

The Princeton Theological Review

CONTENTS

The State of the Church	177
CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY	
Theology and Evolution	193
DAVID S. CLARK	
Sacramental Negotiations at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530	213
HASTINGS EELLS	
Aramaisms in the Old Testament	234
R. DICK WILSON	
Dr. Moffatt's "New Translation" of the Old Testament	267
OSWALD T. ALLIS	
Reviews of Recent Literature	318
Survey of Periodical Literature	347

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1925

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR
THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BY
OSWALD T. ALLIS

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued
Subscription rate, Two Dollars a year, single copies Sixty Cents
Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

BOOKS REVIEWED

BENSON, L. F., <i>Studies of Familiar Hymns. Second Series</i>	343
BLACK, J., <i>The Mystery of Preaching</i>	336
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>Rubble and Roseleaves</i>	347
CADMAN, W. H., <i>The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem</i>	345
<i>Discipline or Book of Order of the Reformed Churches of France</i> ..	330
DONNELLY, H. I., <i>What Shall I Do with My Life</i>	341
DOUMERGUE, E., <i>Le Christianisme Est-il Chrétien</i>	318
FRANCKE, E. E., <i>The Facts About Our Bible</i>	341
FROST, H. W., <i>Matthew Twenty-four and the Revelation</i>	342
GARRETT, W. O., <i>Church Ushers' Manual</i>	342
GARVIE, A. E., <i>The Beloved Disciple—Studies of the Fourth Gospel</i>	324
GORE, C., <i>The Holy Spirit and the Church</i>	332
HASTINGS, J., <i>The Speaker's Bible—St. Luke</i>	326
HELMS, E. E., <i>Forgotten Stories</i>	346
HYMA, A., <i>The Christian Renaissance: A History of the "Devotio Moderna"</i>	327
JOHNSON, F. E., and HOLT, A. E., <i>Christian Ideals in Industry</i>	346
KIRK, H. E., <i>One Generation to Another</i>	337
MACCALLUM, J. A., <i>Now I Know: A Primer of Faith</i>	338
MCCONNELL, F. J., <i>Living Together—Studies in the Ministry of Reconciliation</i>	339
MORRILL, G. L., <i>Life as a Stewardship</i>	341
<i>Our Bible</i>	341
TODD, E. S., <i>The Kingdom of Heaven</i>	347
VERKUYL, G., <i>Devotional Leadership</i>	342
VOLLMER, P., <i>New Testament Sociology</i>	339

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1925

THE STATE OF THE CHURCH

The Church has been passing through troubled waters. This is no new or strange experience for the Church, but has been her history from the very beginning, ever since Christ said to His disciples, "In this world ye shall have tribulation." As the ocean is the home of storms, so is the world the home of unbelief and of opposition to the kingdom of God. But even in the ocean there are different kinds of storms; the winds blow out of different quarters; and, after suddenly arising and blowing with great vehemence for a season, they will as suddenly subside and there will be a great calm. Now that the roar of this particular storm through which our Presbyterian Church has been passing, and indeed, all Churches, begins to subside, though for a season only, and one of a great number who tried to keep a sort of mariner's log during this voyage of the past few years, I would like to put down some of the entries from the log-book. Perhaps these entries will be of suggestion to others who want to know from what direction the prevailing winds blew, whether the storm arose suddenly and unexpectedly, or whether in falling barometer and obscured heavens there were unmistakable signs of its approach.

How shall we describe this stormy wind that has left no Church untouched and unruffled by its breath? From what quarter did it blow? To answer this question is not as easy as it might appear. Unbelief, like God, never changes; from everlasting to everlasting it is the same. However he changes his accent, the tempter has never really said anything different from what he said at the very beginning: "Hath God said?" Yet the metempsychosis of error and unbelief is a very curious thing. How diverse and numerous its

forms, accents, uniforms, disguises! To mention just a few of these different appearances of unbelief would cause to pass in review before us the Judaizers, ready to stifle Christianity with the ceremonial wrappings of the old dispensation; Gnosticism, with its baffling evasions of God and sin and Christ; the subtle heresies and denials of the Christological and Trinitarian controversies; the dead hand of Ecclesiasticism in the Middle Ages; and then, in due season, the assaults upon Christianity which used for their weapon scientific hypothesis or ascertained fact,—for example, astronomical and geological and zoological weapons; and after these, or contemporary with them, the critical attacks upon the Old and New Testaments, attacks which sought to reduce the Scriptures to merely human documents, full of error, and unworthy in their teaching.

