data when we seek to defend the authority of the Scriptures. We shall have to overthrow the fortress of paganism before we can lay the foundations of the gospel.

The third form of pietistic evangelism is strikingly similar to the second, but even less compelling in its reasoning. Again an attempt is made by an appeal to facts to substantiate the claim that the Bible is God’s Word. This time the facts are the personal experiences of the evangelist and of other Christians. We hear this sort of evangelism in many a “testimony meeting,” on several radio broadcasts, and in almost any street meeting or rescue mission. The argument, as we have often heard it, is something like this: “The Bible tells me that if I believe in Jesus, I shall be happy. I have found joy and peace since I believed in Jesus just seven years, three months, and fourteen days ago tonight. I am happy. Therefore the Bible is true, and it is God’s Word.” Of course, rejoicing in our salvation is a wonderful and blessed experience. No Christian should be without it. Our own experience and the experiences of our fellow Christians can be a great comfort and inspiration to us all. All of that, however, has absolutely nothing to do with the effect of such testimonies and “inspirational” evangelistic sermons on unbelievers. Far from converting the unbeliever, the excess emotionalism of many of the stories told in such sermons is much more likely to give him the impression that we are “a bunch of crack-pots.” For he will interpret our holy and exalted experiences according to his own ideas—and those ideas will not be Biblical ideas. Con-

sequently, he will completely misinterpret what we have said, and he will only be confirmed in his paganism rather than converted to the Saviour of the world. Whether we argue for the gospel with the facts of archaeology, the facts of experience, the facts of science, or any other facts, we will never be able to blast the modern unbeliever out of his strong fortifications and persuade him that the Bible is God's Word, because he is convinced that those same facts fit just as well into his belief that the Bible is not God's Word. It is that belief which we must destroy, and we cannot do it with the facts that pietists commonly use.

We have not said and we would not dare to say that these methods of evangelism have been entirely without results. We are deeply thankful that God has been pleased to use the efforts of many sincere Christians to present the gospel thus, and that the conversion of many Christians even of our own acquaintance took place in a revival tent or rescue mission. All we have tried to show—and we believe we have Scriptural ground for our contention—is that these methods of evangelism are not the methods which God would have us use, and that consequently they are not the methods which are most likely to be accompanied by the saving power of God's Spirit. The Bible teaches us a better method of evangelism, and the indictment of the church in the crisis in evangelism today is just this: that it has woefully neglected that better method. The pietists have shown us one of the ways in which the Christian church has failed to crack the armor of modern unbelief. Other wings of the church have used other weapons, and have also failed. We must now look at those other weapons, and then we may proceed to study the proper method of attacking modern paganism.

Before we leave the pietists, however, let us ask ourselves a solemn question. Have not we, who pride ourselves on maintaining a strong doctrinal position, who shun the errors of pietism, often made the mistake of using pietistic methods of evangelism. Even in The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, do not our evangelistic services often consist of little more than quoting the words of Scripture, explaining them only a little, and perhaps attempting to support them by

pointing to the facts of archaeology, science, or emotional experiences? Of course, we try to be more dignified and more scholarly than most popular evangelists. Yet that is not enough. Let us be serious about this. This is not the evangelism that Scripture teaches us to use. There may be an

occasional convert, but this pietistic evangelism will not shatter the strongholds of paganism, and many a well-trained unbeliever who hears such preaching will only turn away from our churches, hardened in his unbelief, even more unwilling to hear the gospel. The fault will be our own.

Christianity and Shintoism

Part III

By a Qualified Observer of the Missionary Scene

The Present Situation

IN A lengthy conversation with a Japanese lawyer of Korea, I was told that "Christianity must amalgamate with state Shinto as the Buddhists did in the sixth century. If it will not do so, it can not continue to exist in the Japanese Empire." This statement represents the determined policy of the Japanese government toward true Christianity.

