

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-OCTOBER, 1931
Vol. 2 No. 6

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Christianity and the Bible

THE relation between Christianity and the Bible has perhaps received its best confessional expression in the opening paragraph of the Westminster Confession of Faith. That paragraph reads as follows:

"Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preservation and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scriptures to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased."

According to the statement cited, it is a mistake to say that Christianity is dependent upon the Bible for its very existence. Christianity existed before the Bible—obviously before that portion of the Bible we call the New Testament—and conceivably God might have found a way of preserving and propagating it without having caused the Bible to be written. It is a relative not an absolute necessity that the Confession of Faith asserts concerning the Bible. What is absolutely necessary to the existence of Christianity in the thoughts and lives of men is "that knowledge of God and His will which is necessary unto salvation," however acquired. God, however, was not content to make known that knowledge of

His will which is necessary to salvation and leave the matter of its preservation and propagation to the ordinary workings of providence. He went further and made special provision for its preservation and propagation. He caused a written record of it to be made "for the better preservation and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church." The Bible is the instrument or vehicle that God employed to convey to men a saving knowledge of Himself and His will (Christianity), "those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased," but we should ever distinguish between the conveyance and the thing conveyed. The famous declaration of CHILLINGWORTH that "the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants" is true only in as far as it be taken to mean that the Bible is the sole authoritative source of a saving knowledge of God and His will.

It is one thing, however, to say that we

could have Christianity had we no Bible and quite another thing to say that we would have Christianity had we no Bible. Granted that God might have adopted some other method for the preservation and propagation of saving truth, the method He actually adopted was the method of committing it to writing. Granted, that conceivably we might have a saving knowledge of God and His will even if God had not committed this supernatural revelation to writing, yet actually and as a matter of fact it is to the Bible that we are indebted for such saving knowledge as we possess. Here we avail ourselves of the eloquent but exaggerated words of Warfield:

"We may say that without a Bible we might have had Christ and all He stands for to our souls. Let us not say that this might not have been possible. But neither let us forget that, in point of fact, it is to the Bible that we owe it that we know Christ and are found in Him. And may it not be fairly doubted whether you and I—however true it may have been with others—would have had Christ had there been no Bible? We must not at any rate forget those nineteen Christian centuries that stretch between us and Christ, whose Christian Light we would do much to blot out and sink in a dreadful darkness if we could blot out the Bible. Even with the Bible, and all that had come from the Bible to form Christian lives and inform a Christian literature, after a millennium and a half the darkness had grown so deep that a Reformation was necessary if Christian truth was to persist,—a Luther was necessary, raised up by God to rediscover the Bible and give it back to man. Suppose there had been no Bible for Luther to rediscover and on the lines of which to refound the church—and no Bible in the hearts of God's saints and in the pages of Christian literature, persisting through

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments.....	3
The Ministry of Reconciliation.....	5
F. R. Elder	
News Notes from Westminster Theological Seminary.....	8
F. H. Stevenson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	12
J. G. Machen	
Books of Religious Significance.....	15
Letters to the Editor.....	16
News of the Church.....	19

Books of Religious Significance

THE TEACHING OF KARL BARTH: AN EXPOSITION by R. Birch Hoyle. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 279. \$2.75.

THE first issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY (May, 1930) contained a review of Brunner's *The Theology of Crisis*. Our February issue (1931) contained a review of Zerbe's *The Karl Barth Theology or the New Transcendentalism* from the able pen of Dr. Cornelius Van Til. Our readers, therefore, cannot be wholly uninformed concerning the Barthian School of theology that is the center of large interest in Germany and which seemed destined to exert a world-wide influence. It cannot be said, however, that even at the best the American reader can be very well informed concerning this important theological movement. Hence we are confident this volume will be welcomed by many. Its purpose is to interpret the theological ideas of Karl Barth and his associates to English readers in the manner that will meet the needs of the average Christian Minister and Christian worker.

The first part of the book deals with "The Man: His Friends: Their Milieu." The second part expounds the message of Barth and his friends, dealing in turn with such subjects as the transcendency of God, the brokenness of humanity, the invasion of time by eternity, the resulting crisis, the bridge between two worlds on different planes, the view of history (pre-temporal, temporal, post-temporal) where God speaks and man hears. The third and final part deals critically with Barth's method and views as a theologian. Mr. Hoyle seeks to be objective in his exposition of Barth and his message and with a large measure of success despite his own more or less liberal viewpoint.

