

# THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

---

---

VOL. XXXVII.

APRIL, 1926.

No. 3.

---

---

## COLONEL JOHN Q. DICKINSON

BY REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,  
*President Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.*

John Quincy Dickinson, by whose Christian liberality the John Q. Dickinson Professorship of Church History and Church Polity in Union Theological Seminary has recently been endowed, was born on November 20, 1831, in Bedford County, Va., where his forebears had settled in the first half of the eighteenth century and where they had lived for more than a hundred years before his birth. He was thus a native of the same county that gave to the Seminary its venerated founder, John Holt Rice. Whether he was specially familiar with the history of Dr. Rice's life and work or not we do not know, but he held exactly the same views as to the need of a great Southern Seminary and a home-trained ministry. He saw clearly that it was only in this way that we could ever have anything like an adequate number of ministers who, being themselves brought up and educated among the people of the South and therefore understanding them thoroughly, could best minister to their spiritual needs. Our branch of the Church has had and still has not a few open-minded, judicious and earnest men from other parts of the country who have been eminently successful in their ministry in the South; and such men have always been warmly welcomed by those who have shared the views of Dr. Rice and Colonel Dickinson; but at the same time our people have never blinked the fact that if we did not train the great body of our ministers in our own institutions the work for which we are specially responsible could not be

## FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIANITY

BY REV. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,  
*Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary,  
Richmond, Va.*

[In the fall of 1924 Francis Landey Patton, President of Princeton University, 1888-1902, and President of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1902-1913, delivered the James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. These brilliant lectures have appeared in book form from the press of The Macmillan Company, 334 pages, \$2.25, under the title, "Fundamental Christianity." As theologian and philosopher Dr. Patton stands in the front rank in America. No minister can afford not to read his book. The Review is pleased to present to its readers the following masterful discussion of Dr. Patton's great book by Dr. Thomas Cary Johnson.—Editor.]

Fundamental Christianity involves a theistic view of the Universe—the view that God is, and is the Creator, the upholder and the providential governor of the Universe, that all things are from him and through him and unto him. This idea of God may have come by inference, intuition, and by revelation, and the indwelling Spirit of God.

"At a pan-ichthyc congress, called to discuss the idea of the origin of water, I have no doubt that after listening to those who spoke or read papers advocating respectively an original revelation, inference, and intuition, great interest was awakened by the remarks of a hitherto inconspicuous member who said in substance: 'Much of this discussion has been irrelevant and unnecessary, for how can we help having an idea of water? In it we live and move and have our being, and out of it we die.' In such terms Paul spoke at Mars Hill impressively, assuring his hearers that 'he is not far from any one of us.'"

But there are many antitheists and they will pay no attention to the evidences for theism until they have been routed out of their smug antitheistic beliefs: There are materialists—ontological materialists, epistemological materialists, cosmological materialists, biological materialists, and psychological

materialists. "Consciousness, however, is the *enfant terrible* of materialistic philosophy. If there were any way of preventing her from blurring out the truth at untimely moments, or of suppressing her altogether, there might be more hope of constructing a mechanical theory of the Universe." The behaviorists, indeed, conscious that consciousness blocks the way to materialism, "write books to prove to the consciousness of their readers that there is no such thing as consciousness," but in vain. In spite of their denial of mind, men love mind, crave mind, crave reputation for having minds. Some men who had been materialists have revolted from it and proclaimed themselves theists, or have slidden into pantheism.

There are pantheistic antitheists, Spinozists, and Hegelians "who would create a Universe with a handful of categories." But their philosophy runs aground on the pronoun I, on self-consciousness. There are subjective idealistic pluralists—some of them pantheists and some of them atheists, both equally unable to account for the ordered Universe.

