

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, *Editor*

Vols. IX and X Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January, 1935 No. 1

EDITORIAL

THE NEWLY APPOINTED EDITOR AND FIELD SECRETARY— AN INTRODUCTION

The time has come for the writer to relinquish his official connection with the League and commend to its constituency the incumbent, Mr. Calvin Knox Cummings who will act as Field Secretary of the movement. In urging his hearty support by the people of God we believe that few know as well as he the vicissitudes and difficulties of the League and its present challenging opportunities, and no one will be so faithful in maintaining the League true to the original purposes. Both as an undergraduate and graduate member of the League, and also as an officer of it, Mr. Cummings has been unostentatiously contending for the unequivocal genius of the League—a warm, intelligent, aggressive testimony for Christ among students. His witness for Christ in a college which is hostile to the evangelical Faith was noble, to say the least. The splendid equipment given him by a thorough theological seminary training particularly fits him for the task of meeting the spiritual problems of college and seminary students.

Many of the methods of League technique may change, and perhaps ought to change, but there must be no alteration of approach which fails to recognize that American students need a forceful, dynamic witness to the evangel, one which will perforce satisfy the longings of their minds as well as of their hearts.

Who can deny the need for the League in view of what the writer heard recently at an evangelistic session of a denominational gathering where pastors were urged to be evangelistic no matter what their theology, for they surely could unite on evangelism! Such a false irenic spirit is disastrous to the church at large, as well as to students. Who would declare the peculiar League approach as outmoded when one still finds theological professors who enjoin ministers to use the Bible for study, devotional comfort, teaching, worshiping, and sermonizing, for “whatever our theory of approach may be, it is a treasure-house of spiritual wisdom undying and imperishable”! Or again, to use the Bible in teaching because “it doesn’t make any difference what your belief”!

One of the leaders of a denominational student movement once wrote the present author that the League of Evangelical Students had been of great help in lifting up a banner against the doctrinal defection of the great Christian associations of this country. His was but one of the testimonies that used to reach the League office from time to time. The League is truly a touchstone for student movements, still it is not the Church, but a vital part of it, and as such a training ground for the future leaders of it. We earnestly and thoroughly believe that in the success of the League and her stirring evangelistic and apologetic message lies the success of a great portion of the Church. Our most earnest wishes go with Mr. Cummings in the field work in the hope that a period of vigorous leadership awaits him.

WILLIAM J. JONES

THE SHORT BIBLE—ITS MEANING AND MENACE*

OSWALD T. ALMS, PH.D., D.D.

How can a *short* Bible be a menace? There are many books on the market which contain only part of the Bible—the Psalms, a single Gospel, the four Gospels, the New Testament. There are also books which contain selections from the Bible, favorite chapters, portions especially appropriate for the sick-room, the house of mourning, etc. A part is never equal to the whole. But such books serve a useful purpose, are handy and helpful. How then can a short Bible be a menace? The answer may seem difficult, but it is easy.

There are short Bibles and short Bibles.

Whether they are a blessing or the opposite will depend on what they *keep* and what they *leave out*.

THE WORK OF CHICAGO UNIVERSITY

I am to speak to you about what is probably the most recent "short Bible," one which was published by the *Chicago University Press* last October. It represents an abridgment of the so-called American translation of the Bible which was published several years ago; "so-called," because the book has no right to such an ambitious title. Every one of its editors was more or less closely connected with Chicago University. Drs. Powis Smith and Goodspeed being professors in that institution. It should properly be called "a Chicago University" translation, for it bears the imprimatur of that institution in an unofficial but very definite way.

I.

Let us now turn to the *Short Bible* and examine it as fully as our time will permit. It is about a *quarter* the size of the Bible. One-sixth of the Old Testament is retained and one-half of the New, which makes it one of the shortest "Bibles" yet published. It is about half the size of the *Shorter Bible* which Professor Kent of Yale published a decade or so ago.

A MUTILATED PENTATEUCH

We will begin with the Pentateuch. Only a little more than a sixth has been preserved, most of which is from Genesis and the first half of Exodus. Of the great section beginning with Exodus 24 and running through Deuteronomy, which constitutes about three-fifths of the Pentateuch, only five chapters or portions of chapters have been retained—5 out of 114!

Why is this? The answer is significant. The second half of Exodus deals largely with the tabernacle, the instructions for its construction given to Moses, the carrying out of those instructions, the erection of the tabernacle, and its acceptance by the God of Israel. Through the closing chapters there run like a great refrain (repeated nearly a score of times) the words, "as the Lord commanded Moses," as if to prove beyond all peradventure that, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, Moses carried out the command, "See, saith he, thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount."

* *Abridgment of an address at Moody Bible Institute Founder's Week Conference, February 5, 1934. Reprinted through the courtesy of the Moody Bible Institute Monthly.*

AN IMAGINARY TEMPLE

Now it is the view of the destructive critics—emphatically expressed by Wellhausen—that this tabernacle never had any existence. The real Mosaic tabernacle they say, was the temporary tent mentioned in Exodus 33:7, but not described in any way, a simple nomad's tent. The elaborate structure described in detail in Exodus is simply imaginary. Priests of the exilic or post-exilic period felt there must have been a tabernacle in the days of Moses comparable to Solomon's temple, so they imagined a kind of "portable" temple, a tent-temple as it were, and worked it out in great detail, but it never really existed! Is it any wonder then that this whole account is omitted by the shorteners? Why burden the *Short Bible* with the details of a great tabernacle that is made out of moonshine and rainbow?

But this is not all. The book of Leviticus and considerable parts of Numbers and Deuteronomy contain the laws of the ritual to be observed at this tabernacle. If the tabernacle didn't exist, how about the ritual? The critics would probably prefer to state it the other way round; the laws are late but are attributed to Moses. The attributing of the laws to Moses made it necessary to attribute a portable temple to him also. So the situation is this. The tabernacle never existed at all; the laws and institutions were unknown till centuries after Moses. Consequently the shorteners omit nearly all of Leviticus and Numbers and Deuteronomy, which attribute to Moses a tabernacle and a code of laws with which he had little or nothing to do.

NO ATONEMENT BY BLOOD

But we must remember that the very heart and core of the Mosaic law was the ritual of sacrifice. "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," we read in Leviticus 17:11, and when we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, that great New Testament commentary on the Mosaic ceremonial law, we read, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (9:22). We have seen already that very little of the 114 chapters (Exod. 25 to Deut. 34) has been retained—less than five complete chapters. In the case of Leviticus we have only twenty-seven verses—a verse for a chapter we are tempted to say. Of Hebrews we have about one-third retained, but of that great central doctrinal section which deals with the fulfillment of the Old Testament ritual of priestly sacrifice in the atoning, high priestly death of Christ, little remains. Of the 150 verses between 3:7 and 10:18 only 10 verses are retained. The verse I have quoted is not among them.

NO ARK OF THE COVENANT

The most sacred of all the vessels of the tabernacle was the ark. The ark of the covenant, or the ark of the testimony, as it is frequently called, is mentioned nearly two hundred times in the Old Testament. It stood in the Holy of Holies and it was there that once a year, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest, entering the most holy place, might make atonement for his own sins and the sins of the people by sprinkling blood upon the mercy seat which covered the ark.

How many times do you suppose the ark is mentioned in the Old Testament portion of the *Short Bible*? Once! Once out of nearly two hundred times. And where is it mentioned? In Leviticus 16 which tells of the Day of Atonement? No, but merely in the story of the boy Samuel sleeping beside the ark! And how

about Hebrews 9 which deals particularly with the ark and with the New Testament meaning of the Day of Atonement? The whole chapter is omitted.

NO SAVING FAITH

Reject the type and logically you will reject the antitype. In the proportion that you reject the law of Moses will you reject the Epistle to the Hebrews. That this is not a matter of theory is illustrated by the treatment of the Epistle to the Romans. Of the great doctrinal section (chs. 1-14), scarcely a third has been preserved. Yet among these we find chapter 5 and chapter 8, the latter reduced about one-half! Apparently it did not seem wise to omit them. But although 3:27-31 is retained, the immediately preceding verses are omitted. Let me read them to you in the familiar rendering of the Authorized Version.

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

Now with these verses still in your ears let me read you what the New Testament editor, Dr. Goodspeed, describes in his brief introduction to the excerpts from this epistle contained in the *Short Bible*, as “the great features of the Christian faith” as Paul sees them:

“Jew and Greek alike have fallen short of the truest uprightness, but a way to such uprightness has now been revealed through Christ. It is the way of faith—that inner attitude of trust and dependence upon God which must be the germ of any real achievement in character. God has forgiven the world, and man has only to accept that forgiveness through faith, and live the life of the spirit.”

You notice how sadly this devitalizes the great doctrines of redemption as taught by Paul. Dr. Goodspeed seems concerned to substitute faith as a Christian virtue for that faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord which is of the essence of Christianity.

II.

I cannot speak fully about the shortness of the *Short Bible* because there are other and equally important matters which must not be overlooked. But there are some things that must be said before we pass on. Let me remind you that one of the distinctive glories of our Christian religion is that it is a historical religion, not a mere philosophy, but a record of great redemptive acts of God: the Bible is a history of redemption. In the Old Testament we speak of the books Joshua to Esther, as the historical books. Together they constitute about one-third of the Old Testament. They have 249 chapters. Of these we find in the *Short Bible* only 12 complete chapters and 8 incomplete. Of the 12 the book of Ruth contributes 2, Esther, 4—one-half of the 12.

If you want to know what the higher critics think of the Old Testament as history, this book will give a pretty satisfactory answer. David was a rather conspicuous figure in Old Testament history we might think. The books of Samuel and I Chronicles deal largely with David for example, and 73 of the Psalms are attributed to him by the titles. In the *Short Bible* we have from both books of Samuel only the story of the slaying of Goliath (I Sam. 17) and David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (II Sam. 1:17-27)!

DAVID'S REIGN A BLANK

The books of Chronicles are entirely omitted, it being one of the fundamentals of higher criticism that they are quite unhistorical. Also only four of the Psalms which bear David's name are retained. His reign is a complete blank. What conception of David can we gather from these glimpses of him retained in the *Short Bible*? And what of the 39 kings who followed him, the 20 who sat upon his throne, and the 19 who reigned over northern Israel? Two of them, Ahab and Jehu, appear in the brief excerpts from the Elijah stories, but for all the others we have only the few references contained in some of the prophetic portions.

You may still read in Matthew 6:29 of "Solomon in all his glory," or rather, "splendor," to quote exactly. But you will search in vain for an explanation of this apt historical allusion. The Old Testament passages of the *Short Bible* contain only one mention of Solomon (Neh. 13:26) and the New Testament selections contain but this one, except for the two mentions of Solomon's colonade (John 10:23; Acts 5:12). Our Lord is not allowed to refer to the visit of the Queen of Sheba—which is of course unhistorical in their view, and Stephen is not even allowed to mention that Solomon built the temple.

What possible excuse is there for this kind of treatment, unless it be that the Old Testament is regarded as almost utterly worthless and unprofitable as history? We have been hearing of the "German Christians" who want to do away with the Old Testament. Before we lament the depravity of Teutonic human nature let us remind ourselves that our own higher critics are only a step behind.

THE POETS AND THE PROPHETS

Of the poetical books it is to be noted that only 15 of the 150 Psalms are retained: the Royal Psalms, the Penitentials, even the Fifty-first are missing, also the One Hundred and third and the One Hundred and thirty-ninth. Proverbs, a few selections; Ecclesiastes, the last chapter and parts of three others; Job, six chapters; Song of Songs, none. This is the record for the poetical books.

Of the prophets the record is brief. Of Isaiah, the great evangelical prophet, about one-sixth is retained, 4 whole chapters out of 66 and parts of 20 others, usually only a few verses. Jeremiah's 52 chapters are reduced to one with parts of five others. Of Ezekiel's 48 only 6 remain, 3 complete and 3 incomplete. Daniel fares rather better, with 4 out of its 12 retained. While of the 67 chapters in the so-called Minor Prophets 15 are retained entire with parts of 15 others.

WHAT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

When we turn to the New Testament we observe that, as was to be expected, the process of destruction has not been carried as far as in the Old. Half of the

New Testament is retained. Of the four Gospels, Mark has suffered least, losing only a few verses. The others have lost about a half, Luke considerably more. Acts is reduced about a third. The Pauline epistles each lose at least a third, but Romans loses nearly three-fourths, I and II Timothy suffer yet more heavily. Hebrews loses nearly two-thirds, and Revelation three-fourths. The least that can be said regarding such a drastic curtailment of Scripture is that it defeats its own avowed purpose. It makes the Bible too fragmentary to be intelligible.

III.

But the editors have not been content with merely curtailing the Bible, they have submitted it to an equally radical rearrangement. This also is the natural result of the application of higher critical principles to the Bible. That the Pentateuch is not Mosaic, but a compilation from at least five different documents, the oldest of which dates from about the time of Jehoshaphat, the latest and largest, the one containing the bulk of the law, from the time of the exile or later—this has long been an accepted and assured result of higher criticism.

PLACING THE LAW AFTER THE PROPHETS

According to this view the religion of Israel was not very different from that of neighboring peoples until centuries after the time of Moses. David was a rude warrior whose religious beliefs were so crude that we cannot regard him as the author of any of the Psalms, at least in their *present* form. Jeroboam was simply a religious conservative who adhered to tradition-honored custom in establishing the calf-worship at Dan and Bethel. It was the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries who were the real founders, or we may say, discoverers of ethical monotheism.

The dictum of the critics is first the prophets, then the law. The familiar and historical order which puts the Pentateuch, as Mosaic, first, they regard as a mistake, the result of the perversion of history practiced by the Jews in attributing all their laws to Moses and glorifying their past in a way for which there was no warrant in fact. Israelitish monotheism does not begin with Moses or with Abraham. It begins with Amos and Hosea. Indeed, we should perhaps regard Jeremiah as the first theoretical monotheist, they would say.

But you will object, Do not the historical books, Joshua to Nehemiah, refer repeatedly to the law of Moses? Yes, but you must give the Jews credit for at least a modicum of common sense, is their argument. If the law though actually late was to be made Mosaic with a view to glorifying the past, then the history of that past must of course be "written up" from the same standpoint! Otherwise the Pentateuch and historical Books would be in glaring conflict. If Deuteronomy was really "composed secretly in the half-heathen reign of Manasseh" and was simply attributed to Moses in order to secure the authority of this half-legendary hero for its new and revolutionary doctrines, then of course the old history books had to be revised and rewritten to enable this forgery or "pious fraud," as it has been called, to establish itself in the eyes of the masses!

HOW THE "FRAUD" WAS WORKED

This pious work of rewriting history went on industriously during the exile and afterwards, the Pentateuch being completed perhaps by Ezra—and the historical books reaching their final form about the same time. And the work

was so well done that until about a century ago, everybody believed that the account the Bible gave of itself was true. In fact, despite all that the critics have done to prove the contrary most people who really read the Bible and love it, are taken in by this plausible account which it gives. It is only the sharp-eyed critic who can read between the lines and see things in their true light. Consequently it is of the utmost importance to the critics to make the Bible say what they want it to say. This the *Short Bible* endeavors to do.

WHERE WE FIND GENESIS

It begins with fragments of Amos, Hosea, and Micah—a fourth or less of each. Then come Isaiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, also reduced in volume. Then Deuteronomy, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. You observe that Deuteronomy is placed with prophets of the Babylonian period. Then we have “snatches” from Samuel, Kings, and Judges (note the order). Then we meet the post-exilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah, followed by (remember the order is chronological) Joel, Ruth, and Job.

And now we are at Genesis. Here in the middle of the Old Testament in the post-exilic period we meet those sublime words, to which all of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation is attuned—words which are the epitome of monotheism: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

No, that is not the case. We do not meet *them* even here. What we read is this: “When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was a desolate waste, with darkness covering the abyss and a tempestuous wind raging over the surface of the waters.” A clumsy translation, that is not new, but goes back to Jewish unbelievers of the Middle Ages, has been adopted in place of the simple familiar rendering of the Authorized Version, a rendering which is found in ancient and modern versions alike.

Why is this rendering preferred by the critic? There is only one answer. It is because it eliminates from these verses the great truth of creation out of nothing. The earth and the abyss and the wind and the waters were all in existence when God “began to create.” The first chapter of Genesis is thus not merely demoted to the post-exilic period, it is even made to teach that pagan dualism, the eternity of matter, which is so utterly destructive of any high and worthy conception of God.

DOES IT MAKE NO DIFFERENCE?

But we are often told that it makes no difference when the books of the Bible were written or who wrote them; their religious value remains the same. Whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or Isaiah the Book of Consolation is of no importance.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The words, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” standing where they belong and as they have stood for a score of centuries and more, at the very beginning of God’s revealed Word, strike the key note of that majestic music to which all scripture is attuned, theism, monotheism.

Why do the critics put it down in the post-exilic period? Because—and this is the fundamental reason—because it then agrees with their conception of the development of religion. They hold that in Israel, as elsewhere, it began with animism and passed through the stages of polydemonism, polytheism, henotheism,

and did not reach the monotheistic stage till a comparatively late date. That is the reason the question of the arrangement of the Old Testament books is so vital and this rearrangement is so destructive. It represents and is designed to prove a totally different conception of the religion of the Bible from that which the Bible itself presents.

IV.

We turn to the New Testament. The most obvious feature in the rearrangement is the fact that most of the Pauline epistles are placed first. This is illogical to say the least. Some of the epistles are probably earlier than the earliest of the Gospels; and John's Gospel is of course one of the latest of the New Testament books. But the familiar arrangement—Gospels, Acts, Epistles, Revelation—is a natural and proper one.

The Gospels and Acts, which give us the facts, naturally precede the epistles, which present the doctrines based on those facts. Furthermore, the exact date of most of the New Testament books is not known. And any chronological arrangement would be more or less tentative at best.

The worst feature of this rearrangement is that it rests upon radical theories as to the authorship of a number of the books. Luke and Acts are dated near the close of the first century, or about twenty-five years after the death of Paul. Ephesians, Timothy, and Titus are denied the apostle. The Apocalypse, the Gospel, and epistles of John are not by the "beloved disciple." I Peter and James are also late. You observe how destructive this is of the apostolic authority of the New Testament.

WHY THIS REARRANGEMENT?

The purpose of this rearrangement of the biblical books is plainly stated in the preface. It aims to present "the various books in the chronological order of their composition, so that earlier religious ideas come first and more developed ones later. So arranged," we are told, "the book becomes an introduction to the development of Hebrew and Christian religious thought, and the great messages of the prophets and evangelists stand out in their full originality."

V.

But the editors have not been content with merely mutilating and rearranging the American translation. They have gone a step farther. They have added editorial comment and interpretation. Some fifty-five pages, or about 10 per cent of the book, is devoted to explanatory notes which are prefaced to nearly all the books. It may readily be admitted that so fragmentary and topsy-turvy a book as the *Short Bible* needs plenty of interpretation. If Theseus needed Ariadne's thread to lead him through the mazes of the Cretan labyrinth, how much more does the simple-minded Christian need a word of counsel and advice when he is lost in the mazes of the higher critic's Bible?

But it should be noted that the object of these explanatory introductions is not to help the reader escape from the maze of higher criticism, but rather to entangle him still more deeply in it. If the Bible, even a mutilated, misarranged, and mistranslated Bible, is not utterly destroyed, it still protests against the treatment it has received at the hands of the critics. Consequently the reader must be given a word of counsel and explanation—a pair of critical spectacles, as it were, that he may read what remains of its statements as the critics want

them read. And lest the reader forget to put on these spectacles, that is to read the introductions, they are printed in *larger* type than the biblical text itself, a piece of effrontery which cannot be too severely condemned.

THE EDITOR COUNSELS HIS READERS

The "selections from the books of Chronicles, Nehemiah and Ezra" have one of the longer introductions, it is over a page in length. I want to read you part of it.

"Most of this story had already been told in what we know as II Samuel and I and II Kings. But those narratives were now freely supplemented and exaggerated. The colors of the earlier narratives are deepened, the glories of the past are heightened, and the whole is viewed in the light of the priestly legislation, which had now come to dominate Jewish life. Thus the Jewish mind, at this low ebb in the national fortunes, finds satisfaction in repainting the splendors of its distant past, and glorifying and magnifying its heroic periods. The book is an imaginative priestly recast of Jewish history, prefaced with genealogical lists (chapters 1-9), and has been termed an ecclesiastical chronicle of Jerusalem."

Now, having read the comment let me remind you that of the 65 chapters of Chronicles not a word is retained, while of the 23 chapters of Ezra and Nehemiah, only 2 complete chapters are retained and parts of 3 others. Yet even in reading this meager residuum, the reader must be reminded that he is reading "an imaginative priestly recast of Jewish history."

Similarly the introduction to the book of Judges tells us that in reading of Deborah and Gideon and Samson we must remember that this period "was a shadowy, half-legendary interval between the conquest and the kingdom." Furthermore,

"These adventurous stories were gathered into a book as early as the seventh century, but it was during the exile, under the influence of the religious ideas of Deuteronomy, that the book received substantially its present form, in which the ancient epistles are given a moralizing cast: the Hebrews sin, and in punishment God brings affliction from the neighboring peoples. Then the Hebrews repent, and he raises up a champion who delivers them and judges them through an interval of peace. But they sin again; and the process is repeated."

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

Simply this: The book of Judges describes conditions in what has been aptly called "Israel's iron age," the time between Joshua and Samuel. The narrative represents this period as one which was marked, we may say characterized, by frequent *apostasies* from the true worship of the God of Israel. But in reading even the three chapters selected from its 21, we are cautioned to bear in mind that the book is late, dating from the time of Jeremiah, at which time this period had become half-legendary.

We are also to note that like some "goody-goody" book for children it had been given a "moralizing cast" in the interest of the ideas of a later age. Thus, the book of Judges speaks of idolatry as practiced in the days of the Judges, but it describes it as sinful, an apostasy from the law of Moses which was severely punished again and again. Such statements, says the critic, are quite incorrect.

Idolatry was quite proper in the days of the Judges; it was not till centuries later that the prophets denounced it. But since their views prevailed, the book of Judges was *edited* in such a way as to make the real and lawful worship of that period appear as if it were sinful and apostate. That is the meaning of this explanation!

I need hardly point out to you the tremendous significance which it has for our reading of the Old Testament. If it is true, which it is not, then Jeroboam the son of Nebat, to whom I have referred already, was not the one "who caused Israel to sin." He was simply a religious conservative, who clung perhaps rather too tenaciously to the customs and practices of his ancestors.

GOD'S BIBLE COMPARED WITH MAN'S BIBLE

When we read the Bible in the old familiar version we are impressed with the unity, harmony, and authority with which it speaks. It is a book of singular clarity, beauty, and sublimity of thought. And while there are in it many things difficult to understand, a wayfaring man cannot err therein. When we read the *Short Bible*, we find that it is a babel of many voices. We cannot be sure what it really says, and what it seems to say is not, we are told, what it really means.

The Bible claims to be the Word of God, His precious and perfect revelation of His will to man, the record and the offer of His great salvation. The *Short Bible* tells us that rightly arranged, and we may add rightly interpreted, it is "an introduction to the development of Hebrew and Christian thought."

The two viewpoints are poles apart. The one is historical Christianity, the redemptive supernaturalism of the Bible. The other is Modernism trying to restate Christianity in "modern" terms, in the familiar language of naturalistic evolution. Between the two there is, to use the title of E. J. Pace's most telling Bible cartoon, which appeared in the *Moody Institute Monthly*, "No Middle Ground—Only a Chasm."

The *Short Bible* is one of many attempts, a very subtle one to bridge the chasm, to modernize the Bible.

That is the meaning and menace of the *Short Bible*.

IT CANNOT SUCCEED

We have the sure promise that "the word of our God shall stand forever." But the *Short Bible* can and may destroy the faith of many in that enduring Word. It is therefore a challenge to us as Christians to stand fast in the faith and contend earnestly for the truth of the gospel, and to cherish as our most precious heritage the Bible, the whole Bible, the Holy Bible, that it may be to us and to those who come after us a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path until He come.

TO OUR READERS

The Evangelical Student contains articles which should have a far wider circulation than they do. It is with the humble conviction that God will use these articles and articles of a similar nature in future issues to advance the truth of His Word that the editor suggests that each reader secure one additional subscriber. This will put The Evangelical Student on a self-sustaining basis. Note our change of address.