

February 16, 1953

VOL. 22, NO. 2

The Presbyterian
G U A R D I A N

The moral law is of use to all men, to inform them of the holy nature and will of God, and of their duty binding them to walk accordingly; to convince them of their disability to keep it, and of the sinful pollution of their nature, heart, and lives; to humble them in the sense of their sin and misery, and thereby help them to a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ, and of the perfection of his obedience.

Larger Catechism, 95.

J. Gresham Machen
Editor 1936 - 1937

Published Monthly
\$2.00 per year

Meditation

The Nurture of the Lord

And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but nurture them in the discipline and admonition of the Lord.—EPHESIANS 6:4.

Was there ever a time when information was more plentiful on how to raise children? We have books on the philosophy of education, books on child psychology, books on methods. We have a steady stream of magazine articles for expert and popular consumption. We have our Parent-Teacher associations. We have parent child study classes. We have lecturers and counselors. We even have toys scientifically designed for every age. Is there anything we don't have!

There is some question as to whether we have children properly brought up, judging from the community groans one hears from time to time. Nor should this leave us amazed. It is really quite understandable. Who would be surprised to be lost at sea, if he attempted his journey without a compass? A lot of our theorizing about children never gets its bearings. It usually begins with false assumptions, and heads for the wrong goals. How can it travel under good guidance? It never finds the Pole Star. How can it be realistic? Does it not usually ignore God, deny creation, disbelieve the Fall, and repudiate depravity? How can it be morally sound? It is too much the visions of the myopic and prattle of the idle boaster, because it can boast no more than the wisdom of limited experience—observed by eyes badly astigmatic.

We need to come to the Author of the universe to learn its mysteries. And the sinfulness of our hearts makes it all the more necessary to listen to His wisdom as it is revealed in His Word. The nurture and admonition of the Lord alone yields good fruit in the raising of children. The worldly-wise often hit upon good ideas. But they do it blindly. In their moral condition they cannot know that they know. The god of this world keeps his wool over their eyes. Soon they may think that something bad is better.

Good upbringing involves good in-

struction. Children need to be told what is right and what is wrong. The idea that they should be allowed just to grow does not work out well. It produces too many moral Topsy-turves—as orderly and attractive as an abandoned rose garden. They need to be taught the will of the Lord, and to be urged to do it because it is His will.

But instruction is much more than indoctrination. There must be also demonstration. It was a wise father who headed for the house of worship when he noticed his children stepping in his footprints in the snow. How often the voice of precept is drowned in the noise of bad example! Like father, like son, is no empty saying. Happy is that child who has ever before him the pattern of righteousness outlined in his parents! It will not be easy for him to choose another way of life.

Then, again, some parents raise their children about like boys care for rabbits. While the thing is a novelty it occupies all their attention. But their interest soon dies away to the vigor of periodic spasms ages of indifference apart. The children soon learn to imitate their parents' lack of concern for the vital things of life. And they may very well decide to deal with the occasional outbursts of parental zeal by a temporary acquiescence until the convulsion is over. But the man who takes to heart the way of the Lord will speak of it to his children in word and deed when he sits in his house, when he walks by the way, when he lies down, when he rises up (Deuteronomy 6:6-7).

In their zeal to insure the character of their children, some parents adopt a rigor and severity hardly in keeping with the name of Christ. They seem to see only a literal meaning in the admonitions to use the rod, and apparently see no value in any other means of correction. Filled also with a sense of a kind of absolute sovereignty in the home, they follow a policy of whim and "wham" with their children, which must either turn them into cowards or fill them with a festering resentment that eventually breaks out in open rebellion. Arbitrary, unjust, and unreasonable exercise of authority cannot be respected because it flies in the face of that dignity which alone is becoming

to parents (I Timothy 3:4).

The nurture of the Lord will be best applied by the parents who have first taken it to their own hearts.

HENRY P. TAVARES.

VanTil Lectures in Rochester

DR. Cornelius VanTil, professor of Apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, delivered lectures at four meetings in Rochester, New York, January 19 and 20. The lectures dealt with Barthian or Neo-Orthodox theology, and were sponsored by the Rochester Ministerial Fellowship, being presented in the First Free Methodist Church. His ministry was well received, and proved a source of enlightenment and blessing to all. Those attending noticed especially his genuine Christian attitude toward all men, while standing for what he held to be the truth.

Both the Rev. John DeWard and the Rev. Herbert DuMont, Orthodox Presbyterian ministers in Rochester, participate in the Fellowship, which is a group of 35 evangelical ministers in the area. Mr. DuMont is at present the president of the Fellowship.

Mrs. Anna Gordon

ON January 14, Mrs. Anna Gordon of Philadelphia was suddenly called to her heavenly home, only a day after she had been injured in a fall.

Mrs. Gordon was a charter member of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and at the time of her death a member of Gethsemane congregation. She was active in the Women's Presbyterial, and in the Westminster Seminary Auxiliary. From childhood she had been grounded in Presbyterian teaching and in the Catechism, and was faithful in church duties to the time of her death.

She is survived by her husband, Mr. Robert H. Gordon, an elder in Gethsemane, and by several children and grandchildren. Funeral services were conducted by the Rev. Lester R. Bachman.

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

Religion in Government

A great many people were deeply impressed by the religious element in the inaugural ceremony when Mr. Eisenhower became President of the United States. In addition to the invocation prayer by a Catholic priest, a general prayer by a Jewish rabbi, and the benediction by an Episcopalian minister, the new President himself made his first action on becoming president the offering of a personal prayer.

All of this stands in sharp contrast to the atheistic materialism which enshrouds half the world. That the head of our great nation should make his first act in office a petition to Almighty God for divine help in carrying out his solemn duties is—regardless of our opinion concerning the other religious elements—something for which we may well be thankful.

We say this in all earnestness. And it is only after having said it that we go on to the further comment which we feel the situation calls for. That comment is two-fold.

In the first place, while we rejoice in a religious as against an atheistic or materialistic context for our government, we would be false to our own convictions did we not indicate that within the sphere of religion there is truth and there is error, and we would wish and hope that the religious emphases in our government might be according to truth, and not error.

For religion is not of value in itself, save as it indicates that in the heart of man there is still that which speaks of the sovereign God. But the true religion—historic, Biblical Christianity—which centers in the work God has done in Christ and the Word He has given in Scripture, is of inestimable value for all the activities and relationships of men. Given the revelation from God, in history, in Scripture, and in Christ, for man to reject that revelation is most serious indeed. And for the practices and prayers of a religion which rejects Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour to be given official recognition in a national political ceremony is not something in which we can take comfort.

Since, in fact, the inauguration is a national political ceremony, and since we do not have here any recognized national religion, it seems to us that giving an official place in such a ceremony to one—or several

—specific religions is not proper. From outward appearances it would certainly seem that the religious emphases of the inauguration were designed to appeal to or represent the three major religious faiths of the land. But there are many people who would not accept either the Catholic or the Jew or the Episcopalian as representing them. If certain religious groups are to be recognized officially, why not others?

Our second consideration is this. While we question the propriety, in a land such as ours, of giving specific religious groups official recognition in political ceremonies, that does not mean that individuals in government are to be devoid of religion. On the contrary, just because of the religious freedom which we enjoy, those in government also have a perfect right to the conviction and practices of personal religious faith. And so we think that the new President was entirely within his rights in making his first public action after becoming President the offering of a personal prayer to God.

Furthermore we sincerely hope that religious convictions may stand at the root of many of the decisions and actions of the new administration. For example, the question of right and wrong, which entered into Mr. Eisenhower's prayer, is basically a religious question, and the principles involved are given by God in Holy Scripture. We hope the President and his associates may seek and may find in Scripture strong help and counsel on many occasions in their work.

Of course, again, we would most strenuously oppose any suggestion that by his political elevation the President has become also a religious leader. We would rebel against any effort to clothe a political program with the trappings of a religious pilgrimage. Religion can also be tyrannical. We want none of that. And so the President, while holding with all boldness and courage to his own religious faith, may never by act or suggestion presume to impose it as such on the citizens of the land.

Religious conviction has a most proper and necessary place in the personal lives of those set in authority. May such conviction exist, may it find expression and not be feared, and above all, may it be according to the truth in Jesus Christ our Lord. L. W. S.

Obedience

In the current (January, 1953) issue of *Theology Today* we find a very significant editorial. *Theology Today* is the competently edited, unofficial, journal of Princeton Theological Seminary. The editorial is written by Dr. Paul L. Lehmann, Professor of Applied Christianity at Princeton. His theme is what he considers to be the failure of a large meeting of the International Missionary Council, composed of 200 delegates from 50 countries, and of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, both of which were held in Europe during the summer of 1952. The failure, to be sure, is only a relative one. Lehmann says the latter conference "failed the test of prophetic-apostolic obedience," but that both conferences were marks on the way to the unity of the Church.

Throughout the article Dr. Lehmann uses the word "obedience" (disobedience) over and over again—about twenty-five times in an article of, perhaps, 4,000 words. The idea seems to be that unity of the Church is in obedience to the commands of Christ. Now, in a sense, evangelical Christians can agree with this formulation. Christ does command unity in His Church. Yet, we should hold that the matter would better be formulated, that unity *in the truth* is in obedience to the commands of Christ and that the unity of the Church will come only when there is unity in the truth. A unity apart from the truth is not unity at all in any Biblical sense, and such a unity is certainly not commanded by Christ.

There apparently is a group in the World Council of Churches, of which future Faith and Order Conferences will be an integral part, that realizes that the truth is the only real basis for unity. It is this group, which, apparently, is holding up further "advances." Dr. Lehmann's editorial certainly does not reveal him to be a member of that group. Obedience with him seems to be an obedience to a command of unity which is to be achieved by cutting across so-called theological differences. But where these theological formulations accurately interpret the revealed will of God, there can be no obedience apart from a hearty acceptance of these formulations. Dr. Lehmann talks as if the Holy Spirit will guide to obedience apart from the truth, failing to realize the essential and dominant evan-

Two Items of Interest

Final receipts of the November Thank Offering were \$43,101 from 72 churches and several chapels. This compares with \$34,167 from 65 churches in the offering a year ago. Per communicant average this year was \$7.46.

The need for copies of the Form of Government of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church continues. If you have any extra copies, the Committee on Home Missions will pay 50c each for them, up to the first 25 copies received.

gelical principle that the Holy Spirit leads only by and through the Word of truth.

In an age which glorifies the so-called "scientific" approach, there is nothing more incongruent than the Church, while science seeks greater accuracy in its formulations, seeking greater inaccuracy and ambiguity in her formulations! May we humbly suggest to those who are spending so much of their time and energies in seeking the unity of the Church that they begin with those accurate statements of the truth of the Scripture which are found in the Westminster Confession of Faith and in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; that they compare the other evangelical formulations of Biblical truth to see wherein they may differ; that they re-evaluate these differences in the light of the infallible Word of God; that they thus arrive at a more accurate formulation of the truth, the Holy Spirit guiding them by and through the Word, and that, then, on the basis of a hearty acceptance of this new formulation, they seek the unity of the organization of the Church. That unity will be the unity of obedience!