Against both pantheists and atheists we must, in view of fact, believe in God, of whom we can give no better notion than that set forth in the familiar words: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

The world cannot be accounted for as a fortuitous concourse of atoms. It is a Universe of order, of law, of the most exact sort. The elements of the earth's crust combine with one another only under the rule of exact law. The heavenly bodies revolve in their orbits according to law. Adaptation of part to part in every organized thing is outstanding. The doctrine of final cause, of purpose in the originating cause of the Universe, or ordered world, will not down. It argues a cause big enough to build this Universe, and a cause so big may be infinite. A just consideration of the true, beautiful and good leads also to a holy being in whom these qualities exist in absolute form, who is their eternal abiding place in their perfection.

Again "I have in mind the idea of a Being than whom a greater cannot be conceived." This was Anselm's argument.

“His idea was no chimerical thought, as for example a winged horse. It was a necessity of thought, and not only so, it was the thought of a necessary being. Now it is obvious that the necessity of an idea and the idea of necessity are two very different conceptions, but Anselm combined these in a single phrase, for he says: “This being of whom I think cannot be thought not to be.” “What he meant was that we are under a necessity of thought to believe in the existence of a necessary being.” “We cannot be satisfied with an infinite regressus of finite causes, and therefore if anything exists, something must have existed from all eternity, and have in it the potentiality of all dependent existence; and further this Being must be self-existent.” Certainly it is true that if this idea of God arise naturally and necessarily, when the mind works naturally and normally, and if our mental constitution is trustworthy, God must exist.

The Book of Nature proclaims the existence of God; but it is good “to return from the foreign shores of philosophy to the homeland of the Bible.” “It is a delight once more to use its familiar speech, to sit beside its refreshing streams and feel the tonic influence of its mountain air. The better, too, as the result of our travel, shall we appreciate its philosophy, not less profound because couched in language we can understand, not less satisfying because it makes no effort to explain what the mind is unable to grasp.”

Christianity presupposes theism, teaches theism. It is not for this to be despised.

## II.

### *What Is the Seat of Authority in Religion?*

The three claimants for the position are Reason, the Church and the Bible.

1. If the Bible be a record of supernatural revelation, it is the office of reason to interpret it. The meaning of many parts of it does not lie on the surface. If much of it seems

very plain to the average reader, his comprehension of it is due in large part to what he has learned of its interpretation in the home of his parents and under the tuition of Christian teachers. "Let us, then, make proper acknowledgment of the great work which reason has done in the unfolding of the meaning of the Bible through the representative theologians of the Church in all the ages."

"But we have now to consider another question, and that is whether, in the light of scholarly and scientific investigation, we can continue to trust the Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice. A man may say that this debate has no interest for him, for the Bible is its own witness and needs no defense. Believing as I do in the supreme authority of the Bible, I have no fear that its unlearned reader will suffer any loss by declining to take part in a controversy; for when an action of ouster is begun against the heirs of an estate, those who take no part in the litigation will benefit as much by a favorable decision of the court as those who bear the expenses of the suit; but this does not prove that the suit ought not to have been defended.

"Aside, however, from controversy, it is clear that Reason must give a decision and let us know which of the world's sacred books ought to be taken as a rule of faith; or, left to their own unreasoned choice, men may select the Vedas, the Shastras, or the writings of Confucius; or yet again, as some are now doing, the Koran, the book of the Mormon faith, or of Mrs. Eddy."

Human Reason is not a perfect instrument wherewith to judge a revelation. It works under the limitations of a finite mind and shares in the defects of a sinful nature. It has sometimes been the leader of an insurrection against God. "It has been trammled by prejudice, blinded by foregone conclusions, dominated by pride. It has misread the facts or misapplied the reasoning based on them. All this goes to show that we need another light than that which Reason gives. It can handle categories and make syllogisms, but it cannot make history, . . . cannot speak with authoritative confidence on themes which only revelation can unfold, and it transcends its

prerogative when it says a revelation is impossible. It is for Reason to take the more modest part of showing us that what we confessedly need has been given in the religion which came from God."

