

75
H

MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY

DECEMBER • • • 1934



Moody Bible Monthly

Continuing THE CHRISTIAN WORKERS MAGAZINE
and THE INSTITUTE TIE

Published by The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago on the 25th of the month preceding date of issue. Devoted to Bible knowledge and interpretation; news and methods of world-wide Christian work; editorial comment on current events and conditions; inspirational verse and selected miscellany; catholic in spirit and outlook; evangelical and evangelistic; contending for the faith delivered once for all to the saints.

ERNEST D. CHRISTIE
Publication Manager

JAMES M. GRAY
Editor

CLARENCE H. BENSON
Associate Editor

Vol. XXXV DECEMBER, 1934 No. 4

Cover Picture Courtesy Charles Eneu Johnson and Co.

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| Editorial Notes:—Cut from the Loaf; Present and Coming Features; Help the Needy; A Heresy Trial; The Jews in Germany; What Will Pull Us Out?; "A Notable Anniversary"; Better Motion Pictures; "Mary Is Drunk"; How He Keeps His Poise; Missionary Gratitude; A Twelve-Month Christmas Gift..... | | 151 |
| The Christmas Message..... | | 153 |
| "No Room for Them in the Inn"..... | Noah R. Gray..... | 154 |
| The Deity of Christ..... | Robert T. Lore..... | 155 |
| The Four Square Life..... | Herschel Fravel..... | 156 |
| Unto Us a Child Is Born, Unto Us a Son Is Given: | | |
| The Year of Our Lord..... | Eva Hughes..... | 159 |
| God's Great Scheme..... | Elizabeth A. Paulig..... | 159 |
| Gifts..... | Edith Alice Bang..... | 159 |
| In Memory..... | Leola Littrel..... | 159 |
| What Makes Christmas..... | Annie Johnson Flint..... | 159 |
| The False Christs of Our Time..... | Vance Havner..... | 160 |
| Philosophy, Its Problems and Perils..... | P. B. Fitzwater..... | 162 |
| "A Psalm of David Maschil"..... | LeBaron W. Kinney..... | 163 |
| The Menace of the Short Bible..... | Oswald T. Allis..... | 164 |
| Bible Instruction Alone Will Save Our Public Schools..... | Raymond M. Hudson..... | 166 |
| Conrad Hoffman's World Report on the Jews..... | Solomon Birnbaum..... | 167 |
| Call for Founder's Week Conference..... | James M. Gray..... | 168 |
| False Rumor concerning Captain Wallace..... | Correspondence..... | 168 |
| Greek Word Studies..... | Kenneth S. Wuest..... | 168 |
| Nature Series..... | John Harvey Furbay..... | 178 |
| Missionary Department..... | William H. Hockman..... | 170 |
| Our Monthly Potpourri..... | Clarence H. Benson..... | 174 |
| Truth Illuminated..... | William Norton..... | 182 |
| Practical and Perplexing Questions..... | Grant Stroh..... | 184 |
| International Uniform Sunday School Lessons..... | P. B. Fitzwater..... | 189 |
| For Sermon and Scrap Book..... | William Norton..... | 195 |
| Evangelistic and Bible Conference Fields..... | Ernest D. Christie..... | 199 |
| Book Notices..... | | 203 |
| Alumni News..... | William M. Runyan..... | 207 |

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: \$2.00 a year, or 3 years for \$4.50 to any address in the world. Club rates, 3 or more one-year subscriptions, \$1.50 each. Single copy 20 cents, 5 or more, 15 cents each. Remittances should be sent by bank draft, postal or express money order. Personal check should include 5 cents additional for exchange.

Moody Bible Monthly

Publication Office: Mount Morris, Ill.

Editorial and Executive Office: 153-163 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill.

Address ALL Correspondence for Publication to Executive Offices

Copyright, 1934, by The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago

Printed in U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter January 9, 1919, at the postoffice at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 18, 1918.