But what of this latest attack upon Christianity? It is more difficult to define and describe than any of its predecessors in the field. There is in it an echo of almost every war cry that has been raised against the Church. Yet it is different from them all. It made its appeal to no branch of science; it centered upon no one Christian doctrine; it advanced no particular criticism of any particular book or books of the Bible. It seemed to be rather the blend, or the synthesis, of all forms of unbelief. In a very peculiar way this was a hostile movement from within the Church itself. Christian pulpits, Christian papers and Christian societies were the medium through which it worked. It was all the more dangerous by reason of the fact that it professed to remove obstacles in the way of faith and to lead the believer up to higher and more blessed views of God, the Bible and Christ. While rejecting nothing in particular, it in reality was a rejection of the whole fabric of the Christian revelation. Yet there was no open and angry attack made upon Christian truth. Christian truth was not to be denied, but to be restated and reinterpreted, and recast in the moulds of the "modern mind." The last thing that the advocates of this neo-Christianity desired, or expected, was an open conflict. The plan of campaign was that of sapping and

mining, rather than storming the walls. Great emphasis was laid on brotherhood, good will, Christian spirit, with apparent ignoring of doctrine of any kind, whereas false doctrine was constantly being taught and emphasized. Yet unity was to be the note sounded and no breach was to be permitted which would seem to set one party over against the other. In some places slowly, in other places more rapidly, this work of loosening the stakes of evangelical Christianity and of humanizing its doctrines went steadily forward. Here and there some watchman on the wall lifted up his voice in warning or protest. But a chorus of "All's well!" "Peace, Peace!" drowned such admonitory cries, and the Church was more and more under the spell and witchery of a false teaching and preaching, which was so subtle as to deceive even the elect.

So far had this invasion of orthodox Protestant Christianity proceeded that many of the proponents of the neo-Christianity began to speak and to teach as if the whole field had been won, and as if what is commonly understood as evangelical Christianity was everywhere decadent and abandoned. Constantly one heard or saw in print such expressions as "all thinking people—," "all educated men—," believe thus and thus. Then came the crash and the upheaval. It happened on this wise.

A small group of Church members, most of them Baptists who stressed the imminent coming of Christ, had formed themselves into a Fundamentalist Society. Their views, which, for the most part, with the exception of the premillennial doctrine of the advent of Christ, were the views embodied in the confessions and creeds of all Churches, were given considerable publicity. The fact that anyone should have thought such views extraordinary shows how far the de-Christianization of the Churches had proceeded. A Baptist minister to whom these views were particularly obnoxious had been invited to preach as Stated Supply in the pulpit of a Presbyterian Church in New York. Though not common, such an arrangement was by no means unheard of or without

precedent. On a bright May Sabbath in 1922, this Special Preacher preached a sermon called, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" The sermon appeared in a religious magazine, was distributed in pamphlet form, and by a Presbyterian admirer of the preacher was broadcast through the country. With the sermon went a statement that it was being sent to those who, it was believed, would find the sermon "particularly stimulating," and comments were invited.

Those who were at all familiar with the utterances of the author of the sermon were not surprised at its contents. To them this now famous sermon was simply the confirmation of the impressions they had already received as to the Special Preacher's dissent from evangelical Christianity. While seeming to attack only a small group of premillennarians, the sermon, by implication, attacked the foundations of Christianity itself. The sender of the sermon expressed his surprise and satisfaction that such a sermon could be preached from the pulpit of this old Presbyterian Church. That such a sermon could be preached from the pulpit of any Presbyterian Church provoked righteous indignation among the Churches and Presbyteries of the Presbyterian denomination, nor was the indignation at all lessened by the fact that in no single paragraph of the sermon did the preacher say, "I believe this and this," or "I do not believe thus and thus." He put his views into the mouth of a party who were described as holding views opposed to the "Fundamentalists." This made the sermon all the more reprehensible, as the preacher did not openly confess to views which, by implication, it was clear that he himself held.

