

THE BULLETIN

—OF THE—

Western Theological Seminary

A Review Devoted to the Interests of
Theological Education

Published five times during the year: in January, February, April, July and October, by the Trustees of the Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Edited by the President with the co-operation of the Faculty.

Contents

The New Apologetic for Christianity	5
Rev. Jesse C. Bruce, D.D.	
The Nippur Version of the Flood Narrative	16
Rev. Frank H. Ridgley.	
The Message of Tolstoi	26
Rev. Frank Orr Johnston.	
Literature	33
Alumniana:	
Calls	50
Installations	51
General Items	52
General Information	61

Communications for the Editor and all business matters should be addressed to
Rev. JAMES A. KELSO, Ph. D., D. D.,
731 Ridge Ave., N. S., Pittsburgh, Pa.

75 cents a year.

Single Number 25 cents.

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article.

The Bulletin

—of the—

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

VOLUME III.

FEBRUARY, 1911

No. 3.

The New Apologetic for Christianity.

REV. JESSE C. BRUCE, D. D.

Apologetic is not a popular word in our day. This is due partly to misfortune and partly to fault. To misfortune, because it has been associated with another term very unpopular, i. e., dogmatic; to fault, because it has permitted itself to be influenced too much by the spirit of dogma, and has been too often polemic.

Apart from any compromising associations, however, apologetic is a good word. For it simply means giving a reason for what one believes. So long as men believe intelligently and honestly there must be apologetic. The belief determines the apologetic. Belief is not a fixed quantity. It varies with the evidence available for its support. Evidence varies with the state of knowledge. Apologetic, then, has a history, and an interesting one. A paper could well be devoted to the history of apologetic. It is not my purpose to trace its history. In writing upon the New Apologetic I imply a comparison. The apologetic of to-day is not the same as in the past. Wherein is the difference? This is my task, to point out the difference.

Literature.

tinguish between the idea and the form in which it is clothed. Literary form and method are largely a matter of the time or genius of the inspired writer.

In the N. T. Dr. Orr takes the unassailable position of Dr. Denney in his "Jesus And The Gospels," that we have a sufficient and substantially correct historic record of the life and the mind of Christ, together with the necessary interpretation by His contemporaries. Passing on to miracles he recognizes that in constructing an apologetic we must put first things first. We must begin with the miracle of the matchless personality of Christ, then next the resurrection. The rest, the more difficult to substantiate historically, nevertheless are comparatively easy to understand in their order and connection. In the chapter on the incarnation he ably contends for a real coming of God into human flesh. The Son emptied Himself and lived a real life on our plane of existence. On the teaching of Jesus he shows that, however important his sayings, the more essential part of His revelation is Himself. He is the truth. The discussion of the cross and resurrection follow a necessary but beaten track. As to the much considered question of Paul's interpretation of Christ, he on good ground points out that Paul did not make Christ, but Christ Paul.

Among other chapters that follow, the one on Science and Christianity tells us that the conflict between science and the Bible is really over. Each has learned its proper field. Science as such is not concerned with Final Cause but with methods and order of sequence. Also the Bible does not teach science. As Dr. Orr says, it speaks in popular language, and he might have added, in popular knowledge of the time, on such things. Where found it is but a portion of that ancient world of real life and thought in relation to and in terms of which the truth of God was known and by which it has been preserved for us. On the whole the reading of this book is a tonic to faith.

RUDOLPH P. LIPPINCOTT, '02.

THE WORK OF CHRIST. By P. T. Forsyth, D. D., Principal of Hackney College, (pp. 244—\$1.50) Hodder and Stoughton.

Early in 1909 Dr. Forsyth published a volume of studies on the Atonement, entitled "The Cruciality of the Cross", and delivered and published his Congregational Lecture on "The Person and Place of Christ". Immediately afterward—in July, 1909—he delivered a series of extempore lectures before Dr. Campbell Morgan's annual conference at Mundesley, Norfolk, to an audience largely made up of young ministers. These addresses developed in a popularized form some of the ideas set forth in the earlier and more formal works. They were taken down in short hand, revised, and are now published under the title "The Work of Christ".

The introductory chapter draws a series of contrasts between the work of Christ and that of a Belgian railroad employee who risked his life to prevent a wreck. Christ's work "was not human nature offering its very best to God. It was God offering his very best to man. . . . We have got to learn that it was not simply magnificent heroism but that it was God in Christ reconciling the world. And Christ was the living God working upon man and working out the Kingdom of God".

The Bulletin of the Western Theological Seminary.

The second chapter, entitled "The Great Sacrificial Work is to Reconcile," declares that the great need of the religious world at present is to return to the Bible. In the Bible we find that Paul is the great expositor of Christ's work and describes it as 'reconciliation'. He thinks of reconciliation not as a doctrine but as an act of God, something God has done, forever finally done. By reconciliation Paul meant 'the total result of Christ's life-work in the fundamental, permanent, final changing of the relation between man and God, altering it from a relation of hostility to one of confidence and peace'.

The next three chapters are occupied with the statement and defence of the following five points concerning Christ's reconciling work:—"it is between person and person; therefore it affects both sides; it rests on atonement; it is a reconciliation of the world as one whole; it is final in its nature and effect".

The seventh chapter gives a most interesting summary of the comparatively recent corrections of the popular view of Christ's death and work on which, according to Dr. Forsyth, the best authorities are substantially at one. The precise problem for today is to ascertain "what was the divinest thing, the atoning, satisfying thing, the thing offered to God in Christ?" It is the due and understanding acknowledgment from man's side of the holiness offended, a confession as practical as the sin, placing itself, as if it were active sin, under the reaction of the Divine holiness. "He bore this curse as God's judgment, praised it, hallowed it, absorbed it; and His resurrection showed that He exhausted it. . . . The same stroke on the one Christ went upward to God's heart and downward to ours." For "not only generally is there an organic moral connection and a spiritual solidarity between Christ and us, but also, particularly, there is such a moral effect on Humanity included in the work of Christ, who causes it, that that antedated action on us, judging, melting, changing us, is also part of His offering to God. He comes bringing his sheaves with him. In presenting Himself He offers, implicitly and proleptically, the new Humanity. His holy work creates. The judgment we brought on Him becomes our worst judgment when we arraign ourselves; and it makes it so impossible for us to forgive ourselves that we are driven to accept forgiveness from the hands of the very love which our sins doomed to a curse. . . . He is thus not only the pledge to us of God's love but the pledge to God of our sure response to it in a total change of will and life."

"The active and effective principle then in the work of Christ was the perfect obedience of holy love which He offered amidst the conditions of sin, death, and judgment. . . . The potent thing was not the suffering but the sanctity, and not the sympathetic confession of our sin so much as the practical confession of God's holiness." "This one action of the holy Saviour's total person was on its various sides, the destruction of evil, the satisfaction of God, and the sanctification of men." The last chapter deals with these three aspects of Christ's work, triumphant, satisfactory, and regenerative.

The book closes with a note of thankfulness for the riches possessed by the church in a truth so many sided, and a call to apply to its study intelligence of the first rank.

Not the least valuable element of this book is its frequent digressions into by-paths suggested by the line of thought the author follows. For example, in the second chapter, when speaking of the importance of a return to the Bible, he pauses to distinguish three forms

Literature.

of Bible reading. The first asks, What did the Bible say? It is the method of historical and critical scholarship. The second asks, What can I make the Bible say? It is the method of satisfying our private and personal religious and spiritual needs. Its object is edification and its results are often purely subjective. The third asks, What does God say in the Bible? This is the method which brings out the grand value of the Bible, its objectivity, not our feelings but God's purpose and thought.

Dr. Forsyth has given us a book hard to read because of its lack of logical and progressive development of thought, but one that is well worth reading because of its interesting discussion of the most important of themes or deeds.

JOHN W. CHRISTIE, '07.

MUSIC IN THE CHURCH—The Hale Lectures for 1908-09. By Peter Christian Lutkin, Mus. Doc. The Young Churchman Company.

PRACTICAL CHURCH MUSIC—By Edmund S. Lorenz—Fleming H. Revell Co.

If any one would know the merits of the friendly controversy with regard to appropriate Church Music and the exact views and arguments of those who are engaged in it, he can not do better than to read and compare these two books. Their respective differences are exactly set forth and summarized in their respective definitions of the term "Hymn"—Prof. Lutkin adopts as his own the definition of St. Augustine:

"Hymns are the praise of God with song. Hymns are songs containing the praise of God. If there be praise and it be not God's praise, it is not a hymn." (p. 60.)

Mr. Lorenz gives his definition in his own words:

"A hymn is a sacred poem expressive of devotion, spiritual experience, or religious truth, fitted to be sung by an assembly of people in a public service." (p. 143.)

It becomes very apparent as one reads the two books that the first definition is accepted by a devout soul who has no purpose to serve but his own usefulness and that of others in the public worship of God; and that the second is framed to promote the publication and adoption of songs and music of a particular and partisan kind.

Prof. Lutkin is the champion of the devotional and worshipful in public praise; Prof. Lorenz of the hortatory and didactic. Prof. Lutkin is in full accord with the principles adopted by the Western Theological Seminary of our own Church* in its Department of Practical Theology and Church Music and as set forth at length in the writer's "History and Use of Hymns and Hymn Tunes".

Prof. Lorenz takes issue with it again and again, saying for example, "Dr. Breed here seems to me to be at fault (quoting), 'Nothing should be called a hymn and nothing should be sung in our assemblies which is not virtually a paraphrase—and that a very faithful one of Scripture passage.' Such a rule is mischievous" (p. 151.) And so on for a number of paragraphs.

We very heartily commend Prof. Lutkin's book. It ought to be studied by ministers, organists, choir singers and all who desire to

* His lectures were given before the "Western Theological Seminary" of the Episcopal Church, Chicago.