2. The Church. "One of the strongest arguments in support of Christianity is its uninterrupted stream of history, and the blessings that follow and proceed from it"; and whatever differences exist among Christians, and between different denominations, it is a fact that through the Church, in the inclusive sense of the term, we have strong warrant for the truth of Christianity.

As to the meaning of the term Church, "I agree with those who say that the Church consists of all those who profess the true religion together with their children," although "I am one of those who do not believe that organization is of the essence of the Church." It is the function of the Church to teach all nations, to promote true religion among its members, to keep the deposit of faith. The several branches of the Church have preserved, some more and some less of this deposit. But the Roman Catholic is not satisfied with a revelation given once for all. He craves for his Church the power to communicate new truth under the guidance of the Holy Spirit—a claim unsupported by evidence, but explained in part by his feeling that the original deposit does not quite meet the exigencies through which, in the course of her long life, the Church passes, and that she in virtue of the presence of the Holy Ghost should be able infallibly to add what is needed—a feeling again unsupported by evidence. The Roman Catholic Church is in serious error on important questions. "She teaches what is not taught in Scripture and misteaches some things that are taught there." Nevertheless, "she has never disowned her Lord nor cast doubt upon immortality"; and the Mediaeval Catholic Church of the West "bore the Bible across the sea of centuries in 'Peter's Bark.'"

The third claimant for the seat of authority in religion is the Bible.

The Reformers in the sixteenth century became convinced that the Scriptures are the seat of final authority in the Chris-

tian religion, that the individual has the right to read the Bible for himself, and that salvation comes by the exercise of individual faith.

“So were broken the chains that bound the consciences of men to the organization of the Church. So was launched the great principle of freedom which made possible the formation of free political institutions. So ended the business of brokerage in human souls. So were driven out the traffic in wares of immortality, and so the individual began to transact the business of his soul with God. A great era of human history was thus ushered in by these three principles: The Bible the rule of faith, the right of private judgment, and justification by faith—representing the Reformation movement.”

“The Reformers did not stop with the affirmation of Bible authority. They sought to teach the meaning of the Bible; and accordingly as an early fruit of the Reformation we have the great Protestant ‘confessions of faith.’”

In these later days the Bible is undergoing attacks of two sorts. Attackers who hold a materialistic view of the world would put dynamite under the Bible and blow it into shreds. The naturalistic students of higher and rationalistic criticism would take the Bible to pieces and cast aside many elements that have been incorporated into its structure, e. g., the account of the cosmogony, and the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. “It has found in the different names for God evidence of a prevailing polytheism with a gradual acceptance of a monotheistic faith; it has made reckless inferences based on style and linguistic usage; it has dealt arbitrarily with chronology,” etc., etc.

A plausible account of Old Testament history can be made out by forced chronology, minute linguistic appreciation, and *a priori* arguments based on anti-supernatural beliefs, with the result that what has been regarded as a preparation for Christianity is only the record of the gradual evolution of a monotheistic faith. “For it must be remembered that the critics have a delicate sense of literary values, such as was never known by any student of English, or, for that matter, of Greek literature, a sense so delicate that they have been able to take

a verse or two of the book of Genesis and say what portion of it was due to the Jahvist, what to the Elohist, and what to the Redactor. With what accuracy, or rather confidence, this is done has been made visible to the eye of the unlearned reader in Haupt's polychrome Bible.

Fortunately, there is no lack of men who with equal scholarship are able to defend the claims of the Old Testament Scriptures."

But "the battleground of Christianity is the New Testament, for it is there that the evidence in support of the Christian faith is to be found. If Christianity cannot stand on the specific testimony of the New Testament, it is vain to hope that the Old Testament can vindicate it; but, on the other hand, if the facts of the New Testament are true—that is, are facts—then they confirm the claims of the Old Testament. The New Testament canonizes the Old, as Bishop Wordsworth said in his book on the Canon."