As every Presbyterian pulpit is pledged to a carefully defined view of the Gospel, it would have been strange indeed had no protest been made. This was formally done through an overture addressed to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church from the Presbytery of Philadelphia. What followed is now history. What was at first an incident in a pulpit of a Presbyterian Church became an event of the first importance in every Church. The circle widened and widened

until it embraced the whole Protestant Church. The shot that was fired from the pulpit of the New York Church was heard around the world. The false peace of the Church had been rudely disturbed, and what had long been said in the closet was now shouted from the housetop. Somewhat embarrassed, but having no other choice, the so-called liberals and modernists of all Churches had to rush to the defense of their assailed champion. The Special Preacher was lifted out of his immediate and natural significance and became a symbol. Thus it came about that, in the space of a single week, what the neo-Christians had so long and so successfully sought to avoid took place: there was an open break within the Churches, and almost immediately it was made manifest that in all Protestant Churches there were living together under the same denominational flag and worshipping in the same sanctuaries two groups calling themselves Christians, but whose views as to Christ and the way of salvation were irreconcilable.

Not only did the events which followed in quick succession the preaching of the famous sermon by the Special Preacher reveal that there was a deep and unbridgeable gulf of division within the Protestant Churches, but also that the adherents of the neo-Christianity were very numerous. Anxious as some earnest and thoughtful Christians had been about the state of the Church, few of them had imagined that the disaffection was so widespread. But by conversations, by articles in the press and by votes in the ecclesiastical bodies it has been demonstrated that there are a great host who have gone over, bag and baggage, to this anti-Scriptural view of the Christian religion.

But if there has been a saddening and amazing revelation of a decline from evangelical faith within the Protestant Church, there has also been a thrilling and heartening manifestation of the latent loyalty of a great part of the Church. Both the proponents of the new doctrines and their determined foes received a great surprise at the evangelical loyalty and enthusiasm of multitudes of Christians in all the Churches,

once the occasion arose which gave them an opportunity to give expression to that loyalty. Everywhere, believing men heard the call of their Lord and were eager to go on record for historic Christianity and witness against its foes. The movement has demonstrated beyond all peradventure of a doubt that there are thousands who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of unbelief, and who still understand the difference between Christian faith and what is not Christian faith. Their name is legion, and from every quarter of the earth they are stretching forth hands of brotherhood and mutual trust and encouragement. Men who hitherto were timid and quiescent have become as bold as lions. The mere fact that a man is their installed minister and pastor no longer makes them feel that they must accept without refutation or protest his departures from the faith of the Church. In one prominent pulpit the internationally known preacher, on Christmas Sunday of all Sundays, preached a sermon in which he expressed his disbelief in the Virgin Birth of our Lord. At the close of the sermon, one of his members went to him and said, "Now that on Christmas you have preached a sermon which denies the Virgin Birth, I suppose that on Easter Day you will preach a sermon denying the Resurrection." The great conflict has evoked such testimony as this, testimony which the neo-Christians dread above all else. They like to stand as reinterpreters and as prophets of the new day. What they do not like is to be accused of unbelief in Christ and the Scriptures.

Another good effect of what those who did so much to precipitate it call the "unfortunate controversy," has been the thrusting into the foreground of the great Christian doctrines. Suddenly, the world outside became aware of the fact that Christian people and professors and preachers were talking about something else than "vision," "service," "inspiration," "sacrifice," and the other well worn husks of popular teaching and preaching, and that there were really great Christian facts and doctrines, such as the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascension and the Second

Advent. In almost a day the center of interest and speaking shifted from the periphery of Christianity to its real heart and center. The Church and the world outside have come to realise that you cannot dissociate Christianity from its great New Testament facts, and that the whole structure of Christian truth rests upon a granite foundation of irrefragable fact. All this has been an incalculable gain to the Church.