December, 1934

Monopolist? NO! Partaker? YES!

"And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches."—Romans 11:17, 18.

● SOME Jewish branches were broken off. Not all. SOME Jews will believe the Gospel, right now in this day of Grace. Then why speak of "The Gentile Church" when there is no such mention in God's Word? Do not Gentiles reject the Gospel, even more than Jews?

● Shall we not be fair to Israel? Is not the Jew entitled to receive from you a small return for the sacrifices he made in Apostolic days, that "the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe?" The Jew SHARED with you the Gospel blessings 1900 years ago, and you became a PARTAKER with him. Will you now turn into a monopolist? Or will you share?

● Dear child of God, Paul sewed tents far into the midnight hour so that he could preach the Gospel to your forefathers, free of cost to them! Have you ever tried to pay back the debt? Is it nothing to you that millions of Jews are hunted over the streets of the world like wild beasts, and driven like cattle? Does not your heart ever bleed for those who are still "beloved for the fathers' sakes?"

● Our work merits your every confidence. It is a program of world-wide Gospel testimony to Israel—a program which fulfills the command of Isaiah 40:1, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people."

● Your fellowship is truly needed in these sad days for Israel. Our paper THE CHOSEN PEOPLE is sent to all contributors, and is proving a blessing to many of the Lord's people. May we hear from you?



American Board of Missions
to the Jews, Inc.

Station A, Brooklyn, N.Y.

ASK FOR OUR FREE BOOKLET
"Jewish Mission Annuity Bonds"

Moody Bible Institute Monthly

DECEMBER, 1934

EDITORIAL NOTES

It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom—Luke 12:32.

We can imagine how Esther trembled when she appeared before the king—"If I perish, I perish."

But the king held out the **Cut from golden sceptre, and said: the Loaf** "What wilt thou, queen

Esther? and what is thy request? it shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom" (Esther 5:2, 3).

Her fears vanished.

One time each of us who are now Christians approached Christ in a similar manner. We realized our sins, and what an unbearable burden they were! But a *royal* welcome was given us, and instead of offering us only half of His kingdom, Jesus said:

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32).

How insignificant the offer of the Persian king to Esther compared to the offer which Christ makes us! Oh, that we could only realize that Jesus lays the universe at our feet, and in addition, gives us eternal life that we may enjoy it forever!

Heaven will be a very active place and never see a moment's depression. Jesus is now preparing a place for us in His Father's house. While we can form no conception of the glory of that place, yet new fields of delightful service will ever be opened up for all who occupy those mansions.

That is the significance of Christmas for the Christian believer. Merry, Merry Christmas indeed!

—Adapted from Wm. Leon Brown.

* * *

Rev. P. B. Fitzwater's contribution in this issue, on "The Problems and Perils of Philosophy," fulfills the promise made to our readers a year ago.

Present and Coming Features

We announced that a number of subjects for which they had asked would be found in the issues of this calendar year, and it affords us pleasure to say that all of them have now appeared.

Dr. Fitzwater will be recognized as the editor who deals with the Uniform Sunday School Lessons in the MONTHLY, and whose work on that subject is syndicated throughout the land in both the secular and religious press. This causes him to be perhaps a teacher of the largest Sunday School constituency in the United States. He is also on the faculty of the Moody Bible Institute as director of its General Course, and at one time he held its chair of Christian Philosophy.

For the coming year, we have been asked to give a little more attention to archaeological research in its bearing on the confirmation of the Bible, and this we will endeavor to do. Also an earnest request has come to republish a contribution of the editor-in-chief on the nature of future retribution, which will be complied with as soon as opportunity permits.

But just now we would especially mention our January issue, for which we anticipate a wide reading. Its chief theme as appropriate to the opening of another year, will be *Salvation*. Some of its titles follow:

The Need of Salvation
Salvation the Supreme Blessing
How to Be Saved
The Great Words of Salvation
Once Saved, Always Saved?

We advise our readers to order ahead for extra copies to be distributed by mail or otherwise in directions best known to them. But more imperative still, we beg their prayers to go with our own that the seal of Jehovah may be upon the issue.

* * *

The President of the United States informs us that all the relief which the federal government can give to the needy this winter, plus all that can be given

by state and municipal governments as well, will not be sufficient to meet the emergency. Private charity must likewise be generous or the suffering will be catastrophic. May God Himself put this on our hearts.

In this connection let us not forget the exhortation to do good unto all men, but "especially to them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). There are Christian pastors, evangelists, and mission workers in many parts of our land who are facing near starvation. Their salaries, if they can be called such, are lamentably inadequate to meet their needs and those of their families. Also in some instances even those salaries have not been paid for months. It is all right for us to say that God will take care of them, but let not the fact escape us that He expects to take care of them through those of His people who have the means. May His grace prevent any of us from being charged with neglect of this grave and pressing duty. Christmas is a fitting time to remember it.

* * *

A release came to us, but too late for our November issue, containing the information

that formal steps had been taken in the

Philadelphia Presbytery to initiate a heresy trial against eleven local signers of what is known as the "Auburn Affirmation."

The case is regarded as "a final test to determine whether modernists or old line Presbyterians shall control the Church." Those who have initiated the trial say in explanation of their action, that the leaders who control the machinery of the Church have challenged them to prefer formal charges and that they have now done so for that reason.

Such an event in the history of the Church is always deplorable, but the cause of it as in this case is more so. If it be true as alleged, that 1,300 of the 10,000 ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. signed the "Affirmation," it would appear to be none too early for the highest tribunal in the Church to declare finally whether that Affirmation or the Westminster Confession represents its doctrinal position. Heresy trials face the derision of the world and that of worldly Christians, but they have clarified the spiritual atmosphere in days gone by, and at times greatly advanced the cause of "pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father" (James 1:27). We sincerely pray that it may be so in this instance, for the faith of God's witnesses today calls for such a test.

* * *

We would not be interpreted as holding a brief for Herr Hitler and Naziism, but we always wish to be fair. Especially do we wish to be fair to the

The Jews in Germany Jew whether in Germany, America, or anywhere else. Hence we are glad to give such further currency as we may to a statement concerning the Jew in Germany, by Dr. Otto H. F. Vollbehre, now of Los Angeles, but formerly we believe, of Washington, D. C.

For three years this cultured protagonist for his fatherland, has been sending out memoranda to a selected constituency intended to set Germany's side before American readers. His latest release (Number 7), which replies to a pamphlet by the "Chicago Committee for the Defense of Human Rights Against Naziism," affirms that Jewry in Germany bitterly resents the aforesaid "Defense." He says:

Last summer, for instance, there appeared at a Jewish Printing House in Berlin, a large volume of Jewish testimonies against American reports about so-called prosecutions, and persecutions, and maltreatments of Jews in Germany.

And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: He also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he."

The word "wittingly" in this passage is the same word we are considering. We see here that Israel was given a supernatural understanding.

In the song of Moses, Deuteronomy 32:29, we read, "O that they were wise, that they understood this." Here the word is translated "understood." In Jeremiah 9:24, we read: "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me." The same Hebrew word is here translated "understandeth." Surely we can only understand God through the enlightening power of His Holy Spirit.

In the Book of Daniel

In Daniel the word is used several times. In 1:17, "God gave them knowledge and skill." Here the word is "skill." In 9:13, in Daniel's prayer, we read: "Yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth." Here the word is translated "understand." Daniel knew that this understanding was only through turning from their sins that they might be enlightened by the power of God. Just as unto us it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and the Spirit of God guides us into all truth, so that a Spirit-filled Christian understands things in the Word of God that are dark to the unbeliever. This is a supernatural understanding.

Again, in Daniel 9:22 we read that the angel told Daniel that he had come to give him "skill and understanding." Here the word is "skill." This is not like the skill of a musician as some have thought, but a power to understand, and such a power

that only God can give. The word is used in a bad sense in Daniel 8:25 where of the Antichrist it is said that "through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper." The word "policy" is the same Hebrew word, but refers here to the supernatural understanding that will be given him by the powers of darkness.

In the Last Days

Now we come to the maskilim or understanding ones, spoken of by Daniel 11:33: "And they that understand among the people shall instruct many," or, "the maskilim shall instruct many." Again we read that some of these maskilim shall fall, to try them and to purge and to make them white, to the time of the end." In Daniel 12:10: "The wise (or maskilim), shall understand."

The maskilim are the believing remnant of Jews who will be converted after the Church has been caught away to be with the Lord. When these spiritually enlightened believing Jews come at that time to read the book of Daniel, they will see that they are called "maskilim," and they will understand Daniel's prophecies and the signs of the times. Then when they turn to the Psalms and see thirteen of them with the title, "Maschil," will they not at once think that there may be a message for them in a very special way? Now that is just what we find when we examine the maschil psalms.

F. W. Grant has a note on this in his *Numerical Bible*. He says:

"And why should not these maskhil psalms be marked thus as special instruction for these maskil men so linked together by the inspired word for each—whether instruction for themselves, or for others through them? If we take up the Lord's prophecy of this very period already referred to (Matt. 24), we find clearly directions given by Him,

which, of course, are to be recognized and acted upon by the remnant of those days: 'When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand): then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.' Notice the special Daniel-like reference may, the appeal to be 'men of understanding,' maskilim—certain to arouse the attention of those exercised in that time of trial, and acquainted with Daniel."

Important and Profitable

Now when the maschilim turn to the first maskil psalm (32) they will see a clear explanation of the way of salvation with an emphasis laid upon the fact that it is "without works." When we remember that the Holy Spirit has told us through Paul that the reason for the fall of the Jewish nation was because they sought to be saved by the works of the law (Rom. 9:31, 32), we can understand why this subject should be of first importance to these men who are to teach the Jews of that time. We can imagine them using the words of Paul in Romans 4:5-8.

When these maschilim are being "tried" we can see how fitting would be the words of Psalms 42 and 43. They will no doubt be taunted "daily" with the words, "Where is thy God?" No doubt they will say, "We can show you our God, but where is your God?" Then again, surely the "mighty man" of maschil Psalm 52 is the man of sin, the Antichrist.

A study of these psalms with these thoughts in mind will be profitable. The time is short, the Church will soon be gone, and the remnant will soon be here. What a wonderful book is God's Word, which has very direct and special messages for His people in various times, and at the same time is for all His people at all times.



The Menace of the Short Bible

By Professor Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

THE August issue of the MONTHLY contained an article by Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed, entitled, "The Short Bible; Its Purpose and Value," in which he took exception to the estimate of the book which I had expressed in the April issue. The editors kindly offered me the privilege of a reply, which for reasons that need not be given, was so delayed, that the reader may feel that a literary "statute of limitations" should be invoked against the reopening of the question at this late date. But the importance of the question is my excuse for bringing again to his attention the menace of the *Short Bible*.

If one turns back to my article in the April issue, he will observe that its indictment of the *Short Bible* was along three lines:

1. The extreme *shortness* of the *Short*

Bible, especially of the Old Testament portion, as indicative of the destructive tendencies of higher criticism.

2. The *rearrangement* of its contents along higher critical lines.
3. The *editorial notes* which interpret both the passages which it retains and the Bible as a whole in the interest of destructive criticism.

It was the particular aim of the article to stress that the *Short Bible* is the product of higher criticism and shows its destructive tendencies.

Such being the case, it is to be noted that Professor Goodspeed has failed to meet the main accusation brought in my article. He never mentions higher criticism. He only once uses the word "higher critic," and in this connection: "Now as to the *Short Bible*: the idea that it was ever

meant as a substitute for the Bible, or, as someone has put it, a 'higher critic's Bible,' is a pure illusion, without the slightest basis in fact. It is indeed one of those examples of 'wishful thinking' of which psychologists tell us."

A Misleading Statement

This statement is misleading. Dr. Goodspeed denies that the *Short Bible* is "a higher critic's Bible," but he does not deny that it is a higher critic's *short* Bible. He does not deny this because it is obviously true.

While the use of the words "higher criticism" is avoided (the innocent looking phrases, "literary composition," and "literary emergence" are used in their place), the latter half of his article is largely devoted to a defense of the rearrangement of the contents of the books and of the inser-

Moody Bible Institute Monthly

Remember the Date, February 5-8.

tion of editor arrangement critical to the rests on the clusions of m results of m intelligent B ject.

A single m ets," he tells ticle, "were t the priests ca other words, non-Mosaic. mental teach it has never I. It is contrary and to the h Church. Co himself being higher critic?

In his arti to vindicate editor, the M for the Bible sures the rea Americans o more concern whole Bible, is the *Americ* answer to the issue of the 'destroy,' and nothing of th ject, destroy, should we d study, and t in full, twice

Tr The zeal o of the Bible article. It n many higher study of the mendable. B real question what? In ju the books th ranged, the l to the develo tian religious sages of the out in their obvious that the developm religious thou and at the s thoroughly tr of the will o

Dr. Goodsp article is to *Bible* the ed 'mutilate' the claim, which, I v controversy f

The Cou

My article MONTHLY wa delivered at t ence of the M ruary 5, 1934 a gentleman o with misrep through failu its Preface, th substitute for troduction to

December, 1

tion of editorial notes. But since this rearrangement and these notes are higher critical to the core, his defense of them rests on the tacit assumption that the conclusions of higher critics are the assured results of modern scholarship to which no intelligent Bible student could rightly object.

A single proof will suffice. "The prophets," he tells us near the close of his article, "were the makers of Israel's religion; the priests came after and codified it." In other words, the Mosaic law is late and non-Mosaic. This is one of the fundamental teachings of higher criticism. But it has never been proved and never will be. It is contrary to the teachings of the Bible and to the historic faith of the Christian Church. Consequently, Dr. Goodspeed himself being witness, the *Short Bible* is a higher critic's short Bible.

In his article the professor is concerned to vindicate his zeal and that of his co-editor, the late Professor Powis Smith, for the Bible and the whole Bible. He assures the readers of the MONTHLY that "no Americans of our generation have been more concerned about the Bible, and the whole Bible, than we." The proof of this is the *American Translation*: "This is our answer to the claim advanced in the April issue of the MONTHLY, that we 'reject,' 'destroy,' and 'mutilate' the Bible. We do nothing of the kind. If we wished to reject, destroy, or mutilate the Bible, why should we devote our entire lives to its study, and then translate and publish it in full, twice over?"

True and False Zeal

The zeal of the professors for the study of the Bible was not questioned in my article. It may be frankly admitted that many higher critics show an interest in the study of the Bible which is in itself commendable. But that is not the question. The real question is this: zeal for the Bible as what? In justifying the rearrangement of the books the Preface tells us: "So arranged, 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." Now it is obvious that a scholar may feel interest in the development of Hebrew and Christian religious thought as set forth in the Bible and at the same time deny that it is a thoroughly true and authoritative revelation of the will of God for man's salvation.

Dr. Goodspeed's main objection to my article is to the claim that in the *Short Bible* the editors "reject," "destroy," and "mutilate" the Bible." In support of this claim, which I have no thought of withdrawing, I will trace the course of this controversy from its beginning.

The Course of the Controversy

My article in the April issue of the MONTHLY was an abridgement of a lecture delivered at the Founder's Week Conference of the Moody Bible Institute on February 5, 1934. At the close of the lecture a gentleman came forward and charged me with misrepresenting the *Short Bible* through failure to state that, according to its Preface, the book is not intended to be a substitute for the whole Bible but an introduction to it. As there were people

waiting to speak to me, full discussion was impossible, and he went away unconvinced and aggrieved. The next day he wrote me a letter in which he renewed the accusation in vigorous language. Replying under date of February 21, I pointed out to this gentleman that the statement in the Preface to which he referred reads as follows:

"They [that is, shortened Bibles] are not meant as substitutes for the Bible, but as introductions to it. They seek to present those parts of it which everyone ought to be acquainted with, from the literary, historical, or religious point of view."

Then I said that it is not the first sentence quoted, but the last which is significant: "They seek to present those parts of it which everyone ought to be acquainted with, from a literary, historical, or religious point of view." If this statement means anything it means that from the inclusions and omissions of the *Short Bible* the reader is entitled to draw an inference as to the value from "a literary, historical or religious point of view" of the portions included and omitted. It was the aim of my lecture, I continued, to show that the *Short Bible* applies the conclusions of destructive higher criticism in its omissions and inclusions.

An Objector Answered

I quote the following paragraphs from my letter to this gentleman:

"Let me give you an illustration of what I mean, one which I did not use in Chicago, though it is perhaps better than the one which I did use. If you will turn to page 523 of the *Short Bible* you will note that of the fifty-seven verses of John 11 only fifteen verses are retained. The entire account of the raising of Lazarus is omitted. Why is this? If Jesus actually raised Lazarus from the dead, the record of this act of supernatural power ought to be of great 'historical' and 'religious' value—something which everyone ought to be acquainted with.

"What is the natural inference? Turn back to page 514 and there you will read regarding John's Gospel, that it is 'historically less convincing than Mark.' Turn back to page 415 and note that the account of the raising of the son of the widow of Nain is omitted. What is the inference here? Is it not that it also is unhistorical? Surely if it were historically true it would be religiously important. What, then, is the use of telling the reader to read the whole of John 11 or the whole of Luke 7 if you have already made it clear to him in the *Short Bible* that these passages are omitted because unimportant, which must mean, because they are unhistorical and untrue?"

"Under such circumstances the statement of the Preface, which you deem so important, loses practically all of its significance. For the sentence which follows makes its meaning fairly clear, and a careful study of the book itself makes the meaning still clearer.

"In view of what I have just said, I would suggest that you write to Dr. Goodspeed and ask him whether he believes Jesus actually brought Lazarus back to life after he had been dead four days. His answer may lead you to view the omissions of the *Short Bible* in a different light and make you less critical of my strictures upon it."

This letter has remained unanswered. Weeks later, I received a letter from

Professor Goodspeed under date of May 25, stating that he had just read my article in the MONTHLY, and expressing his indignation that I had misrepresented the *Short Bible* in my lecture and persisted in this misrepresentation in my published article, despite the protest made by his "friend" at the close of the lecture. To my letter to his friend he made no reference.

In replying to Professor Goodspeed under date of June 14, I called attention to the Preface of the *Short Bible* quoted above, and after explaining my position, I stated that I was enclosing a copy of my correspondence with his "friend" since in it I had referred to him.

This letter also has remained unanswered. But in his published reply to my article Dr. Goodspeed says that it shows misunderstanding of the purpose of the *Short Bible* and argues, as pointed out above, that because he and Professor Powis Smith spent years studying and translating the Bible, therefore it cannot be said that they reject any part of it.

A Challenge Laid Down

My distinguished teacher and friend, the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson, used to say that he would not answer a general attack upon the Bible, but that if the critics would make their charges specific he would investigate and if possible refute them. It was a wise position to take, and it has a bearing upon the matter in hand. In response to my detailed indictment of the *Short Bible*, Professor Goodspeed has answered in general terms, stressing his great zeal for the Bible, especially as shown in the *American Translation*. My specific charge that the *Short Bible* is the product of destructive higher criticism he has evaded. In my correspondence with his friend and with himself, I intimated that a statement from him as to his attitude to the raising of Lazarus would be illuminating. He has ignored this suggestion.

In view, therefore, of his public statement that the *Short Bible* has been misunderstood and misrepresented, I feel that it would be well to come to grips with the real question at issue. Therefore I make the following proposal to Professor Goodspeed. If he will state in the columns of the MOODY MONTHLY that he believes and is prepared to maintain in the face of adverse criticism that Jesus brought Lazarus back to life after he had been dead four days, I will admit that the omission of forty-two of the fifty-seven verses of John 11 does not mean that he rejects them, and that the words "historically less convincing than Mark," which he uses in the introduction to that Gospel, do not necessarily apply to the omitted portions of this chapter. If Dr. Goodspeed is not willing to make such a statement, I submit that the omission of these verses amounts to rejection, that is, to the denial of their truthfulness.

Quibbling over a Word

In my lecture in Chicago I was speaking as a Bible-believing Christian to Bible-believing Christians. My great interest in the Bible, as it is theirs, is in its truthfulness. It would not greatly interest me to know that the story of the raising of Lazarus is a genuine part of John's Gospel,

if the incident itself were admittedly untrue and the event recorded never happened. If it could not be regarded as true, I should prefer to believe that it is not a genuine part of the Gospel. It is because I believe the Gospel to be true, and the whole of the eleventh chapter genuine, that I treasure this mighty miracle as one of the infallible proofs that Jesus is the Son of God, through belief in whom I have everlasting life.

For Professor Goodspeed to assert that he and Professor Powis Smith reject none of the Bible, simply because they and their associates have translated all of it, despite the fact that their treatment of it in the *Short Bible* makes it perfectly obvious that they deny the truth of *parts* of it—be they great or small—is to reduce the great question at issue to an unworthy quibble over the meaning of the word "reject."

Omission of Chronicles—Why?

The treatment of the Books of Chronicles in the *Short Bible* illustrates this matter very clearly. The preface states that these books and several others are omitted "on account of limitations of space." Granted. But why are the entire sixty-five chapters of Chronicles completely omitted?

Another, and a more important answer to this question is given on page 221 where we are told that the history later divided into the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and

Nehemiah "is an imaginative priestly recast of Jewish history." It is an axiom of higher criticism that the Books of Chronicles are not reliable as history. In his little volume entitled *The Religion of the Psalms* (this book is a good illustration of the destructive character of negative higher criticism), the late Professor Powis Smith, before proceeding to sketch the life of David, declares his intention to confine himself "to the oldest and best sources of information," and he adds, "that means that we shall leave out of account the materials in the Books of Chronicles" (p. 38). This is the higher critic's estimate of Chronicles; it is the estimate of Professor Powis Smith. There are consequently two reasons for omitting the sixty-five chapters of Chronicles. The one is lack of space, the other and more important is rejection of it as trustworthy history.

What about the Tabernacle?

Professor Goodspeed objects to my use of the word "reject." It would be well to notice the connection in which it is used. As an illustration of the shortness of the *Short Bible*, I pointed out that of the great section from Exodus 24 to Deuteronomy 34 with its 114 chapters, only five chapters or portions of chapters are retained, that the account of the tabernacle, its furniture and ordinances, is almost completely omitted. I argued that this is due to the fact that

the critics of the Wellhausen school hold that this tabernacle never existed. I then made this statement, "Reject the type and logically you will reject the antitype," and I proceeded to show the destructive consequences for our New Testament faith which result from this ignoring of the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice.

These chapters are omitted, so much is obvious. Dr. Goodspeed does not, he tells us, reject them. If Dr. Goodspeed does not reject them, does he accept them as true? Does he believe the tabernacle was Mosaic? Does he believe that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission"? This is the real question at issue. His summary of Paul's gospel given in his editorial note to the selections from Romans certainly does not indicate that he does.

In my lecture and article on the *Short Bible* I described it as an abridgement of the so-called *American Translation*. It is not the fact that it is an abridgement, but the nature of that abridgement which constitutes the menace of the *Short Bible*. The *Short Bible* is an abridgement made in the interest and on the principles of destructive higher criticism, and having as its great objective the inducing of people to view and study the Bible from the higher critical standpoint.

It is this which makes it a menace to Christian faith.



Bible Instruction Alone Will Save Our Public Schools

By Raymond M. Hudson, Washington, D. C.

THE July issue of the MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY contained an article entitled "Public versus Private Schools," by Greta S. Deffenbaugh, in which are a number of statements many of us cannot agree with because of important matters that are not mentioned, and also because no suggestion is offered whereby the public schools may be saved.

She states that Louisiana has a law to furnish free books and free bus rides for private as well as public school children; that Illinois has a law for free buses, and two counties in Maryland have a similar law. She then adds that the Attorney General of Maryland held the law unconstitutional, and intimates that the Attorney General of Illinois would do likewise, if he had the authority. Seemingly she believes these statutes are unconstitutional. With this we cannot agree, nor can we agree that they will injure the public schools. On the contrary, they opened the doors under the Supreme Court construction of them for Bible instruction in the public schools.

Mrs. Deffenbaugh does not state that an attack was made on the Louisiana law and the case carried to the United States Supreme Court where the law was sustained.

(Cochran vs. Louisiana Board Ed. 281 U. S. 377, about 1931). The Court held that the law was for the benefit of the pupil, and not the school, and was for education, broadly, and to safeguard the common welfare.

This decision establishes for all the states that the interests of the pupils and the education of all is of first importance to safeguard the general and common welfare of our people and land.

What the Constitution Says

The First Amendment to our Constitution provides: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and the Supreme Court decided in *Beason vs. Davis*, 133 U. S. at 342, that the real object of that Amendment was not to countenance, much less advance Mohammedanism of Judaism, or infidelity by prostrating the Christian religion, but to prevent any *national ecclesiastical establishment* to give a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government. See *Story on the Constitution*, section 1877.

A certain class opposed to the public schools have so drilled the idea into political leaders whose support they want,

that they have created a "bogey" out of "separation of Church and State." Some have set it up as an idol, and if one mentions instruction in the Bible in the public schools, or if a Bible is even taken into a public school, they set up a wild clamor.

The United States Supreme Court has held that a state cannot prohibit the teaching of foreign languages in the public schools, as it is beneficial for the pupils to study such languages, and the decision was based on the same grounds as the Louisiana decision (*Meyer vs. Nebraska* 262 U.S. 390).

Curiously enough, the state of Washington will not permit Bible reading or instruction, but requires the singing at stated times of many of our best known and best beloved hymns.

The Southern Presbyterian Church recently reported that there are 12,000,000 children in the South who are not given any instruction in the Bible or other religious training—twelve million incipient criminals!

What the Government Should Do

The federal government has recently appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for catching such children as soon as

they be-
prison, a
dreds of
them the
while in
that the
vented f
The
scheme
through
not also
boys thro
lic schoo
run away
The g
in this ti
the politi
are now
state ins
schools.
All the
ment to
county, c
to inaug
religious
of the st
prohibit
or for its
instructi
This w
ticians t
realize th

D
t
c
J
itinerary
Europe a
tion he
purpose o
among th
to acquai
and achie
their disp
combined
the same
Dr. Ho
and Alex
meet with
expressed
Christians
in the fa
in the re
In Cairo
a worker
who wou
among th
Coming
remarkab
and estim
thing like
whereas
174,610.
Decembe