"Are you interested in religion for its own sake? Does it satisfy you to know that Christianity is a piece of super-natural information regarding the way of salvation through Christ? Then take my advice. Do not allow yourself to be disturbed by Old Testament difficulties, or diverted from what for you is the central question of inquiry, What think ye of Christ? If you settle that question right it is a matter of relative minor importance what you know about Jonah," or even about the inspiration of the Bible in every detail. "The real question is whether the Bible is true, not whether the Bible is inspired." The Bible purports to tell you of the shortest and safest road to heaven. "If you are satisfied that it tells the truth, take the road and have no fear."

"It seems, therefore, that there is something to be said for each of the three claimants of which I spoke at the beginning of the lecture; and it is not difficult to see how their claims should be adjusted. A telegraph messenger, let us suppose, approaches a stranger and says, 'A message for you, sir,' and the man replies, 'I need no message; I have my Reason.' 'Quite true,' says the messenger boy, 'you will need your Reason to read the message.' The boy accosts another man. 'Cable for



you, sir.' 'I need no cable, I have a radio outfit of my own.' 'That may be, sir,' says the messenger, 'but this did not come that way; you would not have received it but for the cable. You need the cable to bring you the message, but this is the message.' So that the case stands thus: Your Reason to read the message, the Church to bring the message, but the Bible is the message. It is more than that; it is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Thank the Church for bringing you the message, thank your Reason for ability to interpret the message; but the Bible is the message which tells you 'what we are to believe concerning God and what duties God requires of man. Thank God for it.'"

Read the message. "The Bible is its own best witness and no amount of learning can supersede or make useless the feeling, born of intimacy with it, that it is the word of God."

The authority of the Bible has been weakened in two ways, by tradition when tradition is the only support of a doctrine or is put in a place of competition with the teaching of the Bible, and by the so-called Christian consciousness when men claiming to have this consciousness put a meaning on the word of God contrary to its historical and grammatical meaning, or substitute their conceptions for those of the word, whereby they set agoing a new sort of tradition.

The authority of the Bible may be confirmed as the Scriptures assert by the witness of the Spirit.

In support of our Christianity we have the historical worthiness of the New Testament and of the whole Bible. We have the conviction of its truth in our own subjective state produced in us by the Holy Spirit; and we have the objective inspiration of the Scriptures themselves.

"Inspiration is hard to define." Dr. Patton does not plainly posit that it carries with it the idea of inerrancy as did Henry B. Smith and Charles Hodge; but says: "Ultimately, we are logically forced to choose between a naturalistic and supernaturalistic explanation of the Bible. And if we wish to keep Christianity which teaches salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, we are shut up to a doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible. Taking it in respect to the relations of the Old and New Tes-

taments to each other, taking it as a whole whose parts are organic to each other and the whole, there is no way of denying its inspiration which does not put its leading doctrines in jeopardy.

“Let us look then at the Bible as an organic whole; follow the trend of the Old Testament teaching along the level path of history, into the byways of precept, story and epigram, up the slopes of prophetic vision, and on to the mountain tops of religious aspiration. For this is the Bible’s way. It speaks in didactic narrative, persuades by fervid argument, soars in lofty verse, and sings in a melancholy that stirs the deepest feelings of our being. All that the prophets foretold is fulfilled in the New Testament; all the hopes they fostered are realized in it.”

“The Bible presents to us a panorama of the Divine purpose. As we look we see the unfolding of the great drama of sin and salvation. As we listen to its majestic music from the creation overture in Genesis to the hallelujah chorus in the Apocalypse, we realize that we have been holding in our hands the inspired *libretto* of God’s great oratorio of redemption.”

### III.

#### *The New Christianity.*

A new Christianity has appeared, and is prevailing widely. It is epidemic.

