The CALVIN FORUM

PUBLISHED BY THE CALVIN FORUM BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

CLARENCE BOUMA, Managing Editor
HENRY J. RYSKAMP
HENRY SCHULTZE

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

HARRY A. DYKSTRA (China)  R. A. FINLAYSON (Scotland)
STUART BERGMA (Northern India)  JOHN G. VAN DYKE (U. S. News)
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH (South India)  CHARLES VINCZE (Magyar News)
G. J. PENNINGS (Arabia)  JACOB T. HOOGSTRA (New York)
J. CHIL CONNIE (South Africa)  MARK PAKLEMA (Chicago)
LAMORY M. MISHEKOFF (Balkans)  W. M. CHILD ROBINSON (Atlanta)
J. SEBESTYEN (Budapest)  GEORGE STORE (Pacific Northwest)
P. PRINS (Netherlands)  FRANK DE JONG (Los Angeles)
S. LEIGH HUNT (London)  WILLIAM VERWolf (Canada)

Address all editorial correspondence to: Managing Editor, The Calvin Forum, Franklin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.
Address all subscription and circulation correspondence to: The Calvin Forum, Business Office, at the same address.

The Calvin Forum is published monthly, except bi-monthly from June to September.
Subscription price: Two Dollars per year.
Entered as second-class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

CONTENTS—Vol. V, No. 4, NOVEMBER, 1939

EDITORIALS

The War in Europe.  59
Jesus Comes to Judgment in 1963.  60
Prophetic Study and Idle Curiosity.  60
Tribute to Protestant Missions.  61
The Beddington Free Grace Library.  61

ARTICLES

This Is My Father's World. By Henry J. Ryskamp.  62
The Ministry of Healing and the Task of the Church. By Stuart Bergma.  64
Mixed Marriages . . . Considered Beforehand. By Charles Vincze.  67
Creeds and Christian Faith. By Alan Bandon.  70
Not a Blue Flower. By John Timmerman.  71

FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS

Canada, the War, and the Northwest.  73
Higher Education in South Africa.  73
A Letter from the Balkans.  75
An International Calvinistic Library.  75
News Items and Comments.  76

AROUND THE BOOK TABLE

Remarkable Gifford Lectures.  77
The Mormons in a Prize Novel.  78
Evangelism on a Reformed Basis.  79
As To Preaching.  79
On the Heidelberg Catechism.  80
The Faith of Edwin Lewis.  80
Books in Brief.  80

VERSE

Thanksgiving Prayer.  66
Off Scapa Flow.  72
God's Gold.  80
Use My Words.  80
THE WAR IN EUROPE

A MOST unintelligent, unrealistic, as well as un-Christian way of speaking and writing on the present European war is to minimize the issue at stake and to represent it as a mere quarrel over the European balance of power. Certain pacifists are foremost in this sort of propaganda, and biblical Christians should be on their guard lest they take over the unrealistic and sham-Christian mottoes and catch phrases of these pacifistic war-breeders, who, if the democracies of Europe should—which may God forbid!—lose the war, will bear a tremendous burden of responsibility for the catastrophe. How utterly self-righteous and smugly complacent the American pacifist can be has been demonstrated in recent weeks by the editor of The Christian Century.

At least for a few weeks—of late, possibly owing to the flood of protests that has come to the editor’s desk, there is at least an effort to keep a little more balance—the German propaganda ministry could not have had a better agent in the United States than the editor of this “liberal” and “pacifistic” weekly. With pharisaic self-righteousness he attacked the motives of Great Britain and France, assailed Poland, insinuating all the way through that the European war is but a local quarrel and that a good deal is to be said on the German side of the issue.

Against this reading of contemporary history we wish to raise our voice in protest. What is going on in Europe is vastly more serious than this American propaganda, inspired by a blind pacifism, would lead us to believe. Happily other voices are also heard which give evidence of a saner and more Christian way of speaking and writing on the contemporary scene. Such a voice was that of Dr. Macfarland, who in a recent broadcast on the subject “Can a Christian Be Neutral?” said: “God knows how I hate war. But as I face realities as a Christian I cannot follow those of our national and religious leaders who resolve the problem by adding two sides together and dividing by two. On a moral issue which to me is as clear as a star of the first magnitude in a blackout sky, I cannot be neutral.”

It is sometimes said that there is very little or no difference between the methods by which England rose to power and rules its dependencies and the manner in which Germany is now carrying on its conquests and subjugating the weaker nations of Europe. Marcus A. Spencer, a minister and American citizen at present living in the shadow of the war, replied very effectively to this charge laid at the door of Great Britain, also by the editor of The Christian Century. Wrote he:

That you should think there is little to choose between the nazi state which was conceived in trickery (the Reichstag fire) and dedicated to conquest (Dollfuss, Austria, Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Memel, Poland, fear in Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark) and the British empire, which with all its faults on the whole stands today for the same things as the United States (liberty and justice) is what hurts beyond words.

If you say Britain acquired her vast empire by equally dubious means, I vigorously challenge the word “equally.” I assert in any case that she became rich in land when individuals were becoming rich in property, that she is administering what she owns with a justice and a solicitude for the native unsurpassed by any other colonial power, and that she is gradually giving self-government back to her various units (home rule for Eire, self-rule for the defeated Boers—why did South Africa vote against neutrality and make the Boer General Smuts premier?—independence for Iraq, a greater measure of self-government for Egypt and India).

Again, it is not uncommon to hear some people voice skepticism as to France being the guardian angel (together with Britain) of those rights and institutions which we, Christians, associate with the freedom and development of our holy religion. Cynically some people like to speak of “godless” France in this connection. But such reasoning is beside the point. Dr. Henry Smith Leiper has cleared this issue in these sober words: “The systems of government in the Allied countries give Christianity a free opportunity to teach, preach, organize and develop a following. The governments of Germany and Russia are definitely opposed to the free teaching, preaching, and organizing of Christianity in their respective lands. Those Christians in England and France who are in the war believe that they are therefore defending the kind of civilization which at least has a chance of being Christian.”

A truly Christian, biblical, and at the same time statesmanlike utterance on the larger issue was made by Bishop Manning of New York in a sermon preached on October first at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. It is printed in The Living Church of October 18. Choosing Ephesians 6:10-12 as his text, he said among other things:

As Christians, and as Americans, we hate and abhor war. We know, all of us, that if this were a Christian world there would be no war in it. We know that war is always the result of sin in the lives of men. But we know also that there are situations in which it is not only justifiable but our bounden duty to use force for the repression of crime and for the restraint of the wrong-doer. I have great respect for our extreme pacifist brethren but I cannot agree with their reasoning either intellectually or morally. We all want peace, but right is more important than peace. Peace can only come as
the fruit of righteousness. The Christian religion stands not for peace at any price but for righteousness at any cost.

There are three things which seem to be quite clear:

First, it is useless to pretend that we as a nation have nothing to do with this conflict, that it is only one of those age-old quarrels in the family of nations with which we here in Amur have not much to do. The issues in this war affect vitally the future of practically all peoples throughout the world and they directly affect our life and future as a nation.

Second, in the light of the known, unquestioned facts we call to hold that all nations engaged in this war are equally responsible for it. We know that much can be said with truth as to wrong doing in the past in which we and all the nations have had our share, but to say, or imply, that all the nations engaged are equally responsible for it is to disregard the facts and to do grave injustice to those who used their utmost efforts to prevent and avert it.

Third, this is not merely a war between nations. It is a world crisis. The world is threatened now with something far more terrible than was ever threatened by Genghis Khan or any former world conqueror. The issue in this conflict is between totalitarianism with all that totalitarianism stands for on the one hand, and democracy with all that democracy stands for, on the other. The issue is as to whether totalitarianism with its barbarous and inhuman despotism, its anti-God philosophy, and in place of Christianity, is now to dominate this world and shape the lives of men.

We see now clearly that German Nazism and Russian Communism stand for the same things and that their aims and purposes are one. We see both in Germany and in Russia what totalitarianism means and stands for. We see that it stands for control over every body and over every mind and soul. We see that it seeks to destroy the very elements of civilization and is the open enemy of justice, of human freedom, and of religion. As Thomas Mann so truly says, the aim of both Nazism and Communism is the destruction not only of democracy and freedom but of Christianity itself in which democracy is rooted and whose political expression it is. Totalitarianism denies that the individual has any rights whatever which the State is bound to respect. As Americans, and certainly as Christians, we stand for the dignity of man and for the sacredness of human personality; we believe, and know, and will stand forever for the fact that each individual, each man or woman, no matter what his race or color, is a child of God and as such has rights which are inalienable and of which no government, no State, no dictator, has the right to deprive him.

No Christian, and no true American, can be neutral in judgment between the things for which totalitarianism stands and the things for which democracy stands. Our sympathies, our moral support, and whatever support we can rightly give at this time must be with those who at untold cost to themselves are upholding the principles and the ideals of human life in which we believe. While our ultimate duty as a nation may be if the conflict is prolonged no one can say, and no wise man will now attempt to say.

We must pray only that our country may be spared from war; we must pray also that no matter what comes we may do what is right.

Words like these sweep away a lot of pacifistic cobwebs. However passionately the Christian ought to be devoted to peace, he can never make “peace at any price” the standard of his moral conduct—neither in ecclesiastical nor in public affairs. He must stand for “righteousness at any cost.” Such words ring true to the Scriptures. Such a position can stand the test of both war and peace.

C. B.

Jesus Comes to Judgment in 1963

RECENTLY my postman brought me a free copy of an 82-page booklet entitled, The New Testament and the Millennium. The author, a premillenarian minister, enumerates in great detail the happenings that will precede the return of our Lord. Why call attention to a booklet of this kind? Surely not to advertise it. Its argumentation against the A-millennial position is so purile and so completely devoid of even an attempt to understand what that position is, that it does not deserve reply or refutation. The element of interest in this booklet, however, is that once again a premillenarian-dispensationalist “student of prophecy” has fallen before the temptation of setting dates. We are told with great assurance that God’s program for the fulfillment of biblical prophecy will run off according to the following calendar. 1952 or ’53: First Tribulation. A great world war will take place at this time and about 500 million will be killed. 1954 or ’55: Third Tribulation. This is to be in the Spring. The following Spring comes the Seventh Tribulation. The Eighth Tribulation is due for the summer of that same year (i.e., either 1955 or ’56), and this will be the occasion for a war by 200 million Asiatics, a war in which about 110 million men will be killed. Then Jerusalem will be under the Gentiles for three-and-one-half years, beginning in the Fall of ’59 or ’60. The First Resurrection, the Rapture, and the Marriage of the Lamb are scheduled for the late Fall or early Winter of 1959 or ’60. And Jesus’ Coming in Judgment will take place in the Spring of 1963 or 1964.

It is really pathetic to read this and to have it passed for honest, sincere study of the Word of God. With total disregard of our Lord’s own warning that “of that day and hour knoweth no one” (Matt. 24:36), the writer of this booklet—contrary, it must be said to their credit, to the practice of most dispensationalists—announces a complete program with dates of God’s plan for the consummation of the age. To cap it all, he claims to have received a personal revelation as to the real meaning of the Daniel passage about “a time, times, and a half” (Dan. 12:7), which he makes the key for the computation of his dates. In fact, he does not stop short of the claim that also this “revelation” to him is at least by implication predicted in Daniel! Quoting the Daniel statement, made in that same connection, that “the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end,” he affirms that there can be no doubt we are now living in “the time of the end” and then continues: “And I thoroughly believe that the Holy Spirit, who illumines only when the right time comes, has now shown me, as I was studying this subject and believe the Bible to be God’s Word, the meaning of this prophecy, that others who likewise believe may have the benefit of the revelation.” This unbiblical fanaticism is its own refutation. Let Christians who are tempted to fall into this idle curiosity, so contrary to the sobriety of the Word of God, beware.

C. B.

Prophetic Study and Idle Curiosity

THERE is an insatiable curiosity in the breast of every man and woman to know the future. We wish to draw the curtain aside and have a peep at
coming things. Hence the popularity of fortune telling, crystal gazing, astrology. No Christian will have anything to do with these. But many Christians do indulge their curiosity as to coming events in almost as riotous a fashion as do those who resort to the astrologer. Under such catch words as “reading the signs of the times,” and, “light from Bible prophecy,” we are often being treated to predictions as to future happenings as little known as the events on which the astrologer speaks with such great assurance.

It is only the more pathetic when such claims are made in our day in the name and on the authority of the Word of God itself. One stands amazed to what length otherwise honest Christian leaders will go in claiming to be able to answer the curious questions as to the happenings of the immediate future. Sensational advertisements are employed to draw the crowds to a house of worship—not to worship God primarily, nor to preach Christ and salvation of the Word of God itself. Assurance.

On which the astrologer speaks with such great insinuation as future happenings as little known as the events of the immediate future.

Why Russia had to break with Britain and join Germany. Why Italy must break with Germany and join Britain. Why the Roman Empire must be revived. Why Palestine will be coveted by many and join Britain. Why the Roman Empire must be revived. Why Palestine will be coveted by the nations. Britain’s break with the Jews, and Italy’s opportunity. Etc., etc. Are these the themes of the gospel? Is this preaching Christ? Or is preaching of this type just as secular and apparently, but to answer such curious questions as these: Why Russia had to break with Britain and join Germany. Why Italy must break with Germany and join Britain. Why the Roman Empire must be revived. Why Palestine will be coveted by the nations. Britain’s break with the Jews, and Italy’s opportunity. Etc., etc. Are these the themes of the gospel? Is this preaching Christ? Or is preaching of this type just as secular and “political” as the ethical preaching of many modernists, who reduce the gospel to man’s living a good life in all his social relationships? Some of these “Bible students” tell us: Read the Bible and get the news in advance. Others say that every day they find the front page of their newspaper confirming what they already knew long ago from a study of prophecy. An otherwise reputable Sunday School paper announces a coming series of articles in which “the light of Bible prophecy” will be shed upon the questions as to the events of the immediate future in the chancelleries and on the battle fields of Europe. With true worldly sensationalism, so foreign to all that Scripture teaches on the things to come, this full-page advertisement is adorned with the pictures of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini. In this thoroughly unscriptural fashion the idle curiosity of people is exploited, the great truths of the gospel are thrown out of focus, and the speculations of clever, ingenious “students of prophecy” eclipse the majestic verities concerning God and His Christ.

C. B.

Tribute to Protestant Missions

In a recent two-volume work on Pueblo Indian Religion by Elsie Clews Parsons the writer also gives her evaluation of the difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant missions in their influence upon the pagan religion of the Pueblo. She writes: “Catholicism has by and large enriched Pueblo religion, contributing God and the saints to the pantheon, fiestas to the calendar, candles and who knows how many other details to the ritual . . . . Protestant sects contribute nothing to Pueblo religion but dissension and apostasy. They present so sharp a choice between the old religion and the new that they are called ‘crazy.’ Hopi converts move off the mesa and break entirely with the ceremonial life.”

This is a significant statement, especially as coming from a source of this kind. Apparently the author is writing from the modern pagan point of view which believes that “the beautiful religion” of the American Indians ought to be preserved. Hence she bemoans the fact that “Protestant sects contribute nothing to Pueblo religion but dissension and apostasy,” and she speaks with apparent commendation of the fact that Catholicism has “enriched Pueblo religion.” This is very much similar to the point of view of certain officials in Washington who oppose Christian (especially Protestant) missions among the Indians and strive to do all in their power to preserve the pagan religion of these tribes as an integral element in their Indian “culture.” Viewed in this light it is very significant to read her estimate of the two forms of Christian missions among these aborigines. No doubt she is correct in her diagnosis of the difference between Protestant and Catholic missionary effort among these peoples. It proves again how true it is that Roman Catholicism adapts itself to the pagan religion and fuses its own superstitious form of Christianity with the pagan beliefs and practices of those who are supposed to become her converts. What Parsons intends as a compliment to Roman Catholics is, from the Christian point of view, a most serious indictment of their missionary methods and objectives. And on the other hand, what a wonderful tribute the author brings, quite unintentionally, to Protestant missions among the Indians. “Dissension and apostasy” is all they bring to Pueblo religion. That is exactly what Jesus said would happen if his disciples were unfaithful in bringing the gospel. “They present so sharp a choice between the old religion and the new that they are called ‘crazy.’” What a splendid tribute that the converts under Protestant auspices “break entirely with the ceremonial life.”

C. B.

The Beddington Free Grace Library

During a recent visit to Great Britain it was our privilege among other numerous valuable experiences to become acquainted with a remarkable collection of books known as the Beddington Free Grace Library. This library, of which the founder himself writes briefly elsewhere in this issue, consists of over 20,000 volumes. Its collection was a labor of love on the part of Mr. Williams, who, without having enjoyed any theological education, is well versed in the writings of the Puritan fathers
and of Calvinism generally. He loves the gospel of free grace. The sovereignty of God is a vital and living truth to him. He revels in the writings of the great Puritans and wishes to make them available to others, not only for the purpose of scholarly study, but also, and especially, that God may use these writings to lead others to repentance, the acceptance of God’s grace in Christ, and for the confirmation of men in the great truths of the gospel of God’s sovereign grace. Though the library is in existence less than a decade, it has already proved a great help and a lasting blessing to many. The heart of the library consists of the works of the Puritans, the Reformers, and the writers of the great periods of revival. These works are historical, devotional, as well as theological. Here are works by Baxter, Charnock, Bunyan, Owen, Sibbes, Attersoll, Burroughs, Gill, Goodwin, Brooks, Samuel Rutherford, Doddridge, Toplady, and a host of others, too numerous to mention. Throughout, the collector’s interest in the great Calvinistic truths of divine sovereignty and free grace have prompted him to seek especially the works that champion this genuinely God-centered interpretation of the Gospel and Christian truth. This remarkable collection of books is now housed in a small building in Wallington, a suburb of London, located in Surrey. The building has become utterly inadequate to hold the growing number of volumes and it is hoped that at some future time it may be transferred to a great metropolitan center like London, where it can be made readily accessible to a large number of readers and scholars generally. The owner, to whom this venture has been a labor of love in the interest of the truths of the gospel of sovereign grace, is ready to place this library at the disposal of a responsible organization or school that will guarantee the continuation and furtherance of the ends for which the collection was originally made. Who knows but that some day this collection may become the nucleus of a library of a Calvinistic theological college in the city of London! There are stirrings among certain Evangelicals in London and other parts of England which make this more than a mere possibility. May God bless the Beddington Free Grace Library!

C. B.

**THIS IS MY FATHER’S WORLD**

Henry J. Ryskamp

A STATISTICAL review of the course of our economic affairs during the latter part of the summer seems to indicate that we are again on our way to prosperity. Authoritative sources inform us that the steel industry will very likely have the biggest quarter in its history. Steel production according to the latest reports has already hit the high that it reached in 1929. Automobile producers are also looking forward to one of the greatest fourth quarters of the year in the history of automobile production, production at the rate of about 400,000 units a month. Taking the years 1923-1925 as an average, or as 100, the volume of current production is already pretty close to 120. The best level for the last previous high in December 1936 was 121. The textile industry is almost as busy as it can be; “Sales of cotton goods by mills in the Labor Day week were the heaviest on record, and during the month have equalled four months’ production.” “Woolen goods business has been as large as the mills would accept.” Leather business has broken all records. “Lumber sales have reached the highest level since 1930, and flour production is the highest in ten years. The rush in the wholesale foods business is described as the greatest ever known.” This is only a part of the summary given in the National City Bank letter, to which is added the statement, “and at the moment there are hardly any reports of the opposite character that could be offered to tone the summary down.”

In spite of the prevailing opinion that much of the spurt is due to the war, commentators are telling us that this recovery is widespread and largely domestic in character. The National City Bank letter reports, “The war brought about the change, but the actual war business has not been the significant factor. Domestic orders have far outweighed the export orders, even where the latter have picked up most quickly as in metal products and foods. Evidently business was ready to go ahead whenever any incentive appeared, or confidence was established.”

Employment has been picking up rapidly during the last month, bank loans have been increasing, bank reserves are more than ample, so large indeed as to constitute a threat of inflation. Our banking system, has, however, been overhauled and we have already learned something about the managing of the currency both from European and our own experience, and the threat is therefore not as serious as it might otherwise be. All in all we are being reminded that we can again breathe a bit easier, feel more confident. The world is still our own! It is our “oyster,” ready to be opened.

**Confusion**

Though the past few months of domestic improvement relieve the general strain, the effects of the great depression are nevertheless still with us. Unemployment is still one of our most serious problems, and the tremendous national debt incurred in large part to take care of it is one of the most serious threats to our national financial and general economic integrity. The record of the great industrial
revolution, or revolutions, of the last century and a half is, in the estimation of many a writer and particularly of H. E. Barnes in his latest book, Society in Transition, one of high hopes disappointed. Our civilization, in spite of all our display of scientific genius and marvelous mechanical advances, is but a parade of problem after problem. The discussion of these requires a volume of almost encyclopedic dimensions (Society in Transition).

Shout as we may of our successes, our failures speak louder than our words. Our social, our cultural advances have not kept up with the material, the mechanical revolutions in our mode of living. This constitutes what Barnes refers to as the “Cultural Lag.” We have harnessed the forces of nature but we have not been able to make them serve us well, or rather, we have not been able to control ourselves so that they may serve us.

Our own problems may surprise us when passed before us in panoramic review, but the unfolding of the tragic drama of Europe and of the Orient is enough to shock even the least sensitive soul. Whatever man tries to do, even that which is apparently good, leads to frustration. And in a natural world subdued to such an extent as to permit more abundant living than ever before, the people of Europe are today, and each day as the morning dawns, resigned to die!

Our World

H. E. Barnes’ review of our social problems and the news commentator’s survey of the events of the day leave one with a sense not only of hopes disappointed but of civilizations crumbling. Can’t we profit by our past mistakes, can’t we read the lessons history would teach us? Barnes tells us that man is unable to profit from history, indeed that there is pointed but of civilizations crumbling. Can’t we is that of looking to the hoary past and not going to work painstakingly to discover the laws of social history would teach us? Barnes tells us that man is profit by our past mistakes, can’t we read the lessons history would teach us?

Our Father’s World

The exultant cry, “This is my world,” is quite a different one from the cry, “This is my Father’s world.” To the Christian the record of the past is assuredly one of high human hopes defeated, as assuredly now as at the time of the discomfiture of the builders of the Tower of Babel. He of all men should decry man’s lack of understanding, his long history of inability and unwillingness to understand God’s world, and his failure to meet the command to subdue the earth. That he does not do this and so generally accepts the error rather than the truth, that he is so easily satisfied with a very partial understanding of God’s world, and does not feel impelled to know it and its laws more thoroughly, undoubtedly contributes to the development of such views as those of H. E. Barnes.

The Christian is indeed a Pilgrim, destined for a land that is better far than this. Nevertheless, though he is not of this world, his place for the present is in it. With a heart that has already found its abiding place, its anchor in another world, his task for the present is very decidedly in this one. And this world, the world of opportunities within us and outside of us, is God’s world, not one of our own making, one that we are ever challenged to understand and to use in his service. In spite of our satisfaction with our achievements we must be ever testing, ever changing, never relying too much on the instrumental, the institutional supports necessary to help us on our way, never relying too much on aids of our own making, never delayed by the apparent grandeur of the little edifices we build.

For all that we human beings can build is but a means to an end. Ever and again in this world we need new knowledge, new power, new inspiration. Such a world is not an easy world in which to live, certainly not a world without dangers, not an altogether peaceful world. Though we uncover wonders of creation hitherto unknown, and though we do realize possibilities in our social life that men are now vaguely and blindly moving toward, we shall not be able to solve all our problems. This world, corrupted as it is by influences which H. E. Barnes does not consider, will remain one in which we shall have to walk “tremblingly” among the problems we ourselves create. But it is one nevertheless in which the Christian may walk confidently, for he may walk hand in hand with God and face the problems of every day with a mind illumined by Him. Instead of piping a hollow “This is my own great world,” he can triumphantly sing, and prove by achievements as yet unknown, “This is my Father’s World.”
THE MINISTRY OF HEALING AND THE TASK OF THE CHURCH*

Stuart Bergsma, M.D., F.A.C.S.

I S the ministry of health and healing an essential part of our Christian message or is it some philanthropic worthy work superimposed on the real evangelistic work? Was medical missionary work one of the tasks which Christ himself started by His example and which the Church is continuing today in obedience to Christ’s example? We know we are preaching, carrying on evangelistic work, because Christ commanded us to do so and Himself preached. Are we doing medical missionary work because Christ commanded us to do so and Himself healed the sick?

In order to understand the place of medical missions in the broad work of the Christian church we must go back to Jesus. We may ask reverently: “What were the motives of Jesus in healing the sick?” We may then ask: “Are our motives the same as those of Jesus?”

False Motives Advanced to Justify Medical Missions

Here are some of the motives which have been suggested in times past as justifying medical missionary work:

1. Medical Missions are bait to get a hearing of the Gospel.

Hospitals and clinics give an audience, furnish a group of people who by reason of sickness are peculiarly susceptible to the message of the Gospel, who are sick abed for several days and can hear many messages, and who by reason of kindness shown them in ministering to their bodily illnesses are favorably drawn to the Christian doctors and nurses and likely to believe what they say.

Commenting on this first motive mentioned, some have said this is a very unworthy motive. They say that medical missions are thus simply bait used to catch poor helpless fish who are in a contained tank from which they cannot swim away because they are sick.

In reply to this I would say that while the furnishing of an audience for the Christian message is by no means the real motive for medical missions, nevertheless it is a by-product of the real purpose, and as such is no more unworthy or degrading to the name of the Christian Church than are our mission schools, our bazaar stereopticon lectures which draw the curious, our music or other programs which have as their aim the attracting of people so that there may be someone to listen to our message. But this is not the real motive of medical missions.

Christ Did Not Use His Works of Healing as Bait To Get an Audience

Christ did not use His medical missionary work to draw people to Him as bait. Think of how many times he expressly commanded the healed one not to tell who had healed him lest it draw too much attention! In Matt. 8:1 Jesus heals a leper and says to him: “See thou tell no man.” In Mark 8:30 Jesus healed a blind man, leading him first outside of the town of Bethsaida. The man said: “I see men as trees, walking.” Then Jesus gave him complete sight and said: “Go not into the town nor tell it to any in the town.” When Jairus’ daughter was raised from the dead (Luke 8:56) we read he told them to “tell no man.”

After telling the leper not to tell any man we read in Luke 5:15: “But so much the more went there a fame abroad of him. And great multitudes came together to hear and to be healed.” Some say: “This was using good psychology on Christ’s part.” However, that was not His purpose in telling the healed to refrain from publicity, or we make Christ insincere. This fame, this gathering of people was a by-product. Many of those healed did not even know the name of the one who healed them. The fame was a by-product. Many of those healed did not even know the name of the one who healed them. The man healed at the pool of Siloam, the man born blind, had to learn it was Jesus from others. Jesus “missed many an evangelistic opportunity,” we would say.

2. Medical Missions are Solely for Medical Relief in Neglected Areas.

Others maintain that medical missions are for the purpose of bringing healing to those areas where there is much disease and no other medical relief. Again, medical relief inevitably accompanies medical missions, or the work is neither medical nor missionary, but simply quackery unworthy of the Chris-

* My deep obligation in preparation of this paper is to a small study booklet on 'l'ambaram Conference Topics, by Dr. C. Frimodt-Møller of Copenhagen called: "The Witness of the Church. The Integral Place of the Ministry of Healing in the Work of Christ’s Church."
tian church. But again we must vehemently affirm that "Christ did not heal simply to bring medical relief to places where it did not exist." If this were true then great would be our condemnation of Christ's failure in this part of His task. Christ left far more unhealed than He healed. By His miraculous power He could have healed every single disease in Palestine in His day. Jesus could even heal at a great distance. Think of the Centurion's servant. Jesus could have raised all the dead from their graves, as He did Lazarus, the child of Jairus, and the widow of Nain's son. Would it have been a good deed to do? Was mass healing His purpose in His medical missionary work?

Think of one instance, the pool of Bethesda. He went there to heal one man sick thirty-eight years. As far as we know He left the pool of Bethesda with many sick people still lying there awaiting the moving of the waters. He healed only one of the many there.

3. Medical Missions Serve only as an "Opening Wedge."

Nor did Jesus heal only early in His ministry, as if to draw attention to Himself, and then abandon this ministry as His fame and name was assured. No, He healed to the end. Lazarus was raised in the last week of Jesus' life. Jesus did a "plastic operation" on the ear of the man whom Peter attacked even after He was seized by His enemies.

**What Are the Real Motives of Medical Missions?**

What then was Jesus' motive in His ministry of healing, and what must be our motive? Jesus healed men to reveal God, His Father, unto them through that healing. Disease of the body was to Jesus a picture, an unavoidable accompaniment as it were, of sin. Scripture clearly teaches that with the coming of sin there came disease and death. Christ came to overcome sin. He showed God's uncompromising attitude toward sin, He showed God's forgiveness of sin, a forgiveness wrought by the Cross. The Cross proved that God, rather than leave sin go unpunished, would send His own Son to pay for it with His blood.

Jesus declared this message by sermon and by deeds of miracles. His miracles of healing were sermons as if He said: "Behold, disease came by sin. I overcome and pay for sin. Hence I overcome disease. God has pity on you poor sin-sick mortals. I, seeing your diseases, have compassion on the multitudes sick in soul and body. I cast out this disease, I open these blind eyes, I expel the evil spirits, I raise the dead, because God hates sin but loves the sinner. It costs God, My Father, a terrific price to overcome sin, for it costs Him the life of myself, His only begotten son. It costs me a price to heal your diseases for every time I heal someone "power goes out" from me. I become physically tired, my pure soul shrinks from this contact with defilement, this leprosy that reminds me day by day of the hold of sin on all mankind. I hate these diseases, but I love you who are diseased."

**Scriptural Proof That Christ's Motive in Healing Was to Reveal God**

Here are some references that prove this aspect of Christ's ministry of healing. When Jesus healed the man born blind He said: (John 9:3) "This man was born blind that the works of God should be made manifest in Him." How? By sending Christ to reveal God to him. "I must work the works of Him that sent me. As long as I am in the world I am the light of the world." In other words, "God is a God of light. Blindness is the type of the darkness of sin. I come to reveal God as light, sinlessness, holiness, hating darkness."

What was the answer to John the Baptist when he inquired if this was the Christ indeed? "Go and shew John again the things which ye do hear and see. The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them." In other words, His ministry of healing proved His messiah-ship. In effect He said: "This is God's and my attitude toward sin and disease, blindness of body and soul, leprosy of skin and conscience. We hate sin and disease. We love the sinner and the diseased because of what they can become as children of God."

**He Revealed God as a God of Compassion and Mercy**

Jesus in His ministry of healing revealed God as a God of compassion. (Mark 1:41.) Jesus saw a leper who fell at His feet saying: "Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean." Jesus said: "I will. Be thou clean." "And Jesus moved with compassion put forth His hand and touched Him." Some think Jesus broke the Jewish ceremonial laws here by touching a leper and was by law Himself unclean for a time. Impossible. Untrue. The leprosy fled from before His fingers and Jesus touched sound skin. Compassion characterized His ministry as if to say: "As I have compassion for your diseased bodies and am ever willing to heal you, so God my Father is a compassionate God ever ready to heal your diseased soul."

Jesus gave us this example. We must follow in His steps. He had compassion on the multitudes, Matt. 9:35: "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease and every sickness among the people. But when He saw the multitudes He was moved with compassion on them because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd."

And here is where we come in, in our mission work: "Then saith He unto his disciples: 'The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest.'" Modern missions are the answer to this prayer. Medical missions form a part of this harvesting. Jesus said...
to these same disciples (Luke 10:9) (where these same words about the harvest are mentioned): “Go your ways. I send you as sheep among wolves. Enter the cities and if they receive you heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them: ‘The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.’” In other words, their medical ministry revealed God as a God of compassion, eager to forgive, to heal, a tender God moved by their sufferings of body and soul. I wish I could stop right here, but if I do it’s not the full gospel.

He Revealed Also a God of Wrath

Jesus continued (Luke 10:10) “But into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you not, go your ways into the streets of the same and say: ‘Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth unto us, we wipe off against you. Notwithstanding, be ye sure of this: The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.’” Again, the implication is plain: Christ, his disciples, and we his followers, also reveal God as a God of wrath against sin, disease, and the unrepentant sinner. No wishy-washy sentimental modernistic stuff about God being all mercy and compassion; this is the New Testament, but God can be hard as flint as re­vealed through Christ Jesus!

Are Not Christ’s Ideals Too High for Us in Medical Mission Work?

Some may say: This motive, this ideal for medical missions that the doctors and the nurses work in operating room, in clinic, in wards, in village work as if their every action is a shouting abroad: “THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS COME NIGH UNTO YOU!” —this is far too high and unattainable a motive for modern medical missions! There is only one answer: “God requires it of us.” He knew those weak disciples twelve whom he sent out, yet He required it of them. We have far more light than they had at that time. The Church’s conduct toward the sick and afflicted reflects its nearness or farness from God. The neglect of the ministry of healing by the Church is perhaps “one of the chief ways of express­ing in its life the love of God.” Christ used this agency mightily. Medical mission work is the Gospel in action. Christ referred to His work saying: “Though ye believe not me, believe the works which I do.” The Christian church today cries out to India: “Though you believe not me believe these works that are done in Christ’s name, and through them learn what God is.”

Oh, how far short we medical missionaries fall from this goal. Our impatience with the sick, the ignorant, yes even the suffering ones who cause us to use our physical strength and go home weary in body and soul because our therapy has failed through their ignorance or ours, how un-Christlike our conduct often is. We can’t heal in Christ’s name unless Christ’s spirit is in us. The terrific pace at which we must work in the busy season to get finished at all, the strain of bearing so much of the woe of the world and seeing so much of it, the taking of life into one’s hands on the operating table, or operating on the only good eye a man or woman may have and knowing that the blessed gift of sight de­pends, under God, on you as a weak and sinful human being . . . all this militates against a serene walking through the wards with an atmosphere of: “The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.”

And yet . . . and yet . . . if our lives, our abominable impatience, our tempers, are such that instead of the Kingdom of God coming nigh it seems to recede into the background, God pity us for coming way across the seas to give a picture of discontent, discord and turmoil in our own souls! “It is not easy, in the daily routine, with a large number of patients, for a Christian doctor to heal and to speak in such a way that the Kingdom of God come nearer to each patient. Yet the mere fact of difficulty is no reason for neglecting the Lord’s command and thereby giving a false and incomplete presentation of the Gospel.”

Summary of Ideals

The place of the Ministry of Healing in the work of the Christian Church is briefly this: To show by example of healing of sick bodies, by our determined and unceasing fight against disease and sin, God’s uncompromising attitude toward sin. To show God’s compassion for sin-stricken mortals, by the Church’s compassion for diseased bodies which bear the effects of sin. To strive to be a follower of Christ in this work, bearing reproach with fortitude, taking up our cross daily. “Behold, the Kingdom of God has come nigh unto you this day!” What kind of a God have I revealed unto my patient today by my words, my deeds, my attitude?

This does not mean the medical missionary will not preach. He has been commanded to do so by Christ, preach the word, in season, out of season and heal the sick. But in no other field is there so much danger of undoing the good of your words by the petulence of your deeds. Someone said to a Christian: “Your actions speak so loudly I can’t hear a word you say!”

God forbid it should be so in medical missions. The Kingdom of God comes nigh to the patient in medical mission work. It is a vital part of the work of the Christian church. Without it the church is crippled and even unfaithful to her Lord. “But whoso seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?”

THANKSGIVING PRAYER

Dear Lord, forbid that I should wait
Until some man-appointed day
My thanks to give for blessings great
Thou hast bestowed upon my way.
Grant me in weal or woe to view
Each day a God-appointed day
On which to render thanks anew,
My life on thy altar to lay.

H. P.
MIXED MARRIAGES.....CONSIDERED BEFOREHAND*

Charles Vincze
Minister Free Magyar Reformed Church, Perth Amboy, N. J.

BOY meets girl, girl meets boy. How? Where? . . . . Who could predict! Then they go together. They become friends. In time they fall in love with each other, they become "sweethearts." By and by everybody regards them as such. They receive joint invitations to social affairs, and instead of being called by their names they are just called so and so's boy friend or so and so's girl friend. Besides being mutually drawn toward each other, they also feel pushed in each other's direction by a congenial world, which always loves a lover—as they say. Sooner or later both come to the conclusion that they ought to get married. The boy proposes and the girl graciously accepts. So far so good. And if the boy and the girl are adherents of the same religion and perhaps even belong to the same congregation, then the road to married bliss is smoothly paved all the way through, provided the parents do not raise any objection, which is extremely rare in such cases.

Marriage Not a Private Affair

But if one of the parties happens to be a Roman Catholic or a Greek Catholic, then the situation changes materially. So far the parties primarily concerned were of the mind that the whole thing was their own private affair. True, they received the first intimation that it is not quite so from the state, when they learned that they have to apply for a license and subject themselves to a blood test in order to get that license. But now when discussing the question of where to get married they feel that the Church is "butting in." And it has just as much right to "but in" as the state has. Marriage is not purely a person's private affair; it is essentially a social and religious institution. The state regulates it from the social point of view, and the Church has its own regulations for it from its religious point of view. And both the state and the church are sovereign in their respective spheres. There is no escape from either of them if we want to live in a marriage recognized by both of them. This is the reason why the ecclesiastical regulations of marriage should be reckoned with just as earnestly as the regulations of the civil authorities. When a minister is giving you the regulations of his church it is just as much in bad taste to argue about them with him as it would be to argue with a civil magistrate about the regulations of the state. The laws and the regulations are made and the burden of making a decision falls upon the parties themselves.

A Clash Between Two Faiths

Now, when one of the parties is a Roman or a Greek Catholic, it is really hard to make a decision. Because you find out that both the Roman or Greek Catholic Church and our Reformed Church have the same and thereby mutually exclusive regulations. The Roman or the Greek Catholic Church wants you to get married in one of their churches. Our Reformed Church wants you to get married in one of our churches. The Church of Rome wants you to sign a pledge before marriage that all the children regardless of sex who might originate from your marriage will be baptized and brought up in the Church of Rome. And our Church says that none of our ministers can marry you unless both parties sign a written pledge giving all the children regardless of sex to the Reformed Church. And if the Reformed party gives in to the Roman Church then the Reformed Church will treat you as one who broke his or her confirmation vow and thereby forfeits all rights to Reformed church membership and ministerial services. And if the Roman party gives in to the Reformed Church then he or she will be excommunicated from the Church of Rome and deprived of all priestly services. Truly this is an impasse, this is a dilemma. Young couples sitting in a dimly lit parlor or engaged in sweet conversations in a darkened automobile do not have even an idea about it until it breaks upon them right when they want to bring their affair to its logical and honorable conclusion.

But you will understand that this is not a matter of rivalry between priests and ministers. It is not a question of which church should have the honor of solemnizing your marriage. Neither is it a question of whether a priest or a minister should pocket the marriage fee and pronounce you husband and wife. It is a question of the religion of your future children and thereby it becomes a test of the loyalty of the parties to their own church and religion. And as children constitute the future of both churches, it is a life and death struggle for existence on the part of both churches. It is a struggle between two entirely different types of Christianity, a struggle between evangelical, we might say, Protestant Christianity and sacerdotal or priestly Roman Catholic Christianity. It is a continuation and a modern variation of the struggle of Reformation times and of the religious wars of former centuries.

The Roman Catholic Policy

We readily admit, that it is an ugly thing and a scourge upon a Christendom which is so much in need of peaceful relations within its own ranks and of a united front against a terrifyingly unchristian world. We, Reformed Christians, would have never

* This address was delivered before a recent Youth Conference of the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. Our readers will readily recognize that a number of allusions in this address can be understood only from the historical background and from the present situation and regulations obtaining in the denominational group to which the address was made. —Editor.
thought of throwing such a burden upon unsuspecting loving hearts and thereby present them with such an almost unsurmountable dilemma right in the midst of the happiest period of their life. The roots of this impasse are to be found in two facts. First, in the divided state of Christendom. Second, in the reaction of the Church of Rome to that divided state. In the midst of the rifts caused on the one hand by the separation (schism) of Orthodox Eastern Christianity, and on the other hand by the establishment of the churches of the Reformation (heresy, according to Rome), the Church of Rome had stiffened herself into a twofold attitude. Negatively she denies real recognition to any religious body or organization that is outside of the pale of papal jurisdiction. Positively she upholds her claim to being the only and exclusively true Church of Christ more than ever. This is why she addresses herself as the Catholic Church. The strict and consistent application of these two principles to the question of marriage results in the policy according to which (even in a case where only one of the contracting parties was “baptized in the Catholic Church, or converted to it from heresy or schism”) only such marriages are recognized by her as valid that were solemnized by one of her own priests in good and regular standing, and where all the expected children, regardless of their sex, are safely pledged in writing to be baptized and brought up in the Church of Rome.

This policy of Rome is codified in a papal decree, the so-called “Ne temere,” issued on August 2, 1907. It has subsequently been elucidated by various decrees and rulings handed down by the respective organ of the Roman See. (For the original text of the “Ne temere” and for a selection from the subsequent decrees, see Marriage in Church and State by T. A. Lacey. London, Robert Scott, 1912, pp. 227-231.)

This Policy in Practice

Seemingly this is an innocent policy, inasmuch as it purports to regulate the marriage problems of Rome’s own constituents only, and it is an established fact that any church has the indisputable right to exercise whatever authority or discipline it wishes or deems advisable or necessary to exercise over its own members. But due to the fact that it ignores another fact, viz., that the adherents and the non-adherents of the Church of Rome are not living in isolation from each other either territorially or socially, its practical workings are simply disastrous for Protestantism. Whatever our Roman brethren may say in justification or defense of this policy, in practice it amounts to nothing else but to a continuous declaration of war on Protestantism, to a grand-scale attempt to utilize the love-stricken state of espoused couples. In the case of religiously mixed marriages it gains the appearance of a veritable act of cradle snatching, seizing unborn babes in order to gain external growth even at the price of making shipwreck of other people’s faith. (The Roman contention that it is not a true Christian faith but only a heretical one, does not suffice and cannot be accepted by any self-respecting Protestant church without openly committing suicide.) It places the Roman Church under the impression that it cannot gain enough adult converts from Protestantism, consequently it devised this policy to secure babes even before they are born.

We hear a good deal about “aggression” and “aggressors” nowadays. There can be no question that in this war on Protestantism Rome is the aggressor. Before the issuance of the “Ne temere” Protestants of all countries were usually content with the arrangement according to which the children of Roman Catholic and Protestant parents followed the religion of their parents according to their sex, the boys following the religion of the father, and the girls that of the mother. That was the case in Hungary, too, where the aged king Francis Joseph I prevented the promulgation and the putting into effect of this decree until his death. It was promulgated and put into effect in a coup-like fashion by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Hungary during the most trying and distracting days through which that country passed in 1918. Since that time a relentless war is going on over this question in the country of our origin, as well as over here.

The Problem in America

American Protestantism has so far failed to meet this issue squarely. Possibly it has been blinded by the numerical plurality which it has maintained until now, although even the blind can see the forward rush of Rome in the United States. Another factor might be that the strength of Romanism is chiefly in the industrial centers where hosts of Roman Catholic immigrants from Europe settled, and the strength of Protestantism is in the more or less rural sections of the country. Thus the bulk of American Protestantism did not have a chance to notice this danger so sharply as we Hungarian Reformed Christians do, who also are immigrants and settled chiefly in industrial centers. This explains the fact why we are stricter in the handling of mixed marriages than our American Protestant brethren. We are the vanguard of American Protestantism in this defensive warfare against the exclusive, totalitarian claims of Rome. We are firmly convinced that the day will come when the armies of American Protestantism will march behind us and will justify every measure we have taken in defense of our Faith, our Church, our Future. To criticize or to condemn our church’s stand is to take side with Rome. To expect our church to give in, is to ask for its surrender to Rome. To go after a Roman or Greek Catholic person and sign away our children is to humiliate ourselves beyond words, it is to belie our ancestors who courageously fought Rome for centuries. It is to betray our church; it is to sell out the religion, the spiritual welfare of our unborn children; it is to burn the Bible of our forefathers in the fire of our blind love. This is why our Church
adopted and maintains just as firm a stand in the matter of mixed marriages as Rome did, and this is why you find the same alternative in the office of your minister as in that of the priest.

Ways of Dodging the Issue

And now when young—or, for that matter, even older—people who did not think of this problem before, find themselves in this trap, they naturally act like fish that are caught. They wiggle around and try to find a way out.

Some think that if they shun both churches alike, and get married before a civil magistrate of some sort, the problem will be solved. This is a serious mistake. First, any God-fearing person would shrink from avoiding the church of that God Who instituted marriage for the welfare and happiness of mankind just on the occasion of marriage. Any truly religious person would abhor starting out on the path of married life without the blessing of the Almighty being invoked upon him or her in a consecrated church by an ordained servant of the Lord. Secondly, the parents would be shocked by it and it would result in bitterness in the family. Third, both churches would refuse to give ecclesiastical recognition to such a marriage, and both parties would be denied admission to the Holy Communion and to regular church membership.

Then some simply elope in the hope of getting away from it all. They drive and drive until they find some sort of a clergyman, who asks no questions, possibly because he derives his living from the commercialization of marriage, and set up a day-and-night advertised marriage mill, just as an undertaker’s place is advertised day and night. This again does not solve the problem. There is more cowardice in it than daring. It means ingratitude and lack of respect and tact toward the parents. It leaves a sense of guilt in the conscience. And again, neither of the respective two churches will give public recognition to marriages entered into under such spurious, clandestine and undignified circumstances.

Another Unsuccessful Attempt

Some conceive the idea of getting married in both churches. In this way they hope to satisfy both of them. If it would be just a matter of paying respects to both denominations and both churches, the idea would perhaps work, although even then it would be a useless repetition emphasizing more the conflict than the harmony. But it does not work. It simply complicates matters. First, both churches regard it as a humiliating patching of their already valid ceremony. One point in the pledge to be signed before a Roman priest performs a marriage ceremony is a promise not to try to get married in another church again, although they freely marry those who were married in our church already. Naturally this forces us to take the same measures. But the main point is in the conflict of the pledges to be exacted by both churches before the marriage ceremony can take place. One has to pledge all the

children Roman or Greek Catholic there, and Reformed Christians here. Which pledge do you intend to keep? No matter which church’s pledge you keep, you will be a liar and a cheater in the sight of the other church for the rest of your life, and even before your own conscience.

You see, neither of these imagined escapes and solutions help. They bring you back to where you were before you took any step. You have to make a decision and turn either to the right or to the left. One of you has to give all, and the other one has to take all. One of you must betray his or her formerly dearly held loyalty. One of you must become crippled and thwarted in his or her spiritual life. One of you must take upon his or her conscience the decision for the changing of the religion of his or her yet unborn children. Our alarm is over the doleful fact that so far in the majority of cases our boys and girls give in and our religion and church suffers the loss of the children that are to constitute their future.

Advice to the Unmarried

What advice can be given to people in such a predicament and to every one still on this side of marriage?

If you find yourself in such a predicament already, first try to back out of that marriage by mutual consent and honorably. Of course this can be considered only where the period of courtship and engagement was not confused with the married state. It is a shame and a cause for deep humiliation how often that mistake is made. Many first-born babies could be named “Accident,” “Sin,” “Lack of Restraint,” “Loss of Wisdom,” and so on. Such people lose their personal freedom just at a time when they should be in full possession of their full personal freedom. Truly did the Lord say that sin makes slaves out of sinners. You can be free only if, and to the measure in which you are free from sin.

Then seek for advice, in time, from your minister. He is your friend until you prove yourself unworthy of his pastoral care. He taught you in the church school. He confirmed and perhaps even baptized you. He used to call you by your first name. He always sought your good, perhaps even helped you a number of times. Go to him in time. Give him a chance, too, to influence your decision. He needs this confidence and co-operation because the priest has an advantage over him. Through the confessional the priest usually knows about your romance before even your own mother does. Through the power which the confessional gives him he is sitting behind you, though invisibly, whenever you are with your friend. Do not go to an unknown priest before you see your own pastor. Do not fall a prey to an unsuspected trap. See your pastor right during the early stages of your courtship.

Stand By Your Convictions!

And if you have to go through the marriage, whether by the force of your sentiments or by the force of circumstances, take care that you be the
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winner. Even if the girl is a Roman or Greek Catholic, do not follow her into the office or sacristy. (You know of course that they will not let you go before their altar.) Persuade her to follow you to the altar of your church. We give her more recognition than her own church does on account of your religion. Do not think that you have to follow the girl. That rule does not apply to mixed marriages. It applies only when both parties belong to different congregations of the same denomination. In such cases the bride’s minister is in authority to marry them, unless the bridgeman is an officer in his church and special considerations require the marriage to take place in his church. Such cases are always amicably arranged by fellow ministers of the same denomination. But in the case of mixed marriages, the ceremony always takes place in the church of that party who displays a more inflexible loyalty and a more unshakable attachment to his or her faith and church. This is why you should be more fervent in your religion when you go with a Roman or a Greek Catholic friend. You should study your religion, know its truths, so that you would know fully what you will be called upon to give up both for yourself and your future children. Ignorance and lack of real interest in our holy religion is largely responsible for the ease with which so many of our boys and girls squander away the faith of our fathers. In fact the fundamental remedy against mixed marriages is a deeper and a more spiritual perception of our faith. We feel no anxiety on this score for truly Reformed young people.

But knowing how frail and uninformed you are in matters of faith, our final advice to you is to limit your choice of marriage partner to the adherents of Protestantism and preferably to the members of our own denomination. Abraham and Isaac laid great emphasis upon their sons marrying from among their own kin, despite the fact that they had to cross entire countries to get them. We have no serious objection against racially, linguistically mixed marriages. As long as people of fundamentally identical spiritual outlook are brought together, our faith, our church does not suffer an irreparable loss, and the spiritual harmony of the married partners is not endangered and adjustments resulting in a fuller harmony—so essential to happiness in marriage—can be made. So in the interest of your own happiness, too, search for your life partner among the sons and daughters of your own faith. If you succeed in finding him or her among them, then your romance will smoothly and naturally bring you before the Lord’s Table in our churches for God’s blessing upon your marriage. Then, as far as you are concerned, the problem of mixed marriages will become once and for all solved and non-existent. May the Lord, the God of our fathers, so guide the affections of your heart and the deliberations of your mind, that you find a life-partner who can worship God in the unity of faith with you.

CREEDS AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

BEHOLD, a certain woman had a large orchard.

And it came to pass that she went to her orchard with a basket to pick some of its fruit. This she did, first to test her orchard and satisfy herself that its fruit was good. She also wanted some fruit for her children to eat and they were too small to go and pick for themselves because the orchard was large and interlaced with irrigation-ditches and the trees were tall. Her third reason was that a critical fruit-buyer was coming and she wanted of her best fruit to show him as a sample. So she sought diligently and worked hard and returned with her basket full of fine fruit of every kind. She arranged the fruit tastefully and set the basket as a centerpiece for her dining-room table.

What think ye? Will the woman say in her heart, "Behold, what fine fruit I have made"? Or will she say, "Behold what fine fruit God made to grow in my orchard"? And when, in the course of time her children return from school and see the fruit, what think ye, will they say in disdain, "That fruit is not good, mother’s hands have handled it, we would go and search out our own fruit from the orchard"? Or will they with grateful cries lay hold upon it and eat to the satisfaction of their hunger? And when the critical buyer comes to see, think ye that he will be so unfair as to say, "That fruit is not genuine, it is man-made, it is of wax"? Or will he be honest enough to take the fruit at the woman’s hand and take up the challenge that she throws out, saying, "Taste and see what fine fruit I have gained from my orchard"?

The woman and mother in our parable is the Church. Her orchard is the Bible. She goes out to gather from the Bible the choicest bits of its vast store of truth, first to satisfy herself of the riches God has given, also to give to her children thereof, and finally, to prove to a critical world what it is in which she believes and for which she stands. So she picks her hazardous way through the Bible and culs its richest treasures and puts them all together in a creed in attractive form and easy to understand. Should she pride herself that she has made something that was not in her Bible? Should her members refuse to accept it and call it man-made and insist on each one seeking out the truth of the Bible for himself? Should the world, no matter how critical, be able to say in all fairness, "That creed is not representative of what the Bible teaches"? What think ye? ALA BANDON.
SOME people talk about Literature; others read it. Some people make a living out of it; others find in it one important privilege of living. Some people think the memorable phrasing of memorable thought is one of the enduring glories of man; others think its perusal as weary discussing it; people have squirmed under its reading and people have been supremely thrilled. Whatever literature is, it is an immense and enduring fact.

A famous scholar has said that to define a thing is to understand it; if this be true, the understanding of literature is in a noteworthy predicament. The definitions of literature are legion, and exhibit a great many grave authorities in splendidly virile imaginative review, the great brow of Coleridge high-spots of critical aphorism: "Familiar as an old mistake And futile as regret."

Ink pots have been emptied and tongues have grown weary discussing it; people have squirmed under its reading and people have been supremely thrilled. Whatever literature is, it is an immense and enduring fact.

If, then, the definitions of literature offer so much difficulty, why bring salt water to the sea, by offering still another? For the simple reason that there is a certain fascination and value in trying to clarify one’s own reactions to a complex problem. The only quarrel with me that may arise in the minds of the nine people who will read this article is not that I define literature, but that I define it so abominably. Or you may say precisely enough—precisely wrong.

It was the redoubtable Oscar Wilde who popularized the gaudy doctrine of Art for Art’s Sake, and in his own words, I fear that “like all people who attempt to exhaust a subject he exhausted his listeners.” Wilde was a peerless master of pungent epigram, and he himself demonstrated his favorite doctrine that “nothing succeeds like excess.” His doctrine is excess, and for a time it succeeded in the minds of the smart young men, and the emancipated young women. It was fashionable to ridicule all moral implications in art and to observe no moral restraint. But the doctrine has obvious weakness. If the only need of a work of art is to be esthetically pleasing, then one must assume the existence of a separate, discrete emotion, namely, the esthetic—irrelevant to and apart from life. Otherwise moral judgments must needs enter in. Such an assumption leads to anarchistic lawlessness in art and the esthete becomes absorbed in a world of purely formal art totally indifferent to the realities of man. A still-life picture may be comparatively free from moral implications, but how can a sensible man experience the subtle involutions of the soul of Iago free from a moral reaction? And if a moral reaction occurs, how can one judge solely in terms of artistic execution? The theory smacks of the emancipated sophomore who mistakes a fluency of language for wisdom. The theory demonstrates the weakness of the glittering phrase of the merely brilliant man.

Romanticism is a term of terrific voltage. As an epithet of reproach it is deadly in some circles. To be described as a romanticist is equivalent to being called a vapid, maundering sentimentalist. In other circles it is spelled with a splendid “R” and stands for imagination and liberty of thought, the “Republic,” and what not. Historically, it is applied to a literary movement originating in Germany and culminating in England, but philosophically it is a term of endless confusion. Quiller-Couch suggested that it, like the word “nature,” were well expelled from our tongue. But there is a phase of romanticism I would discuss, a phase of romanticism that results in writing undeserving of the designation of high literature.

This phase of romanticism is that which in Hurd’s words leaves the author “free to wander in his own realm of chimeras.” The author has absolute liberty to create. He meets a brittle, beastly, prosaic world of facts, a world uncouth and ill-omened, a world which he can’t smash to bits and rebuild according to his wishes, and so he builds up an imaginative world compounded of heart’s desire and wish-thought, and in this world he is fancy free and whirl may be king. It is the world of the mystical, illusive “Blue Flower” of the German romanticists, a world of mist and rainbow. Now, I do not admit the first assumption that the artist is absolutely free in his creation. He should surely have a large measure of freedom of selection, but his selection should be grounded in the facts of life. These may be transfigured by imagination as Wordsworth laudably maintained, but they should always constitute the artist’s rock-bottom basis. The artist’s work must be credible, and it can only be credible if rooted in life and human experience. Furthermore, such art is dangerous. The artist’s world is
an incomparably beautiful one, so much superior to a drab fact, that instead of engaging in make-believe, he comes to believe. An incessant absorption in an unreal world may and has (cf. Hölderlin) led to belief in it. Finally, such creation often does and has led to grotesque and baroque effects, a cult of purely verbal lustre, and even as recently into the cult of the unintelligible (cf. the unintelligible jargon of Gertrude Stein and E. E. Cummings).

ONE could take up more pseudo-theories of art, but I am afraid that of my nine readers four have left me, so I shall proceed most diffidently to a definition, or rather a suggestion of the nature of literature. Literature is an organized, interpreted, and permanently significant account of experience expressed in language which, by its sensuous qualities reinforces the meanings it communicates. Let us examine the suggestion.

Literature is organized experience. Experience comes to us a miscellany, ill-consorted mass of impressions, vague impulses, and sketchy reflections. The artist selects from this chaos and organizes it so that it may become both the subject and object of reflection. We are all aware of the tragic character of life and its inevitable waste. In King Lear we have a living picture of these experiences upon which we can reflect. As Goethe says the ideal poet takes into his own being the monotony of nature and the discordance of nature and gives it organization, life, and rhythm. After the poet has done this, we have such a magnificent poem as Wordsworth’s “Tintern Abbey.”

Literature is an interpreted and permanently significant account of experience. When Moses so many centuries ago looked upon life and observed the brevity of the burning of the candle of man, he said:

“Thou carriest them away as with a flood: they are as a sleep: in the morning they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down and withereth.”

This is not only sacred truth but high art; it is a permanently significant account of man's experience. How universally valid is its description of our haste to

“The undiscovered country from whose bourn
No traveler returns.”

Literature deals with experience—the whole of it—honestly and courageously. The author should even in humor and satire do this with the high seriousness of which Arnold made much. Of course, he should use taste. Certain details of life may be technically necessary to make a character believable, but they should not be wearisomely reiterated. John Steinbeck’s book, “The Grapes of Wrath,” deals powerfully with life but it lacks taste. It should be true “not only to the flat, stale, and unprofitable uses of this world” but also to what Emily Dickinson so happily calls “the transport of the aim,” and “the visions of latitudes unknown.”

The language of literature should have beauty of sound and suggestion; there is a subtle power in words that is indescribable and the great artists are masters of it. Take the incomparable closing words of the superb simile of Prospero:

“We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.”

There is magic in the cadence and the music of the words re-echoes the thought.

Literature thus conceived, gives a new appreciation of the total qualities of existence. T. S. Eliot has said, “But the essential advantage for a poet is not to have a beautiful world to deal with; it is to be able to see beneath both beauty and ugliness, to see the boredom, and the horror, and the glory.” To see the “boredom, and the horror, and the glory,” and to record it in memorable speech—that makes great literature.

In this article, I have tried to suggest the nature of literature. The suggestion has doubtless many weaknesses, but it does have the value of presenting literature as a magnificent gift of God; it enables the sympathetic reader to re-live in imagination the manifold glory and the wonder and the pain of life. And so, in the high and noble language of Paul, instinct with music and grace, “Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.”

---

**OFF SCAPA FLOW**

Hitler gave me an iron cross.
I am a hero!
My country sings my praises.
It was my U-boat,
My torpedoes,
That sank the Royal Oak ....
And drowned eight hundred men ....
Off Scapa Flow...

* * *

I bear a cross, a heavy cross.
I am a widow.
My children mourn their father.
It was my love,
My children's dad ....
Drowned with the Royal Oak ....
One of eight hundred men ....
Off Scapa Flow.

J'AIME DIEU.
FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS

Canada, the War, and the Northwest

Sumas, Washington, October 16, 1939.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

HERE, as elsewhere, the War occupies a large place in the thought and speech of the people. It would be anti-climactic for us to speak of suffering from its effects, when we think of the written of sacrifice and death that must be borne by members of combatant nations and their neighbors. But we do feel some of the effects of the Scourge. In our own State, the growers of world-famed Washington apples are staring at a surplus of 8,000,000 boxes of apples, created by the cessation of foreign consumption. The State government is releasing a mammoth sales campaign seeking to step up home consumption. Apples are being given free to patrons at football games and other public events and through that means, as well through extensive newspaper advertising, buying sympathy is being aroused to diminish the shock of the collapse of the foreign market. For the rest, we feel the irony of the price-rise in every day commodities, which reminds us that the profiteers are already using a remote war as an excuse for legitimate pick-pocketing, even though a little more than a month ago they were still praising the defeat of German capitalism and the greatness of the same commodities. The devilish plunderers are not all in Europe!

Our Canadian neighbors, friends and brothers, are at war. It seems hard to believe. The disturbing things that enter into our minds sympathetically affects us, too. The border that separates us, for the most part, to be only an imaginary line. For the rest, our lives and our interests and our feelings mix freely. It does not seem right that they should be at war when we are not. In many homes an intruding fear brings disquiet. Strapping sons, whose energies are now being used to provide food-stuffs for the world, as well as to resolve the difficulty of bringing livelihood to their own families, are expectant of being gobbled up by conscription measures. Fathers and mothers fear that that evil day of Canada's participation is bound to come.

And yet there is a good measure of solemn belief that this is rightly Canada's war. The loyalty with which the war aims of the British government are being supported is somewhat surprising. Perhaps the visit of British Royalty to this great dominion last summer achieved its purpose. Many are still full of fond reminiscences of the visit of their "beloved King and Queen." It is not hard to believe that thousands would be willing to throw themselves into the conflict and die for the "lovely Queen," whose personal influence in winning the loyalty of Dominion subjects can hardly be overestimated.

Meanwhile, riding through Canada, one's eyes are diverted from the pastoral beauty of spotted cows grazing on green pastures, to the sight of plain-clad, elderly watchmen, standing guard even at small bridges over creeks crossing the main line. A huge forest fire, raging in the hills in full view from our home, was said to have been started by German incendiaries. And on this side of the border, citizens are chary of Canadian home, was said to have been started by German incendiaries. And on this side of the border, citizens are chary of Canadian food-stuffs.

Word of God? We feel that this "newest contribution to World Peace" will fail. After all, there can be no substitute for the power of the Old Gospel.

George Bros.

Higher Education in South Africa

University College, Potchefstroom
University College
Potchefstroom
South Africa
Aug. 26, 1939.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

IN my letter of May 14 I told you something about the meeting of the General Synod of the Gereformeerde Church of South Africa and detailed the main problems discussed and the main decisions reached. In that letter I omitted to tell you about one of the most important issues raised at the Synod, viz., the relation between the Potchefstroom University and the Potchefstroom Theological institution, a point also raised by you in your personal letter to me dated Oct. 19, 1938. In this letter I should like to tell you all about the relation between the two Potchefstroom institutions, and at the same time briefly indicate the position at the other South African centers of higher learning, particularly where the Dutch South African group proceed.

On this side of the border, citizens are chary of Canadian home, was said to have been started by German incendiaries. And on this side of the border, citizens are chary of Canadian home, was said to have been started by German incendiaries. And on this side of the border, citizens are chary of Canadian food-stuffs.

The University College and the Seminary at Potchefstroom

At Potchefstroom we have the two Colleges, the University and the Theological, working in the closest relation, having as a matter of fact had the same origin. When the Gereformeerde Church started the training of its own ministers in 1869 at the newly established Theological School at Burgersdorp, Cape Province, it found it absolutely necessary to give the future theological students a preparatory training in the fundamental secular letters and arts and partly also in the sciences. As a consequence the training of the future ministers of religion had a dual character right from the start: a preparatory secular education followed by a more extensive theological education. The further consequence was that the theological Seminary existed right from the beginning as two departments, the "Literary Department" and the Theological School itself. This literary department very soon developed itself into an independent department, in which besides the preliminary training of the future ministers of religion was also undertaken the teaching of candidates for the public University examinations of the old University of the Cape of Good Hope. In 1926 the General Synod decided to reorganize the work of the institution at Burgersdorp, mainly in extending the Literary Department. It was decided to appoint two Professors Literarium to take over the work and the responsibility of the literary department, and from now on there were four professors teaching at Burgersdorp. The literary and the theological training were now separated from each other, though the two departments were still united in the same institution, the Theological School. In 1975 the Synod resolved to make the Matriculation Certificate education at the University of the Cape of Good Hope prerequisite for admission to the theological course, which itself consisted later of a two years' literary followed by a three years' theological study, and so the Literary Department raised the standard of its work to two years' post matriculation study and still conducted its own Literary examination for those who intended to proceed to the theological course.

In 1995 the Theological School was moved with its Literary Department to Potchefstroom. This was a wise move, because from now on the two institutions grew rapidly. Up to April, the Literary Department, with its own professors and students, remained an integral part of the Theological School. Like the Theological department it was financed, administered, and controlled solely by the Gereformeerde Church through its Body of Gereformeerde Church. But from April, 1939, the literary department, having by now developed into a private University institution, accepted a subsidy from the State on condition that it should in the near future be definitely separated from the Theological School. The separation did actually take place in the same year and from now on the Literary Department became
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known as the Potchefstroom University College for Christian Higher Education, but still as a private institution, mainly under church control. In 1920 this new University institution was incorporated upon decision of the General Synod and by act of parliament and thus became one of the State-aided institutions of South Africa, a position it still holds. The Potchefstroom University College had now lost its church control and became a State-aided institution. It was made training place for the professors of the Gereformeerde Church and partly by the State through its own Council on which were represented the Church, the State, and private Contributors as well as past Students. It was made with the theological training in 1917 when the Ministers in the Transvaal which made it vitally important for the Dutch Reformed Church to have a training place also in the Transvaal. The Synod of the Church appointed a professor of theology at the University College to look after the interests of the theological students belonging to that church. The Church, which appointed a professor of theology at the University College had now partly control of the University College, and in the official student life and activities the two bodies of students live and act as one.

As a matter of fact, the present position is one of the closest relations of the professors of the Theological College are also the professors of theology at the University College, and several professors of the University College staff do teaching work at the Theological College. The continual expansion and growth of these institutions such an established legal contractual relation would have to be continually changed. The Synd, however, found it necessary to define by written contract the relation between the two institutions and referred the matter to the next meeting of the General Synod in 1942.

The Theological Faculty at Pretoria University

At Pretoria the position is totally different. There are two existing separate institutions. While the legal training is given there, is done at the University Precoria itself in the Faculty of Theology. The University institution at Pretoria is in independent control of the University College staff, shall be full members of the University Senate. The professors of theology were not over-enthusiastic in their allegiance to the Stellenbosch theological professors, the late Dr. J. du Plessis, who after a long drawn-out and bitter struggle was first suspended and afterwards dismissed. He had many sympathizers, and especially in the Transvaal section of his church, and they were in a majority. The church asked the Synod to consider the question of the future theological students for the admission examination at the Transvaal which made it vitally important for the Dutch Reformed Church to have a training place also in the Transvaal. The Synod decided upon the training of its own ministers in the Transvaal at the University of Pretoria on practical grounds. The Nelson Commission ad hoc recommended that it was not advisable to draw up a legal contract between the two institutions both as one. As a matter of fact, the present position is one of the closest relations. The综合性 of the students of the Theological College and the Potchefstroom University College for Christian Higher Education is very great. This became clear at the last General Synod of the Gereformeerde Church at Bloemfontein. The Syndnal Commission ad hoc recommended that it was not advisable to draw up a legal contract between the two institutions in the Faculty of Theology was instituted at the University of Pretoria for the express purpose of giving the Transvaal Dutch Reformed Church the opportunity for itself to have its own theological training. The professors of theology were inaugurated, all members of the Dutch Reformed Church, to undertake the necessary training and teaching work were members of the Dutch Reformed Church. The Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church by the University Council and are responsible for the following departments: Old Testament exegesis and theology; Church History, Dogma, and Church law; Dogmatics and the Science of Religion. The course runs parallel to that of the Hervormde Church and lasts the same number of years. At Pretoria we have thus a University institution serving in its two independent sections of the Faculty of Theology as the Theological Seminarium for all church organizations. The institution of the Synod of the church, caused by cooperation of all church organizations. The institution of the Synod of the church, caused by cooperation of all church organizations. The institution of the Synod of the Church for the examinations of the old University of the Cape of Good Hope. It developed in 1918 into the present University of Stellenbosch, the biggest of all Afrikaans speaking University institutions in the South African Union. As three institutions exist side by side, and they are: a professor for Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis; one for Church History, the History of Dogma, and Church Law; one for Christian Ethics, New Testament Exegesis and Theology; and one for the Science of Theology.

The Seminary at Stellenbosch

At Stellenbosch in the Cape Province we have the oldest Theological Seminarium in South Africa. As far back as 1847 the old Dutch Reformed Church at the Cape began feeling the necessity of South African trained ministers. Previously all ministers were obtained from overseas; the English government at the Cape, trying to anglicise the Boers, importing ministers from Presbyterian Scotland; while the Dutch Church itself was looking to the old mother country, the Netherlands, both for its supply of trained ministers. In 1847 the Cape Synod decided upon the establishment of its own Theological Seminarium, but this did not materialize until 1859 when the present Stellenbosch Theological Seminarium was started. It was from then on partly controlled by the English government at the Cape, trying to anglicise the Boers, importing ministers from Presbyterian Scotland; while the Dutch Church itself was looking to the old mother country, the Netherlands, both for its supply of trained ministers.
view and in its teaching, not necessarily non- or anti-Christian, but definitely not Calvinistic. There are many of course many of that University men of Calvinistic conviction, but the institution is not like the Potchefstroom University institution pronouncedly Calvinistic in its point of view and in its teaching.

Stellenbosch University also has Faculty of Theology, in which the same men serve as professors who serve at the Theological Seminary, but in this Faculty there are no systematic, or the appointment of the Seminary’s professors to the University. The conduct of the Faculty is more careful, but rather of convenience. The position is thus distinctly different from that of Potchefstroom and at Pretoria. The University professors of Theology at Stellenbosch are not apprised of any single man in this present confusion of the countries of the world, but the noble character, has determined in dealing with international questions, to hold out of the war, and to work for international peace, for good-will, and to deal with the problems of the day in a Christian-like way.

It is the will of our Tsar that Bulgaria shall remain neutral during these days of warfare and butchery. We do not believe that the nations of the world will solve their problems by destroying contemporary civilization. There is no other way, but the way of the cross. So, as you see, we out here near the Black Sea, are not "premillenarians." Perhaps we shall never be, because we do believe that in the end, by the preaching of the blessed Gospel, the nations of the world shall become the Kingdom of God.

Faithfully yours in Christ,
LAMBRY MISIKOFF,
Pastor of the Evangelical Church, Bourgas.

An International Calvinistic Library

THE visit of Professor Bouma to the Beddington Free Grace Library last June (during his stay in London) proved a most happy event and I readily accede to his request to give the readers of THE CALVIN FORUM a short account of the history, present position and aims of the enterprise. God has a way of using insignificant means to further the interest of His people everywhere. He has seen to it and is being remarkably displayed in the birth and growth of the Calvinistic Library Movement of which we write.

Motive

Less than ten years ago (1931), as I surveyed a small but somewhat unique collection of works by Calvinistic authors in my home, I was seized with an irresistible urge to make it the basis of a public and international circulating and reference library of works advancing the distinctive doctrines of Grace. In other words, a truly Protestant and Evangelical Library of world-wide scope, calculated to influence a return to the fundamental standards of Scripture and to arouse a lively interest in the truths which have been at the root of every great Revival of spiritual religion. It seemed evident to me that there was a need of some systematic attempt to gather together in one Institution thesource authorities and literary heritage of Evangelical Calvinistic Theology in all ages and climes, for the benefit of posterity (independent of race or denomination), the furtherance of the Gospel, and the extension of the dear Saviour’s Kingdom.

First Steps

This desire was quickly translated into action, and the proposal communicated to Mr. Fred Kirby (Minister of Staplehurst, Kent, a decided critic and one-time publisher of the works of J. C. Philpot, William Huntington and others). This “Father in Israel” warmly approved the venture, promptly dispatched 30 parcels of priceless treasures, agreed to become first President, and strove with constant energy and zeal to strengthen our hands until taken to the Banqueting House above of which he so loved to preach and write.

Revival

Mr. Kirby became deeply interested in the mighty Revival of the Eighteenth Century under Jonathan Edwards in America, Whitefield in England, Howell Harris in Wales, Cennick in Ireland, and Robe in Scotland, and this subject forms one of the chief sections of the Library, books dealing with it having been compiled from a large and varied collection of material. The foremost zeal of Calvinists in this and other ages forms a complete historic refutation of the charge of Armenians that Calvinism kills missionary effort, and it is our constant prayer that the “Free Grace Library” may serve as a powerful medium for the furtherance of a revival of true religion.

Progress

Immediately the existence and aims of the Library became known, friends from all over Great Britain, and from as distant a point as Australia, took an active interest, and by the beginning of the year 1938 the Library was increased tenfold, a temporary building was erected with the help of funds raised by the Rev. J. C. Philpot, and the Calvinistic Library, now containing 20,000 volumes, made, we believe, the most comprehensive of its kind in the world.

This Providence unfolds the Book,
And makes its Channel sound:
Each opening leaf and every stroke
Fulfills some deep design.

Plan

The arrangement of the Library has been so planned that main prominance is given to works on or by those whose efforts God conspicuously owned and blessed and the results of whose labors, and from as distant a point as Australia, began to send valuable books, and in some cases whole libraries. Before we were aware, the Library was increased tenfold, a temporary building was erected with the help of funds raised by the Rev. J. C. Philpot, and the Calvinistic Library, now containing 20,000 volumes, made, we believe, the most comprehensive of its kind in the world.

Lambry Misikoff,
Pastor of the Evangelical Church, Bourgas.

A Letter from the Balkans

SOME years ago, in a class in the University of Chicago, the professor who was conducting a class in sociology remarked in effect: Bulgaria is the Balkan's sport field of firecrackers. Whether the gentleman was justified in making this statement or not, I am not presently to discuss this matter.

As I think over the remark made by that university professor so many years ago, I would venture to suggest that, after all, he may be right in a way. In the years gone by the Bulgarians were indulging a great deal in war. You need not go very far.

In one of your personal letters to me you also raised the point of our struggle over here for Christian national education. I may report that during July of this year we held over here at Bloemfontein a most important and representative Conference on this problem of Christian national education in our primary and secondary schools.

Very cordially yours,
J. CH. CONTRZE.

November, 1939

LAMBRY MISIKOFF.
labours were the most lasting. In other words, those whose work included the great intensity of God in revival and the effects of the sovereign love of God in the widespread conversion of the worst of sinners. As a background to the new book on section 269, a committee formed dealing with the History of the Church of God throughout the ages; its great champions, its ministers, their works, their sermons, and the records of their particular sphere in extension of the Kingdom of God.

The undertaking is still in its infancy. The scope is tremendous and the difficulties great. But the quest is glorious, and if God grant His continued aid and spirit of fresh champions for its cause, who will measure its possibilities or number the benefits which by such simple instrumentality are offered to the glory of God and the extension of His dear Kingdom!

GEORGE WILLIAMS.


NEWS ITEMS AND COMMENTS

Theological Discussion

Solomon admonished “my son” and said “of making many books there is none end; and much study is weariness of the flesh.” Many a reader of Reformed persuasion in the Netherlands, is thinking about this admonition, because another book has been published on “The Covenant of God.” Dr. G. Ch. Aalders is the author. A good deal of controversy about the author’s position is already under way. Most important point under discussion so far, is the question of the Lord’s house of the Covenant. Grace, or its Mediator? Dr. Aalders is reported to have stated his position unequivocally: Christ is the Head! And Aalders is sure that his position is shared by all Reformed, thinking men. As a background of his position is his own section 269 publishing on the sinners. As a back­ground to the new book on section 269, a committee formed dealing with the History of the Church of God throughout the ages; its great champions, its ministers, their works, their sermons, and the records of their particular sphere in extension of the Kingdom of God.

Discriminating Against Churches

In the good state of Mississippi it is illegal to bequeath money or property to a church, or an institution related to a church, such as a college, an orphanage, or a hospital. Section 269 and 270 of the State constitution definitely forbid giving by last will and testament any money or property to any church or religious organization. Two amendments are going to be placed before the voters at the November elections. An amendment repeals section 269 outright. The other amends section 270 so that property may be bequeathed to religious organizations if the will is made 90 days before death, and (if there is a husband, or wife or child or grandchild) devises not more than one-third of the estate. If land is devised it is taxed as usual, but must be sold within 10 years from the date acquired.

As is to be expected, the churches of Mississippi are waging a strenuous campaign to see that the amendments receive the necessary number of votes. It is strange that these sections of the constitution (which was adopted in 1899) should have remained on the books so long.

Doctrinal Issues at Dutch Synod

Speaking of strange situations: The Synod of the Reformed churches in the Netherlands appointed in 1936 a committee to study the doctrines which in recent years caused a good deal of controversy. The Synod of 1939 in session at Sneek, appointed a committee to advise Synod in treating the reports of the former committee. But lo and behold, Professor Hepp and Professor Schilder, leaders of the opposing factions, members of the 1936 committee, are both included in the 1939 committee. (The other members of the new committee are Dr. W. Van Es, Dr. D. Dijkstra, Dr. J. Ridderbos, Dr. E. Kraan, Rev. T. Hagen, and four elders.) Theirs is the task to weigh and judge their experiences. For each subscriber the church gets 25 cents and the American Bible Society 10 cents. The churches are asked to help build up the circulation. For each subscriber the church gets 25 cents, and the American Bible Society also 25 cents.

Riding the Churches

In this good land of ours there is a publishing company which glorifies the human body. As it is to be expected, it is the woman’s body which receives the honor and the glory. This company has put out this year a new magazine. It deals with “Faith,” and “Amazing answers to prayer.” On the front cover it asks, “Why not try God?” The material published in the magazine is paid for by the company. The churches are asked to help build up the circulation. For each subscriber the church gets 25 cents, and the American Bible Society also 25 cents.

The true believer in Jesus Christ will always bear testimony to the glory of God. But he will think twice before he sells his sacred experience to a publishing company. But in turn is bent upon financial success. Let us not confuse prophets and profits.

Moreover, look at the magazines at the Macfadden company publishes, and you will see who it is that asks for your spiritual experiences.

Music and the Sermon

During recent months, many church periodicals have either by editorials or special articles emphasized the need of preaching the Gospel in the services of worship. Some papers make a plea for sound Biblical preaching. Others ask for a more important place for the sermon.

Dr. S. M. Zwemer in the Oct. 13 Intelligencer-Leader writes about “Jubal Cain Invades the Sanctuary.” Says he: “Jubal Cain has conquered both the sacred and sacred pulpits. One has only to read the church notices in the metropolitan press, or listen to the radio to realize how music monopolizes the sanctuary at Advent or Easter. And the worshipper finds it easy to glut himself. All the sermons have the same formula; the last verse of the article, but space does not permit. Suffice it to say that we are glad to see renewed expressions of desire for the Word of God in the services on the Lord’s Day.”

J. G. VAN DYKE.
The early Christians had never been hypnotized by such nursery dreams. With far less knowledge, by far less acquaintance into the true nature of existence. They perceived that from the ephemeral, indeed, with none, theirs was a far deeper comprehension, standing immeasurably superior. The early Christians had never forgotten, 'our will to impress others to share my pleasure by inducing them to read it also. Undoubtedly I can best attain my purpose by quoting the author at some length."

Dixon has an interesting passage on actualism. It reads as follows (p. 40):

"The dear child! So simple was the faith of the rationalist, as simple as that of the medieval Christian. As simple? No, much simpler. The early Christians had never been hypnotized by such nursery dreams. With far less knowledge, by far less acquaintance into the true nature of existence. They perceived that from the ephemeral, indeed, with none, theirs was a far deeper comprehension, standing immeasurably superior. The early Christians had never forgotten, 'our will to impress others to share my pleasure by inducing them to read it also. Undoubtedly I can best attain my purpose by quoting the author at some length."

Dixon has an interesting passage on actualism. It reads as follows (p. 40):

"The dear child! So simple was the faith of the rationalist, as simple as that of the medieval Christian. As simple? No, much simpler. The early Christians had never been hypnotized by such nursery dreams. With far less knowledge, by far less acquaintance into the true nature of existence. They perceived that from the ephemeral, indeed, with none, theirs was a far deeper comprehension, standing immeasurably superior. The early Christians had never forgotten, 'our will to impress others to share my pleasure by inducing them to read it also. Undoubtedly I can best attain my purpose by quoting the author at some length."

Speaking of nineteenth century rationalism the writer says (p. 40):

"Aristotle thought there was nothing in the end that was not in the beginning. The beginning was prophetic, it foretold what was yet to come. In the view of Kant also, it was impossible to avoid the question, 'What to end, or for what purpose, for example, was to be the end or goal of that process which may ask what caused it, but the answer to that question does not explain the organism, whose use or object cannot be brushed cavalierly aside. Do not, I pray you, confuse causes with reasons. You are, let us say, present at a naval battle. You hear the salvos and see the destruction of a vessel. You describe, and rightly describe, the shell fire as the cause of its destruction. But the reason of the firing is quite another thing—a quarrel of two navies, for example, the need for it, its value must be considered. To suppose it an accidental variation is sheer absurdity ... The eye of the bird is adapted both to near and far vision. The butterfly's are drawn at a venison. These various eyes were meant to certain definite ends, the very obvious end in each case that the creature might have the advantage of vision, and that advantage of a kind specially suited to its own way of life. Except by reference to the purpose or use of these eyes you can say nothing sensible or intelligible about them. There are folk who tell you that these are fortuitous occurrences, that nature's bow was drawn at a venture, and that all her millions of arrows struck each the center of the target by sheer accident; they were aimed at nothing in particular. Were a painter without eyes—set to produce D. Vinc's Last Supper, Raphael's Dresden Madonna, Titian's Sacred and Profane Love, all by sprinkling canvases at random with a brush dipped in unseen and unselected colours, should we say that such an artist would be accomplished, and was endowed for me, namely, call attention to the book. They may thank me as I have done him.

There are two kinds of books which in general, there are exceptions, one does not find very profitable reading—those with whose every page one agrees, and those with whose every page one disagrees. The former offer little intellectual stimulus, the latter too seriously upset one's endocrine glands. From this point of view the book under consideration is almost ideal. One disagrees as enthusiastically with some passages as one agrees with others.

The result is an unusual book. It manifest on nearly every page that the man has something more than a mere bowing acquaintance with the whole history of philosophy from Plato to Bergson, and has a quite amazing acquaintance with the results of recent investigation in both the organic and inorganic sciences. Yet withal he carries his burden of learning lightly. Even James and Gilson, both Gifford lecturers, did not write with the same charm than Dixon. My purpose is to evaluate the book. It is, as I have already said, to invite others to share my pleasure by inducing them to read it also. Undoubtedly I can best attain my purpose by quoting the author at some length."

Dixon has an interesting passage on actualism. It reads as follows (p. 40):

"Aristotle thought there was nothing in the end that was not in the beginning. The beginning was prophetic, it foretold what was yet to come. In the view of Kant also, it was impossible to avoid the question, 'What to end, or for what purpose, for example, was to be the end or goal of that process which may ask what caused it, but the answer to that question does not explain the organism, whose use or object cannot be brushed cavalierly aside. Do not, I pray you, confuse causes with reasons. You are, let us say, present at a naval battle. You hear the salvos and see the destruction of a vessel. You describe, and rightly describe, the shell fire as the cause of its destruction. But the reason of the firing is quite another thing—a quarrel of two navies, for example, the need for it, its value must be considered. To suppose it an accidental variation is sheer absurdity ... The eye of the bird is adapted both to near and far vision. The butterfly's are drawn at a venison. These various eyes were meant to certain definite ends, the very obvious end in each case that the creature might have the advantage of vision, and that advantage of a kind specially suited to its own way of life. Except by reference to the purpose or use of these eyes you can say nothing sensible or intelligible about them. There are folk who tell you that these are fortuitous occurrences, that nature's bow was drawn at a venture, and that all her millions of arrows struck each the center of the target by sheer accident; they were aimed at nothing in particular. Were a painter without eyes—set to produce D. Vinc's Last Supper, Raphael's Dresden Madonna, Titian's Sacred and Profane Love, all by sprinkling canvases at random with a brush dipped in unseen and unselected colours, should we say that such an artist would be accomplished, and was endowed for me, namely, call attention to the book. They may thank me as I have done him.

There are two kinds of books which in general, there are exceptions, one does not find very profitable reading—those with whose every page one agrees, and those with whose every page one disagrees. The former offer little intellectual stimulus, the latter too seriously upset one's endocrine glands. From this point of view the book under consideration is almost ideal. One disagrees as enthusiastically with some passages as one agrees with others.

The result is an unusual book. It manifest on nearly every page that the man has something more than a mere bowing acquaintance with the whole history of philosophy from Plato to Bergson, and has a quite amazing acquaintance with the results of recent investigation in both the organic and inorganic sciences. Yet withal he carries his burden of learning lightly. Even James and Gilson, both Gifford lecturers, did not write with the same charm than Dixon. My purpose is to evaluate the book. It is, as I have already said, to invite others to share my pleasure by inducing them to read it also. Undoubtedly I can best attain my purpose by quoting the author at some length."


If the editor of The Calvin Forum were to receive today a review of Thackeray's Vanity Fair, or James' Varieties of Religious Experience, he would be justified in questioning the sanity of the reviewer. To review at this date the Gifford Lectures, "imperial and sacred," of Professor Dixon, the author of the "Rationalism and the Aims of Science," the latter too seriously upset one's endocrine glands. These various eyes were meant to certain definite ends, the very obvious end in each case that the creature might have the advantage of vision, and that advantage of a kind specially suited to its own way of life. Except by reference to the purpose or use of these eyes you can say nothing sensible or intelligible about them. There are folk who tell you that these are fortuitous occurrences, that nature's bow was drawn at a venture, and that all her millions of arrows struck each the center of the target by sheer accident; they were aimed at nothing in particular. Were a painter without eyes—set to produce D. Vinc's Last Supper, Raphael's Dresden Madonna, Titian's Sacred and Profane Love, all by sprinkling canvases at random with a brush dipped in unseen and unselected colours, should we say that such an artist would be accomplished, and was endowed..."
"I cannot accept the view of some theologians that man's animal ancestry may be set aside without anxiety as of no importance. The leader of the last century had no cause for alarm when Darwinism received the imprimatur of science, and that they needlessly exaggerated its bearing upon faith and doctrine. If man could be proved a separate and unique creation, it would do more for the situation for theologians. The old belief in the human species as a special creation, altogether peculiar and outstanding, laid a firm foundation for the great cataclysm of thought. Religion and ethics. No doubt he has by virtue of superior intelligence placed all the other tribes under his feet. The distinction is not so much one of balance, is this difference one of kind, or merely of degree? Such a difference as anyone can see between the octopus and the camel, the caterpillar and the eagle, or something far deeper? The churches have built high upon the difference, whatever it be, but have they built on quicksand or the eternal granite?"

He continues thus (p. 119): "The supreme attraction of Darwinism lay in its exclusion of special creation and the idea of purpose. That was its peculiar charm. For that reason it was exultantly received and proclaimed as the final truth. "It is very absurd," remarks Kant, 'to expect enlightenment from reason, and yet to dictate to her interest in the human or sub-human types found in Java, Pekin, have a faith, which so seized upon the mind, such was the devotion, but we cannot form None the less it was agreed that the doctrine must be true, and there followed a sustained effort to prove it true. Never has there been a greater grandeur and industry displayed in search of corroborative evidence. We see it today in the search for fossil remains of early man or man's immediate predecessors, the interment of the human or sub-human types found in Java, Pekin, Piltdown, Heidelberg, Neanderthal and Rhodesia. Here you have a faith, which so seized upon the mind, such was the devotion it inspired, as to energize thought to find the grounds upon which it might support itself—a belief that it was to be true, which preceded the evidence and why? Because the thought that it might not be true was utterly hateful and intolerable. With the utmost frankness Huxley himself gives us the clue to the culmination with which Darwinism was received, and espoused before it was demonstrated. The doctrine, he tells us, did men of science the immense service of freeing them from the dilemma, "Therefore, accept the evidence and then have you to put in its place?" Expressed succinctly, we may say, the theory was a God-send to the disbelievers in God. It postulated at least, though it could not finally expunge, the alternative of God as the cause of all things. For the moment the unwelcome concept of a creator sinks below the horizon of thought, and so ceases from troubling. Mysteries, indeed, are not to be excluded, but we reason away from reality, in the far distance. They become, however, less vexatious, as someone we dislike may be forgotten in his absence, much less examined as a problem. Religion is therefore of infinite and, and free of his immediate company many philosophers and men of science breathed more freely. The theory eased the mind, and offered leisure to develop further the alternative of man as against supernaturalism."

"And thus (p. 121): "Descent, however, from your mountain height, look a little closer and what do you find? Everywhere a pertinacious discontinuity everywhere where races and barriers, separation, a great diversity of disconnected species. Examine into the matter, condescend to particulars, to details, and you come to a dead stop. Throughout the whole scene you are at a loss to say exactly how a single species has given birth to another. You rub your eyes. How is this possible? Since evolution is a certainty, why did the peer, particularly does so obscurely! "I will confound Batsheva," which in the abstract are apprehended and accepted with facility, fade away before the concrete case. It is easy to imagine how man was evolved from the Anceolus, but impossible to show how Veronica polita were evolved, either one from the other, or both from a common form."

"All then is not easy sailing.""}

The rationale of leadership and Brigham Young loom large from the pages of this long story.

In one of the chapters Joseph Smith is called "a philosopher with a capital "M, a master of a method," as far as human beings are concerned. In fact, the author does qualify it. Smith is a mystic and visionary with the tremendous ability to inspire people to follow him and his teachings. In an age when wild-eyed prophets were despised, on many a green hill he conducted the schemes of thought save in their manner of execution. You may stop. Throughout the whole the states. At last the persecuted "saints" had found a home far away from their "Christian" tormenters. The hardy people survived plagues and clouds of grasshoppers and internal dissensions. But the United States caught up with them when Utah was taken into the Union. Then sincere men and small, mean men took up the cry and the sword again. And after the death of Brigham Young there appeared no leader strong enough to stop the devastating flood. The third and last part of the book presents a sorry picture of decline and deterioration when leaderless and less convinced, many of the "saints" became "anti." The book concludes that the "saints," the sister-wives of the "saints," became the sons of the gentiles. The book presents the amazing evidence of what a people will do under the inspiring leadership of one or two men. It is an enigma why thousands should fall under the spell of Joseph Smith's under-rife and over-rife visions. But the fact is that they did. This moving story of the people and Palestine. And when a man was told to go, he simply went. Explain it if you can. There are commendable features in the Mormon set-up. Their leaders, no co-operating, no sharing. Their leaders had long of any kind, their readiness to suffer for the faith are no all these and more are in their favor.

The book points out the principle that, although the doctrine in the nineteenth century was the result of that startling doctrine of "celestial marriage," that is, polygamy. When Smith first announced it, his leaders were shocked, and some went. When those leaders in later years announced it, the people were thunderstruck, and some left. But gradually the teaching was practiced by more and more, and that brought grief. In the east ministers and editors thundered
against this open display of immorality, and immoral mobs became apostles of chastity. When the wave of opposition swept against this open display of immorality, and immoral mobs their shadow side. Secret faults, family squabbles, murders, profanity in conversations and sermons are all here. Yet all the

The book is too long because of repetitions, and though it weakens toward the end, yet there are sustaining passages of beauty. The pages that tell of the great exodus over barren plains are high poetry. There the aged and the little ones die and are buried, and men are grim in the presence of

EVANGELISM ON A REFORMED BASIS

This is an eminently worth-while volume. Twelve experts in the field of missions to de-Christianized folk, collaborated to a great extent. There is also an attempt to reflect the practical layman. Dr. F. W. Grosheide, a theological professor at the Free Reformed University of Amsterdam, edited the book and contributed the first two chapters. Two ministers rendered him assistance, one of whom wrote three articles on the first sixteen comprising the "Handbook." The book is of more than duodecimo size and numbers 387 rather closely printed pages. In some respects its publication, it is well bound and attractive in point of appearance.

A peep between its pleasing covers at once impresses the prospective reader with the splendour value of the bibliographical volume. The index tells us that the material presented in the collection of essays, is well organized. Like Gaul of ancient times it is divided into three parts, viz., "Algemeen," "Historisch" and "Practisch Deel," respectively. The first part, covering 128 pages, deals with the principles underlying the work of reclaiming those who have been lost to God and His church. As the very title of the volume indicates, the authors take as fundamental divisions of the subject, those in their opinion are the distinctively Reformed principles and methods of the great work of the church of bringing back to its maternal bosom those who walk in the ways of the prodigal son. In chapters entitled, "De Gesagteelde Bekeerders" and "De Gereformeerde Evangelisatie" and "De Evangelisatie en de Kerk," Professor Grosheide presents a mass of fine material, both clearly and perspicuously. It is not an easy task to write a handbook of such a subject and the task is one of which the author can be proud.

The "Historisch Deel" comprises but 40 pages. Fact is, that, sad to say, the movement in the Dutch churches, which aims to return lost sheep to the fold, is of recent origin, and does not enjoy sufficient support. It would seem, that those who work in this field of work, should be encouraged by all who can help them. This is a common one. In America, where the mountains, wild and bleak, are fairly teeming with sheep and lambs of all descriptions who have wandered far from the fold, is not as yet fully realized. Here, it is simply a matter of life and death. God's people, too, are not yet generally aware, and if awake at all, hardly wide awake, to the crying need of "Gereformeerde Evangelisatie." However, the few who have been awakened by the elec
cussion presents ample evidence of the happy circumstance that our Dutch brethren are, in growing numbers, fired with holy zeal to perform a task long neglected, and to perform it well, theologically as well as methodologically. The "Praktisch Deel" has received the lion's share of the space the book affords: it comprises pages 176 to 378, more than a hundred pages in excess of the space-limits of the other two departments put together. These proportions run contrary to the reputation which has been given to the American Reformed Church for being too preoccupied with practical questions and too little interested in the affairs of the church on paper. The relative brevity of the first, or fundamental, part should, the present reviewer is sure, not be explained from loss of interest on the part of our Dutch brethren, but due to an instinctive sense of the great need of engaging in "Gereformeerde Evangelisatie" long before all the theoretical angles and aspects on the subject have been sufficiently multiplied.

At any rate, the authors of this splendid book devote a generous measure of their available space to such subjects as, "De Zondagschool," "Arbeid onder Jongens en Meisjes," "Arbeid in Gemeenten," "Kerken en Gereiformeerde Kerk," "De Hetekerk," "De Protestprediking," "Lectuur-verplichting," "De Roomschelijke en de Secten" and "Evangelisatie in de Ruïmeren Kerk." Perhaps, there is more emphasis on the "Ruïmeren Kerk" because in a measure, the far-flung front along which our Dutch brethren are attacking the problem, growing more acute and pressing every-where every day, of turning back the tide of self-exiled members of the Kingdom of God.

This "Handbook voor Gereformeerde Evangelisatie" should be read and studied by all who can read Dutch, particularly by those who, as officers of the church of God, are charged with the responsibility of the work under study. From those who are attending the return, under God's blessing of the wayward who are wandering to their death in the wilderness of the present wicked world. As to those whom the language of the book may present difficulties, there is nothing to prevent them from confining their attention to the smaller jobs and from certain necessary adaptations, should make it available for them, in order that its great value and usefulness need not be confined to the relatively few among us who have a good command of the Dutch language.

AS TO PREACHING


Professor Montgomery's choice of title was not a happy one. Preachers have been prepared for preaching; they are not being prepared for preaching. Of course, preachers prepare for preaching, and that is already been preempted, unless it be such titles as Reformed Homiletics, or or any other Homiletics, or is neither explicit nor emphatic. And to make matters no better, it should be conceded, that practically all conceivable titles for such a book as this set out to write, have already been preempted, unless it be such titles as, Reformed, Lutheran, Roman Catholic Homiletics, and the like. The late Professor Bastiaan van Schip, of the American Reformed Seminary, styled his chef d'oeuvre "Gereformeerde Homiletiek."

Preparing Preachers to Preach is a typically twentieth century American treatise on Homiletics. It is characteristically pragmatic. It does not look into the fundamental problems involved in the business of preaching at such a time as this or any other Homileal theology, i.e., the theology that answers the question: What has God, who instituted preaching, to say on this head in His Word? This is a common one. In this book. Any book on preaching must necessarily be incomplete, and, by that token, defective without it. The book abounds in practical counsels, enforced by illustrations from ministerial life. Many of these have been served to prospective ministers so often in Homiletical literature, that they are quite stale and rather trite.

One can read the author's orthodoxy between the lines. But it is neither explicit nor emphatic. And to make matters no better, he mentions outstanding liberals in such a fraternizing way, as to leave the impression with raw recruits for the ministry, that he commends their books and the theology they represent. As to the plan of the book, the organization of the material is what one could wish for, at least it is a lack of structural precision, which leads to confused thinking and lack of cohesiveness. Besides, a good part of the book deals with the pastoral background of the preacher rather than his pulpit labors in his study. Any book on preaching must necessarily be incomplete, and, by that token, defective without it. The book abounds in practical counsels, enforced by illustrations from ministerial life. Many of these have been served to prospective ministers so often in Homiletical literature, that they are quite stale and rather trite.

The volume does not inspire, carry forward, enrich Homiletical study, however much need there is of books doing just that. It is, in fact, a book of the voice that below the surface there is a lack of structural precision, which leads to confused thinking and lack of cohesiveness. Besides, a good part of the book deals with the pastoral background of the preacher rather than his pulpit labors in his study. Any book on preaching must necessarily be incomplete, and, by that token, defective without it. The book abounds in practical counsels, enforced by illustrations from ministerial life. Many of these have been served to prospective ministers so often in Homiletical literature, that they are quite stale and rather trite.

S. VOLBEDA.
ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

HST ENEGOND DES HEEREN, By De J. G. Fesenroed, J. H. Kok.
Kampen. 1893. Cloth fl $2.50.

THE sub-title of this handsomely volume of 242 pages: "Korte Verklaring van den Heidelbergen Catechismen," expresses the purpose which it was designed to serve. By qualifying the Exposition (Verklaring) of the venerable catechism as he does (Korte Verklaring), the author has no desire to encourage those to buy and read his book, who appreciate the old Heidelberg enough to be eager to study it at home, but who lack the funds to purchase, and the leisure to study, Dr. A. Kuyper's E Vite, or Dr. Bavinck's two volumes of catechism sermons, or who discover that Dr. Schilder's Exposition of the Heidelberg catechism, published serially as a supplement of De Reformatie, is largely beyond their reach, and in these the volume now under review should be welcome. For it indeed explains the book they love so well, but in brief compass. It is more than a paraphrase. It is what may be called an interpretative expansion of the text of the catechism. The author has succeeded in packing as much commentary in his book as is consistent with its spatial limits and its popular purpose. And the book has a distinctly homileal ring throughout.

The appearance of the book leads one to think that the old catechism has not yet lost its charm. May it never suffer this loss: it is a pearl of great price, which may be had, and enjoyed increasingly, and preserved indefinitely, at small cost indeed.

S. VOLKEDA.

THE FAITH OF EDWIN LEWIS


ONE of the most interesting phenomena in the religious world of recent years is the evident shrinking away from the general direction toward which Modernism seems to be going. Leaders within the movement itself have themselves assumed a more or less decided attitude toward the one group with whose names they were so intimately associated. Fosdick, the popular spokesman among them, was a severe critic. Lewis, representing the professional group, was not another. Dr. Lewis was perhaps the more thoughtlessly in this recoil. The impact of Barthianism exerted its influence upon him. There was also in the minds of some of these theologians a recognition that Modernism had failed to stand on its own pragmatic test. Its fruits were extremely disappointing. And such theologians are sounding the call for the "New Orthodoxy" in which the supernatural character of Christianity may be reaffirmed. This volume before us constitutes one of those calls.

In this book there is an insistence that the representatives of Christianity are to proclaim and not to put too much faith in logical argumentation. The Gospel carries its own authority. Again the author is tired of preaching of Christianity in terms of social and ethical values. Whatever values it may have along these lines, it has only because it is vastly more than either of them. Working men and women, in league with a Christian, it is averred, for nothing less than faith in God through Christ Jesus is demanded on the part of one who may have been called after that most precious name. The author contends, further, for the unity of Christian faith. He deplores the practice of tearing it apart and selecting only that which may fit into some scheme of human notions. Lewis has no illusions about the goodness of man. Man is his estimation a sinner that needs salvation by the grace of God. Finally his contention that "human flesh became the tabernacle, the dwelling-place of the Son of God" as a statement of the incarnation (though subject to various interpretations) will sound like music in the ears of those whose faith in the real incarnation has never been shaken.

It will be a bit gratuitous to assume that Lewis has entered the fold of traditional orthodoxy. Just a gleaming or two will give us my contention. Traditional orthodoxy insists upon faith in the infallibility of the Word of God. Lewis is not altogether without appreciation for the work of the modern Bible. Anxiously he seeks a middle of immense importance of decisive import. Traditional orthodoxy cannot have fellowship with the New Orthodoxy except on that ground. Then, again, the facts recorded in the Bible are not always appreciated as such by Lewis. But this too is the marking of the Ascension—a great truth which we can ruin, if we literalize it, but which we can work into the structure of Christian faith when we take it as we should, and read it as indicating that he who gave himself to be a new and living way remains that new and living way forever more."

S. VOLKEDA.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

The World's Saturday Night, By Wm. E. Biederwolf. The Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 167 pages. Price $1.00. This is a baker's dozen of sermons by the well-known and popular pulpiteer. It deals with pertinent and up-to-date subjects. Its style is pithy, challenging, and loaded with interesting illustration.

The Whole Armour of God. By Albert Hughes. Zondervan, 137 pages. Price $1.00. Eleven sermons by a popular Canadian preacher who has traveled far and wide at various Bible Conferences and who, upon the request of his audiences, offers them in printed form to the public.

The Bible and Things to Come. By David Freeman. Zondervan, 136 pages. Price $1.00. Ten sermons by a Presbyterian minister in Philadelphia dealing with the things pertaining to the end of the world. The sermons are far more the fruit of exegesis than the usual run of sermons on this subject offered to the public today.


In the Land of Cromwell and Bunyan. By W. R. Wrighton. Zondervan, 100 pages. Price $1.00. In this volume philosopher Wrighton turns to be an historian and a descriptive writer. In captivating style he presents the geographical, political, and religious backgrounds of the important men named in the title.

The Higher Path. By F. J. Thorn. Zondervan, 165 pages. Price $1.00. Twelve sermons by a Baptist preacher from Texas. There is here a spontaneity of expression suggestive of extemporaneous speaking. The sermons are, however, well constructed. The tone is deeply evangelical.

Life by the Son. By D. G. Barnhouse. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 167 pages. Price $1.00. Here are five practical sermons on the subject of holy living. The following topics are discussed; assurance, knowledge, cleansing, walking, and darkness.


GOD'S GOLD

Come, tramp the woods with me And feast your eyes. Autumn has come, The season that transmutes The forest into purest gold! These are not trees, That's not a maple, Nor this an oak. This is God's artistry! This is God's gold! J. AIME DEU.

USE MY WORDS

Lord, sanctify thy gift—use it for blessing. Let not one word of mine cast others down; Let me not stoop to small retaliations When words of others cause an inward frown. Give me the answer soft that turneth anger—Grant me the lifting word that brings a smile; Make me too humble to depend on me—Use Thou, O Lord, the gift that thou hast given Always and only in reflecting Thee.