Our previous study clearly shows that state Shinto is a pagan system of religion; the Bible labels it idolatry and the devotees idolaters. It is clearly stated, in Rev. 21:8, that idolaters shall be cast into the lake of fire. Idolatry is man's greatest sin, and God has warned His people to keep away from it, to destroy their idols and to flee from them.

We see the church divided, in the Japanese empire, over the matter of state Shinto. The Japanese Christians wish to be loyal to their emperor and nation, and many have accepted the government's statement that Shinto is only patriotism. This permits them to indulge in shrine worship and yet continue to attend worship in their Christian churches. Japanese pastors who expose Shinto as an abominable idolatrous system are very rare. They seldom employ St. Paul's method by uncovering Shinto. Japanese theological seminary teachers do not expose the pagan character of Shinto worship to their students and warn them of its hideous nature. The church in Japan proper, as a whole, has never taken issue with state Shinto nor ever abandoned it. The members still indulge in some forms of the system. There are exceptions, no doubt, but they are very rare. Sad to say, many missionaries have taken the same position.

The situation is better in Korea. There many Christians have refused to participate in shrine worship, and as a result have been beaten, imprisoned and tortured in various ways. Churches have been closed and pastors deprived of their livelihood. Christian schools and the theological seminary in Pyongyang have been closed because they refused to do shrine worship.

State Shinto is a complicated system, a religious, patriotic cult, a pagan polytheism. It is not necessary to understand the more obscure tenets of Shinto in order to discover that it is idolatry. One look at a Shinto shrine is enough for anyone. Of course, a Japanese or Korean pastor, and especially a theological professor, should know the more detailed elements of the system in order to teach the people, and there is no excuse for their being ignorant of the technical details of Shinto.

There are four main points of Shinto that are closely connected with the government and which are causing trouble for God's elect in the Japanese empire and Japanese-occupied territory on the Asiatic mainland.

Any Christian who will engage in any of those four points of Shinto worship is guilty of idolatry, whether he is aware of it or not. Let us examine those four points:

1. Bowing before, and worshipping, the portrait or image of the emperor of Japan.
2. Jinja Sampai, or visiting for worship and bowing before any Shinto shrine.
3. Yōhai, or distant worship. As a rule, this distant worship is toward the shrine of the Sun Goddess, the East, and the Emperor's palace in Tokyo.
4. Ijin Sūhai. The worship of,

and bowing before, Shinto shrines where Japan's illustrious dead are enshrined.

Image Worship

The Scriptures clearly prohibit the making of images of any kind or the bowing in worship before them (Ex. 20:4, 5). And yet it is customary in Japan to bow before the emperor's portrait or image. Just inside the gates of primary schools are found small vault-like structures made of concrete, brick or stone. Inside of these is a portrait of the emperor. As the children pass before these vaults, caps are removed and a bow is made. The portrait cannot be seen.

These portraits may also be found in other places, inside of schools and other public buildings. When occasion demands, the Japanese bow before them. Japanese scholars teach that this bow is not only a token of respect but also conveys the larger point of worship.

In our teaching to the Japanese, we absolutely prohibit this bowing before the emperor's image. Pagans do so, we say, but Christians never!

We explain it this way: A portrait on paper, wood, canvas, brass, gold, iron or marble is an inanimate object. It is, as far as actual being goes, non-existent. No one should bow before such an object or worship it. Of course, due respect should be given to the emperor's portrait. This simply means the recognizing of it as a likeness of the emperor. But there must be no bowing before it.

In our teaching to Christians, we allow them to bow before the emperor if he is visible in person. This is an entirely different matter. Here is God's ordained minister of state and, as the bow is the customary token of respect among the Japanese, we permit it. But we allow no service of any kind before the emperor's portrait.

Christians in the Roman empire met the same problem. They absolutely refused to bow before, or in any way to participate in worship before, the Roman emperor's portrait or image.

Shrine Worship

Jinja Sampai, or shrine worship, is the most common activity of Shinto. "Jingu" and "Jinja" are the native words used to describe the large government shrines. "Jin" means deity, or God, and "Gu" and "Ja" means

house, or dwelling-place. Literally, the words mean, "God House" or "Dwelling-place of the Gods." And when a Japanese goes, for instance, to the shrine of Amaterasu-Omikami, the Sun Goddess, he goes to the house of the Sun Goddess. Or if he goes to Meiji Jingu in Tokyo, he goes to the shrine or god-house where former Emperor Meiji is now enshrined as a deity, a supernatural being.

School children by the hundreds of thousands are taken to the many shrines of the nation to worship the various deities. Government officials, before assuming office, report their proposed assumption of office to the Sun Goddess and to lesser deities, and endless are the functions taking place daily before the shrines.

Let us examine a Shinto shrine and see what it contains. On passing through the shrine gate we find ourselves before a building called the "haiden." Here the worshiper claps his hands, and rings a bell to call the attention of the gods. He then bows his head and makes a brief prayer, tosses in a few coins and departs. Certain rituals are carried out inside the haiden by the priests in charge. The worshiper usually does not enter the haiden. In the case of the dedication of an infant, I have seen them enter, but ordinarily they do not.

Beyond the haiden is the "honden," or holy of holies, where the gods dwell. Only the priests enter this sacred place.

One, two, or even more deities may dwell in a single shrine. In the

honden is an object called the "shintai," or "god-body." This is also called the "spirit substitute." An archaic name is "god-seed" or "sacred kernel."

This shintai is the symbolic representation of the god. It may be a stone, a sacred text, an old scroll, a picture, a sword or, as in the honden of the Sun Goddess, an eight-pointed mirror. Through appropriate ceremonies engaged in by the priests, the deity is present in the shintai during the Shinto ceremony.

Let us view a Shinto service and see what goes on there. On February 17, 1941, an elaborate service called the "Service of Praying for the Cross" was held in the great Meiji Jingu in Tokyo. Prayer was made to the gods of heaven and earth, and also elaborate solemn rites were observed at the three imperial palace shrines in the presence of the emperor.

In the Meiji Jingu, before the assembled people, stood the priests, be-

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS
Bible Lessons in Bible Order

Orthodox explanations and interpretations by Reformed Bible Scholars

- THE KEY
- THE INSTRUCTOR
- CHILDREN'S COMRADE

Christian Reformed Publishing House
GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

**Use This Handy Coupon for
YOUR GIFT TO THE LIBRARY FUND**

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

I WANT to help place The Presbyterian Guardian in public libraries. I enclose my gift of \$..... to be used for this purpose.

I shall endeavor to make an additional contribution of \$..... to The Library Fund, prior to June 1, 1942.

Name.....

Address.....

Date.....

fore tables containing the imperial offerings. In front of the offerings was the "Himorogi," the magic article of Shinto made of cut paper, hemp and a branch of the sacred tree of Shinto. This Himorogi stood on the eight-legged table of Shinto. The priest then called down the gods into the Himorogi.

Next he read the government-established prayer. Here is the prayer made to the gods for a good harvest:

"In the dread presence before the sacred shrine [name of the shrine is here inserted], the chief of the shrine [rank and name of the priest is here inserted in the prayer], with trembling makes utterance. Now that His Imperial Majesty, about to make beginning of the [rice] crop for this year, has caused offerings to be presented in abundance, do we [coming] cleansed and purified into thy great presence make offerings of food offerings, soft rice and rough rice [i.e., hulled and unhulled rice]; of drink offerings; making high the tops of the wine jars and arranging in full rows the bellies of the wine jars; of things that live in the blue sea-plain; things broad of fin and things narrow of fin, even to grasses of the offing and grasses of the shore—all these do we offer in abundance; and, as the full and glorious sun of this day of life and plenty rises, do thou hear to the end these words of praise in tranquillity and peace. [Grant that] all things that may be grown, beginning with the late-ripening rice which will be produced by the people by stirring with arms and hands the foamy waters and by drawing the mud together between the opposing thighs, and extending even to the part blade of grass, [grant that they] may not meet with evil winds or violent waters; prosper them with abundance and luxury, and make the festival of New Food to be celebrated in sublimity and loveliness. Thus, with dread, we declare the ending of the words of praise."