The symptoms of this disease are its inadequate sense of sin, and of Christ as very God of very God, and of the doctrines of grace, its easy going morality, its fluctuating faith. The causes of this disease are a fancied better knowledge of the New Testament Greek, or better knowledge of the conditions under which the Scripture writings came into existence, or a more subtle psychological insight into the spirit of Christianity, a new attitude toward the Bible, and a new attitude toward the universe. The prevalence of a new materialistic psychology and of the evolutionary philosophy are highly unfavorable to pure Biblical Christianity.

The new Christians are trying to unite Christianity with

anti-Christian philosophy—with pantheism or materialism. In this way came about the new Christianity—new gnosticism—and, as by-products, false issues as to what Christianity is, and as to the evidences by which it is accredited.

### *What Is Christianity?*

As a system of teaching Christianity is “supernatural information in respect to the salvation of men. The Bible is a record of that supernatural information and is a supernatural record of it. Interpretations of this record vary indeed, but there is a core of doctrine which is commonly held as containing the essence of the Christian faith.” It is involved in what has been said that “there is an area of difference among Christian people which does not menace the right of those who stand for those differences to bear the name of Christian.” Questions as to the nature of inspiration, the area covered by it, the sense in which the Scriptures are infallible, come within the area of difference.

From whom are we to learn what Christianity means? From whom better than from the Apostles—“from Paul, who held the garments of those who stoned Stephen to death, who persecuted the followers of Christ even unto strange cities; and who afterwards devoted himself to preaching the faith which he once destroyed.” If we wish to learn what Christianity is, let us read the Bible, and particularly the New Testament, and read it aright.

If we read it aright, we must fulfill two conditions—we must take it at its face value and take it in its totality. Most of the new Christians fail to comply with one or the other of these conditions. Some do not take the Scriptures in their totality: They attend to the three synoptic Gospels. They say, “Christianity is the religion of Jesus, and Jesus was a man.” They do not take the whole of the teaching of these three Gospels; but take the parts they do take at their face value; and so receive Jesus as the founder of their religion, as their teacher and exemplar, and as the revealer of God. But if Jesus was only a man, the Church is only a human society

whose founder is dead; and if he was only a man, though a great teacher, he is dead like other great teachers, such as Seneca, Marcus Aurelius; and if he was only a man, though a great friend, does that entitle him to our worship? and had he not been more than friend, how could he have said, "I call you not servants; but I have called you friends"? And if he be only a man, how distinctively does he reveal God? These new Christians have abandoned the old arguments for the existence of God. How, if he be a mere man, and if God's works no longer reveal him, can he reveal God? How on this new agnostic scheme could Jesus reveal God? Only by being more than creatures, only by being God.

Some of these new Christians take all the Scriptures, but not at their face value. Hegelians, for example, "regard the Universe as a thought process, and all history, providence and even Christianity itself as the logical unfolding of a set of categories." Hegelianism represents Christ as a mythical representation of the presence of God in the soul of man, makes every man an incarnation after a sort, and, having given the idea, has lifted us above the need of historical exhibition of it. It sums up the Gospel in "Die to Live." The death of Christ was a dramatic exhibition of the duty. "Was Jesus a Hegelian? Did he connive at this theatrical performance only to impress us with the idea that our sufferings may be a benefit to others and that it is up the rough stairway of pain that we ourselves attain a higher and better manhood?" Was Paul a Hegelian? Did he preach and labor as he did only to improve the manners of those to whom he preached? Did Christianity have to wait the rise of Hegel to learn what its real purpose was? The Hegelian interpretation of Christianity is not Christianity.

Naturalistic interpreters of Christianity do not take the Scriptures at their face value. They resolve the origin of Christianity into the simple statement that Jesus attempted to effect a revolution and failed; else adopt a Darwinian interpretation of morality and say that it is only one of Nature's tricks whereby she seeks to secure "the healthful perpetuity of social tissue."

Ritschlian interpreters of Christianity do not take the Scrip-

tures at face value. "They accept the teachings of Jesus, speak of him as revealing God, and by preaching the Gospel of peace on earth and good will to men are doing what they can to set up the kingdom of God; but it is an earthly kingdom after all, and they preach only a cismortane Christianity." They let faith in personal immortality die. They make no attempt to solve difficult problems of religious belief. They content themselves with simple trust in Christ, "believing where they cannot prove," or they consciously live in mist, or they are at sea and befogged—pious agnostics—holding what they hold because of the pleasure the views seem to give. Riding on a train of value judgments, they seem headed for agnosticism.

#### IV.

##### *The Person of Christ.*

The primitive Christians regarded Jesus as both God and man. It was some centuries before the doctrine of the hypostatic union of the two natures was satisfactorily stated in scientific language. The Church was driven to make the statement by the noble curiosity of some who held to the Biblical teaching, but yearned to understand it; and was spurred by the denial of some of either the human or the Divine element, because they could not understand how he could be God and man. In 325 the Supreme Deity of Christ was affirmed in the Nicene Creed; and in 451 the Chaledonian Creed taught of Jesus Christ, "That being the eternal Son of God, he became man and so was and continueth to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." This statement sets forth the view of the mass of Christian thinkers down to this day.

Strauss and his followers have tried to break down the Chalcedon Christology. Strauss taught that the Gospels were not written till late in the second century; and that Jesus, a mere man, was, between the time of his death and the writing of the Gospels, transformed in the thought of his disciples into God incarnate; but renewed study of the origin of the Gospels and the greater Epistles of Paul showed that they were

written not later than from twenty to thirty years of the crucifixion, and so killed the attack of Strauss and his followers. Another attack was made by the school of Drews, who said: "The primitive Christians worshipped a humanized God, a heathen god under the name of a man. Though a phase of a widespread tendency to paganize Christianity, this particular attempt has no ground to build upon and has excited little attention. These critics desire above all things to get rid of supernaturalism.

Another class of critics try to prove Jesus to be a fanatic "by misinterpretation of everything he says concerning the later order of events." Still another class of critics, who pride themselves on their psychological discernment, are looking for an earlier form of Christianity back of the existing biographies of Jesus. They have done nothing effective.

"For the present the great storm of destructive criticism seems to be over save for a few retreating clouds, subdued thunder on the horizon, and now and then a pale flash of lightning, all of them signs of clearing weather."

### *The Divinity of Christ.*

"Jesus was a man, there is no doubt about that. Was he also God?" The Scriptures satisfy me that Christ is the incarnate Son of God." Let us try to show this:

#### *"1. Specific Proofs of the Divinity of Christ.*

(1) *The primitive Christian community believed in the Deity of Christ.*" They had been his close companions, had witnessed his crucifixion, had seen him after his resurrection, and had practiced that doctrine at Jerusalem, "where some of his mighty works had been done, in the sight of the High Priest's Palace, and under the shadow of Pilate's judgment hall. Victory here was victory everywhere."

(2) *"There is the witness of Paul,"* an extraordinary man mentally, morally and spiritually, once a persecutor, afterwards a promoter of Christianity, at vast cost to himself.

(3) *"There is the story of Jesus' life,"* which shines more

splendidly with every attempt to discredit it—the best man that ever lived, and yet not *good if not God*.

(4) "*There is the evidence furnished in Old Testament prophecy.*"

(5) "*There is the argument for his divinity based on his resurrection.*"

2. "*The interdependence of the doctrines of Scripture*" argue Christianity true.

3. "*The cumulative power of the arguments for the divinity of Christ*" is great.

The effect of the incarnation and redemptive work of Christ, not confined to this planet which promises to be overcrowded at no remote date, but blessing holy intelligencies everywhere, is cosmic.

## V.

### *The Pauline Theory.*

It is to Paul's writings that we must turn for the fullest exposition of the Christian system. The primordial mass of Paul's manhood was large. His was great depth and power of feeling, his was a great will, and his a great intellect, so that he could, and did, serve as the pre-eminent pastor, as the greatest man of affairs of the Apostolic age, and its greatest theological thinker.

No other New Testament writer is so full and explicit in his interpretation of the origin, meaning and consequences of sin as Paul. No other New Testament writer sets forth in so complete a way the process of salvation—what is done for us, what is done in us and what is done by us, in the saving process.

"As to what is done for us, the Pauline statement of the case is very simple. Sin has separated us from God: there is alienation. Sin has exposed us to penalties. There is punishment. The estrangement must give place to reconciliation. Paul represents the method of reconciliation by the use of three figures of speech, borrowed respectively from the court, the camp and the altar. We are insolvent debtors, but Christ has

settled the claim against us. We have been carried captive by our sin, but Christ has paid the price of our ransom. We have offended against God's holy law, but Christ is the propitiation for our sins."

"There is something to be done in us. We sin because we have a sinful nature. That nature must be changed. Jesus said to Nicodemus, You must be born again." "A young man tells me that he wishes to learn to be a poet. Literary culture will help him, but no amount of it will enable him to transcend the law that the poet is born, not made."

"In the two things which have been considered we have the whole plan of salvation from the Divine point of view." There is something which we must do. We must believe. We must trust, we must have a faith that moves us to obey God; but God gives this faith. "By grace are ye saved through faith and that not by yourselves; it is the gift of God."

There are critics of this Pauline doctrine. One man says that he denies the whole of the Pauline conception of Christianity. But if the denial be correct the Christian world has lived two millenniums under a belief that has no warrant, and fundamental error underlies Christian history. Another may say that Paul derived some of his teaching from heathen sources; but the supposition, for example, that Paul borrowed the vocabulary of the mystery religions as the vehicle of his message is altogether gratuitous. His conception of Christianity was in no sense colored by these religions.

Another man may say: "I do not repudiate Paul's teachings," but as he modernized Judaism so I would modernize Christianity. He would, however, violate the fundamental principles of Christianity by cutting out ideas common to the Old Testament and the New, which are essential in the doctrine of the salvation of sinners by God, who is both infinitely merciful and infinitely just.

Ritschlians claim to accept the Christian doctrines as taught by Paul, provided these doctrines are regarded as value judgments, but this is to take the subjective worth to them of these judgments for that which gives them worth.

Another critic says Paul misunderstood the sacrifice of Christ,



“that in its ultimate meaning it was simply a means of proclaiming the duty of self-sacrifice, and a stimulus of moral endeavor.” If so, however, Christ died without a reason that can justify his death and God is unjust.

Another would reduce Christianity to a “regulative faith,” but “there are two kinds of regulative faith, one which consists in believing that ‘the half has not been told us,’ the other in rejecting half of what the Scriptures have to say. The difference between the two is the difference between accepting and rejecting Christianity.”

### *Paul's Orbit.*

Paul makes the Divine purpose the starting point in his theology. This purpose embraced the entire history of the human race, from its entrance to the achievement of its destiny. The American systematic theologians, Hodge, H. B. Smith, Thornwell, Shedd, Dabney and Breckinredge, have in this matter patterned after Paul, and treat creation, sin, redemption and eternal life under this eternal purpose.

Paul lived also under the influence of an eternal hope that was to find its realization in a future life. Without this hope he would have made little of eternal purpose. Without heaven before us this life would be of little worth. But heaven is to be reached by the child of God. What heaven is we do not know, but truth, beauty, goodness will be there.

Along some such course as that imperfectly indicated in the preceding pages, Dr. Patton carries us in this great course of lectures delivered and published on the James Sprunt foundation. As he proceeds, he makes side excursions into fields of truth and beauty, and returns with increasing freshness to the main course. He gave a great course of lectures, he has published a great book, one bound to strengthen weak knees and faint hearts, and to quicken the slow of mind. This his every reader will say, even though he agree not with every position taken.