Our reading of Mr. Hoyle's exposition confirms us in the view that the Barthian movement is wholesome as over against Modernism but that it is inadequate as a substitute for the historic Reformed Faith. However it is a movement concerning which the Christian scholar should be informed and which none such can afford to ignore. It seems destined to be as influential for the next generation as Ritschlianism has been for the past generation. It seems to us a decided improvement over Ritschlianism. In giving us this relatively full account of Karl Barth and his message Mr. Hoyle has made us all his debtor.

S. G. C.

HUMANISM AND CHRISTIAN THEISM by William Hallock Johnson, D.D., Ph.D. Pp. 154. \$1.50.

THIS book is small in compass but rich in content. It deals in an informing and discriminating manner with a subject that

is being widely discussed—often in a more or less confused and confusing way. That this discussion should be more or less bewildering to the general reader is not surprising in view of the fact that the word Humanism is used to designate views so diverse and even antithetic. "There are," as Dr. Johnson says, "literary, scientific, philosophical, economic, religious, and ethical Humanists; and there are Humanists of every shade of religious belief and unbelief—atheistic, agnostic, positivistic, theistic, naturalistic and supernaturalistic, Roman Catholic, Anglo-Catholic and Protestant."

"Humanism and History," "Humanism and Religion," "Humanism and Science," "Humanism and Philosophy" and "Humanism and Morals" are the titles of the five lectures (they were given on the L. P. Stone Foundation) of which this book is composed. Throughout his discussion Dr. Johnson keeps clearly before the reader the fact that there are two main schools of Humanism in the world today and that these two schools have little in common but the name, apart from the fact that both seek to promote the happiness of mankind. "What one kind of Humanism asserts the other denies. Humanism A. says that man is essentially good, that we may follow without check the impulses of our nature, that man through science can solve all problems and assure the highest progress, and that through science and the natural altruistic impulses an ideal kingdom of man can be established. Humanism B. on the other hand says with Plato and Aristotle that there are conflicting impulses in man, the higher and the lower, that the lower passions need to be restrained, and that man has free will and responsibility. Humanism of the former kind denies God and the future life, or at best is completely agnostic about them; Humanism of the latter kind has shown itself in its leading advocates to be an ally of religion, at least cooperating with it, and at most finding it essential to the highest development of man. The former is agnostic, naturalistic, monistic; the latter is dualistic, not unfriendly to the supernaturalistic, and asserting at least in man a power of restraint or control that distinguishes him from nature and the animal" (pp. 35-36).

Our author concludes as follows: "Our study of Humanism in its various forms and its bearing upon the problems which affect human life bring us face to face with certain alternatives between which it is necessary to choose. We can find no certainty anywhere in the present welter of confusion unless we find it in the sure word of prophecy of the Christian revelation. . . . If there is no certainty in Christianity, there is no certainty anywhere. Our discussion

of Humanism and morals shows that we must adopt the highest conception of God, the Biblical conception, and believe in a living God who can raise the dead, a loving God who so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son; or we shall have no God at all to worship. Our ultimate choice lies between 'the ethics of infinite and mysterious obligation from on high,' and no ethics at all. We must choose between supernaturalism and naturalism: between a supernaturalism in revelation, in history and in redemption, and a naturalism, in theory and ultimately in practice, of a very poor sort."

S. G. C.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY AND ITS WORK by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Oxford University Press, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York. Pp. 400. \$3.00.

THIS is the sixth of the ten volumes of the selected writings of the late Dr. Warfield that are in process of publication by the Oxford University Press. For information as to the five preceding volumes as well as for an appraisal of Dr. Warfield as a theologian the reader is referred to the July issue (1931) of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

This volume derives its title from its opening article—an essay which is typically Warfieldian in the breadth and accuracy of its scholarship. This is followed by an article on "The Making of the Westminster Confession, especially of its Chapter on the Decree of God" that gives the reader some knowledge of the great labor and care that was employed in the preparation of the Westminster Standards—a fact that goes far to explain the further fact that they still remain, in the judgment of a body of Christians second to none in intelligence and evangelical zeal, the best expression that has ever been framed by the hand of man of the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures.

Particular value attaches to the article, "The Westminster Doctrine of the Holy Scripture," in view of the fact that a much different view of Scripture is widely held even among those who subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith. It is safe to say that no where else is to be found so adequate an exposition of the origin and contents of this the foundation chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith. Dr. Warfield makes clear, whatever may have been said to the contrary, that the inspiration which the Westminster Divines affirmed of all the books of the Bible was an inspiration which constituted them "in the most precise sense, the very Word of God, di-

vinely trustworthy and divinely authoritative in all their parts and in all their elements alike." Of the clause, "All which (books of the Bible) are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life," he writes: "The misinterpretation of this clause, which would use it as a definition of inspiration, in the hope of confining inspiration to matters of faith and practice, is discredited as decisively on historical as well as on exegetical grounds. This view was not the view of the Westminster Divines. It had its origin among the Socinians and was introduced among Protestants by the

Arminians. And it was only on the publication, in 1690 (forty-three years after the Confession was first given to the public), of the 'Five letters concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, translated out of the French,' which are taken from Le Clerc, that it began to make a way for itself among English theologians" (p. 203).

The volume closes with a significant discussion of the first question of the Shorter Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?" with its answer, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever."

S. G. C.

prepared, brethren" who meet as the Sanhedrin in Philadelphia!

C. L. RICHARDS.

Poynette, Wisconsin.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Permit me to express a word of appreciation for the outstanding articles in your paper CHRISTIANITY TODAY which I read with great pleasure, benefit spiritual help and enjoyment. The reading of your story in the last issue "They Shall Not Pass" was a great treat and spiritual uplift. Today the need of such stories is very urgent. Any stories bearing on similar subjects would be a great help to expose Modernism which is not lacking in our own Presbyterian Church in Canada.

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Canada.

Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editors. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked kindly to sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In the article, "The Irish Evangelical Church," in the mid-August issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, there is a long quotation from the Rev. James Hunter, M.A., of the recently formed Irish Evangelical Church. In this quotation Mr. Hunter says:

"Chillingworth's famous saying still stands—'The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible is the religion of Protestants.'"

Since most of your readers probably have not access to the Works of Chillingworth, it may be of interest to them to have the exact words of this famous saying, and their context. The following excerpt is from the first American edition of Chillingworth's Works, Philadelphia, 1846, page 480:

"By the religion of protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon; nor the confession of Augusta, or Geneva, nor the catechism of Heidelberg, nor the articles of the church of England, no, nor the harmony of protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions: that is, the Bible. The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion: but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption."

The reader may wonder why in this excerpt, in referring to theological confessions, Chillingworth does not mention the Westminster Standards. The reason is that they had not then been formulated. The book, "The Religion of Protestants," from which the excerpt given above is taken, was pub-

lished in 1638. The Westminster divines began their work in the following decade.

Very sincerely,

HAY WATSON SMITH.

Little Rock, Arkansas.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I have read "They Shall Not Pass" by Eva Brown, and pronounce it one of the finest things I have read in many a day. If most of the Ministers would read that story several times, and commit the main drift of its dramatic movements to memory, and deliver it in their own way, it would strike a telling blow to present-day looseness and unbelief. I shall use it.

In my judgment an occasional article like that would, in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, tremendously help in steadying many a Minister and elder and family. Let's have more of them. Wings and weight to CHRISTIANITY TODAY!

Fraternally,

REV. A. C. V. SKINNER, PH.D.

San Diego.

Irony

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: What a blunder Jesus Christ made when He rode into Jerusalem on the foal of an ass, and posing as a Reformer drove the money changers out of the Temple! He made Himself unpopular with the General Council and the best he could do was to go up to Galilee and mix in with the unlearned and ignorant men and make same "Missionaries" out of them.—Peter James and John.

Ought not Christ to have known that those Galileans were wholly "unprepared to meet all the responsibilities of fully ordained Ministers of our Church"? The idea of "placing them on a level with their better

The Auburn Affirmation

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I sent you yesterday under separate cover under my mailing number 775-S a copy of the "Christian Observer," printed May 27, marked, directing your attention to article entitled "A Final Word About the Auburn Affirmation" on page 27. It does not seem to me that this is by any means a "final word." The whole trouble about the thing is that Dr. Thompson has ignored a rule of law, business, and common sense.

If we were to resort to the law, I mean the civil not ecclesiastical law, for our definition, we would find that the Auburn Affirmation contains two distinct pleas: one is a plea to the jurisdiction, namely, that the General Assembly had not power to pass regulations instructing the presbyteries how they should ordain Ministers. Instead of stopping there, which would have been the proper practice at common law and under common sense, the affirmance went on to deliver themselves of certain theological views which are very objectionable to many members of the Northern as well as the Southern church.

A proper plea to the jurisdiction would have raised the jurisdictional question alone, "simply that and nothing more."

Assuming, for the sake of the argument, that I thoroughly agreed with the affirmants that the General Assembly in directing who should and who should not be ordained, was acting beyond its jurisdiction, I should have refused to sign a paper which went beyond that and committed me to theological doctrines of which I did not approve.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided on several occasions that if a man sign a paper he is bound by it, and it is not at all sufficient for these affirmants to say that they only intended to object to the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, when, as a matter of fact, they signed a document going on beyond the jurisdictional question and raising certain theological points.

No lawyer or even a business man would have signed this sort of paper unless he