The official who brought the offerings from the imperial household department then read a prayer.

"Grant to favor with ears eight hand-breadths long, yea, with fine ears the harvest of late-ripening rice which the sovereign deities bestow. From the great and august gates of the Ruler to the people grant that all may prosper more and more [with lineage] long and [with families] wide like the luxuriant manifold

branches of the mulberry tree."

The priest, through a closing ceremony, then sent the gods back to heaven.

Here is idolatry as clear as crystal, and no person who calls himself a Christian can in any way participate in such a service. Christians cannot do Jinja Sampai.

Let us now investigate the matter of Yōhai. Yō means "distant," and hai means "worship." Thus yōhai is worshiping from a distance. On October 17th there is held the Festival of Presentation of First Fruits. The first fruits of the new harvest are presented as offerings at the grand imperial shrine of Ise, the shrine of the Sun Goddess. The emperor makes an offering of the new grain to the Sun Goddess through the three shrines that form the imperial sanctuary. At this time, the emperor performs yōhai, distant worship, towards the shrine of the Sun Goddess in Ise.

In Korea, the government demands that schools and churches do yōhai, bowing toward the east before beginning their services. Included in such yōhai is the living emperor of Japan, residing in the palace at Tokyo, and the grand imperial shrine of the Sun Goddess of Ise.

On January 1, 1939, one thousand

Japanese Christians proceeded to the famous Niju Bridge in front of the imperial palace and bowed, thus doing yōhai. On the same day, the Christians in many of the Tokyo churches rose to their feet bowing deeply toward the imperial palace. This yōhai is being done daily all over the empire, in schools, churches and places of business—always toward the imperial palace and the shrine of the Sun Goddess.

The question arises, Can a Christian do yōhai and not be guilty of idolatry? We answer emphatically, No! Japanese pastors and Christians combat us, and tell us that we foreigners cannot understand their deep love and reverence for their emperor and nation, that this yōhai is not worship but only reverence and respect.

But, in the first place, when engaging in yōhai, the person is *worshiping from a distance* and not carrying out simple respect. And if it were respect, has the Christian any right to rise in church and bow in the direction of the idolatrous shrine of the Sun Goddess? No true Christian can respect the idol called Amaterasu-Omikami. No, my friends, doing yōhai toward Ise is absolute worship and thus absolute idolatry.

(To Be Concluded)

Today in the Religious World

By THOMAS R. BIRCH

Dr. Mudge is Irritated

WE HAVE been informed that at the 153rd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., meeting in St. Louis during the latter part of May, Dr. Lewis Seymour Mudge, stated clerk-emeritus, proved that he is a very bad loser. Dr. Mudge complained bitterly because the courts had failed to award to his denomination the property of the Second Parish Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Portland, Maine. He presented the report of the Committee on Legal Procedure and in it he charged legal exclusion of Presbyterianism from the state of Maine by action of the United States District Court. He said, "Stripped of legal phraseology, the decision of the court is to the effect that none but congregationally governed

churches can have an existence in the state of Maine, or, in other words, a local church in Maine has the exclusive right to determine who shall be its pastor." He added that, on behalf of the general assembly, an appeal had been filed in the United States Circuit Court, and said, "We await with much interest the outcome which obviously involves principles of church government of the most fundamental character and of large significance to other churches as well as our own." We do hope someone will send Dr. Mudge a copy of the decree of the court, that he will read it, and that he will then explain the beautiful *non sequitur* of his declaration.

Disciples and Baptists

For some time the Northern Bap-

tists and the Disciples of Christ have been discussing union. Early in May the merger seemed imminent, and the two groups even went so far as to join together in the production of a hymnal for use by both organizations. But when the Baptists met later in Wichita, Kansas, they decided that they wanted closer cooperation with the Disciples, but not union—at least not for the present. We are still trying to decide which church would be the loser, doctrinally speaking, if the merger were consummated.

Dr. Macartney Aids Princeton

Princeton Seminary is very grateful to Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney for the tremendous boost he has given its Student Center Building Campaign and for the highly complimentary things he has said about the seminary, as well as for his contribution to the campaign. On May 8th, at the home of a member of his church, Dr. Macartney led a meeting "to discuss the work of Princeton Theological Seminary and its plans for the continued preparation of young men for the Christian ministry." Dr. Macartney, in the opening address, spoke of the greatness of Princeton (although most of his allusions seemed to be pre-1929) and said that three of his assistants, employed in recent years, have been Princeton graduates. But the most amazing part of the evening was yet to come, for, after Dr. Macartney's address, the well-known Barthian president of Princeton, Dr. John A. Mackay, spoke in detail about the "problems" and "opportunities" on the seminary campus.

Dr. Macartney, it may be recalled, once contended earnestly for the faith.

House-Party Hess

Rudolf Hess, Nazi counterpart of America's Wrong-Way Corrigan, is a follower of Frank Buchman, founder of the Oxford Group Movement, and went to Britain "as a penitent seeking peace," according to William Hillman, European editor of *Collier's* magazine. Mr. Hillman, in a radio talk, asserted that Hess undertook his journey as a Buchmanite "moved to confess his sins and those of his Nazi associates and to plead with the British to help him put an end to the slaughter of men." Mr. Hillman did not reveal the source of his information, but a rumor has been current in Oxford Group circles for some time

that Hess is a Buchmanite. It is known that when Buchman went to Germany, in the summer of 1939, he saw most of the top Nazi leaders. If someone now tells us that Hitler sells tracts for Jehovah's Witnesses, we shall feel that life has been complete.

Myron Taylor's Successor

From Roosevelt to Taylor to Tittman seems to be the latest double-play combination on the Washington-Vatican diamond. The whole question revolves about the interpretation of Harold Tittman's position: Is he or is he not a successor to Myron Taylor as President Roosevelt's personal representative to the Vatican? Ray Atherton, State Department Secretary for European Affairs, says No; the United Press says Yes. Mr. Atherton says Mr. Taylor retains the office and Mr. Tittman is only his secretary. The United Press says, "Pope Pius XII next week will receive Harold Tittman, successor to Myron C. Taylor, as President Roosevelt's personal representative to the Holy See, the Vatican announced Saturday." We wonder if Mr. Roosevelt knows the answer.

Soviet Persecutions

Dr. W. O. Lewis, general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, who has just returned from a seven-week sojourn abroad, declared that restrictions against religious worship have been applied indiscriminately to all faiths in the territories recently occupied by the Soviet Union. Estonia and Latvia, he stated, are principally Protestant; Lithuania is Roman Catholic; and Russian-occupied Poland and Bessarabia are Greek Orthodox. In all these countries, said Dr. Lewis, the Soviet government is closing and confiscating churches, arresting and imprisoning or banishing priests and ministers, and hampering all church activities on various pretexts. Bibles and hymn books can no longer be printed or imported, and vigorous campaigns of atheist propaganda are being conducted.

A Modernist Call to Prayer

A call to American churchgoers to pray for the success of the first general conference of the new united Church of Christ in Japan, scheduled to be held in Tokyo on June 24th, was issued by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, a modernist-inclusivist organization. The confer-

ence will be attended by three hundred representatives of forty Protestant denominations in Japan, and will commit almost the entire movement in that country to a single corporate church life. "This epoch-making event in Christian annals," says the call,

HOTEL WHITFIELD
Ocean Grove, N. J., by the Sea. A Christian Hotel away from home. Since 1914—C. M. Herman, Owner.

UNION LESSON HELPS

on the International Uniform Lessons

stand for and proclaim

the heart of the Gospel

One hundred and twenty-two years of experience are back of these true-to-the-Bible periodicals. Can be used with confidence by Christian teachers and pupils.

Write for free specimen copies

AMERICAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION
1816 Chestnut St. Philadelphia, Pa.



GRAND CENTRAL LOCATION

Free use swimming pool, solarium, library and gymnasium.

Squash courts and Health Club facilities with steam cabinets and massage available at nominal cost.

Popular Priced Restaurant

SENSIBLE RATES

DAILY . . from \$2.25

WEEKLY from \$11.00

SHELTON HOTEL

LEXINGTON AVE., at 49th St.

NEW YORK

Under KNOTT Management

A. R. WALTZ, Manager

A Short Walk to the Church of Your Choice

When in Atlantic City, you will find the Hotel Runnymede, located on beautiful Park Place and free from the noise of traffic, but a few minutes walk to whatever church you wish to attend.

Here at this lovely hotel, you will find bright sunny rooms, an enclosed Solarium and open Sun Deck overlooking the Boardwalk and Ocean, good wholesome food properly prepared and a cordial personnel that anticipates your desires.

No Liquor Served

For Moderate Rates and Illustrated Folder, write

EVERETT J. HIGBEE, Manager

The
Runnymede

ATLANTIC CITY, NEW JERSEY



FROM NURSERY TO ADULT

You'll get a big thrill when you see all that Standard offers in Sunday School Supplies and teaching helps. Fully Graded Lessons (Cradle Roll to Young People); Uniform Lessons (Beginners to Adults); Illustrated Weekly Papers (Children to Adults), and a host of other inspirational True-to-the-Bible materials.

PROSPECTUS • SAMPLES • CATALOGUE will be sent on request. Give your department, name and size of school. Everything will be sent **FREE**, postage paid. Address Desk PG-7

The STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY
8th & CUTTER STS., CINCINNATI, O.

"has large potentialities for good, but also has its dangers." While a united Japanese church "is the realization of the prayers of many Christians over long periods," the call points out, "it is also an inescapable adjustment to the increasing tensions and controls of a nation in crisis." The call nowhere so much as approaches the Christianity of the Bible, and it is difficult to discover to whom the prayer should be addressed. A suggested prayer, prepared by the Foreign Missions Conference, pleads for "an escape from the threatening dangers of conflict, and for the opening of an era of coöperation and good will between our nations."

A Triumph for Religious Liberty

The New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled, in a sharply-worded decision, that school officials have no right to require salutes to the American flag by pupils. The decision reversed a verdict by the Nashua Municipal Court which sent three Nashua children to the state industrial school at Manchester for failure to salute the

flag. Specifically, the court decided that the statute under which the children were sent to the reform institution was not applicable in the present case.

Speaking of Jehovah's Witnesses, Judge Elwin Page of Concord, who wrote the opinion, said, "It is conceded that the belief, however strange, is one of religious conscience and is held in good faith." Later, after commenting on the conditions which surrounded the expulsion of the children from school and their sentence by a Nashua police court judge, the opinion declared: "In view of the sacredness in which the state has always held freedom of religious conscience, it is impossible for us to attribute to the legislature an intent to authorize the breaking up of family life for no other reason than because some of its members have conscientious scruples not shared by the majority of the community; at least, provided these scruples are exercised in good faith, and their exercise is not tinged with immorality or marked by damage to the rights of others."

Have you bought your copy of

The Standards

of Government, Discipline and Worship

of the

Orthodox Presbyterian Church?

EVERY minister, elder and layman of the denomination needs this important part of the constitution of the church. Buy yours today from your pastor, or send 50c to

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN

1505 Race Street

Philadelphia, Pa.