The present conflict has once more brought up the question of creeds and credal Churches. Almost a quarter of a century ago, a distinguished scholar and theologian, Dr. Francis L. Patton, predicted the present defection from the true faith, and declared that when that day came it would demonstrate the importance and opportunity of Churches which still held on to a dogmatic faith. His prophecy, both as to the great defection and to the importance of credal Churches, has come true. Now that the conflict has become open, the neo-Christians direct their assault upon the creeds of the Churches, for they are sensible enough to realize that if it had not been for credal Churches holding their pulpits to a definite view of the Gospel, no protest could or would have been made against false teaching. Repelled from the ramparts of the credal Churches, the enemies of the evangelical faith now would persuade the Churches to abandon their creeds as unnecessary and un-Christian. One Presbyterian minister wants to know if Presbyterianism shall be permitted to stand in the way of Christianity. A religious journal asks if the time has not come for Presbyterians to give their creed its true historic setting and return to the "simplicity of Jesus." The drift of these complaints is quite evident, and the credal Churches may expect a campaign against their creeds, and directed by those within their own communions. Once get the credal barrier and fence down, then the way will be clear to take Christianity from its revealed and supernatural foundation and make it an experience of individuals, with no authority and no common standard, a Christianity which every Christian evolves out of his own mind and experience, much as the spider weaves his attenuated web.

In the recent struggle to reaffirm the faith of the Church, it was quite manifest that the influence of many of the educational institutions was cast on the side of the neo-Christi-anity. The memorials from student bodies, the utterances of professors in colleges and seminaries left no doubt as to the fact that there exists a breach between the Church and the School. At first thought this would seem to be a serious indictment of evangelical Christianity and a strong argument for the "liberal" and "modernistic" theology. What better commendation of the new views than that they are favored by the majority of the students and teachers in our colleges and seminaries? To some, undoubtedly, it will so seem. But to others this favorable inclination on the part of the educational institutions will be the evidence of the serious state in which the Church finds itself. It means that the very fountains are being poisoned, and if the springs be corrupted, what can we expect of the streams which issue from them?

The attitude towards Christianity in many of the state institutions is well described by former Governor Nestos of North Dakota in an address delivered at the University of North Dakota on Founder's Day, February 22, 1922:

During the past couple of years, as I have been travelling around the state, I have frequently learned of parents who had sent a beloved son or daughter to some of the state institutions, and, upon the return of the son or daughter at the end of the year, in sorrow had learned that their children had become scorers of religious truths and professed agnostics. I can understand the sad disappointment of the father and mother who, from the teachings of childhood and the experience of a life-time, have reached the conclusion that their faith and religious experiences mean more to them than anything else in life, and constitute, if followed by the children, a greater guarantee of their success and happiness in life than anything else that might be given them—when they discover that some teacher whose salary they are helping to pay has sought to dynamite every foundation of the faith that is theirs.

In his *History of the Jewish People*, Renan says:

A very moral people is almost always opposed to science; and, on the other hand, I have grave fears that what we scientists are doing will not conduce much to the moral advancement of the masses. The popular morality demands enormous sacrifices on the part of reason; the advance of reason harms the moral sense of the masses, who are governed by their instincts.

The fruit of the Tree of Knowledge has always been dangerous to those who pluck it with proud and irreverent hands. Yet knowledge we must have. The problem is how to have religion and knowledge dwell together in unity. Religion without knowledge will degenerate into superstition, and knowledge without religion will light the way to chaos.