R. S. M.

Dr. Conant on Dissent

LAST April, addressing a gathering of school administrators, Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, attacked the system of independent privately controlled

schools. "The greater the proportion of our youth who attend independent schools, the greater the threat to our democratic unity."

This attack on independent—chiefly Christian or parochial—schools by the head of a great university, brought immediate and widespread objection.

One wonders whether Dr. Conant has changed his mind, or whether he thinks things are different when related to a university, than when related to an elementary school. At any rate, Dr. Conant, who has now been appointed high commissioner to Germany, in his farewell to the University from which he has retired, spoke in a radically different vein. His words, as quoted in the *N. Y. Times*, were in part: "It would be a sad day for the United States if the tradition of dissent were driven out of the universities. For it is the freedom to disagree, to quarrel with authority on intellectual matters, to think otherwise, that has made this nation what it is today. Our industrial society was pioneered by men who were dissenters, who challenged orthodoxy in some field successfully . . ."

This is exactly the right which the Christian school maintains—the right to dissent from authority on intellectual matters—the right to question whether the faculty of Harvard University possesses the last word on what is good for the children—the right to teach our children what we believe, not what Dr. Conant believes. And with him—as he now says—we agree that it would be a sad day for our land if this tradition of dissent were driven out.

L. W. S.

The Presbyterian **GUARDIAN**

1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Leslie W. Sloat
Editor and Manager

John P. Clelland
Arthur W. Kuschke, Jr.
Robert S. Marsden
Contributing Editors

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Robert L. Atwell
Leslie A. Dunn
John Patton Galbraith
Edward L. Kellogg

Pastor and People

The mutual duties and privileges of the pastoral relationship

To the Pastor

I charge you in the presence of God faithfully to persevere in the discharge of those duties associated with your office as an ordained minister and pastor over this congregation. To this end I would call to your attention an exhortation which the Apostle Paul gave to Timothy. It is recorded in I Timothy 4:12—"Let no man despise thy youth, but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity."

Always there is some opposition to the ministry. It has to be so because of the warfare between the kingdom of darkness and the kingdom of light. And oftentimes the ministry is despised. But of course it was true that the chief Shepherd was despised and rejected of men. And Jesus said, if the world hate you, you know that it hated me before it hated you. Now such despising of the ministry is not found only in the strongholds of Satan in the world, but sometimes even within the church. For even the Apostle Paul was despised and at times accused by those who were members of the visible church.

There are many reasons why, on occasion, the ministry is despised. Sometimes because of physical appearance. Sometimes because of voice, sometimes because of clothing, sometimes because one is old, sometimes because one is young.

The Apostle Paul in writing to Timothy realizes that the last reason may apply in his case, for he was a young man, though he was given a very solemn responsibility at Ephesus. For we read in the first chapter and the third verse, that he was called upon by the Apostle to charge some that they teach no other doctrine. But in the church of Ephesus no doubt there were some more advanced in years than Timothy. No doubt there were some who had considerable learning. And there would be great temptation for them, if he proclaimed the Word to them, or if he admonished them because of departure from the truth—they would say, well,

By EDWARD L. KELLOGG

he is young, why should we hearken to him. Therefore, in answer to that, Paul said, Let no man despise thy youth.

But how could he help it, if he was

The Rev. Edward L. Kellogg, pastor of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church of West Collingswood, N. J., brought the charge to the pastor and the congregation on the occasion of the ordination of Mr. Albert G. Edwards, III, and his installation as pastor at Crescent Park, N. J. We believe his comments have an application that goes far beyond one local church.

young? It was a fact that he was young. If someone decided to despise his youth, how could he help it? Paul tells him what he should do. He says, Let no man despise thy youth—but—be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. And so, by truthfulness of message, by godliness of life, by love in the heart, by boldness of spirit, by steadfastness of faith, by purity of your whole character, show that spiritual maturity that will silence those who might despise your youth.

But how can that silence opposition? Do truth and righteousness silence the opposition of the world? No, they do not. But you see, the Apostle Paul is concerned that there be no *just* criticism, no just accusation, that he *not merit* that despising. It is certainly true that Joseph was despised, but he was only cast into prison on the basis of false charges. It is true that Daniel was despised, but they could find no fault with him concerning the kingdom. It is true that the Apostle Paul was despised, so that the world had the sentence of death upon him, and sought to carry it out. But Paul contended that he was doing the will of God, and boldly said at last, I have fought a good fight.

So it is important that one live such a life, that there be no proper ground

for the world to accuse and despise. Let no man despise thy youth.

We shouldn't conclude that this exhortation was given to Timothy simply that he might maintain his own good name. There was more than that. It was not even given simply that he might maintain the honor of Jesus Christ, though that was infinitely more important. That is indeed of primary importance. But there was still another reason why it was given, a reason that pertains to the church to which he would minister. And it is expressed in these words—But be thou an example of the believers.

So your word and conduct are important for your own good name. Your word and conduct are infinitely more important concerning the honor of Jesus Christ. Your word and conduct are also important in relation to the flock, that you may set an example before them.

In this day when profane men blaspheme the Word of God, standing as prophets in the church—in this day when they often offer the poison from broken cisterns to thirsty souls, in this day *be thou an example of the flock in word.*

In this day when men laugh at the law which was thundered from Sinai, and usurp to themselves the position of lordship over the Sabbath, play a game with the commandment, thou shalt not steal, make a joke of the command, thou shalt not commit adultery, scoff at the law of God—*be thou an example of the believers in conversation.*

In this day when the earth drinks the blood of young men who die on battlefields, *be thou an example of the flock in love.*

In this day when wise men are filled with questions and doubts and strong men waver and fall, *be thou an example of the flock in faith*, as you place complete confidence in the Lord, and trust only in Him.

In this day when not only the sanctity of marriage is desecrated, but also when morality in its broader aspects is breaking down all around us—people go on following the course of this world under the prince of darkness—*be thou an example of the flock in purity.*

Let no man despise thy youth, but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in purity. And then when the chief

Shepherd shall appear, he will give you a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

To the Congregation

A few minutes ago you members of this congregation promised to receive the word of truth from Mr. Edwards in all meekness and love, and to submit to him in the due exercise of discipline. Well, there was good reason for making that promise, very good reason. It is because Mr. Edwards is ordained and installed as your pastor by the appointment of God.

It is true that there was much human activity in connection with his coming to you, leading up to this meeting this evening. And it is not true that any one received a special direct revelation from God saying, Mr. Edwards should be ordained and installed as a minister in this church. But in spite of all the human activity that was involved and in spite of the absence of a special direct revelation from God, we nevertheless have gathered together this evening because we are persuaded that God has appointed him to serve as a minister of this flock.

When the Apostle Paul was greatly burdened as he faced bonds and imprisonment, and he called the Ephesian elders, that he might give them counsel and instruction, he said to them—Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers. Now there may indeed have been certain human activity in the selection of teaching and ruling elders at Ephesus. But whatever human activity entered in, the Apostle Paul was firmly persuaded that these men had an oversight by the appointment of the Spirit of God, because he recognized that Jesus Christ is the sovereign Head of the church, who rules over His church and carries out His will by the activities of the mighty Spirit of God.

It is because of that divine appointment that those men had a very great responsibility with respect to that church. And it is also because of that divine appointment that the church had a great responsibility in regard to those teaching and ruling elders. That divine appointment made it a very serious relationship. It was one established by God Himself.

Well, it is therefore important that you make the promise that you made. That was a good promise. It is well

that you made it. May God help you to keep it.

But it is well also to recognize one's weakness. We are weak and sinful people. The best ones here are weak and sinful, easily turned away from the Word of God, often rebellious in their hearts against the most High God. You will never fulfill this promise unless the Holy Spirit works in and through you enabling you to turn to God in prayer, for God has given you a great and wonderful privilege that you might invoke divine help. And He promises to give the Spirit to all who ask of Him. It is important to pray then for much divine help.

If you are to receive the Word of truth, in meekness and love, most cer-

tainly you must attend the public worship services in this place. Now it is conceivable that someone here this evening raised his hand to answer the questions, who has been careless about attending the services of this church. I know not. Perhaps that is true. But I trust that you did not engage in a lie when you raised your hand. I trust you solemnly and seriously purposed to be very faithful. For you must come to the public worship services to receive the Word of truth. It is appointed of God that you gather on Sabbath days to worship Him.

And think not that if you simply gather in the morning you have done well. Your pastor spends many hours
(See "Kellogg," p. 35)

The Relevance of the Theocracy

The bearing of Old Testament practices on some modern problems

By MEREDITH J. KLINE

MORE than is generally recognized, the answers to some live questions facing the Christian today depend on a right view of some "dead" Old Testament history. In recent articles, for example, two writers seeking to define the roles of family, church and state, have, in our judgment, erred in so far as they have founded their conclusions on the history of Israel, because both misconstrue the nature of Israel's Theocracy.

Fresh from their experience of divine deliverance out of Pharaoh's tyrant hand, Israel at Sinai entered into a covenant with the Lord. This covenant was pursuant of the earlier covenant promises made to Abraham, and in terms of it, the seed of Abraham which had meanwhile multiplied to national proportions was now organized as a nation whose king was the Lord. Directly from Him would Israel receive both Law and Land. It is to this unique arrangement that the name "Theocracy" has been given.

To what shall we compare it? Was it a state-church like the Church of England? Or were it better to call it a church-state? These answers are equally inaccurate. For when we work with the ordinary concepts of church

and state and family we do not have the materials out of which the Theocracy can be constructed. It is as though we tried to construct a three-dimensional object out of two-dimensional elements. The conjunction of two or three or a thousand depth-less planes will not produce a solid. So no combination of family, church and state can produce the theocracy, for

THE Rev. Meredith J. Kline is instructor in Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary, and a minister of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In this article he comments on views recently expressed, both in the *Guardian* and elsewhere.

they do not have their being in the same "dimensional" sphere as the Theocracy. They exist in the sphere of common grace; but the Theocracy in the sphere of Consummation. As G. Vos points out: "The significance of the unique organization of Israel can be rightly measured only by remembering that the theocracy typified nothing short of the perfected kingdom of God, the consummate state of Heaven" (*Old and New Testament Biblical Theology*, 1942, p. 80).

Our illustration of two and three-dimensional things will not take us all the way here. For with these dimensions the difference is simply one of addition. Even when depth is added as a third dimension, length can still be distinguished from breadth and depth as length, and breadth can still be isolated as breadth in the resultant solid. But the difference of the Theocracy and its anti-type, Heaven, from the ordinary institutions is not merely a matter of combination or addition. There is here the appearance of a new species.

For in the kingdom of glory the family cannot be isolated as family distinct from the citizenry of the kingdom. Nor is the sessional record book with its church membership roll something distinguishable from the royal archives with its register of his majesty's subjects. Nor can it be said, "In this activity the heavenly community functions as a family, and in that activity as a state." But in the "dimension" of common grace it is essential to the nature of family, church and state that they be separately organized and perform separate functions. That it is at times difficult for us without access to Urim and Thummim to determine the boundary line of the appointed territory of each institution does not blur this distinction. Since then what is essential to these institutions under common grace vanishes in the Kingdom of the Consummation, the difference must be one of kind. Heaven is a brand new species.

What is true of Heaven is true of its divinely ordered type, the Theocracy. For though the Theocracy was in the world of common grace, as a type of heaven it transcended its environment and anticipatively shared in the world to come. Whenever we would deal with the theocracy as we behold it in the pages of the Old Testament, we should first listen attentively to the Lord as He speaks to Moses on the Mount: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation" (Ex. 19:6). If we do listen we will not try to segment the Theocracy into the usual three discrete institutions. We will not then say: "Here (*e.g.* in Aaron) is the church, and here (*e.g.* in Moses or David) is the state, and there the family." Not even roughly speaking. For all that can be said accurately is, "Here are theocratic priests, here are theocratic kings, here are theocratic

prophets and there are the theocratic people from whose ranks all these have come. (Cf. Ex. 28:1; Dt. 17:15; 18:15.) Over all His Old Testament house as the mediator of the covenant stands Moses, the servant of God. And behold, he directs our eyes down the ages to his antitype, Jesus, the Son of God, who is exalted 'over his house, whose house we are, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm unto the end (Heb. 3:6).'"

In illustration of the relevance of this thesis to the solution of some current problems of church, state and family relationships, we turn to the articles mentioned earlier. One of the writers leans heavily on an argument from theocratic arrangements to support his theory that the Christian religion should be officially recognized by the civil government. (Rev. M. R. Mackay, "Is 'Equality of all religions before the Law' Scriptural?" Part IV. *The Contender*. July, 1952.) Having indicated the positive roles played by David and Solomon in the establishment of Israel's centre of worship at Jerusalem, the opposition of various godly kings to Baalism, and similar data, the writer suggests that those who do not accept his view of the relation of church and state are confronted with a dilemma. Their only alternative to capitulating to his position is, he thinks, to contradict the Bible's approbation of the conduct of David, *et al.*, by judging that these kings transgressed the limits of

their authority in interfering in religious affairs.

That the horns of the dilemma are vaporous is evident, for the argument rests on an utterly false equation of the theocratic monarchy with the ordinary state. As observed above, neither church nor state is isolable within the Theocracy. It is therefore impossible to identify one theocratic institution such as the kingship with the ordinary concept of the state. From this it follows that one cannot determine the relationship which should obtain between, *e. g.*, the United States of America and the Christian religion, by a study of the relationship of godly theocratic kings to the worship of the Lord in their day. What we do see in the activity of these theocratic kings is a typical portrayal of the kingly office of the Christ of God, exercised in behalf of His Body, the Church, in a reign which now is and is to come in the glory of the Consummation Kingdom. For that Kingdom will be the anti-type of the theocratic kingdom ruled over by David's dynasty of old.

To cite another example of the misuse of theocratic history, we turn to an article by the Rev. J. M. Kik in the December, 1952, issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. While it is our opinion that the particular error which will be noted below is part and parcel of a failure throughout his argument to follow the most fundamental exegetical (See "Theocracy," p. 36)

Orthodox Presbyterian Church News

Portland, Me.: Second Parish church is seeking contributions to the Memorial Organ Fund, to be used for repairing the present organ and obtaining a new Austin console. Total cost will be \$7,800. It is expected the organ will be ready for use in late summer. A Christian Day School is now meeting in the church building. Sessions began last October. There are nine pupils and one teacher.

Rochester, N. Y.: Mr. D. Heuseveldt and Mr. H. VanBrummelen were installed as elders, and Mr. Fred Kalsbeek and Mr. Arthur Taylor were ordained as deacons of Memorial Church

on January 1. Mr. William VanHall became a trustee. Dr. Van Til was in the city January 18 and 19 giving a series of lectures on Barthianism.

Albany, N. Y.: The Rev. John P. Clelland, of Wilmington, Del., is giving a series of lectures at Maywood Church. The first, on January 28, was on "Understanding the Scriptures." On January 25 Miss Margaret Wendel, a Bible translator serving in old Mexico under the Wycliffe translators, spoke at the church.

Fair Lawn, N. J.: Recent improvements to Grace church include painting the interior of the church auditori-

um, and new equipment for the church basement. An organ fund has been started. About 150 persons attended the Christmas program of the Sunday school.

West Collingswood, N. J.: An addition, containing several rooms for Sunday school classes, is being built on to Immanuel church auditorium. Changes are also to be made in the main structure, including a steeple and a new entryway. On January 21 a ten-week Bible study course was begun at the church. Classes are being taught by Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse and the Rev. Meredith G. Kline, both of Westminster Seminary. Recently the church conducted an intensive two-weeks' campaign aimed at reaching children in the community.

Crescent Park, N. J.: Church attendance at Immanuel has been soaring recently, due in part to a Sunday school program encouraging children to attend the church. Members of the congregation are actively engaged in improving the appearance of the church building.

Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.: The Rev. John Galbraith, Missions Secretary of the denomination, recently visited First church. Accompanied by his wife, Mr. Galbraith was on a three-weeks' trip designed to acquaint him with church conditions in some of the southern states. The church building has been improved by the addition of the loggia, washrooms, and a pastor's study. The next aim is to secure pews.

Glenside, Penna.: Calvary Church has opened a branch Sunday school in Fulmor Heights, near Hatboro. On the first Sunday afternoon, there were fifty persons present at this school. Mr. Robert Fifer is serving as superintendent, with Seminary students helping in the teaching. The pastor, the Rev. Robert L. Atwell, left February 2 on a month's visitation trip for Westminster Seminary. In his absence the pulpit is being supplied by Ministers Robert Marsden, John Galbraith, C. Van Til and Meredith Kline. A congregational fellowship supper was held Wednesday evening, January 28, with a music program during the evening.

Middletown, Penna.: During the Christmas holidays the men of Calvary Church began the work of redecorating the church auditorium. On January 18 a delegation from the Middletown Fire Department and its Auxiliary attended the evening service.

Pittsburgh, Penna.: A board of directors was recently elected for a Christian Day School. Plans for the opening of the school are now under way. Fifteen adults and nine covenant children were recently received into church membership.

Waterloo, Iowa: Mr. George Griffiths was elected president of the men's society of First Church. At the meetings of the society the Rev. Oscar

Holkeboer has been discussing the Sermon on the Mount. The Sunday school has purchased a slide-film projector for instructional use in Bible teaching.

Gresham, Wisc.: Christmas programs of three Sunday schools were held in two places this past holiday season. About 90 persons attended the program at the Old Stockbridge (See "Church News," p. 33)

A Home Study Course in Christian Doctrine

The Application of Redemption

By JOHN MURRAY

LESSON V

Regeneration II

IT was the apostle John who recorded for us our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus. John had learned its lessons well and particularly the lesson that regeneration is the act of God and of God alone, that men are born again "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:13). He has inscribed this teaching indelibly upon his first epistle, also. Explicit reference to regeneration appears in that epistle on several occasions (I John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18). The leading emphasis in these passages is upon the fact that there is an invariable concomitance or coordination of regeneration and other fruits of grace. In 2:29 it is the concomitance (togetherness) of the divine begetting and doing righteousness; in 3:9 of the divine begetting, on the one hand, and not doing sin and incapacity to sin, on the other; in 4:7 of the divine begetting and love; in 5:1 of the divine begetting and believing that Jesus is the Christ; in 5:4 of the divine begetting and overcoming the world; in 5:18 of divine begetting and not sinning and immunity to the touch of the evil one. As we shall see later, this is a very significant emphasis and warns us against any view of regeneration which abstracts it from the other elements of the application of redemption.

In most of these passages all that is expressly stated is this truth of the invariable concomitance of regeneration

and these other blessings of grace. But in 3:9 we are expressly informed of something else, namely, the relation which regeneration sustains to the other particular graces mentioned in that text. "Everyone who is begotten of God does not do sin, because his seed abides in him; and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God." Not only is it stated that the person who is born again does not do sin, but we are also informed of the reason why he does not sin. He does not sin because God's seed abides in him. Now this abiding seed alludes clearly to the divine impartation which took place in the divine begetting. It is this divine begetting with its abiding consequence that is the *cause* of not doing sin. Hence regeneration is logically and causally prior to the not doing sin. And, again, John tells us that "he cannot sin because he is begotten of God," an express statement to the effect that regeneration is the *cause* why this person cannot sin. So the reason why a person cannot sin is that that person is regenerated—the order cannot be reversed. In this verse, therefore, we are informed that regeneration is the source and explanation of the breach with sin which is characteristic of every regenerate person.

We have found thus in I John 3:9 a principle which must apply to the other texts cited in this epistle, even though the principle is not expressly mentioned in these other texts. The inference is confirmed when we compare 3:9 with 5:18. The latter reads: "We know

that everyone who is begotten of God does not sin, but he who has been begotten of God keeps himself, and the evil one does not touch him." The thought here is very closely similar to that in 3:9. In fact it is in part identical, with a slight variation of terms. If what we have found to be true in 3:9 applies to what is taught in 3:9, it must also apply to what is taught in 5:18. And that means that the reason why a person does not sin is that he is begotten of God and the reason why the evil one does not touch a person is that he is begotten of God. Regeneration is the logical and causal explanation of abstinence from sin and freedom from the touch of the evil one.

Of course it is not our purpose now to determine what this freedom from sin, this incapacity to sin, and this immunity to the invasion of the evil one precisely mean. All we are interested in at present is simply to establish the relation which regeneration sustains to these characteristics of the regenerate person.

We are forced to the conclusion, therefore, on the basis of 3:9 and 5:18, that the relation established in these two texts applies to all the others also. In 2:29, we must infer, that the reason why the person in view does righteousness is that he is begotten of God. And likewise in the others. In 4:7 regeneration must be regarded as the cause of love, in 5:1 the cause of belief that Jesus is the Christ, in 5:4 the cause of overcoming the world. We have therefore a whole catalogue of virtues—belief that Jesus is the Christ, overcoming the world, abstinence from sin, self-control, incapacity to sin, freedom from the touch of the evil one, doing righteousness, love to God and one's neighbour. And they are all the fruit of regeneration. It should be noted how comprehensive and representative this catalogue is. It covers the wide range of the virtue demanded by the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. In the order in which they have been stated above, as Bengel expressed it in another connection, faith leads the band and love brings up the rear.

It should be specially noted that even faith that Jesus is the Christ is the effect of regeneration. This is, of course, a clear implication of John 3:3-8. But John the apostle here takes pains to make that plain. Regeneration is the beginning of all saving grace *in us*, and all saving grace in exercise

on our part proceeds from the fountain of regeneration. We are not born again by faith or repentance or conversion; we repent and believe because we have been regenerated. No one can say in truth that Jesus is the Christ except by regeneration of the Spirit and that is one of the ways by which the Holy Spirit glorifies Christ. The embrace of Christ in faith is the first evidence of regeneration and only thus may we know that we have been regenerated.

The priority of regeneration might create the impression that a person could be regenerated and yet not converted. These passages in I John should correct any such misapprehension. We need to remember again that the leading emphasis in these passages is the invariable concomitance of regeneration and the other graces mentioned. "Everyone who is begotten of God does not do sin, for his seed remains in him; and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God" (3:9). "Everyone who is begotten of God overcomes the world; and this is the victory which has overcome the world, even our faith" (5:4). "Everyone who is begotten of God does not sin, but he who has been begotten of God keeps himself, and the wicked one does not touch him" (5:18). When we put these texts together they expressly state that every regenerate person has been delivered from the power of sin, overcomes the world by the faith of Christ, and exercises that self-control by which he is no longer the slave of sin and of the evil one. That means, when reduced to its simplest terms, that the regenerate person is converted and exercises faith and repentance. We must not think of regeneration as something which can be abstracted from the saving exercises which are its effects. Hence we shall have to conclude that in the other passages (2:29; 4:7; 5:1) the fruits mentioned—doing righteousness, the love and knowledge of God, believing that Jesus is the Christ—are just as necessarily the accompaniments of regeneration as are the fruits mentioned in 3:9; 5:4, 18. This simply means that the whole catalogue of graces mentioned in these passages are the consequences of regeneration and not only consequences which sooner or later follow upon regeneration, but fruits which are inseparable from regeneration. We are warned and advised, therefore, that while regeneration is the action of God and of God

alone we must never conceive of this action as separable from the activities of saving grace on our part which are the necessary and appropriate effects of God's grace in us. The apostle John had learned of his Lord and what he teaches in his epistle is, in other terms, exactly what Jesus taught in his discourse to Nicodemus. If it is true that no one enters the kingdom of God except by regeneration (John 3: 3, 5), it is also just as true that everyone who is born again has entered into the kingdom of God. If regeneration is the way of entrance, then those regenerated have entered and, having entered, they see the kingdom of God and are members of it. This is again the pointed lesson of Jesus in John 3:6: "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," that is to say, the person born of the Holy Spirit is indwelt and directed by the Holy Spirit. The regenerate person cannot live in sin and be unconverted. And neither can he live any longer in neutral abstraction. He is immediately a member of the kingdom of God, he is spirit, and his action and behaviour must be consonant with that new citizenship. In the language of the apostle Paul, "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things have passed away, behold they have become new" (II Cor. 5:17). There are numerous other considerations derived from the Scripture which confirm this great truth that regeneration is such a radical, pervasive and efficacious transformation that it immediately registers itself in the conscious activity of the person concerned in the exercises of faith and repentance and new obedience. Far too frequently the conception entertained of conversion is so superficial and beggarly that it completely fails to take account of the momentous change of which conversion is the fruit. And the whole notion of what is involved in the application of redemption becomes so attenuated that it has little or no resemblance to that which the gospel teaches. Regeneration is at the basis of all change in heart and life. It is a stupendous change because it is God's recreative act. A cheap and tawdry evangelism has tended to rob the gospel which it proclaims of that invincible power which is the glory of the gospel of sovereign grace. May the church come to think and live again in terms of the gospel which is *the power of God* unto salvation.

Missionary Society Page

By MRS. JOHN P. GALBRAITH

Missionary Society Activities

Bend, Oregon

Writes Mrs. Robert E. Nicholas:

Greetings from Bend, Oregon, the heart of Oregon's vacation land with Westminster's little white church beautifully situated across from a park and right on the Deschutes River.

The women of our church have two organizations, the Ladies Missionary Society and the Fidelis Fellowship. The Missionary Society has been going strong since the organization of the church under the leadership of the Rev. Glenn R. Coie. In addition to the regular Society Meeting one afternoon a month, the Executive Committee also meets once a month. For devotions in our Society Meeting we have been using the book entitled *How to be a Happy Christian* by William W. Orr. The devotional leader gives out relevant Scripture references to be read by the ladies during her talk. She is also responsible for the prayer hour and distributes requests obtained from the *Messenger* and *GUARDIAN*.

Our Program Committee this past year has prepared an exceptionally interesting and varied program. Discussions on such topics as these have been held: "How to pray for missionaries, and how to write letters to missionaries" (with a schedule for missionary letter writing); "The stories of hymns we love with music"; and "What should a minister expect of his congregation and what should the congregation expect of its minister?"

In December we had an open meeting, inviting the men. However, we not only invited them but put them in charge. They held an interesting forum discussion, and *supplied and served the refreshments*.

We are also privileged in having an artist in our midst and she has been giving us excellent chalk talks illustrating various hymns. Her talent has added much enjoyment to our meetings.

Once a month this same group meets for work and a social time. We pack boxes, sew, and roll bandages for our

missionaries. We endeavor at these meetings to have an inspirational article, a missionary letter, or something from the *GUARDIAN*, read.

The Fidelis group is made up of mothers of Sunday School children and women who cannot come to the regular Missionary Meeting because of its meeting in the afternoon. This group holds its meetings in the evening, once a month. Occasionally we have a speaker but usually just work on a project. Right now we are concerned with sponsoring a "Pioneer Girls" group. We are planning a dinner and social evening soon to which we can invite some of the young husbands who are not as yet interested in our church.

At this point let me add that the Minute Men of our church have sponsored "Sky Pilots" for the boys. This has been highly successful in winning boys for Christ.

If any of you would like to have any further information about these organizations or about sources for our program material, please write us.

I might also add that we have had prayer partners also. We gave each couple an identical prayer list (composed of names of church members and interested people, missionaries and church organizations). Each lady is supposed to pray at the same time her partner does each day. Each month the list is changed. This has resulted in our becoming more interested in the people for whom we have been praying and has gotten us to call on those outside of the church who are within calling limits.

PROBLEM MINUTE

(This is a frequent problem on mission fields. Various answers are given. What is your answer? You might be able to discuss it at one of your missionary meetings.)

A man on the foreign mission field is converted. He has four wives. Should he be allowed to keep all four? Should he be allowed to keep just one? If so, which one? What are to be his responsibilities toward these wives and their children?

Home Missions

Evergreen Park, Illinois

We have been endeavoring from time to time to acquaint the ladies of our churches with the work of our home missionaries as well as that of our foreign missionaries. This month we bring to your attention the Evergreen Park, Illinois, home mission field of which the Rev. Robert W. Eckardt is missionary pastor. Mrs. Eckardt writes:

Although home missionary work is at times discouraging, it nevertheless has its compensations. The foremost reward is to see lives transformed by the power of the gospel. This does not occur as often as we wish, but we realize that this is in the hands of the Lord. Since this is true, it is misleading to compare the numerical progress of various home mission fields. We must all trust the Lord to use the sowing of the Word as He sees fit. 'I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.'

The Women's Missionary Society was organized a little over a year ago. There has been a genuine interest among the ladies in this Society. During our devotional time we have made a study of the Parables. Correspondence with our home and foreign missionaries has resulted in their replies being a basis of information and a more efficient and specific source for our prayer time.

A Men's Club also has been started in the church. It meets monthly, and the program consists of a Bible study and discussion period, followed by a social period. This Club makes certain projects within the church its responsibility—such as making repairs or improvements on the building when necessary.

We have two young people's organizations that meet once a month. They are: the Teen Agers (ages 13 and above); and Live Wires (ages 8-12). One of the special features of the Teen Agers Club is their handwork. The devotional period of the Live Wires is a flannelgraph lesson. (We have used

the flannelgraph lessons on the book *Pilgrim's Progress*.)

Finally, we can honestly say we are encouraged with our Catechism classes which meet once a week. There are about fifteen children of school age who attend and indicate a real interest in learning.

Even though these organizations are functioning, they will not be a success

without the blessing of the Lord. For this reason we naturally covet the prayers of God's people. Pray in particular that the parents of the Sunday School children will realize their personal need for worshipping the Lord and that the various people who are contacted from day to day may be won to Christ and finally brought into His church.

an Apostle of the uncircumcision while Peter was made an Apostle of the circumcision. Yet Paul never forgot that his responsibility was to "the Jew first" and Peter was compelled to realize that he had a responsibility toward Cornelius, the Gentile.

Surely as a Christian, with countless daily opportunities, I should not expect the pastor or a member of *another* family to be *as* responsible for witnessing to *my* family as I am. They have many families towards which they have as great a responsibility as they have to mine. For them my family may be a second or third responsibility, but for me it is a first. So with the people on our street, in our factory, school, or army outfit. We should not expect those living on another street or connected with another factory, school, or army outfit, who have many such circles toward which they have an equal responsibility, to feel *as* responsible toward our circle as we are. They might, as a third or fourth step come to our street or factory and help us, but the evangelization of our street is primarily the duty of the Christians on our street. The evangelization of our church area is the responsibility of our church primarily, and only secondarily the responsibility of a church in another area or of the Home Missions Committee of the Presbytery or the General Assembly. The evangelization of our Presbytery area is primarily the responsibility of the combined churches located in our Presbytery and only secondarily of the Assembly. The evangelization of our country is primarily the responsibility of the Assembly and the combined churches in America. Only secondarily is it the responsibility of the Koreans, Japanese, Chinese and European Christians. Yet it is definitely their responsibility too. If we fail they must come and evangelize us.

As we have said before there is a definite order, and this order gives each of us primary responsibility as well as a second or third responsibility. If each was fulfilling his own primary responsibility and as a second or third going into other fields to help people whose prime responsibility that other field was, or to help others with a field that was to them also a second or third responsibility, we would see the work of the Lord accomplished with less effort and much more efficiency.

(To be continued)

Telling the Good News

By Bruce F. Hunt

CHAPTER IV

The Geographic Order of Telling The Good News

Place for beginning witness is fixed by God

In the realm of my more official work, I have used this simple geographic order as a practical guide in deciding where to begin work in any area. In house to house evangelization, I usually begin either with my very next door neighbors and so go on down the street in either direction, door to door, or begin with the people who live next to the church, the temporary meeting place or the "contact" I may have been given in an area. This way one avoids hearing the charge that a person has lived next door to a church or a pastor and has never heard the gospel or been urged to receive the Lord and the eternal life which he offers so freely. I have found that following this simple, rather obvious, Biblical rule in the geographic order of procedure has saved me a lot of worry and hesitation about where I should begin a work. I have found, too, that it keeps my work from being guided so much by my own prejudices and preconceived notions as to where would be the best place to begin or who would be the most likely prospects, and compels me to be directed more by the Providence which wrote such an order.

In following this practice I have been led, in fact, to start work in places which my natural reason and inclinations voted against; places that the judgment of my friends was also against. I think especially of our work in Harbin, Manchuria. We began a

work in our home which reached out into a nearby neighborhood where the class of Koreans was so low, largely engaged in operating brothels and opium dens, that people told us it was useless to start a church in that area. Contrary to their prophecies, our church became the largest Korean church in Harbin and later we had three groups in the same area. In Santee, California, by working an area immediately around our "contacts," a church was started in a sparsely populated, small-farms' area where there already existed one struggling community Methodist church. It was an area that I would not naturally have chosen, both from the sparseness of the population and the fact that a church already existed there. The years of its faithful ministry in an ever growing population have proved again that God's wisdom is better than man's. Some of the pillars in our National City work are those who were neighbors to the successive pastors or to our different meeting places.

Guide to Division of Labor

This geographic order also gives us a guide in our division of labor in the over-all task of blanketing the world. The normal order for each of us should be my house, my street, my town, my state, my country, my neighboring countries and my world. Following this order we soon find that our lines converge or become interwoven with the lines of others who are acting on similar orders. Then it is that we should, as far as possible, work together at our "common" task and the time for a mutual agreement on division of labor becomes practical.

Paul and Peter began from Jerusalem. Both had a responsibility to reach the ends of the world. But, under Divine direction Paul was made

Plain Talks With Young People (5)

Keeping The Sabbath

By LAWRENCE R. EYRES

I READ once of an English gentleman who, on a journey, had seven gold sovereigns in his pocket. On a lonely road he was confronted by a wretched beggar who presented such a pitiful spectacle that he was moved to give the man six of his sovereigns, reserving only one for himself. But what was his amazement when the beggar turned on him and robbed him of his remaining sovereign! The application was made that God has given six days of every seven for man's own use, pleasure and enrichment; and man, beholden as he is to the Creator for these six days, has robbed him of the seventh also.

The Sabbath problem is a problem of the whole church, but it is particularly the problem of you young people, and for three reasons: (1) It has been said so often that it sounds trite, but still it is true: upon your shoulders will fall the burdens of tomorrow. You will have to maintain the institutions of true religion. Perhaps my generation's poor example will impress you that godliness and sobriety cannot endure in a generation or nation where God's holy day is profaned and despised. (2) You are the number one target of Satan's attacks. If he can rob you of the holy day he will be able to strangle your true spirituality. And with the loss of your spirituality your morality cannot long be maintained in an evil world. (3) You are more teachable than your elders just because you are young. Older people—even though truly born again—change their habitual pattern of life only under severest pressure, and then not as radically as they should. For these reasons I urge you to take to heart what I'm going to say to you about keeping the Sabbath.

The Surrender of the City of God

For the remainder of this article I'd like to have you think of the Christian Sabbath as a city, a *holy* city, in fact the *city of God*. By and large my generation has surrendered God's holy sabbatical city to the world. It has been a subtle, gradual surrender, but the

process is almost complete—so complete that I must urge many of you to change the entire pattern of your thinking as to your use of the first day of the week. Because there is no school or special home task on that day many of you stay up (and out) till unearthly hours on Saturday nights. Even if this were not a technical transgression of the commandment, it violates its spirit. Some of you work for employers, others go to school. Don't you think you owe your employers and your teachers a fresh mind and rested body when you come to serve them and be taught by them? And yet you feel no obligation to your heavenly Master and Teacher to come into His service and into His sanctuary with a rested body and mind! That person who, except for extraordinary reasons, must consume the greater part of the Lord's day morning in bed is equally a Sabbath breaker with him who spends the Lord's day in needless labor or pleasure!

I must speak of other parts of the day. Is it not habitual for young people to use the afternoon or evening of the "best day" for amusements and school studies? Radio and television have even invaded most of your homes, and of course the "best" programs are on Sunday afternoon and evening! This problem takes a lot of moral courage to solve, but physically it requires a "simple twist of the wrist." As to school studies, I remember a boy in my young people's group several years ago who protested that he *had* to study Sunday afternoons for his Monday lessons. I asked him what he was in the habit of doing Saturday afternoons and evenings. He hung his head sheepishly. The discussion was over.

All sorts of solutions have been proposed to accommodate the program of the church to the habits of modern churchgoers. Have an early worship service for those who want to go golfing or picnicking or visiting; have Sunday school and worship later than usual for the benefit of those who must "sleep in" Sunday mornings; or maybe

it would be best to move the whole business to Sunday afternoon! Many churches have settled for just one hour in which to hold both Sunday school and church simultaneously, an hour least offensive as a time to acknowledge the Giver of all good—10:30 to 11:30 A. M. Other larger churches have had an early and a late worship service, hoping (sometimes vainly) to catch all their members at one service or the other. Does not this sound like appeasement? The Church of the Lord of heaven and earth begging the world for "just one hour a week, if you don't mind!" And, tragically, "My people love to have it so." This condition indicates who is in true possession of the holy sabbatical city.

Retaking the Holy City

In every age the youthful spirit is a rash spirit—the young adult is extremely idealistic. Here, young people, is a conflict worthy of your metal! Here is a holy city which ought to be retaken for the King's glory. God, from the beginning of days, has reserved one day in seven for Himself. He does not say in the commandment, "Make it holy." He made the day holy in the beginning. To us He says, "Keep it holy!" He has further sanctified the Christian Sabbath in the true spirit of the Law by breaking the bands of death and Hell on that day when Jesus came forth alive from the grave. And further He sent forth the Spirit of His Son upon a waiting church on that "day of all the week the best." Surely the God and Father of both Christ and all the faithful *owns* the Christian Sabbath in a doubly sacred sense. And He has given it to His people for their own joy and blessedness, being most jealous of its proper employment. And yet, like the land of Canaan, we must go in and possess it for Him. Only for such as will honor the King in His holy city is it a delightful place, a land that flows with milk and honey.

Young people, I entreat you, go back to the Word of God, see what use He will have you make of the holy day—then claim it, *all* of it, for Him. Plant over its ramparts the banner of the cross. My generation has virtually abandoned the holy city to the godless; let yours reclaim it for Him whose right it is to reign over it—"The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

Beautifulizing the Holy City

The Fourth Commandment does

not begin with a "don't," but with a "do." "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." Isaiah tells us to "call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." Our Lord said, "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath." These all add up to one thing: God gave us this day to make us happy, not to make us miserable. "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The Christian Sabbath was intended to be a delightful place, a beautiful city, a holy habitation for the people of God. And you and I must make it so. But *how to beautify the city—that is the question!*

There is only one way. The true beauty of the new Jerusalem will not be the pearly gates or the golden streets; the beauty of it will be the radiance of the presence of our wonderful, heavenly Lord dwelling in the midst of it. So also this present city of God which is the "emblem of eternal rest"—its beauty is in that it is "*the Lord's day.*" Put Him in the very centre of it, make communion with Him the business of the day and it will become a foretaste of heaven to you. This is unattainable to the unbeliever for he does not love our Christ, but it is the most congenial thing imaginable for the true believer to spend one day in seven with Him in whom his soul delighteth.

Public worship is the crowning aspect of this communion. Do you

find Christ when you attend church? If you are in the right church you should unless you don't go there prepared and seeking Him. Do you obey the negative prescriptions of the commandment so as to clear the ground for quiet, deliberate public and private communion? How much time do you spend apart for the two worship services (be sure you attend both!) in private devotion—in reading your Bible and in prayer? This, too, must be deliberately planned; then if you seek Him you'll find Him, if you seek Him with all your heart. There is the matter of Christian service. It is delightful to serve Christ with a portion of His day, that is *if* you serve Him out of true love, not for the praises of men. Finally, see to it that the spirit of quiet deliberation characterizes the entire day. Get up early enough to be deliberate about breakfast, family worship, Sunday school and church and on through the day. A change of pace is restful in itself. Make the Lord's day a change of pace from morning till night; with quietness and firmness place Christ in the center of your public and private worship of God and in your service of Him. "Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isaiah 58:14.)

Philadelphia Presbytery Again Recalls License

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, meeting in regular session at Eastlake Church, Wilmington, Del., on January 19, voted 13 to 6 in favor of a motion recalling the license of Mr. G. Travers Sloyer. The motion stated that in the judgment of the Presbytery Mr. Sloyer holds to views on "guidance" which are in conflict with the Confession of Faith, chapter 1, section 6, the first sentence, and section 1 the second sentence.

This action followed an examination of Mr. Sloyer at the November meeting of the Presbytery. In accordance with the directive of the 1952 General Assembly, this examination was recorded and transcribed. Copies were distributed to the members of Presbytery several weeks before the January meeting. Those who supported the motion appeared convinced that the transcript of the examination provided clear evidence that Mr. Sloyer's views were contrary to the Confession. Those opposed to the motion seemed to feel that while some statements in the transcript were unfortunate or unguarded, there was not clear evidence of erroneous views. Notice was given at the meeting that a complaint would be entered against the decision.

The Presbytery also decided to embark upon a program of church visitation, somewhat along the lines of the report published in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN in November, 1952. The Presbytery was divided into three sections, of about 4 churches each, and three committees, consisting of two ministers each, were elected, one for each section of the Presbytery. The committee will visit each of its churches once a year, will examine sessional records and sit with the session as corresponding members at a regular session meeting. The purpose of the visitation, which is to be tried out for a two-year period, is to give sessions an opportunity to seek advice and help from the visitors, and to give the visitors a chance to ascertain, for the information of the Presbytery, whether the local work is being properly handled. Arrangements for the visit are to be made in advance, so there will be no "surprise" visits, and any reports by the committees to Presbytery must first be presented to the session. The committees have no authority to act in any local matter, but can only report to

Church News

(Continued from p. 28)

Church. The other program was held in a rough hall in the Menominee forest, with light provided by lanterns hanging from the rafters. About 70 pagan, Peyote and papist Indians attended. Bible school children sang and gave recitations, and the pastor, the Rev. John Davies, brought the message.

Volga, S. D.: The November Thankoffering of Calvary Church amounted to \$1,500. Attorney Frank Vust, of Sioux Falls, was guest speaker at the men's society in November. The Christmas cantata, *Even Unto Bethlehem*, directed by Mrs. Lucille Amie, was presented on December 21st to an audience that filled the church. On January 5, 18 boxes of good used clothing were shipped to the Rev. Bruce

Hunt for Korean relief.

Bend, Oregon: Machen League groups at Westminster Church were busy during the holiday season. Two groups went caroling on Christmas Eve. Twenty members of the Senior League enjoyed an overnight outing at the James ranch. On New Year's Eve the Senior group had a progressive dinner, followed by games and a watchnight devotional period. The pastor, the Rev. Robert E. Nicholas, has concluded the second series of sermons on the Westminster Confession, this time covering the latter part of the Confession. Evening messages are being given over the radio.

Long Beach, Calif.: Plans for a young people's winter conference, to be held at Idlewild, have been completed. Six new members were received into First Church in December. An expansion program is expected to start soon.

Presbytery. Visits will be only with the session, not with the congregation.

Presbytery also decided to give some time at its next meeting to a considera-

tion of the proposed changes in the Form of Government, which have been handed down by the two previous General Assemblies.

The RSV and Creation

Some Translations in Genesis

By EDWARD J. YOUNG

IN our previous article we called attention to what we believe to be a very serious mistranslation of Isaiah 7:14. It is a mistranslation so serious, indeed, that we believe it destroys the heart of a Messianic prophecy.

In our present article our purpose is merely to call attention to several specimens of translation work in Genesis and evaluate them. By this means we hope to gauge the general accuracy of the translation.

Genesis I.1

One notes with considerable pleasure that the first verse of Genesis is rendered, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is our firm conviction that this is the only correct translation here. We believe the Hebrew states the fact of absolute creation. In an article of this kind, we cannot of course engage in a discussion of fine points of Hebrew grammar, but suffice it to say that such a discussion would show that the translation of the first verse given above is a correct one. It is, therefore, somewhat discouraging to read a footnote, "Or *When God began to create.*" Frankly, we wish that the translators had adopted either one or the other of these two renderings, rather than admit that both are possible. This is a characteristic of the RSV. It will put one rendering in the text and then insert in a footnote a rendering which gives an entirely different, even opposite meaning. Such a procedure can lead only to confusion. The reader of the Bible who does not know the Hebrew language will come to the conclusion that the text of the Hebrew is very ambiguous and capable of opposing translations. Such, however, is not the case at all.

In the present instance this is particularly serious. The translation given in the text teaches absolute creation, or as we commonly say, creation out of nothing. That simply means that God, by

the exercise of His sovereign will and power brought into existence that which previously had no existence. The footnote, however, teaches something quite different. The footnote teaches that when God began the work of creation, the material which He used was already present. In other words, the footnote does not teach an absolute creation. This is extremely important, for if the footnote is correct, then it follows that the fundamental doctrine of creation can find no support in the first verse of Genesis. Now, Genesis either teaches or it does not

THIS is the third in a series of comments on the new translation of the Bible, the Revised Standard Version, by Dr. Edward J. Young, Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

teach creation out of nothing. It does not teach both, and its language is not capable of two contrary interpretations. It would have been far better, we think, if this footnote had been omitted entirely.

Genesis I.2

The second verse is rendered, "The earth was without form and void, etc." Here we find missing the word "and," which is so common in the King James' Version. What of it? the reader might be tempted to say. What difference does it make if such a small word is omitted? Why quibble about it? Well, for our part we do not desire to quibble, but we feel that, small as is the word "and," it is nevertheless a very important word. It gives a certain force to the connection between verses one and two which is lost as soon as the word is omitted. Let us paraphrase the thought, as follows: "In the beginning God created the heaven and specifically the earth. Now, the earth was without form and void, etc."

Thus, we see that the word "and" serves a very definite purpose. It stands as a connective between the two verses. This force is completely lost when the word is omitted.

This practice of omitting the word "and" where it should be retained, is rather frequent. We note for example Genesis 3:1, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any other wild creature that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, etc." There is something lost here. Likewise chapter two, verse fifteen, begins, "The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it, etc." The original should be translated literally, "And the Lord God took the man and He caused him to rest in the garden of Eden to serve it and to keep it." The omission of the "and" may be regarded as a very little thing, but when we omit it from translation we remove something of the Biblical flavor. In this connection I would quote the words of the late William Wright, a distinguished Arabist, "I also endeavour to preserve a somewhat antiquated and Biblical style, as being peculiarly adapted to the rendering into English of Oriental works, whether poetical or historical. The Old Testament and the Koran, which are, of course, in many ways strikingly similar in their diction, can both be easily made ridiculous by turning them into our modern vernacular, particularly if we vulgarize with malice prepense." In some cases the omission of "and" makes little difference, in others, however, it makes considerable difference, as in the case of Genesis 1:2. We must remember that God revealed the Old Testament to men who spoke an oriental language. This fact cannot be neglected in translation.

The latter part of verse two is translated "—and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters." This is fine. However, there is a footnote which would substitute the word "wind" for Spirit. Again, we would insist that such a note will lead to confusion. Does this verse speak of the activity of the Spirit of God, i. e., the Holy Spirit, or does it merely speak of a wind of God, i. e., a mighty wind, moving over the face of the waters? For our part, we think that there is no doubt. The Hebrew word *merah-epheth* which is translated "was moving" really means "was brooding," as a bird broods over her young. It is

rather difficult to conceive of a wind brooding. Hence, we believe that the note referring to "wind" would better have been omitted.

Genesis II.4

There is one point in the second chapter of Genesis which calls for particular comment. It is the translation of verse four. This verse is divided into two paragraphs. The first paragraph reads, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created."

Then begins a second paragraph, the first sentence of which continues throughout the seventh verse. We shall give the beginning and conclusion of this paragraph—in between the beginning and the conclusion there is a long parenthesis. "In the day that the LORD GOD made the earth and the heavens, when no plant of the field was yet in the earth and no herb of the field had yet sprung up . . . then the LORD GOD formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." The parenthesis which goes in between the beginning and conclusion of the above sentence is as follows: "—for the LORD GOD had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground—."

Now the question arises, Why is there this division of verse four into two paragraphs? Why is the phrase "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth" separated from what follows? Before we attempt to answer that question we would point out that, as far as we can determine, there is no grammatical objection to the rendering of the RSV. It is true, it seems to us, that this is not the natural rendering of the Hebrew, but at least it is grammatically possible. Why, however, was it adopted? To answer that question we should have to know just what went on in the minds of the men who voted to render the Hebrew in this way, and that of course we cannot determine. However, there is one consideration which should not be lost from view. It is this. Many critics, who do not believe in the infallibility of Scripture, think that there are two different, conflicting accounts of the creation found in the Bible. Now, there is a strong objection to such a

view, namely, the presence of the phrase "These are the generations, etc." This phrase serves as a heading, and introduces the section which follows. The words speak of that which the heaven and the earth produced. They therefore announce that the section following deals not with the creation, but with that which came from heaven and earth, namely, man.

Many critics are painfully aware of the force of this phrase. Hence, they assert that here it is not a *superscription*, but merely a *subscription*. Some even say that it is out of place where it stands in verse four. Originally, some maintain, it belonged before verse one of chapter one. (If the reader will consult the Moffatt Bible, he will note that this is where Moffatt placed it.) If, then, this phrase can be regarded as a *subscription* and not a *superscription*, then Genesis 2:4b ff. is without a heading, and the critics are free to regard it as a second account of creation. Let us state the matter in even simpler language. The phrase "These are the generations, etc.," of verse 4 is a *superscription* over what follows and tells us that what follows has to do with the creation of man. Many critics say that the phrase therefore is out of place, and hence has no reference to what follows. What follows therefore is without a heading, and so we can regard it as a second account of creation.

Now this is a very familiar and common procedure upon the part of many scholars who do not believe the Bible to be the Word of God. We can only say that we are very sorry the RSV has seen fit to adopt this arrangement of things. We believe that in the long run it can only serve to introduce confusion. It does not set forth matters in their proper perspective. We do not say that the translators did this intentionally in order to get the "critical" view across. We do not know what the intentions of the translators were. At the same time, with the arrangement of Genesis 2:4 which we find in the RSV, it will be far easier to present the "critical" view. In the classrooms of Westminster Theological Seminary, where the students are required to study the Hebrew language, the present writer tries to point out to the students why the arrangement which we have just been discussing is incorrect. And it is an arrangement of the text such as we here find in the RSV which causes us to remark that the

man who uses this version should be a good Hebrew student.

It is phenomena such as the above which lead the present writer to maintain that the many excellencies of the new version are overshadowed by the liabilities. In translation we must seek to free ourselves from subjective influences as much as possible. We must try, in so far as we are able to render the original exactly. We may listen to Dr. Wright again, "In my translation I have striven to be as literal as the differences between the two idioms will allow. My method is first to translate as closely as I can, and then to try if I can improve the form of expression in any way without the sacrifice of truthfulness to the original." Truthfulness to the original must ever be the goal of the one who would present the Scriptures in English.

Kellogg

(Continued from p. 26)

each week preparing a sermon to deliver in the evening, as well as in the morning. The Sabbath is all day long. It is set aside for the public and private exercises of worship. It is important that one have such an intense spiritual appetite for the Word of God and for the fellowship of the saints, that to be absent from public worship will be painful experience. It is important that we long to gather in God's house.

You promised to receive the Word, but it is so often true that one comes to the house of God and doesn't actually receive the Word. You need the Spirit of the Lord to enable you cordially to receive it. You need to concentrate upon it, that you may intelligently grasp it. And you need to pray that the Spirit will so write it upon your hearts that you may go forth to be doers of the Word.

You promised that you would receive the Word of truth. Indeed in this day when so many preach another gospel which is no gospel, it is cause for thanksgiving when a congregation has one who stands up to preach the truth. That is a blessed privilege, to have one that preaches the Word of the living God. But there is also a responsibility, particularly of the session, to see to it that the truth is preached, and nothing else.

You have promised that you would

receive the truth here, and also that you would submit in the Lord to proper discipline. A tragedy of our times is the disregard the people have for the church and the proper authority that is in the church of Jesus Christ. So that instead of humbly submitting to discipline, that they might grow in grace and turn away from sin, they arrogantly despise it and go on in their iniquity. But you promised tonight. May God help you to keep that promise.

And even though the promises pertain particularly to that one who is called to be your pastor, it is also important to remember that he has an help-mate. And it is important to remember that affection for and love for her and cooperation with her as she also aids him in the work in this place is likewise necessary. May God help you in this, too.

And I am sure, friends, that if you carry out these promises you have made, you will have a happy and blessed relationship with your pastor and his family. And I am sure you will rejoice as you receive spiritual blessings from the heavenly Father.

Theocracy

(Continued from p. 27)

ical principles of the discipline of Biblical Theology, it is nevertheless by no means the intention of the present article to criticize Mr. Kik's argument as a whole or to evaluate his theory as such.

The article in question contends, in part, that the Old Testament by precept and example gives to the Church alone the right and duty of training men for the ministry. It offers as proof of this claim: 1. the role of the Levites in the instruction of the people; 2. the training of Samuel by Eli, the high priest; 3. the training of Elisha by the prophet Elijah; 4. the divine calling and instruction of the prophets.

As matters of detail it may be noted that the first item is inaccurate (for with only one partial and inconsequential exception none of the passages offered in evidence has anything to do with the non-priestly Levites). Also item four is irrelevant (as would be the first point even if corrected). Mention may be made, too, of certain features of the calling of the theocratic teaching ministry which seem, irrespective of our main objection, to pre-

vent close enough comparison with the teaching ministry of the new covenant to warrant one's basing the mode of preparation of the latter on that of the former. Of the two special teaching groups in the theocracy, the priestly and the prophetic, the first calling was hereditary and the second was charismatic. It is obvious that these features would control the agency and mode of preparation, and neither of these features is characteristic of the gospel ministry today.

Our chief criticism again, in terms of the thesis of this article, is that to label the priests and/or the prophets as the church within the Theocracy is unwarranted. The priests were, indeed, the representative-mediators of the congregation in its approach to God, and the prophets declared the Word of the Lord to the congregation. But the king ruled in the congregation, and Israel was that worshipping, serving congregation. All alike who lived in the Theocracy were always engaged in specifically religious, because theocratic, business. God was in the midst of the covenant people and, therefore, all was church, as also all was family and all

state—the church of God, the family of God, the Kingdom of God—all in one and one in all, and such was the Theocracy. However, if all is church and all is family and all is state, then nothing is church and nothing is family and nothing is state *in the usual sense of those words*. Strictly speaking all is Theocracy and nothing but Theocracy.

The one criticism presented here, it need hardly be added, does not by itself invalidate either of the theories used in the illustrations. Our present purpose is only the narrow one of defining the true nature of the Theocracy and so to clear the way that certain problems might be approached on the basis of proper Scriptural evidence. Wide enough, however, is the application of this thesis, for how many pages *pro* and *con* regarding the definition of the specific functions of the major institutions have been devoted to irrelevant appeals to theocratic practice. The systematic theologian is always obliged to stop, look and listen to the voice of Biblical theology, but that is, perhaps, nowhere more apparent than when he comes in his search for proof texts to the Theocracy.

Book Reviews

John Murray: CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. Philadelphia. The Committee on Christian Education of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. 1952. 93p. \$1.75.

EVERY minister and ruling elder of Reformed persuasion knows the practical difficulties involved in the administration of the sacraments in this day of ignorance of Christian doctrine. On the one hand he encounters superstition and on the other obstinate rejection of the truth. From parents of a new-born babe he hears the question, "Pastor, when do you take christenings?" From a confirmed Baptist, "You'll never get me in a church that baptizes infants."

Here is a book that should be of help in dispelling darkness in the first case and confusion in the second. Professor Murray does not merely rattle dead bones when he writes. The old controversies between immersionists and believers in other modes of baptism go on. Opponents of infant baptism have multiplied. The author has seen a need and seeks to meet it. The material which originally appeared in *The*

Westminster Theological Journal is clearly presented so that Christian people in general may profit greatly from its reading. For that which makes the book so practical is its emphasis on Biblical support for the position taken.

The author begins by expounding the meaning of baptism. To use his own words "Baptism signifies union with Christ in the virtue of his death and resurrection, purification from the defilement of sin by the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit, and purification from the guilt of sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. The emphasis must be placed, however, upon union with Christ" (page 8). From this basic consideration the author proceeds to examine the contention that immersion is essential to the symbolism of the sacrament and finds the contentions of the immersionists unsupported. Here as in the other parts of the book the author is careful to be fair in presenting the position of his opponents. In so doing he increases the force of his own arguments.

The church as it is viewed by men

receives consideration. For it is by fallible men that persons and their children are admitted to the privileges of the sacrament of baptism. The church has responsibilities in receiving those who give an "intelligent and consistent profession of faith in Christ and of obedience to him." Although hypocrites may enter the church and do, yet this does not destroy the truth that the church is the communion of the saints and baptism the sign and seal of communion with Jesus Christ. One cannot read this chapter without appreciating anew the solemn responsibilities that rest upon office-bearers in the church.

Throughout the argument for infant baptism which presents old arguments in new and refreshing ways there is appeal to Scripture. In making this appeal the author is careful not to fall into the error of some in claiming more support for his position than a particular passage may give. He recognizes that the covenant of grace which embraces parents and their children alone gives us warrant for baptizing infants. Here he makes a noteworthy statement, "It is the divine institution, not, indeed, commended by human wisdom and not palatable to those who are influenced by the dictates of human wisdom, yet commended by the wisdom of God" (page 71).

What about this claim that the Bible doesn't give us any warrant for infant baptism. Let every Sunday School teacher, every ruling elder, every minister digest the abundant Biblical exposition, given in support of this doctrine. A diligent study of the chapter on objections to infant baptism will help to dispel defeatism in seeking to maintain our Presbyterian heritage in a day when it is lacking many champions. Let church sessions consider chapter 6 on "Whose children are to be baptized" when confronted with difficult decisions. Let parents read about baptism as a means of grace in chapter 7. Here is a book that should strengthen the faith of God's covenant children and lead others to believe and receive God's full provision for communion with Him.

LE ROY B. OLIVER.

* * *

Edward J. Young: ISAIAH FIFTY-THREE. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Wm B. Eerdmans. 1952. 91 p. \$1.50.

In the writing of this book, the author shows a remarkable versatility.

Some of his other books give evidence of his ability as a precise and exact theological commentator. In this volume there is abundant evidence that Dr. Young is able also to produce that which is termed "Devotional and Expository."

In the Preface to "Isaiah Fifty-three" the author quotes the highly-revered scholar, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, where he expresses his lofty estimate of this chapter of Holy Scripture. It certainly does contain precious truths for the child of God.

In the Introduction, Dr. Young examines Isaiah 52:13-15, which immediately precedes the chapter under study. The Servant of the Lord is there described as one who "shall deal prudently." He shall "prosper." He shall be "successful" in His mission.

Worthy of note is the word "sprinkle" of verse 15. The author shows clearly why the word should be translated as "sprinkle" rather than as "amaze" or "shine." Your reviewer compared this with the recently-issued Revised Standard Version and found that there it is rendered as "startle." To this is added a footnote which states that the Hebrew word, so translated, has an "uncertain" meaning. While the R.S.V. creates confusion, Prof. Young clears away all uncertainty and ably shows why he has chosen "sprinkle" as the correct rendering of the Hebrew.

Isaiah 53:1-10 is considered under the heading, "Golgotha." Verses 11-12 are examined under the title, "Sit Thou On My Right Hand." The concluding section is entitled, "Of Whom Speaketh The Prophet?"

Limited space forbids comment on these divisions, except to say that the author is not satisfied merely to follow the ordinary evangelical approach, which stresses the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement. Dr. Young states very clearly and correctly, we believe, that this portion of the Old Testament teaches the doctrines of total depravity, God's sovereignty, salvation by grace, satisfaction and expiation, and Divine Providence.

The book's concluding section deals with some attacks upon the unity of the prophecy of Isaiah. These are refuted in admirable fashion and thus increase one's appreciation of the author's extensive knowledge of Old Testament studies—critical and otherwise—and his devout reverence for the

Bible as the Word of God. Ministers and laymen, alike, will find this study of "Isaiah Fifty-three" most stimulating and helpful.

MELVIN B. NONHOF.

* * *

Fred H. Klooster: THE INCOMPREHENSIBILITY OF GOD IN THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CONFLICT. Franeker: T. Wever. 1951. Paper, 142p. \$1.50.

The doctrinal controversy which occupied the Orthodox Presbyterian Church a few years ago was regarded to have such significance for Christian theology that one aspect of it could be the subject of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Theology, and such degree was conferred on Mr. Klooster by the Free University of Amsterdam.

Before taking up his studies at Amsterdam the author, a graduate of Calvin College and Seminary, studied at Westminster during the time this controversy was reaching its climax. Likely his proximity to the struggle in no way lessened his objectiveness, but only impressed upon him the importance of the true doctrine of incomprehensibility of God for the life and worship of the church.

In the first chapter Dr. Klooster states the issue which confronted the church. Dr. Gordon H. Clark sought admission to the ministry of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (though not, as the author incorrectly states, because a certain congregation desired to call him as its pastor), and was ordained over the objection of several members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. These persons then brought a complaint against the action of the Presbytery one of the grounds of which was the allegedly erroneous views of Dr. Clark on the incomprehensibility of God. Dr. Klooster confines his thesis to the resulting controversy on this point of doctrine. The statement of the doctrine set forth in the *Complaint*, together with its criticism of Dr. Clark's position, is carefully analyzed, as is also the document known as *The Answer*, which was prepared by Dr. Clark and others at the direction of the Presbytery (although never officially adopted). When the complaint was not sustained by the Presbytery it was carried to the General Assembly which, in the hope of clarifying the situation, appointed committees in subsequent years to deal with the doctrines in question. (See "Book Reviews," p. 40)

GUARDIAN NEWS

The COMMENTATOR

VIEWING THE NEWS FROM THE RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE AND THE RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR PRESS

Is there hope for the World Council?

AN international theological commission appointed by the World Council of Churches is attempting to formulate a statement as to the nature of the Christian hope.

The members of the Commission include Karl Barth, John Baillie, of Edinburgh; Robert Calhoun, of Yale; C. H. Dodd, of Cambridge; Hendrik Kraemer, of Belgium; G. F. Thomas, of Princeton; Heinrich Vogel, of Berlin, and a dozen or so others.

The Second Assembly of the World Council is scheduled to meet in Evanston, Ill., in 1954. In preparation for that meeting, a main theme was adopted, which is—"Jesus Christ, our Lord, the only hope of the church and the world." The function of the Commission is to enlarge and develop that theme, so as to indicate just what the churches mean when they say that Jesus Christ is the only hope.

The commission brought out its first or preliminary report in the fall of 1951. Significantly, the commission decided to interpret the theme in terms reminiscent of language used by conservatives when they talk about the second coming of Christ.

Robert Bilheimer, an American member of the staff of the commission, described the first report in these terms: "The advisory commission has defined the Christian hope in eschatological terms. The event for which we all hope, or should properly hope, is the final coming of Christ in glory. It is important to understand at once that this means the time when Christ shall have completed His work, when His kingdom will come on earth in full, when the promise of salvation shall have been fulfilled. It is the time of resurrection. . . . It will not come by man's effort, but by God's grace and power. . . ." (*The Christian Century*, January 2, 1952.)

This first edition of the report aroused substantial criticism from the old guard American liberals. They found two chief faults. First, they objected to what they understood as a taking seriously of the "second coming" doctrine. American liberals do not genuinely believe in the second coming, the final resurrection and judgment. They repeat the Apostles' Creed with tongue in cheek. They admit the early church believed such things, but frankly assert that the early church was mistaken. And they claim that the whole idea of the second coming is a sort of "escape mechanism" which has occasionally featured certain periods or certain groups in the church, but which has no proper place in discussions by such a body as the World Council of Churches.

Their second objection to this preliminary report was that it effectively discounted the "social gospel." Basic to the social gospel is the idea that man can bring in the kingdom by his own efforts. This report, however, pictured man as helpless, and the kingdom coming by the power of God alone. Old guard American liberals are not willing to give up the social gospel. They still believe in man.

What these American liberals did not realize, apparently, is that the report, in more or less adopting a Barthian form of language, really does not proclaim the hope of an historical second coming such as orthodoxy or Fundamentalism affirms. Like a great many other people, American Liberals do not understand Barth or the Barthian manner of speaking.

The publication of the first report brought strong denunciation from these liberals, demands that the theme be changed, and assertions that the report was a counsel of despair, rather than an expression of hope.

Taking into some account the criticisms of its first effort, the commission late in 1952 published the second draft of the statement on the theme of the Evanston Assembly. This second statement seems to give greater recognition to the idea of Christ as present with the church now. But it also and again asserts that the real hope of the church must be set in an eschatological framework. It warns, however, against taking Biblical language literally. After speaking of the different meanings of words, and the difficulty of conveying the meaning of such expressions as "second advent," "second coming," "parousia," "last judgment," "end of the world," the report states, "there has been an implicit agreement to reject any language or phrases which do not make Christ Himself the Christian hope." And the report then states, "A literal acceptance of the whole of Biblical imagery and symbolism, as though they were factual description, leads to a picture of the Christian hope in apocalyptic terms remote alike from the real center of Christian hope, which is Christ, and from everyday life." This warning must be kept in mind as one reads the rest of the report.

The main portion of chapter 1 (the report is in four chapters) consists in a series of scripture quotations coupled with brief comments on them. The quotations are: John 5:25; Col. 3:3-4; I Peter 1:3; Hebrews 2:17; Hebrews 13:13-14; Matt. 26:64; Romans 8:23; I Jn. 3:14. To get the tone of the report, here is the comment which is attached to Romans 8:23 ("Not only so, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body")—"When he returns, that will be the resurrection of the dead, but already we live as participants of His risen life. When He returns, that will be the day of inheritance, but already we live as sons of the Father in heaven. When He re-

turns, that will be the final destruction of evil, but already the powers of evil have been dethroned. When He returns that will be the restoration of creation's lost harmony; but already the powers of the kingdom are at work to heal and restore. When He returns, that will be the union of the church with her Bridegroom; but already the Lord lives in the midst of His church. When He returns, that will be the final judgment and the consummation of history; but already the judgment of this world has begun."

Chapter 2 of the report begins thus: "The theme of hope in the Scriptures finds its expression often in terms allied to those familiar to us in ancient apocalyptic tradition and literature. These symbols and conceptions in their Biblical use are of major importance for the believer, but lend themselves to grave misunderstanding." The report then warns against the errors of apocalypticism and turns to the "Christian" teaching on "the New Age," which is described as both present, and to be fulfilled at the end of history. "The New Age that has come and now exists, is also yet to be. Neither the length of time remaining nor the detailed character of the consummation is a proper subject for speculative curiosity, as we have seen. But at least it is to be affirmed as a matter of faith, that the Christian church looks for a completion of God's redemptive work beyond earthly history. That consummation is not an event within the historical series. . . ."

We have quoted enough to show the tenor of the report, and the type of language that is used. Coming from men known for adherence to the historic Christian faith, this language would evoke many expressions of commendation. But coming as it does from a group of men, some of whom have publicly denied the historical facts which stand at the foundation of true Christian faith, the language cannot be accepted as meaning what orthodox Christians would mean in speaking much the same way.

Many American Liberals and, unfortunately, many American conservatives will doubtless be misled by the report. Should the Evanston Assembly issue a message couched in such terms, the misunderstanding would be far wider. But when it is recognized that men who joined in preparing this report do not accept the historic Christ, nor the

historicity of such past events as the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of Christ, as these are received by orthodox Christian faith, their talk of the "second coming" must be seriously examined. And when they say the consummation is "not an event in the historical series," it appears that their hope is something different from the true Christian hope.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the hope pictured in this report is a universal hope. Not only believers, but all mankind, will share in its benefits. Barthianism does not accept the particularism of Christian faith.

One picking up this report and knowing nothing of its background might think there was hope for the World Council. But against the known background from which it comes, the traditional warning is most apt: *Caveat emptor*—let the buyer beware!

C. E. Macartney to Retire

DR. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY, for 26 years pastor of Pittsburgh's First Presbyterian (U.S.A.) Church has announced that he will retire on July 1st of this year.

Dr. Macartney is widely known as a preacher and writer. He is a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary. He became prominent in conservative Presbyterian circles as the author of the famous Philadelphia overture (1922-3) against Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's Modernism. This overture, adopted in substance by the 1923 General Assembly, along with a declaration concerning "essential doctrines" was followed by the Modernist answer, *The Auburn Affirmation*, of 1924. In 1924 Dr. Macartney was elected Moderator of the General Assembly.

A member of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Macartney opposed the reorganization of that Seminary's oversight in 1929, and joined with others in planning and establishing Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia. He was a member of Westminster's Board of Directors until 1936.

When it became apparent that the movement headed by Dr. Machen would be compelled to separate from the Presbyterian denomination, Dr. Macartney and several other members of the Board, with one member of the faculty, resigned. Dr. Machen was

ordered suspended from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church by the 1936 General Assembly, and he with others left that church and organized the (now) Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Macartney chose to remain in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., though he denounced the Assembly's action against Dr. Machen. The cause he once championed in that denomination has been effectively silenced, and Modernism has taken over the reins almost completely.

Dr. Macartney, who will be 73 when he retires, never married.

Evangelical Theological Society Meets at Wheaton

ON December 29 and 30, about 50 scholars of the Evangelical Theological Society came to the campus of Wheaton College for their Fourth Annual Meeting. The attendance was the best so far and keen interest was shown in the papers and discussion. A tabulation showed that the members present came from over twenty institutions.

Papers were presented in the fields of Old Testament, New Testament, theology, apologetics, and archaeology. Greatest interest centered in papers on and panel discussions of the new Revised Standard Version. Dr. Burton L. Goddard, of Gordon College, objected to emendations of the Hebrew text made without warrant and with no footnote to indicate what had been done. Dr. Allan A. MacRae, of Faith Seminary, noted especially the tendency of the Version to alter the Messianic prophecies against the true reading of the Hebrew and against their Messianic import. Dr. J. Payne, of Bob Jones University, spoke against mistranslations of the Hebrew, particularly noting cases where a contradiction was

thus created with the New Testament. Dr. Frank J. Neuberg, of Wheaton College, agreed that the translation was often poor and the handling of the text was bad, but sounded a note of caution that the new Version did embody much scholarly work which should be appreciated by discerning students. He added that as criticism of the new Version is given, evangelical scholars should confess their guilt in not having done the job themselves. The Society established a committee to consider the advisability and possibility of fostering an evangelical version careful in scholarship and true to the Biblical text and the doctrines of the Christian faith.

As officers for the coming year, Dr. Neuberg was elected President, Dr. John F. Walvoord, of Dallas Seminary, Vice-President; Dr. R. Laird Harris, of Faith Seminary, Secretary; Dr. George A. Turner, of Asbury Seminary, Treasurer, and Dr. Burton L. Goddard, of Gordon Divinity School, as Editor.

The Society voted to push a publishing program. The Editorial Committee reported that a book, "Men and the Scriptures," was being prepared, giving a general history of Bible interpretation. Funds are in hand to publish this and also to reproduce in mimeographed form some of the papers presented at the meeting.

Plans were laid to foster regional meetings for the benefit of the members who could not travel every year to a central spot. The Treasurer offered a favorable report and the Secretary reported that the membership had increased to 170, not counting Student Associates. It was voted to promote more vigorously the plan of increased student participation in the benefits of the Society.

The feeling was general that the Society, though still young, was growing nicely in size and vigor and moving toward a worth-while goal of service to evangelical scholarship. Questions concerning the Society should be addressed to the Secretary, Dr. R. Laird Harris, c/o Faith Theological Seminary, Elkins Park, Philadelphia 17, Pa.

Book Reviews

(Continued from p. 37)

tion. The second chapter reviews the discussion as it was carried forward in the several reports of these committees

and in numerous papers circulated by individuals on both sides of the debate. The Scriptural basis for God's incomprehensibility is ably set forth in the next chapter, some nine passages being exegeted. The next two chapters present a survey of the history of the doctrine from the ante-Nicene period to the twentieth century, special emphasis being placed on Calvin, Hodge, Thornwell, Kuyper and Bavinck.

By far the most important chapter of the book is the final one. The conclusion is that Dr. Clark's doctrine is out of accord with the Biblical doctrine. A major criticism is that Dr. Clark and *The Answer* apply incomprehensibility to what is unrevealed and unknown while according to Scripture the limitation of our knowledge of God refers to what is known from revelation (pp. 115 f.) The author insists, and properly so, that "incomprehensibility can apply only to what is known" (p. 116). Dr. Clark held that God is incomprehensible insofar as He has not revealed Himself to man, and that God will remain incomprehensible because man, being a finite creature can never receive an infinite number of revelations.

Although the *Complaint* is also sharply criticized at some points, Dr. Klooster holds that it sets forth the essential elements of the Biblical doctrine in question. Those who were called upon to engage in this conflict, filled as it was with many distressing experiences, will perhaps be re-assured by these convictions of the author: "The doctrinal conflict in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has helped to make some of (the) Biblical elements more clear. In this way, controversy

with all its difficulties and hardships within the church, paves the way for a better understanding of the truth. That does not mean that such conflict is not the result of sin. On the contrary, in the conflict itself we can see the effects and action of sin. But the wonder of it all is that even in this way, the Holy Spirit leads the church according to his promise. Indeed God's ways are incomprehensible" (p. 135).

It is certainly fair to say also that Klooster's accurate and penetrating analysis of the struggle contributes materially to a better understanding of the doctrine and to the further realization that the Holy Spirit is leading the church into all truth.

D. E. BRADFORD

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS

Edited by Orthodox Bible Teachers

Flannelgraph Pictures and Helps

CHRISTIAN REFORMED PUBLISHING HOUSE
Grand Rapids, Mich.

GOWNS
PULPIT · CHOIR
CONFIRMATION
BAPTISMAL
DOCTORS
MASTERS
BACHELORS
CAPS GOWNS AND HOODS
EST. 1912
BENTLEY & SIMON
7 WEST 36 ST · NEW YORK 18, N.Y.

ORDER FORM

THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN
1505 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Dear sirs:

Enclosed find \$2.00 for which please send The Presbyterian Guardian for one year to:

Name.....

Address.....

The Presbyterian Guardian is a monthly magazine committed to stating, defending, and promoting orthodox Presbyterianism as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith.