

○ F. S. DARNES
MAY 1935-R
R 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

OCTOBER, 1934

Vol. 5

No. 5

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

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

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE Minutes of the 1934 General Assembly have the excellencies of their immediate predecessors—but also their defects. As regards their format they could hardly be improved upon. It still seems to us, however, that the Stated Clerk, in obedience to the instructions given him by the General Assembly, could have given us a more helpful volume. “To the Stated Clerk,” we read in the Preface to the volume, “was committed the responsibility of selecting and arranging the contents . . . as to provide ‘a full, accurate, and usable record of the year’s history of the Assembly.’” In view of these instructions, it might be expected that the Minutes of the General Assembly would provide a record of its proceedings such as would enable the 9,500 ministers (not to mention the 50,000 elders) who did not attend the Assembly to obtain from a reading of its pages something like an adequate knowledge of what happened. It does not seem to us that these Minutes make such knowledge available and hence that it is hardly proper to call them a “Journal of the 146th General Assembly.” For instance, while we may learn from the Minutes that the action against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions recommended by the General Council was adopted, there is nothing to indicate that there was any debate over the matter. This is also true of the action taken relative to the proposed union with the United Presbyterians, not to mention other matters. A particularly flagrant instance of inadequate reporting is what is told us concerning the Protests occasioned by the action of the Assembly relative to the Independent Board. On page 236 a Protest against this action, signed by 15 commissioners, with eight reasons therefor, is recorded. Again on page 285 there is record of a Protest, signed by two commissioners, against the action of the Assembly in striking out section 9 of the former Protest with no intimation of the contents of said section. Such a record certainly leaves much to be desired.

One can hardly read these Minutes without realizing the large—altogether too large, it seems to us—place that the General Council plays in the life of the Church. If we deduct the pages devoted to recording the names of the commissioners, the overtures and the Revised Book of Discipline we find that more than one-third and nearly one-half of the Minutes proper are taken up with the report of the General Council. Just why so much good paper and ink should have been used to preserve the articles on “The plan of Union” by DR. STEVENSON, SPEER, DeWITT, MUDGE, KERR, VANCE and COVERT we are somewhat at a loss to know—in view of the action of the United Presbyterian General Assembly.

“THE REFORMED FAITH IN THE MODERN WORLD”

PROFESSOR FLOYD E. HAMILTON, of Union Christian College, Pyongyang, Korea, to whom we are indebted for two such excellent books as “The Basis of Christian Faith” and “The Basis of Evolutionary Faith” has placed us under his indebtedness still further by making available what is perhaps the best brief discussion (pp. 37) of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformed Faith, to wit—divine sovereignty, human inability, unconditional election, definite atonement, efficacious grace and final perseverance. The following extract indicates PROFESSOR HAMILTON’s point of view: “Nothing is more needful at the present time than a rediscovery of the doctrines of free and sovereign grace, which lie at the center of the Calvinistic system. The Church today needs more than anything else a new Reformation, which will sweep away the tawdry schemes of self-salvation, and get back to the Biblical teaching concerning the Almighty grace of God. Not only is Calvinism true; it is the only effective defense against modern paganism. In discarding Calvinism the Church is neglecting the only weapon which can give it the victory in the conflict with the forces of unbelief. There is no rational defense against paganism except Calvinism, and no logical position which can be successfully defended if that be abandoned; for once the Church starts attributing the tiniest portion of our salvation to man, it has started down an inclined plane on which there is no stable equilibrium this side of thorough-going Pelagianism or paganism. . . . It is with the purpose of showing the reasonableness of that position, as well as its scriptural basis, that this pamphlet has been written.” Unfortunately for us this pamphlet is published only by the Sovereign Grace Union of London. Copies, however, may be ordered through this office. Single copies, 15c. Ten or more copies, 10c each.

FAIR TRIAL

INDICATIONS of the kind of “fair trial” to be expected by the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions are supplied by an illuminating letter received by President J. OLIVER BUSWELL of Wheaton College (a member of the Board) from the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Chicago. The Clerk, none other than Dr. A. C. ZENOS, professor emeritus in McCormick Theological Seminary, and noted liberal, is the chairman of a committee appointed by the Presbytery of Chicago to deal with Dr. BUSWELL. The letter is as follows:

“August 4, 1934.

“President J. Oliver Buswell,
My Dear Dr. Buswell:

Yours of July 19 informing me of your determination to con-

bore from within, corrupting the doctrine and destroying the peace and unity of the churches? Is this righteous? Is it constitutional?

Is it righteous for the Presbyteries to refuse ordination to young candidates so splendidly evangelical and magnificently equipped to preach the gospel of Christ? If they failed to fulfill the requirements of our doctrinal standards, it would be quite another matter. But here they stand, splendidly orthodox, creditably versed in their academic and theological parts, with a passion for the Word of God dearer than life, and a passion for souls, seeking the authority of their brethren of the Presbyteries to preach the gospel of the Lord of Life to perishing sinners. Shall any minister of Christ, in the presence of his Lord, standing with pleading eyes and outstretched hands with the nail prints, and saying, "feed my sheep," say *no!* to these candidates because, forsooth, of a verbal technicality by which the Assembly seeks to force them against their conscience to pledge support to a Board whose doctrinal corruptions they can not approve? Does not loyalty of the conscience to that great imperative, "feed my sheep," supersede any ecclesiastical *caveat*? The Constitution

concedes the priority of the conscience over church synods or councils, (Conf. XX, II), "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship."

The action of the Assembly reflects the eternal antagonism of the natural man to the supernatural, and marks the attempt of the rationalists of the Church to crush the evangelicals and their School of the Prophets. If the Presbyteries and General Assembly wish to debar true, loyal, evangelical men from preaching the gospel of Christ in their pulpits, let them put the Auburn Affirmationists out of *their* pulpits as an evidence of good faith.

Here is the whole trouble with the churches and foreign fields! Let the Presbyteries charge these disloyal ministers of the gospel (spare the name) with heresy, and with disturbing the peace and unity of the churches, and try them on the charges. There is not one of them that could stand up under an evangelical examination. A few good old-fashioned heresy trials would be a wholesome means of purging the churches of the doctrinal corruption that infests them today.

Professor Bryden's Apologia: A Review

By John Murray

[The Editors feel privileged to be able to publish this evaluation of the new book, entitled "Why I am a Presbyterian," by the Rev. Prof. W. W. Bryden, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History and the History and Philosophy of Religion, Knox College, Toronto. Mr. Murray is instructor in Systematic Theology in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.]

THE aim of this volume as the name indicates is to vindicate the refusal on the part of the author to enter the union of Churches consummated in Canada in 1925. A publication of this kind after nine years of retrospect from the pen of one who can view the situation before and after the union with such intelligence and discrimination we welcome as calculated to throw a great deal of light on the history of the Church in Canada for the last few decades.

We find ourselves, moreover, entirely sympathetic to the main thesis of Professor Bryden's book, the justification of the existence of a continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada. The Presbyterian Church in Canada has a great tradition and we are opposed to a union that would sacrifice so great a heritage. This the recent union would without question have done.

It is gratifying to find Professor Bryden expose so frankly "the highly disreputable propaganda" conducted by exponents of the union cause. Our agreement, however, goes much deeper than opposition to many of the methods and arguments used to make the union an accomplished fact. Professor Bryden finds his main argument against union in the realm of doctrine. "In any great movement," he says, "we must first of all be able to perceive that at its heart there are powerful and urgent convictions" (p. 70). "For it would appear almost certain that the

future is with that Church which will courageously take her stand for a more positive and definitely theological understanding of the Christian faith, and this in a renewed and vital understanding of doctrine along the traditional lines." (p. 95.) Much more might be quoted to which we could give hearty endorsement.

It is disappointing, therefore, to have to proceed to disagree so basically with Professor Bryden. We can, however, do no otherwise.

In chapter ii a reference is made to an episode in the early life of the continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada. It is the resolution adopted by the continuing Presbyterian Assembly in 1925, giving enthusiastic reaffirmation of very strict adherence to the Standards of the Church. He recognizes with sympathy that this resolution was largely due to a feeling of resentment in the minds of many against what they believed to be an unfaithful ministry. "At the same time," he proceeds, "we believe that the passing of that resolution was most unfortunate from any angle we care to consider it, and particularly for the continuing Presbyterian Church" (p. 44).

It is quite possible that this action was ill-considered as to method and time. It may have been done as Professor Bryden suggests in an atmosphere of passion and largely in ignorance. Such circumstances are, of course, to be deplored. But Professor Bryden's condemnation embraces

not only conditions of this kind but the thing in itself. This, in the judgment of the present writer, intimates a clear-cut divergence on Professor Bryden's part from the historic position of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The very claim to be *continuing* implied in itself affirmation of adherence to these standards in accordance with the "Basis of Union" of 1875 and the formula of subscription for all officebearers of the Church as in vogue then and now. Otherwise the claim would be blatant hypocrisy.

Those refusing to enter the union of 1925 had, of course, the opportunity to initiate in a constitutional way changes in the creed and constitution of the Church. They could have altered their Standards or relaxed subscription to them. This, however, would have prevented them from the right to use the word *continuing* though they might have by so doing been accorded the right to assume the name Presbyterian. But this is the very thing that was not done. The contention was emphatically that the integrity of the position of the pre-union Presbyterian Church was fully preserved. Hence the reaffirmation of 1925 was simply the affirmation of what was according to their claim already a fact. How can an affirmation of this kind then be an action to be deplored? Indeed, it would appear to have been a peculiarly appropriate time for the declaration of the fact.

The "Basis of Union" of 1875 says explicitly, "The Westminster Confession of Faith shall form the subordinate standard of this Church: the Larger and Shorter Catechisms shall be adopted by the Church and appointed to be used for the instruction of the people; it being distinctly understood that nothing contained in the aforesaid Confession or Catechisms regarding the power and duty of the civil magistrate shall be held to sanction any principles or views inconsistent with full liberty of conscience in matters of religion." The formula of subscription for ministers, elders and deacons on ordination Art. (2) reads, "Do you believe the Westminster Confession of Faith, as adopted by this Church in the Basis of Union to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and in your preaching do you promise faithfully to adhere thereto?" *

These have not changed their meaning and intent. The latter is the solemn vow of every officebearer in the Church. It was surely to this well-defined position that the reaffirmation of 1925 had reference. And yet Professor Bryden says it is to be deplored from every angle we may view it; to reaffirm, let it be remembered, that to which every officebearer had already solemnly pledged himself! The question here is not mainly one of theology; it is one of ethics. Underlying is an attempt by unconstitutional method to get away from the plain terms of solemn subscription.

This rather pronounced divergence of view from that which now in fact obtains of the relation of the Church

to her subordinate standard is necessitated in Professor Bryden's case by what we believe to be his radical departure at vital points from Reformed Theology. The cleavage becomes nowhere more vocal than in his doctrine of Holy Scripture. By our doctrine of Scripture, after all, will be determined our Theology.

There are two wholly different views of what constitutes the Word of God. One view is that the Word of God is to be identified with Holy Scripture, that the Bible is "immediately inspired of God" and therefore in all its extent and in all its parts the Word of God inerrant and infallible. This is the position of our Reformed Theology and is embodied in our Reformed creeds. The other view is that a distinction is to be made between the Word of God and Scripture, that the Word of God is not to be identified with the letter of Scripture. On this position the affirmation that the Bible is God's word in no way involves an infallible Scripture and this because the Word of God is not to be identified with the letter of Scripture but, to quote Prof. Bryden's words, "With the witness of God contained in that Scripture to men of faith." (p. 86.) This is the view given widespread currency today in the Barthian Theology. It is the view Professor Bryden avowedly and wholeheartedly adopts. A concrete example appears on page 16. Referring to John xvii, 11, 21, 22 he says, "Scholars are well aware that there have been grave doubts as to whether this particular *prayer* of Jesus, in which the afore-mentioned verses are embodied, together with many similar passages in this gospel, are to be attributed directly to Jesus Himself. St. John's gospel is not primarily a historic record of the life of Jesus; it is rather an interpretation of that life and of the experience of the Church." (cf. also p. 65.)

Which view is the Presbyterian Church in Canada to hold, the view that allows of many errors, contradictions, unhistoricities in the very autographs of Holy Scripture, or the view that the Bible is from beginning to end "immediately inspired of God" and therefore inerrant? There can be no question as to what the confession of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has historically been and to what view by solemn subscription every officebearer is committed.

But Professor Bryden (as also many others) takes the position that the view he represents is the view of the early Reformers and even of the Westminster Confession. "Moreover," he says referring to the original Reformed Church, "in consideration of their distinctive interpretation of what the Word of God signified—many claims to the contrary—they did not, at first, mean to identify that *Word* with the mere letter of Scripture." (p. 46.) Again he says, "We should not however pass on without observing *what these Reformers meant by Holy Scripture*. . . . Their writings everywhere imply that they were making a distinction between what they denominate at times as the 'Word of God' and Scripture, that is, as the latter may be simply read and understood in an external way," and finally quoting Professor Daniel Lamont's interpretation of the Westminster Confession, "The Scripture is

* The General Assembly of 1889 with the approval of Presbyteries passed a resolution allowing liberty of opinion in respect to the proposition in the Westminster Confession; Chap. xxi, section 4, "A man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own" (c.f. Book of Forms, p. 100).

authoritative only as it is borne home to a man by the testimony of the Holy Spirit." (pp. 91-92.)

Neither Professor Bryden nor Professor Lamont is the first to make this contention. It is now becoming quite ancient. But it is gross misunderstanding and misrepresentation. The Westminster Confession makes no such distinction. In Chap. i, sect. ii, it says, "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these:— . . . All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life." As the late B. B. Warfield points out (cf. "The Westminster Assembly and its Work" Art. "The doctrine of Holy Scripture"), the Confession defines Holy Scripture in this section both extensively and intensively, quantitatively and qualitatively, as in section iii it defines it exclusively. The peculiar quality of Scripture is that it is "given by inspiration of God" or as in section viii, "immediately inspired of God" and because so it is the Word of God and "infallible truth." Inspiration is not defined, but it is stated to be a fact and it is this fact that makes Scripture to be the Word of God. Holy Scripture is the extent of inspiration and since inspiration is, as Warfield observes, asserted to be pervasive, "Holy Scripture" and "the Word of God written" are synonymous. In other words Holy Scripture is identified with the Word of God. We may say not only that the Bible is the Word of God but also—since former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people are now ceased (cf., sect. 1)—that the Word of God is the Bible. Confirmatory of this is what the Confession says in Chap. xiv, 2, "By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein," etc.

In Section iv of this same chapter the Confession deals with the authority of Scripture. "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God, (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God." The ground of authority is the fact that God is its author. It is to be received simply because it is the Word of God and it is the Word of God because given by inspiration of God. Let it then be distinctly marked that the Confession does not rest the authority of Scripture upon the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, but upon the fact of inspiration (cf. also Sect. iii).

It is just here that Professor Bryden's interpretation is fatally incorrect. He interprets the Confession as teaching that Scripture is "authoritative only as it is borne home to a man by the testimony of the Holy Spirit." (p. 92.) He has failed to grasp the simple distinction which the Confession eloquently makes. It is the distinction between the authority of Scripture and our "full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof." With the ground of authority it deals in sections iii and iv; with our full apprehension of that authority in section v. The ground of authority is the fact of inspiration, of divine authorship—something characteristic of

Scripture as a divine product quite objective to us and antecedent in the nature of the case to any reaction on our part. The source of our conviction or persuasion of that divine character and authority is the "inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts,"—a subjective operation that ever continues with the Spirit's saving operations and the effect of which is the fact of conviction in our consciousness. No further explication of so elementary a distinction is necessary. Professor Bryden may disagree with the Confession but he has no right to misrepresent it and introduce confusion where there is plainness.*

We have, however, touched upon what is in this regard the central divergence of the Barthian Theology from Reformed Theology. According to the former, Holy Scripture in its own right as the inspired Word of God does not have objective authority. It could not have because, in its judgment, it is fallible. Consequently the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit involves at the outset a distinguishing operation, distinguishing what in Scripture is the Word of God. It is only what He (the Holy Spirit) distinguishes as God's Word that is authoritative. The effect of this is to get away entirely from what is an objective absolute norm of faith. It is to remove the standard of faith from the objective sphere of revealed fact normative for and binding upon all irrespective of their attitude to it, to something else.

It was not thus that our Reformed Theologians conceived of Scripture nor of the inward testimony of the Spirit in relation to it. They conceived of the inward testimony as having the effect of producing in our minds a full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth of Scripture as *in toto* The Word of God. By reason of the perfection and infallibility of Scripture the Holy Spirit did not need to distinguish. His function they conceived of as regenerative and illuminative in the mind of man, so that the darkening effects of sin being removed we might be persuaded of the divine origin and authority of the whole of Scripture.

The Barthian Theology therefore differs from Reformed Theology on what are the two pillars of the latter, the doctrines of Holy Scripture and of the inward testimony of the Spirit.

It is the conviction of the present writer that the ultimate tendency of such a position is just that subjectivism which has been the bane of Modern Theology and which we generally associate with the name of Schleiermacher.

If this movement of thought becomes dominant in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, then a truly Reformed testimony will be just as effectively destroyed as it would

* Dr. B. B. Warfield in two articles, "The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture" and "The Doctrine of Inspiration of the Westminster Divines," published originally in "The Presbyterian and Reformed Review" (1893) and "The Presbyterian Quarterly" (1894) respectively, and recently reprinted in the volume, "The Westminster Assembly and Its Work," shows conclusively by extended quotations that the high doctrine of inspiration contained in the Westminster Confession was the doctrine of the representative Theologians of the Reformed Church of the time. It is not difficult to show as Prof. T. C. Johnson of Union Seminary, Richmond, Va., has done in "The Evangelical Quarterly," July, 1932, that this is the doctrine of the theologian of the Reformed Church, John Calvin.

be by what Professor Bryden assails as Modernism. May we make our humble appeal to the ministry and people of this Church, which has by the singular grace and providence of God so marvelous an opportunity for true and

consistent witness to the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to avoid such a catastrophe.

Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A.

Sunday School Lessons for October

(International Uniform Series)

By the Rev. Prof. N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D.

Lesson for October 7, 1934

FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST

(Lesson Text—John 15:1-16. Golden Text—verse 4.)

ON the background of the departure of Judas from the intimate fellowship of the inner circle, Jesus sets forth in these verses the character of true discipleship. The branch which fails to bear fruit, he tells us, is cut off and is cast into the fire of judgment, but the branches which have been purified face the happy destiny of bringing forth an abundance of fruit to the delight of the Husbandman.

How can those who have remained with Him make sure of the fulfillment of the purpose of their call to discipleship? The answer of Jesus in this discourse is that this purpose can be realized only if they sustain a living relationship to Christ. They are told that they are *branches*, and branches do not bear fruit of themselves, but only as they retain their organic connection with the vine itself. "Apart from me ye can do nothing" (5); but abiding in Christ they shall be true disciples, and bear much fruit to the glory of the Father (8).

It is important to observe that abiding in Christ is not represented as an act or process which can be carried out by anyone at any time through one's own initiative and strength. The new relationship to which Jesus calls His disciples does not find its origin in man but is God-centered from beginning to end. The whole enterprise in which they are engaged is God's. It belongs to Him, is planned by Him, and exists for His glory. And Jesus presses home the subordinate position which man occupies in the endeavor when he reminds them that their peculiar relation to Him, the true Vine, is not of their own making but His: "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you, and appointed you that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide, that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." To pray in the name of Christ is not, as the treatment of this lesson in *The Westminster Intermediate-Senior Quarterly* states, to pray "in his spirit," that is, "for the kind of things that Christ wants," but is rather to come to God pleading one's unique relationship to Christ as a disciple.

And genuine discipleship, according to

the teaching of Jesus, is not a kind of mystic experience which exists apart from what Christ did for the disciples in dying for them upon the cross. Abiding in Christ is abiding in His love (9). The true disciple is the object of Christ's love, and this love of Christ found expression in His laying down of His life for them (13 f.). No one can possibly understand or obey the exhortation to love as Christ loved unless he grasps the true character of Christ's redemptive work on Calvary. And only the Scriptural teaching of the substitutionary character of Christ's giving of Himself in death in the stead of His disciples adequately expresses the love of Christ. A true disciple, therefore, is one who continues as the object of the love of Him who went even to the cross because He had set His love upon him.

Nor does the experience of abiding in Christ take its rise or sustain itself apart from what Christ has spoken. It was to His disciples, who stand in so intimate a relation to Him that He calls them "friends," that Jesus granted the privilege of knowing all the things that He had heard from the Father (15; cf. Mt. 11:27). And this revelation of Christ, His WORD, is the instrument by which the new life comes to expression and reaches its true fruition. The Word of Christ is the instrument through which the disciples come to stand in a new, decisive relationship to Him who secures for them a future of fruit-bearing to the glory of the Father. "Already ye are clean through the word that I have spoken unto you" (3; cf. 6:68; 17:6). And having become true disciples through the Word that He has spoken, and their reception of it, they are subjected, as fruit-bearing branches, to a further cleansing process at the hand of the Husbandman that they may bear more fruit (2). And the continuous, living relationship to Christ which results will necessarily involve an abiding in the words of Christ (7).

Being a Christian is commonly defined today too exclusively in terms of following Christ's example. So *The Westminster Adult Bible Class*, commenting on this lesson, p. 611, says: "To be a Christian in the twentieth century is to treat people as Christ treated them in the first century, to love the things that he loved, to do such things as he did." True, our passage sets forth Jesus as an example in calling upon us to love as He loved. But a definition of a true

disciple may not leave out of consideration a man's relation to the love of Christ and to the Word that He has spoken. Consequently, the life of a Christian is not merely a life in conformity to Christ's example but also a life of *obedience to His word*. It has been the fashion in recent years for the "leaders" of the church to formulate elaborate programs of social reform which are said to be an expression of the spirit and principles of Jesus, but we lack evidence of a concern to abide in the revealed word of Christ. The fruits of the branches must be the fruits of the Vine, and the surest guarantee that Christ will honor and claim our efforts as His own is for us to order our life as individuals and as a church according to His Word, for it is through the Word of God that He nourishes and cleanses and sustains our relation to Him.

Lesson for October 14, 1934

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS BIBLE

(Lesson Text—Acts 8:26-39. Golden Text—Ps. 119:97.)

The discussion of the lesson for October 7 has shown how indispensable the Word is to the Christian disciple. It was through the Word that Christ had spoken that they had been set apart for fruitful service, and this service which was defined in terms of obedience to His words could be accomplished only if the disciples abode in what He had spoken. The story of Philip and the Ethiopian illustrates the way in which one true disciple, abiding in the Word, used it to the salvation of one to whom he was called to minister.

As a true servant of the Word Philip set forth the teaching of the whole Word. He did not tell the Ethiopian that the Old Testament could very well be dispensed with in the Age of the Spirit and that its external authority would prove a hindrance to his free spiritual development. But he took his stand firmly upon these inspired Scriptures, and beginning with the prophecies of the Old Testament he went on to show how they had been fulfilled in Christ. Only he who accepts the authority of the whole Word of God and recognizes its wonderful unity in its divine authorship is fit to come to the help of those who are perplexed as to its teaching.

And as a true servant of the Word Philip set forth the central and unifying message of the Word: he preached unto him Jesus. Isaiah, he told the Ethiopian in answer to his question, was not speaking concerning himself or any other mere man but concerning the Lord's Anointed. How different the