In his widely read book, *The Reconstruction of Religion*, Dr. Ellwood points out how our universities have become the centers of the neo-paganism which is everywhere in evidence, and frankly confesses that for a professor in one of our great universities to avow his faith, not in the redemptive doctrines of Christianity, but even in Christian ethics, is to find himself discounted as a scholar and a thinker. In the quasi-ecclesiastical institutions the situation is oftentimes worse than in the purely secular institutions, where there is an increasing tendency to ignore the subject of Christianity entirely, whereas in the religious schools Christianity and the Bible must be dealt with, and the manner of dealing with them is generally that of the most radical school of criticism. In addresses and sermons before the student bodies the distinctive doctrines of the Christian faith are often ignored, as if it were taken for granted that it would not do to ask the "student mind" to receive the great doctrines of grace. The situation is aptly described by the president of one of our leading Christian colleges when he says, "The problem of the Christian college is how to keep it Christian." If our Christian colleges are permitted to sink into the morass of secularism and materialism, then woe to the Church.

When we look to the field of Christian life and practice, we are confronted with the seeming disintegration of religious customs which for ages have been associated with the Protestant Church and which have been a fountain of inspiration and strength. One of these is the formal recognition of God in the home. When Alexander the Great landed on the soil of Asia, he claimed it by throwing his spear on the ground. But when Abraham came to the land of promise, he claimed it by building an altar to God. When Christian

homes were established, those homes were claimed for God and the Church by the building of an altar. But today the family altar has fallen. In no thought or plan for the welfare and progress of the Church can we fail to take into the reckoning of our strength and resources that the ancient ally of the Church, the home, no longer marches by the side of the Church. We have devised many schemes and plans and orders, built up agency after agency, and launched movements so numerous that the mind is dazed in keeping count of them. But we have yet to discover any substitute for a God-fearing father and mother, who, in the home and in the presence of their children, pray for their eternal salvation. Take out of the ministry all those men who are in the ministry because they came from such a home, and three-fourths of our pulpits are vacated.

The other Christian custom to which the Protestant Church has borne so noble a witness is the observance of the Christian Sabbath, "the mainspring of the moral government of God." Who can estimate the tide of morality and spirituality which the keeping of the Sabbath has poured into the life of the Church? But everywhere today this invigorating and uplifting custom is fading and declining, and even in the homes of the ministers themselves. Here, again, the Church has suffered incalculable loss. This loss is felt in every branch of the life and work of the Church, and nowhere more than in the spiritual influence of the Church, for, as Thomas Chalmers truly says:

We have never, in the whole course of our recollection, met with a Christian friend who bore upon his character every other evidence of the Spirit's operation, who did not remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. We appeal to the memory of all the worthies who are now lying in their graves, that, eminent as they were in every other grace and accomplishment of the new creature, the religiousness of their Sabbath Day shone with an equal lustre amid the fine assemblage of virtues which adorned them.

"As ye go, preach," was the command of our Lord when He sent the first preachers of the Gospel into the world. These words are still the marching orders of the Christian

Church. But what of the preaching of the Church today? We have spoken of the assaults of unbelief and of the decay of Christian customs; but the condition in the Church which is the occasion for the deepest misgiving and the most earnest prayer is the subsidence of redemptive preaching in our pulpits. There are indeed those who in our pulpits wrest the Scriptures and pervert the great Christian doctrines. But that is not the chief danger. The chief danger is the neglect of distinctive Christian doctrine in our pulpits. When I speak of "distinctive" Christian doctrine I mean redemptive doctrine, for the whole Christian revelation is to that end, the salvation of man's soul. It would not be difficult to find here and there utterances in our pulpits which are anti-Scriptural in their explanations of the Way of Life. But what is far more serious is the widespread neglect of the Way of Life. "Ye do show the Lord's death till He come," said St. Paul of the witness of the Church through the Lord's Supper. We know from his own preaching and from that of the other apostles that the one great fact which they declared "first of all" was the death of Christ for the sins of the world. In His ministry between the Resurrection and the Ascension, if we are to judge from the fragments of that teaching preserved by St. Luke in his Gospel and in the Acts, the one great subject which Christ discussed with the disciples was His death and how through Him remission of sins was to be preached to the world. The Atonement is God's own mystery, and there is no human language which is a door into that mystery. But as to the fact itself, that Christ died to reconcile the sinner to God, that He died as the sinner's substitute, as to that there can be no doubt, nor can there be any doubt that it was the preaching of that fact which established the Christian Church in the world. All of Christianity, its litanies and liturgies, its creeds and symbols, its art, its music and its theology, centers in this one great truth that Christ died for our sins "according to the Scriptures." It is the one great essential, without which we have no Christianity. In the words of one of the greatest of the Reformed theologians, Francis

