
The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

VOL. IV

Wheaton, Illinois, January, 1930

No. 2

EDITORIAL

THE primacy of doctrine is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the League; it asserts that the beliefs of historic Christianity are basic, fundamental, if you please. It is true, though, that in liberal Christian circles there seems to be a reaction to the idea that beliefs grow out of Christian experience, rather than that doctrine, or belief, give rise to Christian experience.¹ The leaders of student religious life in this country are still dallying with the shibboleth, *Christianity is not a doctrine, but a life!* But "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Psalm 11:3.)

One student movement, older than the League, recently winnowed its condition of membership, the process yielding the formula that the organization was "a fellowship of students who desire to understand the Christian Faith and to live the Christian Life. This *desire* is the *only* condition of membership." We have italicized the words "desire" and "only". Perhaps an Agrippa could qualify for membership, with such terms! That concept of Christianity (both in its beginnings and in its history) must be woefully dwarfed, which allows such a group to be called a *fellowship*, in the Christian sense of the term. Such a shallow view of the gospel and similar views occasioned the formation of the League's testimony against the superficiality of certain quasi-Christian student associations.

It is revealing to notice certain objectionable statements in that portion of the constitution of this organization just mentioned, called the "Aim and Basis":

"We affirm our faith in God our Father, whose nature is creative love and power."

"God is *made known* to us in Jesus Christ, in whom we see the true expression of His being and the true nature of man."

"We seek the Kingdom of God, the re-creation of all mankind into one family, without distinction of race or nation, class or capacity."

We would not be unfair in our stricture of these statements, but it does seem as if a God whose only attributes were "creative love and power" would fail dismally to correspond to the God of the Old and New Testaments. Men need to know the justice, the righteousness, and the mercy of God, quite as much as His love and power, for only when His awful

¹*Beliefs That Matter*, William Adams Brown.

COMPARING THE INCOMPARABLE

OSWALD T. ALLIS

A DECADE or so ago an English scholar, Dr. Oesterley, made the prediction that "the study of comparative religion must in the future become one of the greatest dangers of the Christian religion or else its handmaiden."¹ It was hardly necessary at the time, to make this statement in the form of a prediction. For already the important bearing of the comparative method upon the study of religion and especially of Christianity was quite obvious. The article "Christianity" in the 11th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has a section dealing with "Christianity in the Modern World" which contains the following striking statements, which, it should be noted, have been allowed to remain unchanged in the recently published 14th edition:

"The Bible is studied [i.e. according to the 'modern' viewpoint] like other works, its origins discovered and its place in comparative religion assigned. It does not appear as altogether unique, but it is put among the other sacred books. For the great religions of the world show similar cycles of development, similar appropriations of prevalent science and philosophy, similar conservative insistence upon ancient truth, and similar claims to an exclusive authority."

This it will be observed amounts to a denial of the distinctiveness of the Biblical religion. It is *similar* to the other religions. But let us read a little further. This conception of religion, we are told, involves "an attitude of mind toward the supernatural." The view that the two are distinct and the supernatural could "descend upon the natural and be imparted to it," by which is clearly meant the recognition of miracle, prophecy, incarnation, regeneration, is rejected; and we are told that "In science the process has been reversed; nature ascends, so to speak, into the region of the supernatural and subdues it to itself; the marvelous or miraculous is brought under the domain of natural law, the canons of physics extend over metaphysics, and religion takes its place as one element in the natural relationship of man to his environment."² Such, according to an authoritative article in the latest edition of a great encyclopaedia, was the situation of Christianity in the modern world twenty years ago, and it is averred that it holds equally true today. For those who heartily accept this modern viewpoint, Christianity thus becomes, you will observe, simply one of many expressions of a single element in the natural relationship of man to his environment—namely religion. And how small a figure man cuts in this world of nature by which he is surrounded is indicated by the statement by the same writer that the world "is no longer merely the scene for the drama of the soul and God, nor is man independent of it. . . . Man's place is not even central, as he appears a temporary inhabitant of a minor planet in one of the lesser stellar systems."

¹*The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*, p. 276.

²Vol. 5, p. 636.

Is it any wonder that this writer should tell us that "the new world-view threatens the foundations of the ecclesiastical edifice," especially since he declares that "this revolution in the world-view is no longer the possession of philosophers and scholars, but the multitude accepts it in part."

This is a startling statement and every thinking person must recognize more or less clearly that the application of this so-called "scientific" method to religion and to Christianity, or the attempt of science to ascend into the region of the supernatural and subdue it, has effected and is effecting a transformation in Christian thinking which can be likened only to the Copernican revolution in the sphere of astronomy. In fact, according to the writer of the article on "Fundamentalism and Modernism" in the same encyclopaedia, here lies the very heart of the controversy between these two contending groups in the Christian Church today. For, he tells us, "common to all the Fundamentalist groups was [you note that the past tense is used as if the controversy were now ended] first the acceptance of a view of the supernatural which insists that God manifests His presence in nature and history through exceptional and extraordinary activities, transcending the laws of nature; and, secondly, the determination to use this conception of religion as a test to limit the freedom of teaching hitherto enjoyed by the ministers of the denomination." In other words it is the resistance of Christian people to this attempt of science to ascend into the region of the supernatural and subdue it which is largely responsible for the rise of Fundamentalism!

But how has this momentous revolution been effected? That it has been effected, is the belief of many men today and, what is most significant, of many leaders in the Christian Church. How has it been, how is it being effected? In a word, it is effected by *accepting the theory* that there is in Christianity nothing which makes it essentially different from the ethnic religions and that there is nothing in religion in general which is essentially different from the natural phenomena with which science is constantly dealing. This is the theory. But along with the theory and absolutely essential for its success goes, and must go, the *adoption of the practice* of refusing to recognize or at least to accept at its face value anything which cannot be fitted into this naturalistic scheme.

It is in the practical application of this naturalistic principle that the comparative method attains prominence. The word "compare" may be defined as meaning "to examine (two or more persons or things) with reference to points of likeness or unlikeness." So understood and applied it is a very helpful method and has produced valuable results. But we need to remember that the very idea of comparison implies that the things *compared* are to some extent at least *on a par* the one with the other. For if you seek to compare the higher category with the lower, you run the risk of either totally misconceiving the higher or failing to recognize that which is most truly characteristic of it. Try, if you will, to compare mind with matter, man with a potato. The best in man eludes comparison; he is incommensurate. And if you make the potato the standard of comparison, you will be in danger of ignoring or denying what is most char-

acteristic of man. In comparison the emphasis is likely to be placed on resemblances and not on differences.

Thus, the religion of Israel in the time of the Patriarchs may be compared with the ethnic faiths of antiquity; and the faith of Abraham stands out in the records of that early period like a rare flower in a garden of weeds. In the New Testament also that faith is highly praised. Yet a recent writer tells us that there is "only a small portion of the Pentateuchal tradition that can be used as a source for the Hebrew nomadic period. This is supplemented by comparative philology, comparative sociology, and comparative religion, the presumption being that ideas and institutions which later Israel had in common with the other Semites existed already in the nomadic period."³ You notice the emphasis on the word "comparative"! Now what is the result of the application of this method, the comparison of Israel with the other Semites? In a word, it is this, that the God of Israel in the days of the patriarchs was quite comparable with Chemosh, the abomination of the Moabites. "Except that he was more powerful he did not differ essentially from Chemosh of Moab,"⁴ says a well-known higher critic in speaking of the Yahweh of Moses' day.

But let us consider a little further the application of this principle. The Bible narrates many marvelous things or miracles. How are these miracles brought under the domain of natural law? The answer is simple. It is done by calling attention first and in general to the fact that all primitive and ancient peoples believed in wonders; and then by denying in particular that in the history of Israel anything unexplainable by natural law took place. This denial is stated in many different forms. It is denied that the narrative is reliable; it is declared to be late or composite or self-contradictory, or to represent an unintelligent, unscientific view of what actually occurred.

We may turn, by way of illustration, to the narrative of the Crossing of the Red Sea—a wonder upon which Israel often looked back with gratitude to God for His wondrous deliverance. The narrative tells us that "Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided." It tells us further that "the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." This is a clear and self-consistent statement. It tells briefly what took place, and how it took place. But it does not suit the critics. They divide the narrative into two or three accounts. One of these accounts simply tells us that "the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night and made the sea dry land." This is regarded as describing a simple, natural phenomenon; shallow waters were driven back by the wind and the reference to God can be regarded as simply a recognition of what is often

³*A New Standard Bible Dictionary*, edited by Jacobus, Nourse and Zenos, p. 399b. This article which discusses the "social development" of Israel illustrates very clearly the application of the comparative method to the literature of the Old Testament.

⁴*Religion of Israel*, by Henry Preserved Smith, p. 61.

called the hand of Providence, a singularly opportune natural phenomenon being attributed by a religious, or superstitious or at least "unscientific" writer to divine intervention. When this statement is taken out of the narrative, what remains is a declaration that "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea . . . and the waters were divided;" and it is further stated that the Israelites went into the "midst" of the waters and the waters were a "wall" unto them on either side. It reads as if Moses like an ancient Merlin stretched out his rod; and instantly the waters were cleft as with a knife and stood on either side like walls of glass between which the Israelites passed in safety. This grotesque miracle, made grotesque by critical manipulation of the sources, is rejected as late and legendary, and the other account, the naturalistic one, is accepted as substantially true to fact. That is, it is accepted by those who are ready to find any truth at all in the story.

Another example of the application of this method is the story of Jonah and the whale, or rather "great fish." For centuries it has been cited as a Bible wonder. Our Lord expressly refers to it: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." How is that explained? Quite simply! Jonah never was in the belly of the whale. The statement that he was is an interpolation due perhaps to a misunderstanding of his prayer. That Jonah ever went to Nineveh is far from certain. The story of Jonah is "an imaginary work with a moral lesson" designed to rebuke the Jews of a later age for their narrow provincialism and lack of foreign missionary zeal!⁵ And so highly is the Book of Jonah prized by the advocates of the "modern" view as a missionary tract that we are tempted to forget that the real Jonah and the real whale and the real visit to Nineveh have all been quietly disposed of!

Let us turn to the subject of *prophecy*. There is a strong tendency today to make the teachings of the eighth and seventh century prophets the distinctive feature in the religion of Israel. Everything else can be discarded. The teaching of the prophets is unique. A recent writer who accepts the conclusions of the critics as to the late date and unreliability of the Pentateuch comforts those who are troubled by the destructive conclusions of criticism by saying, "the permanent and unique value of the Bible is now seen to depend, not on any miracle attending its composition, nor on any form of inspiration confined to Biblical writers, but simply on the unique phenomenon of Hebrew prophecy and its culmination in the life and teaching of Jesus. So long as men recognize the distinctive character of Hebrew prophecy or so long as they respond to the influence of Jesus, the volume which contains the history of His people and their preparation for His coming, together with the memories, impressions and reflections of His first disciples, must retain in their hearts and thoughts a place no other book can claim or fill."⁶

But, you will say, is not prophecy distinctly supernatural? And if

⁵Art. "Jonah" in *New Standard Bible Dictionary*, p. 477b.

⁶Art. "Bible," *Encycl. Brit.*, 14th ed., p. 501.

it is unique, does not the religion of Israel stand apart from all other religions? Let us consider the question. It is a familiar canon of criticism, well stated by Davidson, that "The prophet is always a man of his own time, and it is always to the people of his own time that he speaks, not to a generation long after, nor to us. And the things of which he speaks will always be things of importance to the people of his own day, whether they be things belonging to their internal life and conduct, or things affecting their external fortunes as a people among other peoples."

But, we may ask, what is it in prophecy which reveals most clearly the supernatural? Is it not the disclosure of things which only God can know, things hidden in the lap of the future? "Behold, the former things are come to pass and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them." So the Lord describes His divine prerogative to make known what only He can know. But, to return to Davidson's dictum, not merely is the prophet restricted to his immediate audience, but he can make known to the people only things of importance to them. Do you notice how this tends to restrict the scope of prophecy? What is the future which is of immediate concern to most of us? Is it not the near future? When Isaiah told Hezekiah that his sons or descendants should be carried away to Babylon, Hezekiah apparently saw a gleam of comfort in the remoteness of this tragedy: "Good is the word of the Lord. . . . For there shall be peace and truth in my days." It is the future which concerns us directly and personally that is of immediate concern, of vital importance, to most of us. You notice, then, how the application of this dictum of criticism tends to restrict the scope of prophecy. Applied to Isaiah it has torn the book into a hundred fragments and scattered them over five centuries of time, from the days of Hezekiah to the time of the Maccabees.

The extreme to which this view can be carried is well illustrated by the treatment of the Immanuel prophecy (Isaiah VII) by a German scholar, Professor Duhm of Basel. He denies that the child described is to be born of a virgin; he sees in the passage no Messianic promise. Some mother of some child to be born about a year hence (or there may be many) will cry "Immanuel," in gratitude that God has saved His people from Rezin and Pekah; and *that* is the "sign" given by the prophet to Ahaz. But Duhm is not content thus to empty the prophecy of its miraculous and Messianic content; he goes still further. He cites the words of another German scholar who declares that it is "idiotic" to ask any one to believe a statement on the ground that what is said today will ten months hence prove to be correct; and then he gently rebukes this scholar for objecting to such a sign as "idiotic," declaring that such absurdities are often found in the Old Testament; and he cites the "sign" given to Moses: "When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain," a sign that was a wonderful challenge to Moses' faith in God and love of Israel. This also he considers "idiotic." Think of it! A German scholar whose commentary on Isaiah

¹Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 118b.

is described in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as representing a few years ago "the high water mark of criticism" calls it "idiotic" to think that Isaiah gave Ahaz a "sign" which would not be fulfilled for nearly a year, and therefore called for the exercise of faith and patience. He calls it a prophecy *post festum*, a prophecy of the morning after. It is to such meagre limits that prophecy, this unique element in Israel's religion, can shrink when a thoroughgoing attempt is made to apply to it the "modern" method, to bring it under the domain of natural law.

Some of you may have heard of the "Amos Society" with its headquarters in New York. It is described as "a Monotheistic World League," whose aim is "the renaissance of the religion of the prophets." Its secretary is Dr. Charles P. Fagnani, formerly professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. It is informing to learn Dr. Fagnani's idea of what this movement stands for. He has told us in an article appearing a few years ago in *The American Hebrew* that "There is one and only one religion that is different from all the others, and that one is to be seen in the teaching of the great prophets of Israel." This religion stresses "the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the establishment on earth of the 'Kingdom of God' or the organization of the real democracy, which involves world-wide co-öperation for the common good." You note that the "Kingdom of God" is declared to be the "real democracy." Religion is reduced very nearly if not quite to philanthropy. And most significant of all Dr. Fagnani congratulates the Jews that for nearly two thousand years and even in the face of persecution, they have refused to accept Jesus as their Divine Messiah and he urges them to claim Joshua, *ben Joseph*, that is, Jesus the *son* of Joseph as the greatest of their prophets. Thus the religion of the prophets is reduced to an ethical monotheism which is watered down to little more than humanitarianism; and Jesus becomes at best only the greatest of teachers.⁸

But let us turn from studying the effect of the modern viewpoint upon the Bible to consider its effect upon the propagation of Christianity. You are all interested in missions. Tomorrow you are to have a symposium on Foreign Missions. If it be true that Christianity is only one of many religions, all of which are designed to express man's "natural relationship to his environment," the great appeal of the heathen world for Christian Missions has lost its urgency. It is no longer a question of carrying the gospel to those who are in darkness and death. It is at most a case of carrying more light to those who already have some. Let me quote the words of one who attaches high importance to the comparative method. In a thoroughgoing attempt to "revalue" Scripture according to this method Dr. Eakin comes at length to the Koran. Notice what he says:

"If the situation were such that we could think of the Koran and the Jewish-Christian Bible as in a race for world supremacy it would seem that the former must find itself handicapped by the narrowness of its range—its lack of variety in style, literary forms, fields of interest, and

⁸*The Evangelical Student* (October, 1929), p. 15.

⁹*Revaluing Scripture*, p. 206.

methods of treatment. But of course the actual situation is different from that. The Old and New Testaments are the Bible of Christians and the Koran is the Bible of Mohammedans, and it seems probable that Christian missionaries, as well as Mohammedan apologists, will have to be content to leave it so. The utter unprofitableness of centering missionary effort on a contest of Bibles—or rather of bibliolatrics—has been sufficiently demonstrated.”⁹

In other words, the Christian missionary who goes with the Bible in his hands to the lands which are under the sway of the False Prophet is engaging in an unprofitable contest of bibliolatrics! Is it any wonder that missions are valued by many today chiefly for their educational and cultural achievements?

“But why this abandonment of Christian missions as the Christian Church has hitherto understood it? Let us hear Dr. Eakin a little further:

“Christians naturally cannot concede the claim that Mohammed is God’s greatest and final Prophet and Apostle—the one to whom beyond all others humanity must look for its leadership. For better or for worse he was a warrior prophet, and it seems to us that a vindictive spirit speaks unmistakably through his words. We prefer to take our stand with Jesus, who refused to take up the sword and prayed for forgiveness for his enemies. Here is the crux of the comparison.”

The crux of the comparison! What is it? That Jesus is the Divine Messiah, the Only-Begotten Son of God, the alone Saviour of mankind, while Mohammed is proved by his life and words to have been a man, a sinful man, not a saviour of others, but himself in need of salvation? Is this the crux of the comparison? Not at all! Mohammed was a warrior and showed a vindictive spirit; Jesus was peaceable and forgiving! I would not minimize this difference. But is that all the difference between Jesus and Mohammed? How the transcendent claims of the Saviour disappear. They are brushed aside as though they had never been advanced by prophet and apostle, by pastor and evangelist, by cross and creed.

When we consider the disastrous conclusions which result from the application of the “modern” method to the study of the Scriptures, the situation for the Bible-loving Christian is distressing in the extreme. It seems as if nothing can stand the test of the critical crucible. Miracles, prophecy, the uniqueness of the religion of Israel, the Deity of Christ—no fact, no doctrine, seems to be able to maintain itself in the face of its irresistible assault. It seems as if faith having yielded up position after position, long held and thought impregnable, must finally capitulate. The situation seems truly desperate. Yet there is one thing that the despondent Christian should always remember. It is this: the conclusions of the “modernist” critic, these terrible inescapable *conclusions*, were contained already in his *premises*. As Dr. James Orr pointed out years ago, and he is only one of many who have done so, “to a large and influential school of critical inquirers—those, moreover, who have had most to do with the shaping of the current critical theories—this question of a supernatural

⁹*The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 12.

origin for the religion of Israel is already foreclosed; is ruled out at the start as *a priori* inadmissible."¹⁰ Or in the language of the author whom we have already quoted it is assumed that nature can subdue the region of the supernatural, that the canons of physics extend over metaphysics; and all the contents of the Bible is tested, and accepted or rejected in accordance with the foregone conclusions of the advocates of the "modern" view. Prophecy is reduced within the possibilities of human foresight, miracles become natural phenomena misunderstood or elaborated by the wonder-loving fancy of generations of story tellers. Israel becomes a nation among the nations and it is her genius for religion and not God's special dealings with her which makes her history remarkable. All this lies in the premise of the critic. It is only for him to elaborate his theory and apply it in detail. It is the decision of the scholars that the religion of Israel must be *like* that of other nations. They have spoken; let it be so. It is their judgment that the domain of the natural must be extended over the supernatural; who shall gainsay them?

I hope you will not misunderstand me. I am not an enemy of science. I have no quarrel with the comparative method. By all means let us use it and apply it wherever we can. It is a great method, it has accomplished great things, and may accomplish still greater things in days to come. But let me give you two words of counsel.

In the first place, remember that this much lauded "modern" method is not very modern after all. It is an *old* method; and history, both sacred and profane, gives us many instances both of the use and the abuse of it. Benhadad was dabbling with this method when he accepted the advice of his sage counsellors and in trying conclusions with Ahab a second time, chose the plain as his battle ground because, arguing from analogy, he thought the God of Israel was a local deity like other gods—a god of the hills, who would be helpless on the plain. And the Lord gave sinful Ahab a glorious victory that day over Benhadad that men might know that He was the Lord not of the hills alone but of the valleys also. Sennacherib was a great exponent of this view of comparative religions. He taunted Hezekiah with his invincible might. "Who are there among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?" You notice the force of the argument. Sennacherib was speaking like a higher critic of today. But what was the verdict? "And it came to pass that night that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred and fourscore and five thousand and when they arose early in the morning behold they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed." There was a flaw in his argument, a grievous flaw; and it proved his undoing.

But not merely is it important to remember that the comparative method is not a new one, not a weapon first forged by the great thinkers of our day. It is equally important if you would use it aright that you go to the great masters of this method and study their use of it. Elijah made singularly effective use of it at Carmel as the people who were halt-

ing between two opinions could not but recognize. And I know of no greater authority to whom I can send you than Isaiah the prophet. If you would see the difference between the comparative method as applied by the skeptic and that same method as applied by the believer, I counsel you to turn to Isaiah's unsurpassed descriptions of the utter folly of heathen idolatry and the incomparable greatness of the God of Israel. Turn to Isaiah's description of the idol-maker in his forty-fourth chapter, where he pictures the folly of the man who burns part of a tree in the fire because he is cold; "and of the residue thereof he maketh a god even his graven image. He falleth down unto it and worshippeth it. . . . And none calleth to mind neither is their knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh and eaten it; and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?" Or turn to that wonderful description in the forty-sixth chapter: "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols were upon the beasts and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy laden; they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Who are Bel and Nebo? Two of the great gods of the ancient world, gods of mighty Babylon. Why are their idols loaded on the backs of beasts? Because they have legs, but walk not. Where are they going? Into captivity, into endless oblivion with the nation they were impotent to save. And the voice continues: "Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb: and even to your old age, I am he; and even to hoar hair will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry and will deliver you." What a contrast! The impotence of the idols, the might of Israel's God. "To whom," it is the voice of God that speaks, "To whom will ye liken me and make me equal and compare me, that we may be like?" That was the challenge of Israel's God to the great gods of antiquity. Did they take up the challenge? No, they have gone down to oblivion; and who is there to mourn their passing?

Study Isaiah, study Jeremiah in their conflict with the heathenism of their day. Study the New Testament and the history of the Early Church; and observe how in the face of bitter persecution the Christians insisted upon the utter difference between Christianity and the syncretistic faiths of Greece and Rome; and refused to allow the Lord Jesus to be given an honorable place in Caesar's pantheon. Then turn to the great missionaries of the Cross, to Carey, Moffat, Judson, Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, Paton, and many another who has come to grips with heathenism and idolatry, and ask them whether Isaiah was wrong, whether his application of the comparative method must be revised. I need not speak for them. You know their answer.

No, my friends, be not dismayed. Be not afraid of the armies of unbelief, even though they come under the banner of Science and Modern Thought. The old challenge of the Almighty, uttered as I like to think

in reply to Sennacherib's blasphemy and the blasphemy of every enemy of God, is still unanswered and it is as unanswerable as ever: "To whom will ye liken me and make me equal and compare me, that we may be like?" True science and archaeology and history echo the words of Moses, who gave the answer, the true answer, centuries before Isaiah wrote: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun who rideth upon the heavens for thy help, and in his excellency on the skies." Three millenniums support this verdict. There is none like unto our God. It is as true today as it ever was. And it is for us who believe this, to go forth under His banner, the blood stained banner of the Cross, to declare boldly to the doubters and scoffers of our day that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, none other name, than the name of Christ Jesus our Lord; and that He is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God through Him.