Turretin, the doctrine of the Atonement is the "chief part of our Salvation, the anchor of Faith, the refuge of Hope, the rule of Charity, the true foundation of the Christian religion, and the richest treasure of the Christian Church. So long as this doctrine is maintained in its integrity, Christianity itself and the peace and happiness of all who believe in Christ are beyond the reach of danger; but if it is rejected, or in any way impaired, the whole structure of the Christian faith must sink into decay and ruin."

Who is prepared to deny the statement that the doctrine of the Cross, of the Atonement, of remission of sins through the death of Christ, is widely neglected in the Christian pulpit today? "As ye go, preach!" But is the Church preaching Christ and Him crucified? What impression does one receive from a review of the printed sermons which pour from the press? What impression does one receive from the average sermon heard in the Protestant pulpit? Is it not that many of our ministers apparently have found something more interesting, more beneficial, more thrilling, more worthy of the grip of the mind and the glow of the soul than how God saves sinners through Jesus Christ? "The Protestant ministry," writes one minister, "with rare and fine exceptions, has ceased to preach the absolute necessity of redemption from sin through faith in the atonement of Christ on the Cross." We hope that his indictment is too severe. But that the redemptive note, the note of salvation through faith in Christ, is sounding but feebly in thousands of our pulpits, none can deny. Recently I had occasion to look through a book of sermons selected from ministers in all parts of the country and representing nearly all the Protestant communions. Many of them are ably written, and when spoken must have interested and helped those who heard them. But the sad thing about this collection of sermons is that from the first to the last there is not a sermon which shows the Way of Life Eternal or deals with the question of how God pardons and reconciles man through the mediation of Christ. It is not so much a question of new and unscriptural theories of the Atonement

being presented by our preachers, dangerous as this is, as of *no theory at all*, Scriptural or anti-Scriptural. The energy and thought of the average preacher are directed to some other subject than that which is the burden of the Scriptures and the glory of the Saviour, the redemption of a lost humanity. The Protestant order of worship has become more and more ritualistic, even Presbyterian Churches having a confession of sin and words of remission spoken. The symbol of the cross, too, is slowly coming back into Protestant architecture. "Holy Week" will be announced from the pulpit of Baptist and Congregational Churches without any stir or excitement on the part of the congregations. But the strange thing is that, as the formal recognition by service and symbol of the central fact of the Christian faith, the Atonement, becomes more and more marked in the Protestant Churches, the message of the Cross and the Atonement fades more and more from our pulpits. Ministers will read the solemn words of confession and remission as if that were really the great thing, and then proceed to preach sermons which are as far from the Cross as the east is distant from the west. A group of gentlemen representing one of the most popular men's clubs of our day went recently to call on a minister to request that he open his pulpit one Sabbath night to one of their lecturers who was to hold a series of meetings in the city. When the minister asked about the character of the address, the answer was, "A strictly non-religious, mirth-producing address"! Has it come to this, that intelligent laymen think the Protestant pulpit a place for a "non-religious, mirth-producing address"? Even at their best, how often the sermons which are preached may be described as "strictly non-religious," for a religious sermon is one which deals with the great problem of religion, the salvation of man's soul.

With the subsidence of redemptive preaching in our pulpits, it is not strange that there is also a subsidence of Christian joy among Christian people. What was it that brought the "Thanks be to God," the doxologies and the ascriptions leaping to the lips of the apostles? Was it the revelation of

the moral perfection of the Almighty? Was it the deep capacity of human nature? Was it the orderly progress towards a new heaven and a new earth? No; it was none of these. What made the apostles sing for joy was the tidings of the marvellous love of God in Christ, how, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Go to our Church services, go to our prayer meetings, and you will discover that Christian joy has faded, and that the great need of our Churches is to utter the prayer of the penitent king, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation."

The passing of redemptive preaching and the consequent fading of Christian joy are closely linked with another characteristic of the Church today, and that is the practical abandonment of the witness of the individual Christian. We have our lectures and books on "personal work," but the fact is that the preaching of Christ is becoming more and more the work of a few officials, and at stated times and seasons. More and more Christianity is being bottled up in its formal and official vessels and services. Hence, in spite of a vast host of services and sermons and ordained ministers and lay officers and workers, the number added to them that are saved is alarmingly small. It is hard to have an aggressive, conquering movement in the Church without a floodtide of genuine enthusiasm, and that enthusiasm must come from the hearts of Christian disciples who rejoice in the God of their salvation.

These are some of the things that one must say if one would give a faithful report of the state of the Christian Church. But there are hopeful conditions also.

The courageous witness which the Churches have made to Christ and the Scriptures has greatly furthered the cause of true Church unity. When I speak of Church unity I do not mean the ramshackle unity of boards, agencies, federations and ecclesiastical bodies, but the unity of faith and conviction. The assault upon Christ and the Scriptures and things precious to every believer has brought evangelical men of all denominations closer and closer together, and in every quarter

of the earth they are testifying to their common faith in Christ and their sense of brotherhood in Him.

The great controversy which has raged in the Church has awakened a latent loyalty to the Gospel and to Christ, and it has served also to strip the mask from dangerous and Christ-denying heresies which had bewitched a part of the Church. It has revealed the difference between historic Christianity and that which passes under the name of liberalism and modernism, how in reality they are two mutually exclusive and contradictory religions, one a religion of ideals and education and exhortation and inspiration, with no authority but the opinion of the age, and the other the religion of redemption from sin through faith in Christ and Him crucified. The very advertisement which the neo-Christianity has received through these popular discussions will in the end serve the Kingdom of God, for it will show the inadequacy and insufficiency of these hypotheses, negations or platitudinous affirmations. That in the present crisis there were found so many Christians who were able at once to discriminate between a real Christianity and a pseudo-Christianity gives us great hope for the future. Christ goes with His Church through every crisis and when the candle of the Church's witness seems all but quenched, lo, it breaks forth with new radiance. Some hear what they take to be the "sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees." Many think that we are on the verge of a great change in the spiritual condition of the Church, and that a great wind of the Spirit will come from the north and from the south and blow upon our garden that the spices thereof may flow forth. God grant that it may be so!

We note the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Church. But as we do so, and as we repent for these sins and ask for new grace and consecration, let us not forget the weaknesses and the needs of that world which the Church is sent to conquer and to save. When Gideon had reduced his army to three hundred, and still felt some misgivings as to the result of the forthcoming battle when he gazed from the slopes of

Gilead upon the hosts of the Midianites encamped in the valley below, God told him to go down into the camp of the enemy, and "Thou shalt hear what they say." With his ear close to the tent of the Midianites, Gideon heard one tell to his fellow his dream of the barley loaf which tumbled down the hill and knocked over the tent, and his interpretation of it, "This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon, for into his hand hath God delivered Midian and all the host." When Gideon heard that, he worshipped and returned to his army, and said, "Arise, for the Lord hath delivered into your hand the host of Midian!"

Thou shalt hear what they say! We hear what they say to us, what they say in criticism of the Church, in hostility or derision or bitterness, but not what they say among themselves, in their own camp. Would that we might lie quietly by the tents of this world and hear what they think and say! Could we but hear what they think and say of some noble and guileless Christian character; could we but hear their anxious misgivings for the tomorrow of a life without God; could we but see their blank despair as they stand by the grave of one they have loved; could we but hear the restless tossing of their remorse; could we but hear their secret verdict about the ultimate victory of the Kingdom of God,—like Gideon we should worship and return to our posts full of joy and confidence, for we should then know how true it is that the sword of the Lord is also the sword of the Church.

Philadelphia, Pa.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY.