

Calvin University

Calvin Digital Commons

The Calvin Forum

University Publications

1941

The Calvin Forum

Calvin College and Seminary

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum

Recommended Citation

Calvin College and Seminary, "The Calvin Forum" (1941). *The Calvin Forum*. 66.
https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum/66

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Calvin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Calvin Forum by an authorized administrator of Calvin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dbm9@calvin.edu.



the **CALVIN**
ORUM

Democracy and Christianity
An Editorial

The Fourth Commandment
The Westminster View

An Ideal Creation
In the Light of Science

Jesus' Resurrection
Its Apologetic Significance

Dutch Reformed Churches
In European Countries

Letters

Chips

Reviews

Verse

VOL. VI, NO. 10

TWO DOLLARS
A YEAR

MAY, 1941

The CALVIN FORUM

Published by the Calvin Forum Board of Publication

THE CALVIN FORUM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

CLARENCE BOUMA..... *Managing Editor*
HENRY J. RYSKAMP HENRY J. VAN ANDEL
HENRY SCHULTZE JACOB G. VANDEN BOSCH

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

G. J. D. AALDERS..... *Netherlands*
ARTHUR ALLEN *Australia*
STUART BERGSMAN..... *Northern India*
ALLEN CABANISS..... *The South*
R. J. COBB..... *Britain*
J. CHR. COETZEE..... *South Africa*
FRANK DE JONG..... *Los Angeles*
HARRY A. DYKSTRA..... *China*
MARK FAKKEMA..... *Educational News*
R. A. FINLAYSON..... *Scotland*
C. GRIKMAN *Russia*
EDWARD HEEREMA..... *The East*
S. LEIGH HUNT..... *London*
J. GRAHAM MILLER..... *New Zealand*
LAMBRY M. MISHKOFF..... *The Balkans*
G. J. PENNING..... *Near East*
P. PRINS *Netherlands*
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH..... *South India*
WM. CHILDS ROBINSON..... *Atlanta*
JENO SEBESTYEN *Budapest*
EDWARD J. TANIS..... *Chicago*
WILLIAM VERWOLF *Canada*
CHARLES VINCZE..... *Magyar News*

Address all editorial correspondence to
Managing Editor, THE CALVIN FORUM, Frank-
lin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S.E., Grand
Rapids, Michigan.

Address all subscription and circulation cor-
respondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Business
Office, at the same address.

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly, ex-
cept 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.

VOLUME VI, NO. 10

MAY, 1941

Contents

Editorial

Christianity and Democracy	203
Must They Starve?	203
Maintaining American Institutions.....	204

Articles

The Fourth Commandment: According to the Westminster Standards.....	<i>John Murray</i> 204
Science and an Ideal Creation.....	<i>Dudley Joseph Whitney</i> 207
The Resurrection of Jesus.....	<i>Anne W. Kuhn</i> 211
Dutch Reformed Churches in European Countries.....	<i>G. Besselaar</i> 214
Krisnapolski Twits Ala Bandon and Gets a Reply.....	217

From Our Correspondents

A London Letter.....	219
Items from Chicago.....	219
Grand Rapids Notes	220

Around the Book Table

A Scripture Study in Heredity.....	222
A History of Ethics	223
The Sovereignty of God.....	223
Utilizing Life's Experiences	224
Zwemer Writes Again.....	224

Verse

Motherhood	218
First Lord's Day.....	218

EDITORIALS

Christianity and Democracy

KEEN observers have noted that no healthy democracy seems possible except where Christianity permits (or is permitted to let) its wholesome leavening processes to be felt. However, it should also be observed that a democracy seems to be very fertile soil for the growth of a vigorous humanism. There seems to be some reason for this strange alliance. Though the three may seem to be wide apart in their conception of God—Democracy indifferent to Him, Humanism opposed to Him, and Christianity on His side—yet there seems to be a convergence in the matter of this appreciation of man. The ideal of democracy “is the fulfilment of personality in a community of free men capable of taking responsibility for their own destiny.” The high conception of human worth that lies back of this ideal is easy to detect though it may be difficult to state. Christianity regards man as a creature made in the image of God and capable by divine grace to become sons of God. It presents man as head of the created universe and as the chief object of the divine work of redemption. That is the reason it is adapted to all men regardless of their domestic, social, intellectual and economic standing. That is the reason why “democracy in Christian countries professed belief in the worth of common men, in equality of opportunity and in good will toward all men.” In an atmosphere so charged with a warm appreciation of man, humanism can find itself tolerably at home. Had humanism been satisfied to be a sort of a movement interested in promoting practical philanthropic interest, Christianity would not have raised its voice in such loud and vehement protests against it. But, it was not satisfied with its humble position and insisted on becoming a religion, and there lies the danger in our devotion to democracy in these days of crises. This point was properly raised by G. T. Thomas recently in these words, “But the error against which we must be most on our guard in our country is not that of denying all connection between religion and democracy, but that of making democracy into a religion.” There is the danger of making the *Vox populi* identical with *Vox Dei*, or of going further as the humanists have done, namely of discarding the idea of *Vox Dei* entirely. It behooves us to emphasize the tremendous difference between a form of government and a religion, between democracy and Christianity. And let it be remembered that a *true* democracy has a religious basis and

cannot long endure unless it tolerates the mother who deserves some credit for its birth and who is interested in its growth and health. H. S.

Must They Starve?

HERBERT HOOVER, that great humanitarian, has been making himself very busy in recent months about the lot of the people in the occupied zones across the Atlantic. His interest is not difficult to understand. He was the Food Administrator during World War I. He has moved among hideous scenes. He has seen the agonies of famine. He has heard the pleadings of children, the fierce demands of mothers for the right of their children to live. He has seen relief stations and hospitals filled with distorted minds and emaciated bodies, due to the ravages of starvation. He now sees conditions as being far worse than those of a score of years ago. He asserts that in one and one-half years of the present war there are 100,000,000 more people short of food than after three years of the last war. 300,000,000 are already on rations. The most immediate danger and the greatest suffering are among the 70,000,000 people of the democracies which have been overrun by the German armies. And in the wake of this creeping famine is the devastating work of uncontrollable contagious disease. This man, no longer in the prime of life, is spending his declining powers in the attempt to be permitted to do something for the starving millions. But Great Britain demurs, because the proposed plan to feed the starving may aid the enemy. The Americans are slow to respond because, opportunists that we are, we want to be sure that somehow the stretching out of the helping hand will pay. So it seems necessary to waste his efforts to prove to the English that such relief as we may want to give will not be harmful to them and to the Americans, that it will bring rich returns to us. It's the old selfish spirit of man that demands that no mercy and no help be rendered until we can be sure that it pays in some form, or that it may mean no loss. It is tragic that men and nations cannot be appealed to on the basis of divine injunctions. Feeding the hungry and clothing the naked are requirements imposed by God. The thoughts of personal safety and personal returns are not and should not be in the picture. We cannot sit back in smug complacency and declare superciliously, “Am I under the exigencies of the war my brother's keeper?” H. S.

Maintaining American Institutions

MANY of the most important institutions of this great democracy are the fruit of private and group initiative. We are proud of our churches, colleges, schools, hospitals and the many other agencies of good works. But are they secure in this world of kaleidoscopic changes? Will the ever increasing burden of taxation make it possible for the civic spirits of religious minded men and women to continue to support them? Will the propaganda spread among all Americans, that we should concentrate solely on the unprecedented defense program, cause the significance of our institutions to fade and these agencies themselves be neglected? Will the totalitarian spirit that usually raises its head during times of emergency and that is permitted to do so because it seems much more efficient, snatch away from men the privilege of promoting privately what is dearest to their hearts? These are questions that cannot be ignored. Now, perhaps more than at any other time in our history, every institution must justify its existence under private control. No national waste will be tolerated

on this score. Each must be made to render the maximum service. Each must show that it renders worthwhile values in the realm of national security, not by furnishing munitions and implements of war, of course, but by doing its share in promoting and maintaining healthy and educated citizens. Each must show its worth in perpetuating the kind of public service that can only be born out of the principles of democracy, and that is crushed in every country of Europe because of the exigencies of the war. Each must manifest its worth not by promoting churches, hospitals, schools, etc., as such, but by promoting a wholesome interest in the spirit of the freedom of worship, in the highest spiritual values, and in human beings whom they expect to serve. And, finally, each must, from every Christian's point of view, serve to promote the glory of God. If it can't do that, let the state have them or let them die. Now is the time to put the house of these institutions in order. We must prove their worth or they will go with the old order.

H. S.

As in previous years, the next issue of THE CALVIN FORUM will be an enlarged number and will be combined for the months of June and July. It will appear not in the early but in the latter part of June.

The Fourth Commandment According to the Westminster Standards

John Murray

Professor at Westminster Seminary,
Philadelphia, Pa.

A PERUSAL of the statements of the Westminster Confession of Faith and of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms bearing upon the fourth commandment, will show that the position taken in these Standards is that of the universal and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath and that this obligation rests upon divine commandment. The commandment to which reference is made is, of course, what we know as the fourth in the decalogue. These Standards, however, imply that the Sabbath law, expressed in the fourth commandment, was not first instituted when the ten commandments were promulgated to the children of Israel at Sinai. We know that the Sabbath institution goes back to creation; we know that there is explicit allusion to the observance of the Sabbath and of divine commandment bearing upon that observance prior to Sinai. Of such facts these Standards are not forgetful, and so the language is carefully framed to include and guard these facts. Nevertheless, the law that had been instituted at creation did receive at Sinai formal enunciation and promulgation. It was included in the ten words

given to Moses and written with the finger of God upon the two tables of stone.

At Sinai, then, the Sabbath law was set forth with fulness and explicitness and we do not have evidence that it had before then received similarly full and formal pronouncement. So, for our knowledge of what the content and import of the Sabbath institution are, we are largely dependent upon the fourth commandment. What is this law or institution?

The Sanctity of the Day

First, and most elementally and centrally, it is that one day in seven is distinguished from the other six. That day is to be sanctified, and at the heart of the word "sanctify" is the idea of distinction and separation. This one day is set off, it is placed in a distinct category. This import of the word cannot be evaded and it is to be very carefully marked, for on it depends the whole notion of what we may and must call the "sanctity" of the Sabbath.

It is not, however, the bare notion of distinction or separation that is expressed in the commandment.

The command to sanctify occurs in a context. "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God." And it is not only in the context of the remainder of the commandment, but also in the context of the other commandments. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." It is separation, therefore, to God, to the specific purpose of contemplation upon Him and specific occupation with *His* work in contrast with their own work. In this kind of distinction or sanctity the meaning of the fourth commandment resides. Abolish it, and the essence of the commandment is destroyed. There is no purpose in contending for the moral obligation of the commandment unless this sanctity is recognised and preserved, for it is the core around which all else is formed and without which all else disintegrates. Just as there is an ineradicable distinction between the six days of creation and the day of rest by which they were followed, so it is here. And it is precisely with this reminder that the commandment itself ends, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Israel truly was a holy people; they were separated unto God Jehovah. It might, then, be supposed that the sanctification of one day in seven was inconsistent with the totality of their devotion to God. Yet it is an inescapable fact that this kingdom of priests and holy nation was in the most direct way commanded to separate one day from the other six for a specific purpose. And unless our conception of devotion to God, and of time as it is related to Him, can embrace and appreciate this notion, together with the divine wisdom embodied in it, we can have no understanding of the fourth commandment.

Every Recurring Seventh Day

But second, the law or institution of the Sabbath implies that *every recurring seventh day* is to be sanctified. It is not simply a seventh of our time, not simply one day out of every seven, but it is every recurring seventh day in regular succession.

The controversy that has turned on the question as to whether or not, in the Christian dispensation, the Sabbath is the first day of the week or the seventh, and as to whether we can be said to observe the fourth commandment when we substitute the first day of the week for the seventh, has too often been allowed to obscure the central principle, namely, that every recurring seventh day was by divine ordination distinguished from every other day. The difficulty that may be encountered in determining which day of the week is the Sabbath should never be used as a subterfuge to escape from the central and straightforward import of the commandment, that every recurring seventh day is

specifically holy to God. At the cost of repetitiousness, may we say, that that principle should never be perplexed or prejudiced by the further question: which day in the succession of days should be accorded *that* distinction? We may not minimize the importance of this latter question. But we must not allow the difficulties that may attend this question to unsettle what is antecedent and even more central, the obligation, so far as the fourth commandment is concerned, to recognize the divine distinctiveness of every recurring seventh day. And it must be said that the position taken by the Westminster Standards, to wit, that with the advent of the New Testament dispensation there was signalized the change from the seventh day of the week to the first, in no way interferes with the strictest fulfilment of this principle in the Christian Lord's Day.

The Sabbath a Perpetual Obligation?

But some will say, "All this is conceded with respect to the meaning of the fourth commandment. But of what practical concern is that to us? The fourth commandment does not obligate the Christian." This objection we must now face.

If the fourth commandment is not binding in the Christian dispensation, then we have to take one of two positions. We have either to take the position that the fourth commandment occupies a different position from the other nine commandments in the decalogue, or to take the position that the whole decalogue has been abrogated in the Christian economy.* We shall now discuss the former of these two alternatives.

If we say the fourth commandment is abrogated and the other nine are not, we must understand what we are saying. It would indeed be an amazing phenomenon that in the heart of the decalogue there should be one commandment—and one given such prominence and meticulous elaboration—that is totally different from the others in this regard that they are permanent and it is not. Surely no one will dispute that in the Old Testament the ten commandments constitute a well-rounded and compact unit. And surely no one will dispute that the Old Testament is itself throughout conscious of that fact. If the ten commandments were a loose and disjointed collection of precepts, there would be nothing very extraordinary about the supposition we are now discussing. But that is precisely what the decalogue is not. And so to establish this supposition that the fourth commandment is abrogated, when the other nine are not, would require the most explicit and conclusive evidence.

As we read the Old Testament we do not find any warrant for discrimination between the fourth and the other nine. Nor indeed do we find any intimation in the Old Testament that in the Messianic age

* A third alternative that might be conceived is not of any real importance in the controversy and so may be dismissed.

the Sabbath law would cease. If any commandment is emphasized it is the fourth. Obedience to it is a mark of faithfulness and severe retribution follows its breach. The text we are about to quote epitomises the Old Testament outlook and emphasis. "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Isa. 58:13, 14). If there had been in the Old Testament some evidence that would create a presumption in favour of discrimination, if there had been even something that would justify a strong suspicion that in the Messianic age the Sabbath law would no longer bind, then, of course, even slight confirmation from the New Testament might clinch that suspicion and warrant the inference that the fourth commandment had been abrogated. But no such suspicion is created and the evidence is altogether against such a supposition.

So nothing short of compelling and conclusive evidence from the New Testament would warrant the position that the fourth is to be discriminated from the other nine.

Abrogated in the New Testament?

When we come to the New Testament, do we find such evidence? A good deal has sometimes been made of the alleged silence of the New Testament. It must be admitted that the argument from silence may be made to appear very plausible. But it will have to be said at the outset that an argument from silence is not the compelling and conclusive evidence that would in this case be required. In the Old Testament we have continuous and accumulating emphasis upon the Sabbath law that in no way suggests any distinction in the matter of morality between the fourth commandment and the other nine. Indeed, as we found, the emphasis upon the fourth mounts to a degree that constitutes the very opposite presumption. It is with that manifold of emphasis that we are placed on the threshold of the New Testament economy. Silence on the part of the New Testament will not fulfil the exigencies of the kind of evidence required for abrogation.

We must not, however, conclude that the New Testament exhibits the silence alleged. It is not necessary now to enter into detailed discussion of the implications of all the allusions found in the four gospels to the Sabbath. We need not deal in detail with the implications inherent in our Lord's attitude to the Sabbath. The proper insight and care should show that in the very rebuke that our Lord gave to the unwarranted accretions and impositions with

which pharisaic tradition had obscured and perverted the Sabbath institution, there is implicit the same kind of sanction for the Sabbath law in itself as there is in similar episodes of His example and teaching for other commandments. Suffice it to refer to the one affirmation of His, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath" (Mark 2:27, 28).

The Sabbath Made for Man

In this affirmation, contrary to much glib but wanton appeal to it, there is not the least hint that the Sabbath law was about to be abrogated. What Jesus was combatting on this occasion was the travesties of application by which the Jews had made void the law of God. Jesus' unsparing condemnation of those artificialities that had turned a beneficent institution into an instrument of tyranny no more argues the abrogation of the institution itself, than does His condemnation of the traditions by which the Jews had made void the fifth commandment argue for the abrogation of the fifth (Cf. Mark 7:8-13). If His condemnation and correction of the tradition by which the Jews of His day had made void the Word of God in the fifth commandment in no way relieves but rather reinforces the divine obligation of this commandment itself, so His statement with reference to the Sabbath quoted above furnishes no support for the abrogation of the fourth commandment. But let us examine Mark 2:27, 28 more closely.

"The sabbath was made for man." Of course, when it is said that it was made, there is but one meaning, namely, that God made it. It is not a device of human expediency or utility. It is a divine creation. It is God's day. The reasonable inference is that this is an allusion to the primeval institution as recorded in Genesis 2:2, 3. We know that the Sabbath institution existed prior to the promulgation of it at Sinai. So the making of it referred to by our Lord cannot reasonably refer simply to the giving of the law at Sinai. And since we must go back to something that antedates Sinai, what is there that more naturally or perfectly suits the allusion than that referred to in Genesis 2:2, 3?

It was "made for man." Perhaps the fact that Jesus says it was made for man and not simply for Israel has sometimes been unduly pressed to establish the universality of the Sabbath law. But recoil from exaggeration must not be allowed to obscure the real force of what is meant. The Sabbath, after all, was made for *man*, and in that word *man* there inheres a reference to what man's very nature as man and man's highest need as man require. When we bear in mind that the point of time referred to in the making of the Sabbath antedates all ethnical distinction, we are constrained to find in this simple statement confirmation of the universality of the obligation and blessing of the Sabbath institution.

Jesus' Lordship and the Sabbath

But Jesus in this passage also asserts His own Lordship over the Sabbath. "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." The title Son of man is distinctly Messianic and points to the dominion which He in His capacity as the Messiah exercises. It is in His capacity as the Son of man that He exercises this Lordship over the Sabbath. And this simply means that, within that universal Lordship and authority that is His as the one to whom all authority in heaven and earth has been committed, the Sabbath has its proper place and function. Abolition of it is, as B. B. Warfield says, "as far as possible from the suggestion of the passage."

Further, we must observe that Jesus says "even of the Sabbath." The presence of the word "even" serves to show the extent of Jesus' Lordship. This Lordship is so comprehensive that it even includes the Sabbath, and surely such an emphasis discloses the high conception of its sanctity and authority Jesus entertained.

Finally, the reason assigned for this Lordship over the Sabbath is the fact that the Sabbath was made for man. It was for the sake of man that Jesus came into the world, it was for man's sake that He died and rose again, it is for man's sake that He is exalted as the Messiah to supreme mediatorial sovereignty. But it was also for man's sake that the Sabbath was made. If, then, it was for man's sake that Jesus came, and suffered, and died, and rose again to ascend up where He was before, is it possible that that which was made for man—the Sabbath—should be annulled and abrogated by that which He became and did for man's sake? There is complete congruity between His Messianic work and Lordship on the one hand and the Sabbath ordinance on the other. They both serve the same purpose. And so His Lordship embraces the Sabbath institution, embraces it too for the purpose of preserving it, confirming it and blessing it. He is Lord of the Sabbath too.

This is the fifth article in a series on the Fourth Commandment and the question of its binding character for Christians today. In the first two articles Dr. Albertus Pieters of Western Seminary took the stand that the Fourth Commandment is abrogated for the New Testament believer; that the New Testament Lord's Day is not observed in obedience to the Sabbath Commandment; and that this is the real view of John Calvin, a view with which neither the Heidelberg Catechism nor the Westminster Standards agree. The third and fourth articles, from the pen of Professor Kromminga, maintained that there is no conflict between the Heidelberg conception of the Fourth Commandment and that of Calvin; that the interpretation of Calvin's teaching offered in an earlier article is unwarranted; that the Calvin-Heidelberg view properly distinguishes between a ceremonial and a moral (and therefore permanently binding) element in the Fourth Commandment; and that this view is in harmony with Scripture. In the present article Professor Murray defends the interpretation of the Fourth Commandment set forth in the Westminster Standards, holding to the permanent validity of the Old Testament sabbath commandment. Next month Professor Murray will complete his exposition and defense of the Westminster position.—EDITOR.

Science and An Ideal Creation

Dudley Joseph Whitney
Exeter, California

Biology and Paradise Lost

IN the first part of this study the Scriptural basis for belief in an ideal Edenic creation was presented, with some evidence from science, but since science is idolized in this day and age by many persons, a more strict analysis of the subject from the standpoint of science and philosophy may well be given.

There are two possible ways to explain nature. One is by assuming that it came to be as it is through evolution. By this the first living thing would have to come into being in a purely natural way, subdivide into two living organisms, and then by natural increase and natural variation all the living things that live or have lived would have to develop. All processes would have to be purely natural, without direction from the deity.

The other explanation is that special acts of God in creation would have to take place. The possibility of there having been both special creation and

naturalistic change can be conceded, but in the real proposition of special creation versus organic evolution the great question is whether natural processes alone acted to originate life and to bring new plant and animal forms into being or whether God used any special acts of creation in the ordering of nature.

Let us assume that if special creation was used at all, God started an ideal earth by a set of divine acts, as Genesis states. So if evolution fails, we will take the Genesis account of creation as correct.

What Evolution Does Not Explain

In the first place then evolution fails utterly as far as the origin of life is concerned. It is helpless to determine how protoplasm could start *naturally* upon a lifeless earth. What is known of physics and chemistry indicates that protoplasm would not start that way. When it comes to the origin of the eye, of sex, of milk glands, of the wings of birds and in-

sects, and of organs generally, evolution is helpless. Only God could start these. Evolutionists have pretty much given up even the effort to try to find how natural processes could start the organs named, and others. And then too, surely God could as well create a complete fish (or other animal) instantly or slowly, with eyes and other organs, as by special acts of creation change a non-fish which had no eyes into a fish. (The eye of man and of other higher animals is supposed to have been passed along from fish ancestors, but the evolutionists know of no animal not a fish which would be a reasonably good ancestor for the first vertebrate fishes.)

Evolutionists are helpless in explaining how lizard could change to bird, or land animal change to whale, or how other great transformations could occur which must have occurred, *naturally*, if evolution is to be believed, and "family trees" for such kinds of descent are missing.

By evolution something like a shrew would have to change into a whale, but surely only a miracle could accomplish such a transformation, and if God was to make a first whale pair he could as well create them instantly and complete as to transform a shrew into an otter, the otter into a seal, and the seal into a whale. He could as well make man and woman outright, as adult beings, as to cause female ape to give birth to boy and girl babies. From the standpoint of plain common sense therefore, a complete ideal creation is far more reasonable and far better science than the fanciful dogma of organic evolution.

The Machinery of Heredity

Next in the theory of an Edenic creation, investigated on the basis of science, is an examination of the machinery of heredity. For this any textbook or other good work on genetics can be consulted, and only a brief outline of the principles of the subject need be given here.

First it may be said that in the newly formed life germ of every living thing, plant or animal, the characteristics of adult being are present. They are contained, it seems, in what are called chromosomes, which are tiny rod-like bodies. In each of these are many "genes," known only by their effect. These may be compared to beads upon a string. From each parent come chromosomes with their genes. Usually in reproduction half from each parent are used and half discarded, so usually the new individual has a full set and no more.

The main point here (a thing common sense should tell us even if we knew nothing about genes and chromosomes) is that everything a person or an animal has, it inherits from a parent. It would, for example, be absurd to suppose that among some hornless creatures, like horses or elephants, horns should suddenly come into the heredity, or that in eyeless creatures an eye should suddenly appear and be transmitted to future generations. Such a thing would be a miracle, an act of God.

However, the science of genetics shows us that chromosomes and genes provide the machinery for transmitting hereditary factors. Occasionally there may be a doubling of genes, as when a flower develops surplus petals or when a lamb is born with an extra leg or two pair of horns. Instead of a doubling of genes, loss in heredity seems more common, so that lambs or calves are born with no horns in their germ plasm, and thus hornless breeds of sheep and cattle are originated. Albinos are born who lack the color of their normal ancestors.

Loss of genes is very common.* The greatest changes in heredity seem to occur by loss of genes and by a recombination of genes. Very frequently strains of plants or animals are deficient in some essential genes but can reproduce and become parents of apparently normal individuals because other parents provide the necessary genes. That is one reason why hybrids are normally more vigorous than purebreds.

In its application to the problem before us, whether or not there was a perfect Edenic creation to begin with, the point is this: perfect Edenic plants and animals would have complete sets of genes, but in the struggle for existence on a demoralized earth there would be loss of genes in some lines of descent and recombinations in others, so that great changes would develop in different branches of created "kinds," but no individual or species, most likely, would be as complete and fine as its created ancestors. Genetics therefore favors the doctrine of an originally ideal creation, with change since creation being primarily for the worse and in the way of degeneration and specialization. Science in this respect corroborates the theory of a perfect Edenic creation. Genes would never originate spontaneously, without God, and change would be partly by their loss as generations followed one another and partly by recombinations of genes in different races, all of which descended from a common created group of ancestors.

Evidence of Change Since Creation

Another point of the utmost importance now develops, and one where a serious error has been made in the battle against evolution. Too often the battle for creation has been waged upon the doctrine of absolute fixity of species. However, if the Edenic creation was ideal, and nature as it now is is the demoralized and degenerate product of a perfect creation, if the ancestors of plant and animal lice and parasites generally, and disease-causing organisms, were not harmful creatures in the beginning, but made to serve a beneficial purpose on an ideal earth, fixity of species has not been a rule of nature. If carnivorous birds and beasts descended from plant eating birds and beasts on the Edenic earth, with different habits and somewhat different form, transformation of species of a kind has taken place.

* On loss of genes, see discussion in *Science*, Feb. 21, 1941, p. 182.

When therefore the would-be champion of creation proclaims as a foundation feature of his case that there has been no transformation of species, he goes contrary to the Scriptures he attempts to uphold and further convinces the scientists who see abundant evidence of species change (within restricted limits) that creationism must be wrong. The problem of change since creation therefore calls for some analysis.

That there has been change since creation cannot be denied. Among men races are as different as Nordics, negroes, Mongolians and Polynesians. The lower animals display similar differences or even greater differences among groups which are alike in nearly every fundamental respect. Think, for example, how much alike all ants are, or all moths, or all poppies.

Some creationists say in opposition to this view that the races of men are not separate *species*, and that *species* were the units of creation, but the difficulty here is that *species* is one of the most elastic and indefinite terms in science, though a term that is very useful and necessary. No rule whatever exists that can be applied without exception to determine what individuals should be included in a "true" *species* and what eliminated. The term is often applied to groups that are merely races of some more inclusive group, say of squirrels or clovers. Even the term *race* cannot be defined accurately, so as to fit every case.

Monkey Relationships

Under any rule which can be operated with reason members of two groups which are distinct from one another and will not hybridize must be considered distinct *species*. There are about 85 monkey *species* in Central and South America, and these can be classified in nine different groups, termed *genera*. Make the term *species* as elastic as reason permits, there must still be a number of different monkey *species* in the Americas. Nevertheless the existence of relationship between these *species* is indicated as strongly as can be. Although all Old World monkeys have only 32 teeth, all American monkeys have 36 teeth. Surely, all being real monkeys, this is more than coincidence. Again they all have a certain type of nasal structure, while all Old World monkeys have a different kind of nasal structure, in which they resemble one another. This would be coincidence piled upon coincidence if different monkeys were not related to one another. Again, hanging by the tail is a purely American characteristic among monkeys, though not all American monkeys can do this. Here are three coincidences together. Surely therefore a biologist seems compelled to decide that all American monkeys are related by descent from some common ancestral group, and all Old World monkeys are related in the same way. Then since all are monkeys, it is not unreasonable to suppose that both American and Old World monkeys are related.

Now this grouping of animals into *species* and *genera* and even families which are the same in fundamental features of structure, runs through all kinds of plants and animals, in the sea as well as on the land. Monkeys, frogs, ducks, ants, beetles, butterflies, moths, clovers, poppies, palms all form great groups in which are smaller groups which bear all reasonable evidence of being related to one another. Why not agree to this? Genesis records an ideal creation, which became demoralized by the sin of the man and woman who were to dominate the earth. This implies change after creation, and evidence is strong that this has occurred. It does not in any way suggest origin by evolution, since this is helpless either to originate anything, or to make any fundamental changes after creation. Such changes as have occurred are in the way of deterioration, not progress.

The upholder of the doctrine of fixity of *species* may argue if he wishes that transformation could not occur *naturally*, that if it took place some supernatural agency must have operated to bring it about; and for this there is much to be said. Any set of natural processes which would make one line of an ant *species* change into a new ant *species*, one that would not breed with members of the parent *species*, is absolutely undiscovered by biologists. With all the controlled breeding within their power biologists cannot develop any new animal *species*, though a special feature of plant life has allowed them to develop a few new plant *species*—of the same general nature of the parent *species*. If, with all the facilities of science at their disposal the biologists cannot develop a single new animal *species*, it certainly seems absurd to suppose that fish could change to frog *naturally*, or newt to lizard, or lizard to bird, or lizard to warm blooded, hairy mammal, or that shrews could alter into horses, whales and men. Therefore real evolution fails utterly.

For the transformations which evidently have occurred, as many monkey *species* from one or two created *species* kinds, or many ant *species* from one ant group, or many moth *species* from one moth group, for all that can be seen these may have occurred by special decree of the Creator, and not *naturally*, even though competition for existence upon a demoralized earth may well have tended to *species* changes for the worse.

Some Puzzling Problems

Nevertheless, there are certain forms of life for which no reasonable explanation seems available, either in science or philosophy.

For example, in late fall and winter grubs develop under the skin in the backs of my cattle, doing injury to them, particularly when the grubs are numerous. Their history from egg to grub and then to adult fly and back to egg again is very complicated and it seems absolutely impossible to account for the origin of such a kind of insect upon any reason-

able basis. The evolutionists are as helpless in theorizing how such a creature could evolve as they are in figuring how a grub-like creature could sprout wings on its back and become a flying insect.

God evidently did not make the ancestral fly to act like this on the Edenic earth, for then everything was ideal, and nothing was harmful. The ancestral fly kind must therefore have changed after the fall, so that some of its descendants became these warbles which attack cattle. That these changes could occur *naturally*, with the very complicated life history of the species, which need not be given here, seems beyond belief.

That God would cause such changes also seems hard to believe. However, if He did so, it is a strong indication of the extent of the demoralization which came upon Nature as the result of man's disobedience, and of the unbelievable superiority of the Edenic earth to Nature as it is now.

On the other hand, if God did not cause these changes and they did not occur naturally, the great foe of God must have caused them, and it seems unbelievable that he could do this.

Our ultimate conclusion therefore must be that much in nature is beyond explanation. We only know from the Scriptures, and our reason confirms this, that God made everything good, so when some forms of life are very harmful we can only decide that the Genesis account of creation and of the coming of evil upon it corresponds excellently with what true science tells us of nature.

Species Change and the Ark Problem

One very important part of the problem of species change after a perfect creation is connected with the matter of housing the animals during the Flood.

As has been said, species is a very elastic and indefinite term in biology. Altogether botanists and zoologists figure there are more than a million different species of living things, though more than half of these are insect species. Many of the so-called species are really only branches of the same species. Nevertheless by any good species measure the number of kinds of species which would have to be preserved in the Ark, taking the account as it stands and assuming that each species was a created "kind," would have to be so great that the Ark could not house them all.

To the fixity of species defender arises the problem of housing from about thirty to three hundred different monkey pairs in the Ark, plus similar hordes of other types of birds, beasts and creeping things. The Ark simply could not hold them all, even for a few days, to say nothing of housing them for more than a year. Therefore to insist upon fixity of species, denying any real transformation of species, even within the ancestral type, serves to

discredit the Flood account. Surely the cause of the Scriptures is not helped by a method of sustaining the account of creation at the expense of discredit to the Flood account.

To the person however who believes that God made an ideal earth, with very great changes after the fall, the housing problem is simplified immensely. Only one monkey or ape pair would be needed in the Ark, only one bear pair, only one pair of owls, one pair of lizards, serpents, and so on. The housing problem is simplified immensely and made more reasonable and far more consistent with the Bible account of how nature came to be as it is.*

Summary

Space will not allow much further discussion of the problem of the creation now, but a summary of what has been developed may be in order, particularly since the reasons for believing in a primary ideal creation are so seldom noted and since would-be defenders of the faith so often accept the general theories of evolutionists upon the origin and history of the earth.

Genesis, then, clearly states that the early Edenic creation was ideal, with nature at that time far different from what it is now. Science fails completely in its effort to account for nature as it is now by means of evolution, but it sustains Genesis in indicating that change for the worse in the descendants of perfect created ancestors has occurred. This would bring about much transformation of species (within created types) since creation.

This simplifies the Ark problem immensely. It indicates that the whole account of the origin and history of the earth as given in the Scriptures is correct, so that attempts to harmonize science so called with its evolutionary origin and history of the earth with the Scriptures are misleading and doomed to failure.

The truly Christian and scientific method is to take the Scriptures in a simple and natural way. When that is done, nature and the Scriptures are found to be in harmony in even more ways than have been mentioned here.

* There are serious problems still unsolved here: for example, the problem of the housing of sloths, humming birds and certain other strictly American animals, or of the kangaroos and other marsupials of Australasia. The reasonable assumption would seem to be that only the animals of the district where Noah lived before the Flood were preserved and that the others were destroyed; also that on the re-making of the land areas after the Flood the animals of certain areas were re-created. Psalm 104 gives a strong hint of this in verses 29 and 30. "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth." See also verses 6 and 7, *et seq.* The fact is, there will always be much of nature utterly beyond our understanding. Still, a proper study of nature, with the Scriptures as a guide, indicates strongly that only through the Genesis account of creation and the Fall can nature be understood.

The Resurrection of Jesus

Anne W. Kuhn
Cambridge, Mass.

Its Apologetic Value and Significance

IN a former article, under the caption "The Lord Is Risen Indeed," the writer considered the question of the historicity of the Resurrection of our Lord. This second message shall deal with the apologetic value of the event, with a view to demonstrating its relative importance in the field of Christian dogmatics.

Important among the apologetic bases for the doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ is the fact that God raised Him from the dead. Says Principal Garvie: "The primitive community after the resurrection not only renewed its belief in Jesus as Messiah, but ascribed to Him the title Jewish piety assigned to Jehovah, and called Him Lord." At the outset, it is necessary to note that Jesus of Nazareth, during His life, did continually by word and by implication declare Himself to be Son of God in a sense shared by no other. He sought to elicit this belief from His followers. He allowed men, friends and enemies, to thus believe, and to express their belief that He was equal with God. He allowed Himself to be arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced for making such claims for Himself. He made it clear, as rapidly as His followers could grasp the fact, that He was to die and to be raised from the dead.

But the hopes which His life had begotten in His followers were crushed by His death. The crucifixion seemed to negate His claims to Divine Sonship. Therefore, the Resurrection came as a Divine vindication of the claims which He made for Himself. Says Shaw: "His life on earth had been one of humiliation and suffering, of self-denying service and sacrifice for others, until at last the culminating point of His sacrifice was reached in His death. All were 'offended' in Him. He needed to be justified, and the Resurrection was His Divine justification or vindication."

The Seal of God

Pauline theology is especially clear on this point. He makes it clear that the death of Jesus Christ was vicarious: God "hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin." But His death, so surrounded with ignominy, did not appear in its true nature, as a Divine appointment for the salvation of man from sin, until He was "declared" to be the Son of God "with power" through the Resurrection. Says Dr. James Orr: "It is undeniable that, if historically

real, the Resurrection of Jesus is a confirmation of His entire claim. No mind can believe in that transcendent fact, and in the exaltation that followed it, and continue to apply to Christ a mere humanitarian standard."

It is sometimes overlooked that the resurrection of our Lord is not an addendum to His work of redemption, but an integral part of it. It is impossible for us to estimate the extent to which "he emptied Himself, and took on Himself the form of a servant." But the Incarnation provided Him with a body for the suffering of death. This performed, and the necessity for a continuance of the limitations of the physical being past, it was fitting that His body should be perfected. Speaking in this vein, Professor Shaw says: "The Resurrection thus constituted a 'crisis' in the experience of Christ Himself. Through it His activity was raised to a new level, whereby He became clothed with absolute might to carry out the issues of His saving work on earth." Thus, we see the Resurrection, not only as a token of Divine acceptance of His atoning work, but as a completion-step in the whole drama of the Incarnation.

The Resurrection and the Messianic Claim

To the Jewish mind, the crucifixion was a negation of the Messianic claim of Jesus Christ. Probably we Gentiles do not adequately realize the grip which the Messianic hope had upon the mind of the pious Jew of the first century, A.D. But Christianity made its first appeal to such men, to whom Messianism was important. The Old Testament portrait of the Messiah had been largely misunderstood; the hope of the Jews centered about political deliverance, and a glorious restoration of Israel to a place of international importance. It is impossible for us to know how many had connected the prophecies of Isaiah in chapters 52 and 53 with the Messiah, but it is clear that this view was not commonly received. However, the appeal of the early Church was based upon Messianism; and Peter pointed out that David, "seeing this before, spake of the Resurrection of Christ (the anointed), that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption. *This Jesus* hath God raised up . . ." Here, the appeal is to the Resurrection as the link which ought (to the pious Jew) to connect Jesus of

Nazareth with the Messiah. Therefore, the Apostolic Church viewed the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as evidential of the Messianic claim of our Lord.

The Resurrection is thus seen as integral with the Incarnation, and as evidential of Messianism. It is likewise a part of the smaller subject of His Exaltation. The Incarnation (or more properly, His birth) involved a humiliation, a self-emptying upon the part of the Eternal Word. This humiliation, however, was more in the nature of a process than being merely a specific act, though such an act was present; for the Passion of Christ may properly be thought of as continuing through His life, but climaxing at the Cross. As He uttered the words "Into thy hands I commend my spirit," His humiliation was complete. No further indignity was visited upon His body. He was buried by those who were solicitous, not only for Jewish law, but for His remains. And on the morning of the Resurrection, the course of humiliation was reversed: His Exaltation began; and from one standpoint, this exaltation will be complete when redeemed men join the angelic choir in singing "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; and He shall reign forever and ever." But just as the Virgin Birth was *the* outstanding feature in His humiliation, so also the Resurrection was *the* outstanding and pivotal feature in His exaltation. Let us digress here to note that these two miracles are the special targets of liberal criticism, inasmuch as they are events of such a supernatural character as to imply nothing less than the interposition of the Creative Cause. This gives to us of conservative belief a hint well worth noting.

Christ's Redemption and His Resurrection

Not only is the Resurrection an apologetic for the fact of the Deity of our Lord, but it also attests the claim of the Christian message to be an adequate provision for human need. We have noted previously that the Resurrection served to vindicate both the claims which He made for Himself, and His office as Messiah. Closely related to this is the fact that in raising the Son from the dead, God vindicated the method by which the Atonement was effected. Paul makes it clear that, taken by itself, the Cross spelled "foolishness": while to the bereaved followers, whose plaintive comment was that "We hoped that it was He which should redeem Israel," the Cross meant defeated hopes, to the average hearer (to whom the Gospel should come in the future) the significance of the Cross was "unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness." But the inspired logic of Paul saw in the Resurrection a reversal of the normal effect of the preaching of the Cross, until to all who believe, it constitutes the supreme answer to that which they most profoundly desire: Christ is both "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Again, the Resurrection affords us a presentiment of the scope of redemption. The Scriptures make

it clear that the atonement includes provision not only for the salvation of the immaterial nature of man, but also for the redemption of that body. Jesus Christ, as really human as He was really Divine, bore a body which partook of the limitations which we share. We conclude that He stood as the Second Head of the race. Paul makes much of the figure of death and resurrection as illustrative of our salvation. Likewise, the Epistle to the Hebrews makes it clear that He is the "Captain" of our salvation, in whom God purposeth to bring "many sons unto glory." Paul sees the same truth in First Corinthians (and we do not here enter the controversy concerning the Pauline or non-Pauline authorship of Hebrews), concluding that the Resurrection of our Lord is a guarantee of the resurrection of our bodies. Says Shaw upon this subject: "As death was grounded in Adam, so life is grounded in Christ . . . The new life derived from Christ, that is, includes the body as well as the soul in the sphere of its quickening."

The Resurrection of our Lord is therefore valuable as offering a presumptive evidence of the general nature of redemption, as implying that as Christ was proclaimed victor over death, so shall the resurrection of the just demonstrate this in a field co-extensive with the fall; as implying that just as Christ rose in triumph over death, so shall the believer rise to newness of life; as implying that whereas death had no power over the body of our Lord, just so shall that death constitute an adequate satisfaction to the Divine justice, so that God may consistently justify him who believeth in Jesus.

In this, human redemption is shown to be consistent with the general view of the sovereignty of God. While it is essential to ever bear in mind that God is fully and absolutely free to do as He may determine, it is comforting to observe that He is pleased to demonstrate to us the righteous character of His government. Conceivably he *might* have left us "in the dark" concerning this; but rather, "God hath set forth (Him) to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past . . . to declare . . . at this time His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Thus, the whole process of redemption was intended as an eloquent demonstration of the righteous character of the Divine government.

For Our Justification and Redemption

The Resurrection is in Scripture related to our justification. The words of Paul: ". . . was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" have been the subject of much comment. Professor Shaw speaks aptly upon this point: "The Resurrection is necessary to our justification, not merely because of the difference it makes to us as certifying the atoning efficacy of the Death and thus evoking faith in us, but also because of the difference it makes to Christ Himself. It marks the point at which His sovereign power as Lord is made effec-

tive. Our justification, the basis for which has been laid in the Death, becomes an accomplished fact and effective reality only through Christ's rising again, with the virtue of His atoning life and death in Him, to apply His atonement in those who are united with Him by faith. That which redeems is not Christ's atoning death apart from His living Person in union with whom we are brought by faith . . . Nearly every error in theories of the atonement may be traced ultimately to separating the propitiatory work of Christ from Christ Himself . . . Only through union with a living Saviour who has in Him the virtue of His atoning death do justification, forgiveness and all the blessings of redemption become ours."

Nor is there any want of Scripture to indicate that the resurrection is specifically related to the regeneration and sanctification of the believer. In this connection, Paul indicates that "we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead . . . even so we also should walk in newness of life; for if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection, knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

In other connections, we have observed that the Scriptures indicate that the Resurrection of our Lord is causally related to the resurrection of our bodies. Says Paul, the two facts stand or fall together. His conviction that the former has occurred causes him to declare without hesitation that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (to which he significantly adds, "but every man in his own order").

Thus, the Resurrection stands as the "seal of acceptance" upon the work of Christ, by which God proclaimed to the race that in Him should be reversed the catastrophe into which the first Adam precipitated our race, and that by virtue of His atoning work, the believer may be assured of those cardinal benefits which constitute the Christian hope.

The Resurrection and the Church

Finally, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ stands as an apologetic for the validity of the Church, and for her claim to universality. At this point, the testimony is interrelated: the Resurrection of her Lord is central in the content of the witness of the Church; in turn, the Church exists without warrant, unless Christ be raised from the dead.

Higher criticism, bent upon destructive results, has attempted to establish the premise that a belief in a literal resurrection of our Lord was relatively unimportant in the early Church. What matters, say the critics, is that the Church believed that Jesus still "survived." They would assure us that the narratives are but symbolic—as but the clothing of an idea with a romantic figure. One says: ". . .

it is certainly true that the doctrine of the Resurrection which played so large a part in the spread of Christianity was bound up with that belief in a resurrection of the flesh which has been rejected (in his book) as indefensible by any historical arguments." He continues: "So much must be admitted; but against this admission I would place the following considerations: In the first place, the fact that the belief in the Resurrection has hitherto been bound up with certain other views is not decisive proof that it ought not to be separated from them, any more than the fact that the Gospel was originally preached in Greek is a proof that that language ought still to be employed by missionaries. Secondly, what is really central is that to the early Christians the Resurrection had a personal value, because they believed that in the end it was not unique, but was the triumph of life over death in which they all joined. That remains true . . . if the results of the present study be accepted, and is independent of the Jewish or Greek forms of thought in which it was once clothed."

The fallacies involved in this rather lengthy quotation are apparent. The first argument: that the Resurrection was no more intimately related to the preaching of the early Church than was the accident of the use of the Greek language, is almost too frivolous to be noticed. In reply to the second argument, we submit that the documents indicate unmistakably that the early Church was not using either a Jewish or a Greek literary figure to express some vague idea of "the triumph of life over death in which they all joined." If our Gospels do not indicate that the primitive Church believed in the *literal* resurrection of Jesus Christ's body from the grave, it is difficult to imagine any usage of language which could convey such an idea. And to view the narratives as but symbolic—as but the clothing of an idea with a romantic figure—is out of the question to the thoughtful person.

The Apostolic Testimony

It is evident that the Evangelists, representative of the early Church, acknowledge that the Church made large use of the declaration that Jesus Christ literally rose from the dead. Now, whether "times have changed," so that we must patronize the unbelief of our generation (as the critics do), and exhume-Hume to settle our accounts with the supernatural, may be a matter of opinion with the critics. But we believe that the Church which began her life on the Day of Pentecost was infinitely nearer to the events upon which her ministry rested than are we; and perhaps it has not occurred to the critics that there may be something of conceit in the belief that the Church of the first century imposed a fraud upon the centuries which was only exposed when the wise sons of Tübingen began to investigate the New Testament.

It is but a step in our thought to the conclusion which Paul drew, that if Christ be not risen, the Church is an imposture, and has no basis for existence. Moreover, the claim of the Church to a ministry of universal character is based upon the larger subject of the Incarnation. It is from the fact that God became man that the universality of the message of the Church proceeds, inasmuch as God has, through the Incarnation, related Himself to the human race; and just so, the human species is, in a way not hitherto possible, obligated to Him and to Jesus Christ.

In the abolition of death, through the Resurrection, Jesus Christ not only "hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel" and thereby showed us the pattern of the nature of immortality, a view of the future estate of the believer; but also, He has been evidently set forth as Judge of all. And with this as her cue, the Christian Church is impelled to rise in the majesty of her God-given glory to declare herself to be the depository of a message which is to displace all other religions. This claim falls to the ground, says Paul, if Christ be not risen from the dead. Conversely, the fact that "He is risen indeed" is a dynamic apology for the existence of the Church Militant.

The Crowning Event

Therefore, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the crowning event in those high moments in the moral destiny of our race—those moments in which the Son of God made the final offering for sin. Consequently, it stands as the supreme evidence for the validity of the Christian message, and for the validity of the claim of the Church to thrust forward her message—a message of distinctly supernatural character—as the only true way of salvation, and thus to negate the claim of all other religious systems to the adherence and loyalty of men.

This general consideration of the apologetic value of the message of the Resurrection of our Lord serves to enforce two convictions: first, that the Resurrection of our Lord constitutes a key doctrine in the Christian system, and hence, secondly, that it deserves a larger place in the thought and ministry of the Church than it usually receives. It has been the purpose of this article to point out that the doctrine of the Resurrection bulked large in the ministry of the Early Church, occupying then, as now, a key position in the defense of the supernatural character of the Christian religion. Inasmuch as this is the focal point in the controversy between the liberal and the conservative wings of Christendom, the Church of our day may ignore this sector of the Christian dogmatic front only at the gravest peril.

Dutch Reformed Churches in European Countries

G. Besselaar, M.A., Litt.D.
Professor of Afrikaans Culture
University of Amsterdam

THE term Dutch needs no elucidation for the readers of this periodical. There are, however, localities on the American continent where the qualification "Dutch" is misunderstood, being mixed up with "Duitsch" in the sense of German. Nor are our American speaking compatriots to blame for this misconception as the term "Duitsch" used to be employed in both senses in America as well as in the Netherlands. I have seen a picture of an old church building, I think at Halifax, where the name "Duitsch Hervormde Kerk" occurs engraved in stone on the front gable. The designation "Dutch" in English, "deutsch" in German, "tudesque" in French, "Duitsch" and "Nederduitsch" in Netherlandish and Afrikaans and "Dietsch" in Flemish are all derivations from the common root "diet," Gothic "theod," meaning folk, i.e., common people. These cognate adjectives denote severally the language which belongs to the crowd, the *hoi polloi*, in contradistinction to that of a class: the clergy, the scholars, who spoke Latin. It stood for the plain national tongue, spoken and understood all along the coasts of the North and

Baltic Seas from Calais (then Kales) to the regions beyond Danzig. It was the common tongue, the *lingua franca*, or international commercial and nautical language of western Europe in the seventeenth century. Sir Francis Drake and Monk spoke, read and wrote it and when at White Hall the death sentence on Charles I was pronounced, it was read in English, the language of the realm, in Dutch, the speech of the world and in Latin, the tongue of scholarship and history.

The same situation of class distinction by different social layers of speech still obtains in many countries. After the invasion of the British Isles by William the Conqueror Anglo-Saxon remained the common speech of the masses, while the superior classes spoke Norman French. These two currents still run in parallel channels through England today. That is why English dictionaries are so bulky! By law of language, however, doublets in time drop out or become differentiated, cf. chair and stool. Those who remember *Ivanhoe* recall the scene where one party insisted on sheep, the other on mutton (so: ox and beef, swine and pork). When young Thomas

Babington Macaulay at the tender age of six had spilled hot coffee on his knee, a sympathizing elderly aunt inquired: How do you feel, darling? he replied: Thank you, madam, the agony is abated. Any normal boy would have said: The pain is over; excellent Anglo-Saxon and Dutch! The pedantic Norman French circumlocution is the happy hunting ground of the lawyer and poet, the journalist and politician and lacks the ring of sincerity.

To return to ecclesiastic matters, the similarity between Dutch and Anglo-Saxon explains how British missionaries could bring the gospel to the heathen Dutch: their forms of speech were well nigh identical. Which hoary fact of history, however, hardly justified the pathetic pity of the servant girl in a family of staunch Presbyterians in Northern Eire whose son had accepted the call as minister to the Scottish Church at Rotterdam. She wailed: Poor Jim, going to them Dutch blacks! For the veracity of this anecdote I can vouch.

* * *

By the terms of the title above this article I have to leave out of consideration the very precious congregations of the Lord's elect in the Reformed churches of England, Scotland and Ireland, Germany, France and Switzerland, Italy and Spain, Hungary, Greece and other countries. I crave indulgence, however, for a short note.

I came in close touch with these churches in 1930 representing the Calvinistic League of South Africa at the Presbyterian Alliance (Eastern Section) Convention at Barmen-Elberfeld in Germany. Most touching was the closed session at which in a heart to heart talk national representatives of all these churches under seal of secrecy gave a full account of the actual position of Reformed doctrine in their churches, often laboring under cruel oppression. One night we held a meeting of the more strictly Reformed elements which met as *Freunde des Heidelberger Catechismus*. It was a noble, though heart searching delight to meet there till well past midnight, in fact it caused me some brain racking as I had the troublesome honor to act as interpreter in reading the gist of thorough German expositions, of the eloquent French orations and of practical English speeches respectively into the two other vernaculars. The spirit of God was found to work mightily in many of these churches.

Secondly I may not omit to make mention in this connection of the spread of Calvinism recorded and promoted by the Calvinistic Conferences held at London (1930 and 1932), Amsterdam (1934), Geneva (1936) and Edinburgh (1938) which, but for the last, I had the privilege to attend. The universal re-awakening of Calvinism was testified in many ways, not the least by the increase in numbers of young, energetic and theologically well equipped pastors even in countries like France, Switzerland

and Hungary. The Dutch Reformed Churches in two hemispheres are not ploughing a lonely furrow!

* * *

All Dutch Reformed churches trace their origin to the Low Countries, directly or indirectly; they grew from slips planted in isolated spots elsewhere.

There were two inducements, in Dutch style very practical at that! First self-preservation, second self-expression. Fugitives from the Spanish Inquisition repaired to the British Isles and to Germany. Useful information can be garnered from Van Schelven's *Vluchtelingenkerken der 16e eeuw in Engeland en Duitsland*, and from Bronkema's *Essence of Puritanism*, which gains on re-reading. Many of the churches founded then have survived till our times. Dutch commerce built Reformed churches in England, Denmark, Russia and Asia Minor. The only congregation which survived is that of London. The first minister of this London church was Johannes a Lasco, a Polish nobleman, who laid the foundations well. In 1550 the boy-king Edward VI gave this congregation the famous Austin Friars' Church where she met for worship since. November, 1940, the six centuries old Gothic structure was destroyed by a German bomb. Modernism had undermined the principles and practice of the Reformation before that date, for which reason a Gereformeerde Kerk was founded in London of late.

A Dutch Reformed church at Frederikstad in Denmark, one at Smyrna in the Levant and one founded at St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) in 1702 were swept away by the upheaval of the World War (1914-1918). Apart from enhancing Dutch prestige and playing a part in the social life and charitable activities of the local communities, these churches were no strongholds of the Reformed cause during the latter decades. In 1899 and 1900 I was a member of the church at St. Petersburg.

* * *

With the history and the present state of the Reformed churches in the Netherlands I do not propose to deal at any length here. The majority of the American readers of this article, as members of daughter churches in the States, in Canada and in Central and South America are well acquainted with the facts; for other interested readers a brief survey may suffice.

The old established Nederduitsch Hervormde Church, the church of the fathers in the Netherlands of which the reigning monarch by constitution must be a member, was organized by the Synod of Dordrecht (1618-19); remained the stronghold of Calvinism during the 17th century; was assailed by Rationalism in the 18th, and became at best a petrefact of dead orthodoxy until 1816 when King William I by his royal decree put an end to the obtaining system of doctrine, worship and discipline by imposing his new rule on the church. This being a contentious subject I do not enter into any detail.

During the 19th century two reactions set in. First the Secession of 1834 under the Rev. Hendrik de Cock, of Ulrum, who issued a manifesto of Secession and Return, based on the doctrine, service and discipline as formulated in the Standards of Faith and in the Church Order laid down by the Synod of Dordrecht. To call the movement a secession is a misnomer as the unfair and exclusive insistence on half the title of the manifesto amounts to an arbitrary and intentional omission of the equally important second half, the Return. It was certainly a separation from the hierarchical structure superimposed by secular authority, but it was as much a return to the historical and legal original foundation. The movement originated from the heart, was prompted by conscience, was set going and kept moving by a law-abiding community and not by a boisterous and irresponsible rabble. The cruel injustice inflicted by the powers that be, the fining and imprisoning of innocent believers by a callous and heartless magistracy were a blemish on the escutcheon of the House of Orange, a sin against God's saints and an unwarranted attack on citizens of the State who resented infringement on their constitutional right of freedom of conscience.

The characteristics of these "Afgescheidenen" [Separatists] in doctrine and practice of godliness were depth, warmth and simplicity. The persecution in the homeland proved a boon outside as it gave a fresh impetus to the existing Dutch Reformed Churches in North America and South Africa and eventually meant the conception of new Dutch Reformed churches in South Africa and South America. It certainly proved the futility of the attempt to extinguish a fire with hammerblows.

The centenary of the Secession held in 1934 at Utrecht was a national and governmental rehabilitation of the heroes of 1834. Its celebration was attended by four cabinet ministers who took an active part under Dr. H. Colijn.

The second reaction (1886) was similar in principle, but different in method. History does not necessarily repeat itself. The "Doleantie," forever associated with the names of Kuyper and Rutgers was an act of reformation from within. Both movements were carried by an element of believers fearing God and no one else. But whereas those of 1834 were simple folk led by country pastors, democrats, led on more by delicate intuition than by academic lore—the faithful of 1886 followed scholars and jurists, men of noble birth and character who by the incision of their measures secured more immediate effect.

In 1892 the majority of the churches of the Secession (1834) and those of the "doleantie" (1886) united and formed the "Gereformeerde Kerken." Quite a number of the Secession congregations stood out and continued as the Christian Reformed Church. Of late there is rapprochement between these church communities. The relation between the "Gereformeerde Kerken" and the brethren of

Reformed persuasion in the established "Hervormde" Church has lately also much improved and is marked by mutual understanding, appreciation and cordial coöperation.

I must mention in this connection the founding of the Free University of Amsterdam in 1880. The nucleus of a full-fledged Reformed university has developed well and has laid the foundation of a Reformed scientific system of learning embracing life in all its ramifications. The lectures delivered by outstanding scholars in their departments have been attended by students from the Netherlands and many other countries or, to confine our remarks to Reformed church matters north and south of the equator, by students of Reformed theology from Hungary, the Polish Ukraine, South Africa, North America and other countries in considerable numbers and with the intended results.

* * *

The Dutch Reformed churches in Belgium, a bilingual country where the large majority speak Dutch, bear largely a missionary character and endeavor to secure proselytes from the Roman Catholic population. Yet there are also old established "Hervormde" churches in some of the larger towns, which according to local opportunities hold French services as well. To my knowledge they are all orthodox. In 1912 and 1913 I was a member of the church at Ghent. One of the oldest, dating back to Reformation times, is the congregation of Maria Hoorebeke. It is situated in the locality known as the *Geuzenhoek*, a farming community, which often warrants more continuity than an industrial center. The members have clung throughout the centuries to their ancestral farms and so far never yielded to the fantastic prices offered by Roman Catholic bidders. Touching is the inscription over their church porch: Fear not, little flock!—even more so in its double diminutive: *klein kuddeke*.

The Belgian Mission Church supported by funds from the Netherlands, does fine work by evangelization, also by colportage in the country. A great work is also being done by the Norton Mission from the United States. During the latter years "Gereformeerde" churches have been founded in several towns; they have a small membership, but excellent results are achieved, the work being supported by Christian schools as feeders for the church. Among the hundreds of Dutch settlers on French farms the ministers of Dutch Reformed churches in Belgium hold services regularly and *nuclei* of churches have been formed in Paris and other centers all over France.

* * *

Professor Besselaar has been stranded in America since the Germans invaded Holland and, being at the time on a world tour, has since made his home in Vancouver, B. C., Canada. He will write another article on the Dutch Reformed Churches in the next issue, in which he will turn our attention to the Dutch East Indies and to South Africa.—EDITOR.

Krisnapolski Twits Ala Bandon and Gets a Reply

An Open Letter

My dear Ala Bandon:

IN the March number of THE CALVIN FORUM you present an interesting argument against atheism. Your argument, if I understand you correctly, is this. The atheist is in arms against an imaginary being—God. In order to make his opposition more effective he has formed an organization for the propagation of disbelief in God. Now this is absurd. It is like getting up a mass meeting for the purpose of telling people that they ought not to believe in the reality of giraffes with butterfly wings. Anybody who actually got up such a meeting would probably be placed under observation. And for a good reason. Since he is fighting a mere figment of his own imagination he must be a lunatic.

In presenting this argument you employ the medium of dialogue. This is always dangerous. You may get away with it, but as a rule you will not—unless you happen to possess the superb artistry of a Plato. But even Plato does not always get away with it. The pitfall of the dialogue method of argumentation is that of making your imaginary opponent say some fool thing which no real flesh-and-blood opponent would ever think of saying. For instance, whenever you read some of the arguments of Plato's opponents in the Symposium or, in fact, the Republic, you say to yourself: "Well, I think I could have made a better showing than that." So also in the case of your atheist. At the critical point of the argument you conveniently cause him to explode with the statement, "I hate you."

Now I don't believe that all atheists would explode that easily. I suspect that a reasonably intelligent atheist—say a college sophomore with an introductory course in philosophy behind him—might observe that *you* are the one who is really fighting a mere figment of the imagination because you are refuting only an imaginary atheist. Furthermore, he would probably tell you that he was not at all interested in fighting something imaginary, but that he was interested only in fighting those people who try to make themselves and others believe in the reality of what is in fact only imaginary.

The chief objection to your argument is that it proves (or disproves) too much. For example, I think you will agree with me that Santa Claus as he is conceived by those children who still believe in Santa Claus, is wholly a figment of the imagination. Suppose, now, that I should form an organization for the purpose of undermining the belief in Santa Claus. Would not your argument apply to me and my organization quite as validly as it applies to your imaginary atheist? And if you invoked your argument against me, my reply would be this: I have no intention of fighting Santa Claus. In fact I couldn't fight Santa Claus even if I wanted to, because "there just aint no Santa Claus." All I am trying to do is simply to oppose those infantile ideas which some benighted parents still insist upon bequeathing to their children.

I may be mistaken, but I seem to detect in your dialogue a tendency all too common among many earnest Christians who feel called upon to contend for the faith. The tendency is that of underestimating both the sincerity and the intelligence of the adversary. Always remember that a bad argument for the truth usually does as much harm as a good argument against it.

Fraternally yours,
A. KRISNAPOLSKI.

Ala Bandon Replies

Dear Fellow-Anonym:

I FEEL complimented indeed that my voice has so far penetrated the mists of anonymity as to elicit so able a reply, albeit also shrouded in the wisps of unnamed essence.

So, I am tempted out of the shelters of impersonality into the individualism of the battlefield, fully aware that such emergence is fraught with peril. The role of safety would be to simply continue to propound *ex cathedra anonyma*, secure in the knowledge of an editor's protection of my identity. But I, mythical writer, must answer my mythical correspondent, to defend my mythical atheist, who has militated against a mythical God. However, to the fray!

I am sure I must answer you, my dear opponent, because your logic in the "Open Letter" is so air-tight that, before it, my whole argument against "Atheisticus" bids fair to run aground. In the sheer desperation of self-defence, I make reply, encouraged by the conviction that your argument falls, not because of inherent fault of logic, but because of misunderstood premises.

Are there not two salient arguments in your letter, the first, that I am toppling from his steed in the lists of dialogue, a mythical opponent who does not even have the grace to be true to life, or the valor to be worthy of his clan? And is not the second, that it is not necessarily absurd to oppose faith in a myth, as we may do in the case of faith in Santa Claus? If I am mistaken in so estimating your argument, pray sit down forthwith, pen in hand, and read no more, since those are the arguments I now propose to answer.

At the outset, I may as well honestly admit that not every atheist, not even the type most "dangerous" to Christianity is like my imaginary "Atheisticus." The college sophomore, especially with an introductory course of philosophy to his credit, is prone to take a bit of pride in his atheism. We may call him, for convenience, a "practical" atheist. He is not likely to be militant against religion. He is as likely to ignore the frantic antics of the A. A. A. A., as to be supercilious about a Christian evangelist. But he is not strictly an atheist, I think, so much as a sceptic, cynic, or agnostic. The kind of atheist I had in mind is precisely the kind who is militant and propagates his new faith, organizes an A. A. A. A. and carries on world-wide tract distribution and vocal evangelism. To prove that such atheism exists would be a banality. A card to 307 East 14th St., New York City, would produce ample demonstration.

Is it true that such militant opposition against the faith of Christianity in what the atheist calls a myth, is absurd?

I grant, Mr. Krisnapolski, that your negative answer is cleverly supported. You tell me that it is perfectly understandable. To deny, be it ever so vehemently, that something exists, is not necessarily an admission of its reality. One need not be fighting the myth, but the mistaken faith in the myth, just as we oppose not Santa Claus, which jolly old elf we say is a myth and non-existent, and so unopposable, but we oppose a *faith* in that myth since such faith shuts out faith in a higher True Reality.

Now, if I might be convinced that the methods and motives of organized atheism were such that they were consciously opposing religion with the intent of substituting something superior, I might yield the point. But their methods are purely nihilistic.

It should also be borne in mind that I was not intending to reveal by my dialogue what atheism's *expressed* intentions are. My purpose was to show that the methods of atheism are such that they are hopelessly illogical unless a real hidden motive is revealed.

So too, my imaginary atheist conveniently exploded, because I assumed that his ill logic was so apparent that the hidden motive of hatred was apparent. Realism was "playing ball" in the interest of logic. My argument is this: atheism claims that God does not exist, yet his methods serve only to prove that God does exist, but that the atheist hates him.

The tracts of the "4A" try to prove that the Bible, which Christians call the Word of God, shows us a God who is evil and immoral. But if God does not exist, how can He be evil? If He is evil, He exists. Not the non-existence of God, but the atheist's hatred has been proved. Again, if the Bible is immoral, and God is evil, by what standard of good and morality is God judged? Christians say God is the standard of good. The atheist either has no such standard, and so cannot call God evil, or he has such a standard, and then he assumes God's existence, and that assumption must try to prove that God does not exist. In the mind and method of atheism, God exists but He is hated. Again, the atheist challenges God to strike him with lightning if He exists. The silence of the heavens is his answer and he has proved God does not exist. But in his challenge, he is assuming that which he has just denied, namely, that God is good and just and would punish his irreverence if He existed. If God is the kind of God the atheist has been trying to prove He is, He might strike anyone, anytime. The atheist's challenge proves that God is not evil, so He must be good. The atheist's challenge also assumes that God is good, but only serves to prove that the atheist blasphemously hates Him.

My purpose was to show that the methods of atheism are such that they reveal in spite of the atheist's desire, what the real motive is, and that unless that hidden motive is revealed, the method is insanely illogical.

So too, my imaginary atheist showed poor judgment in exploding as he did, but when an imaginary person is being used to bring home a logical point, realism must "play ball" or be sacrificed. The logic, my dear Krisnapolski, is this: atheism claims one thing, but its methods show something else, and unless atheism admits that logically its methods reveal a knowledge of the reality of God, it is a mentality that is unbalanced.

Now, how is atheism driven to that logical necessity? The tracts and speeches of the "4A" try to prove that the Bible, which the Christians call the Word of God, contains things that show that God is an evil being and immoral, and by challenging God to strike them with lightning as they stand preaching in the park against Him, they try to prove He does not exist. One asks the atheist these questions, "If God does not exist, what good is it to prove that He is evil?" If He is no Being, neither can He be evil. If He is an evil Being, He is no less a Being, and so His existence is proved, not denied. "If God is evil, and the Bible immoral, there must be such things as good and evil; where do they come from, if not from that same Bible?" "By challenging God to strike you with lightning, are you not assuming that he exists, and can do it, and would do it, and are you not condemning your own irreverence by demanding a thing that you must assume a righteous God as the Christians believe in, would do?"

I do not know if I have satisfied you, Mr. Krisnapolski, but I contend again, that admit it or not, atheism is a religion of hatred of God.

Further discussion under the aegis of an editorial policy that welcomes debate, is not precluded, on my part.

With this, I greet you, for the nonce, hoping that the greeting may go with warmth, though it comes from an anonymous cloud on one imaginary horizon and goes to a like cloud on an equally mythical shore.

With fraternal amity,
ALA BANDON.

MOTHERHOOD

We hold with awe to this responsibility
Conceived in deepest bliss and sweet tranquility;

Brought through the vale of death into the land of
birth
A living soul to train in Christlike ways on earth.

Mother! the word implies such magnitude immense
In humble prayer we plead for God's benevolence.

The sacred trust we have is prescient all the while
As sinful natures soon show forth where shone the
angel smile.

Children will imitate example that we show—
May God on Mother's Day His grace anew bestow.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

FIRST LORD'S DAY

Music of God's love,
How sweet the sound.
Heavenly peals
From organ's key-board.

Beautiful melodies,
Comforts, promises.
Heaven again
Shines down upon us.

Ecstasy of rapture,
Glorious words.
My only comfort:
I am the Lord's.

—AURENE.



From Our Correspondents

A London Letter

Dear Dr. Bouma:

THE tragic events of the past months must be held responsible, in part at least, for the long interval between this and my previous letter. Our offices in the city of London, which you visited two years ago, were destroyed by incendiary bombs on the night of December 29, but temporary accommodation has been secured at St. Paul's Chambers, 19 Ludgate Hill, E. C. 4, to which all communications for the Sovereign Grace Union should now be addressed. The churches and chapels which have been damaged or destroyed, include some that have long enjoyed a spiritual and evangelical ministry. Such a sanctuary was St. Mary-le-Port, Bristol, a rallying-point for generations of Calvinistic church-people, of which only the ancient tower survives. Founded in 1170, and rebuilt in the XVth century, this church was the only one in the Anglican body, in which the communion-table retained its pre-Laudian position, with the narrow end facing the congregation. The rector, the Rev. W. Dodgson Sykes, is Principal of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary and Training College in the same city, which has suffered severely in the raids. London victims of the *blitzkrieg* include St. Andrew, Holborn, where George Whitefield preached; Austin Friars, which has been a Dutch Reformed church since the reign of Edward VI; St. Bride, Fleet Street, an Evangelical church and one of Wren's finest, of which only the steeple remains; St. Magnus-the-Martyr, burial-place of Miles Coverdale, Biblical translator; and St. Mary Woolnoth, which contained a monument to John Newton, author of the hymn, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," who was rector there from 1779 to 1807. St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, which perished in the conflagration of December 29, was from 1766 to 1795 the scene of the ministry of William Romaine, author of "The Life, Walk and Triumph of Faith"; his monument and bust were destroyed with the church. The statue of Milton, which stood outside St. Giles, Cripplegate, was recently hit by a bomb, while his tomb within the church escaped. Islington parish church, associated for over a century with an evangelical Clerical Conference, lies a mass of rubble and charred timber, but its fine Renaissance spire still points to the skies. For the second time in its history disaster has befallen the Metropolitan Tabernacle, famous for the ministry of Charles Haddon Spurgeon: the surviving congregation is carrying on bravely in a small hall.

This year's "special lecturer" at the Free Church of Scotland College, Edinburgh, was Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones of Westminster Chapel, who commenced his career in the medical profession and had attained considerable eminence as a surgeon when, at the call of Jesus Christ, he consecrated his life and talents to the ministry of the Gospel. An uncompromising Calvinist, his recent volume, "Why does God allow War?" has secured a wide circulation despite its fearless exposure of the world's sin and the real causes of the war. The lectures dealt in the same trenchant manner with the most topical of all subjects, viz., sin, its nature, penalty and remedy.

In the House of Commons on February 20 the Home Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Herbert Morrison, M. P., announced the Government's decision to legalize the opening of theatres and music-halls on the Lord's Day by means of Defence Regulation

42B under the War Powers Emergency (Defence) Act, 1939. The announcement has been received with profound regret by Christians who are concerned for the sanctity of the Sabbath, and who contend further that such a use of a defence regulation was not contemplated when Parliament enacted the measure in question.

British Christians were profoundly impressed by a recent statement of President Roosevelt. Writing to the chairman of the National Christian Mission meeting in Washington, he is reported to have said: "A real revival of religion is what this country most needs, and in such a revival we would find a solution to all our problems, whether political, economic or social. I like, therefore, the emphasis which your group places on the three alternatives that confront society—the collapse of civilization, the acceptance of the new paganism, or the revival of Christianity." In spite of our present distresses, there is little sign of such a revival in this country. A third "Day of National Prayer" appointed by authority, was observed yesterday (March 23) by a fraction of the population consisting chiefly of regular churchgoers, but the press today announces that "huge audiences attended Manchester cinemas for the second Sunday opening." A solution to our problems—and they are many at the moment—would be in sight if we could see not a minority, but the whole nation on its knees before God in penitential prayer.

A letter from Capt. P. Bosio, who was liaison officer between the British and Italian troops in the Four Years' War, and who is now minister of the largest Waldensian church in Rome, has reached us by a circuitous route. He tells of the encouraging results attending a recent evangelistic tour through the Valleys and elsewhere in rural Italy. One small town turned out in force on the occasion of a Waldensian funeral, when the Gospel was listened to with attention for over half an hour. Several of the Protestant churches in the towns were "blacked out" at the beginning of the war, in order that evening activities might continue during the winter months. In spite of difficulties, the 150th anniversary of the death of Giosuè Janavel, the Waldensian hero, was duly commemorated by a large open-air gathering on the historic mountains of Rora, following which the Annual General Synod of the Church took place at Torre Pellice, when four students were ordained to the ministry. At the conclusion of the war the need for the witness of the ancient Church of Italy will be greater than ever, and American and British friends will pray that the need may be accompanied by increased opportunities for proclaiming the Gospel which many in every land have proved to be "the power of God unto salvation."

Fraternally yours,
S. LEIGH HUNT.

London, March 24, 1941.

Items from Chicago

Dear Dr. Bouma:

Here follow a few notes from Chicago.

1. Chicago is falling in line with many other towns and cities of the nation in trying to correlate some scheme of religious education with the public school curriculum. The Chi-

Chicago Church Federation favors the general idea of the superintendent of public schools that some time be given the pupils for courses in religious education in their own churches or synagogues. I gather from the latest reports that the Roman Catholics and Jews are sympathetic toward this movement.

After driving religion out of the public schools during the last one hundred years, our religious people are beginning to realize that a purely secular education does not make for the highest type of citizenship, and also reacts unfavorably upon the spiritual life of the Church.

As Calvinists we cannot be satisfied with this solution of our educational problem. We are also aware that this movement may lead to some form of state religion, which may be as great an evil as our atheistic education today.

On the other hand, millions of our children are growing up without any conception of their responsibility to God and man. Walter Lippmann recently told an audience in the University of Pennsylvania that the public schools have produced a generation that has no culture, in the classical sense of the term. And there is truth in the indictment. And it is just as true that the public schools have given us a generation without morals, without any sense of moral responsibility. Anything is right as long as you can get away with it. If you are "caught" it is because you are not clever enough.

This situation confronts us with a problem. Even if the churches are given a little school time for some religious education for their own children, that does not solve the problem for the 25,000,000 children who never see the inside of a church or Sunday School. Should the public schools do something for the moral education of these millions so that we do not have too many citizens who see no wrong in lying and stealing and worse things if you can only get away with it?

I would like to see our public school teachers and professors in state universities among THE CALVIN FORUM readers give us their views on this problem.

2. We all know the position of President Hutchins of the University of Chicago on the war. Whether we agree with this position or not, we ought to agree with him that our colleges and universities should continue to be educational centers for "the cultivation of the mind and the search for truth." Dr. Hutchins maintains, and rightly so, that after the war we shall need well-educated people to solve the many problems growing out of the war and its aftermath. "The war must stop sometime. Students whose education consists chiefly of learning how to machine shells are not likely to play a useful part in a community at peace, a community that will face the grave difficulties found in every post-war period and which will need all the enlightened intelligence it can muster. To the extent to which you concentrate training men for war, to that extent you are likely to unfit them for peace. And if you turn the whole educational system into an adjunct of a war machine, you will have the tremendous task of re-creating an educational system after the war is over. These things may prove to be necessary, but we cannot be light-hearted about them. They are a part, and a great part, of the cost of war."

3. On two recent Thursdays I had the pleasure of addressing the *Christian Youth League* on the campus of the University of Chicago. This is an evangelical organization affiliated with the *Christian Youth League of America* and the *Intervarsity Christianity Fellowship* of Canada and the United States. I must confess that I did not know that this evangelical organization existed on the local campus until I received the invitation. The experience was very enjoyable and confirmed my conviction that there is a field for genuine Christian work on many of our university campuses. Many students, especially graduate students, are hungry for the truth as it is in Christ.

4. Dr. Jacques Maritain, the well-known Roman Catholic philosopher, who is a guest professor on the local campus, said recently: "The evils overwhelming the world today are exactly the final result of the idea according to which politics cannot and must not be Christian because it is considered a pure technique, an art intrinsically independent of ethics and re-

ligion, and whose only law is the quickest material success by any means at all."

How true these words are!

And how interesting, and perhaps significant, that these words should be spoken at the University of Chicago, where Dewey propounded his *pragmatism* for years!

Cordially yours,
E. J. TANIS.

Grand Rapids Notes

MANY FORUM readers, especially those living in distant parts, must have been wondering at times why among the numerous letters and notes on Calvinistic happenings and doings in various parts of the world which have appeared on the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM, so little has come from Grand Rapids. This is surprising indeed. Grand Rapids is possibly the liveliest center of Calvinistic thought and activity in the United States. Here most of the activities of the Christian Reformed Church are concentrated. Here Calvin College and Seminary are located. Here from time to time conferences are held in the interest of the Reformed Faith. Here THE CALVIN FORUM is published, as also *The Banner*, *The Intelligencer-Leader*, *The Young Calvinist*. It must have seemed strange indeed that so little news from this center of Calvinistic activity has appeared on the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM.

The reason? I do not know. Possibly the only real reason is found in the fact that one does not readily write a letter from "home" to "home". One takes "home" for granted. But there are many people away from "home" who would be interested to know what is going on in the home of THE CALVIN FORUM. Well, a number of things have happened of late which are of interest to all who would promote the cause of the Reformed Faith.

The Calvinistic Discussion Club

The Calvinistic Discussion Club of Western Michigan has recently held an interesting meeting. Meetings are usually held at the homes of the members. This lends a bit of a homey touch to the discussions and to the fellowship. Members of this club are: Prof. Clarence Bouma, Rev. Leonard Greenway, Rev. Peter Holwerda, Dr. J. T. Hoogstra, Prof. D. H. Kromminga, Rev. Adam Persenaire, Prof. Henry Stob, Prof. Ralph Stob, Rev. John G. Van Dyke, Rev. John Weidenaar, and Prof. Thomas E. Welmers. The club had an even dozen members, but this has been reduced by one when Dr. Leonard De Moor last year accepted an appointment to a professorship at Huron College, Huron, S. D.

In 1938, at the time of its organization, the Club decided upon a program. That program calls for the reading of a series of papers under the general heading of: A Study in Christian-Augustinian-Calvinistic Ontology. It will be noticed that, although this club does not officially call itself a Philosophical Club, it is that in reality. It might also be called a Calvinistic Apologetics Club. Without entering into any controversy or even discussion on the difference between Philosophy and Theology in the Calvinistic view of the organism of Science (*Wissenschaft*), which comes in for repeated discussion at the Club meetings, we may say that the subjects of the papers so far delivered and projected are of a philosophico-theological character.

Possibly, CALVIN FORUM readers are interested in the list of these subjects. Here they are: The Nature and the Unity of Reality; Christianity and Platonism; Augustinianism and Reformed Thought; The "Christian" Philosophy of the Middle Ages; Modern German Idealism and the Reformed Faith; Schleiermacher and the Beginnings of Theological Modernism; Recent Neo-Calvinistic Philosophy in Holland. This is the first group of the series. It is, as the reader will notice, an historical group. The papers dealing with those subjects have been delivered from Jan. 1939 to September 1940. A beginning has just been made with the systematic group of this same series. These

subjects are as follows: The Significance of Creation for the Christian View of Reality; Personality and the Trinity in the Christian View of Reality; Divine Immanence and Transcendence; The Supernatural and its Place in Christian Thought; The Problem of Evil and the Conquest of Sin; The Christian Philosophy of History.

The subject discussed at the April 18 meeting was that dealing with Creation. The meeting was held at the home of Dr. Leonard Greenway, pastor of the Eighth Reformed Church, Grand Rapids. Prof. Carel Jan Smit, who teaches Economics at Wheaton College, was present as guest upon invitation, he being on a visit in Michigan just at the time. Speaker was the Rev. Peter Holwerda, pastor of the Lee Street Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids. The speaker stressed the basic significance of the doctrine of creation for a truly biblical view of the relation between God and the cosmos. He dealt critically with the monistic types of thought, which repudiate creation and consequently merge the Creator and the creature. The problem of the nature of time came in for treatment, as also the difference between a creation existing eternally in the mind of God and the actual creation which came into being concurrently with time. The contrast between the idealistic view of a utopia here upon earth was contrasted with the Christian and biblical view of sin and redemption through Christ leading to an ultimate state of bliss in the hereafter. The paper evoked lively discussion, in which all members participated.

Tenth Anniversary C. L. A.

On the evening of April 25 the tenth anniversary of the Christian Labor Association of the U. S. A. was celebrated in a meeting at the Grandville Avenue Christian Reformed Church. Friends and members of the C. L. A. had come, not only from Grand Rapids, but also from other Western Michigan communities. The Christian Labor Association is a Christian labor federation. It aims at the objectives of social and industrial justice for the Christian laboring man. It is a protest against the two existing labor organizations (the Committee for Industrial Organization and the American Federation of Labor), and seeks to reach its objectives by methods in harmony with the standards of God's Word.

Two addresses were delivered, the one by the Rev. William Hendriksen of the Oakdale Park Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, the other by the Rev. John Bovenkerk of the First Reformed Church, Muskegon, Michigan. The former spoke on "The Only Solution" and showed that no Christian laborer could be satisfied with anything less than membership in a positively Christian labor organization. The latter discoursed on "Communism and Christianity", showing the Marxian and anti-Christian basis and objectives of the communistic movement. He stressed among other things that communism sought to gain its objectives by force, whereas Christianity seeks to attain its objectives through love and justice. The General Secretary, Mr. Joseph Gritter, who was to have given an historical review of the first decade of the existence of the C. L. A., gave instead a brief inspirational statement of the objectives and needs for the future. The C. L. A. has its locals in various states of the Union and is coming into the national limelight in these days of industrial struggle and turmoil.

Second American Calvinistic Conference

The Committee charged with preparing plans for the Second American Calvinistic Conference recently held one of its meetings in Grand Rapids. Members of this Committee (given in inverted alphabetical order) are: Dr. Charles Vinze (Perth Amboy, N. J.), Dr. John G. Van Dyke (Grand Rapids), Dr. Leon Wincelius (Swarthmore, Pa.), Prof. Thomas Welmers (Hope College, Holland, Mich.), Dr. K. J. Stratemeier (Dubuque University, Dubuque, Iowa), Rev. John Schuurmann (Grand Rapids), Prof. William Childs Robinson (Columbia Seminary, Decatur, Ga.), Dr. Stuart Robinson (Editor "The Presbyterian", Philadelphia, Pa.), Rev. L. Oostendorp (Battle Creek, Mich.), Dr. J. T. Hoogstra (Holland, Mich.), Rev. George Murray (Boston, Mass.), Prof. Edward Mack (Union Seminary, Richmond,

Va.), Dr. C. E. Hayward (Dalhousie, N. B., Canada), Dr. Samuel Craig (Editor "Christianity Today", Princeton, N. J.), Rev. J. Bovenkerk (Muskegon, Mich.), and Prof. Clarence Bouma (Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids). As for denominational representation, no less than seven different communions are represented on this committee.

As our readers may know, the addresses of the First American Calvinistic Conference, held in 1939, are now in print. The volume, under the title "The Sovereignty of God", has recently made its appearance and has been edited by Dr. Jacob T. Hoogstra, the presiding officer at that conference and a member of the present conference committee. The general theme chosen for the Second Conference is: "The Word of God". It was held advisable to postpone the conference from the proposed 1941 date to the following year. Meetingplace will be Grand Rapids. Time tentatively set will be early in June, 1942. The speakers for the conference have not yet finally been chosen. No doubt the committee will have some announcements on this matter before long.

C. B.

Chips....

Christianity and Crisis is the name of a new 8-page bi-weekly published at \$1.50 a year. It is published at 601 West 120th Street, New York City. The paper is palpably a protest against the pacifist *Christian Century* and takes the stand that it is the duty of Christian people in a world of sin to choose the lesser of two evils. It stands for all-out aid to the Allies and is valuable as being a modernist paper showing up the fallacies of pacifism. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr is the chairman of the editorial board.

Knickerbocker Weekly recently made its appearance in New York City. Its sub-title is "Free Netherlands" and it appeared as a monthly for some time before this. This weekly contains news of the world war and all that is worth knowing about the Netherlands in these days of its invasion. The purpose of the magazine is to keep the American public informed on happenings in the Netherlands and in the Dutch East Indies as well as among the Dutch government officials in London; and also to encourage Hollanders fighting for the freedom of their native country. The journal is a 32-page publication. Subscription price: \$5.00 annually. Address: Knickerbocker Weekly, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.

Said Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the President of Columbia University: "From the point of view of an American it can only once more be repeated that to speak of this war as a European war is childish. To describe it as something from which the American Government and the American people may and should remain aloof and isolated is worse than stupidity. It is suicidal."

Would you like to have a 12-page pamphlet grouping and quoting numberless Scripture passages on Divine Sovereignty? You can have it for six cents (less in quantities) from Bible Truth Depot, I. C. Herendeen, Swengel, Union County, Pa. Ask for tract entitled: "God's Indisputable Sovereignty". Especially Calvinists ought to have these Scripture passages at their finger tips.

According to recent information, although badly battered in the war, John Calvin's house at Noyon, in Picardy, France, still stands. The windows and roof have received damage, and the interior also, but the chapel in the house is undamaged. Calvin was born in Noyon in 1509 and spent the early part of his life there.

Dr. Slotemaker de Bruine, a Dutch Christian educator, theologian, and statesman recently spoke as follows:

"Do not ask us, for the sake of national unity, to eliminate from public life that which is most sacred to us; you would impoverish your people. For the sake of our people, take us as we are. Spiritual freedom has entered into our blood. I mean the freedom of conscience, freedom for the Church, for the school, the freedom for the Word of God, freedom to carry spiritual values into public life. For this is the most characteristic element in our national life. What God gave us in His revelation must penetrate into and give direction to the whole of public life. Not only in the Church, but also in the youth movement, in social life. Does this mean separatism? No, for the miracle of 1568 (beginning of the Eighty Years' War leading to Dutch independence and the Dutch Republic) may repeat itself. A group which stood squarely on the basis of an indestructible foundation, became at that time the focus point for the many and became the spearhead of a widespread national movement. Many call for a strong foundation. It is good patriotism to point to such a foundation. Only a Christian national life is truly national."

"This present war finds us in the midst of a great struggle against the most dreadful danger ever to threaten the highest human values brought by Christianity. Today the danger is much greater than it was in the time of Louis XIV, because the present German government not only threatens political liberty and liberty of conscience but every form of decent, honest, human existence." These are the words of the Dutch Calvinist Premier Gerbrandy, now with his government in exile in London.

"The Puritan feared only God, his own conscience, and the Judgment Day. He was Exhibit A of the Calvinism of the Stuart period, and of early colonial America. He was a builder of commonwealths, an engineer of highways for the advancing interests of the Kingdom of God. When human mightiness met human misery, the Puritan was at once the minister of jus-

tice and mercy in the prevention of ruthlessness by the one side, and in the deliverance from despair on the part of the other. When the day arrived for the erection of the free institutions that made this land a sanctuary for the oppressed, it was the Puritan spirit that dictated the documents appertaining thereto. The early Dutch and French were part and parcel with the English in this enterprise, for had they not all been scorched in the same flame, and did they not all carry the same secret of divinely-born liberty?"

—DR. WILLIAM CROWE, in: *The Presbyterian Survey*.

In one of his lectures delivered some time ago by Prof. August Lecerf on "The Revival of Calvinism", the learned French Calvinist maintained that not predestination but the sovereignty of God is the constructive principle of Calvinism. Predestination, said he, so far from being a first principle in Calvin's mind, was expounded by him only at the end of the third book of his great work. It became specifically Calvinistic when it was treated as a particular case of the sovereignty of God. Sovereign grace and effectual calling were implied in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, where things depending upon the wills of men were assumed to depend, in the last resort, upon the will of God. The principle of Calvinism was the principle of primitive Christianity, and ought to be the principle of Christian theology in our day.

In a commencement address directed by him to the graduating class of Western Seminary (Reformed Church in America, Holland, Mich.) the Rev. Luke A. Brunsting in May 1939 said: "Bring the Word without mental reserve. Mean what you say and say what you mean. Christ, virgin born. Yes, blood atonement. Yes, all the major strongholds of Calvinism. We have the Truth, bring it. It is of the finest spiritual fruit on the market today. It can stand inspection. It does withstand substitution. Bring the whole, full Word."

Around the Book Table

A SCRIPTURE STUDY IN HEREDITY

THE SUPPLANTER DECEIVED, OR, JACOB'S DIVINE INSTRUCTION IN HEREDITY. By John P. Van Haitsma, Ph.D. 1941. Available at H. Kuizema & Son, 805 Oakdale Street, SE., Grand Rapids, Mich. pp. 193. \$1.

ARE you interested in heredity? Does the question of prenatal maternal impressions intrigue you? Do you like goats? Have you been wondering about that goat story in the life of Jacob during his stay with Laban at Haran? Does the harmonization of Scripture and science, of general and special revelation, hold your interest? If so, you will want to read this book.

This is a biologist's discussion of the principles of genetics and heredity coupled with a distinct Old Testament passage and its proposed interpretation. How closely these two elements, the biblical and the scientific, are interwoven in the almost 200 pages of this book may appear from the list of its chapter headings. Here they are: Setting of Jacob's Divine Instruction; Jacob's Previous Training; Jacob's Self-Reliant Scheme; Some Objections to Jacob's Scheme; Genetics versus Jacob's Scheme; God Instructs Jacob; What Jacob's Supernatural Instruction Explains; The Bible Refutes Jacob's Scheme; Jacob's Divine Instruction and Modern Biology; Moral Implications of Jacob's Instruction; Some Basic Considerations Suggested by Jacob's Instruction.



Dr. Van Haitsma, who is the head of the Department of Organic Science at Calvin College, here offers an exegetical and biological discussion of the passage in Genesis 30:37—31:13, which narrates the story of the rapid increase of the speckled offspring of Laban's flocks, which was to constitute the hire paid to Jacob as his father-in-law's sheepmaster. He rejects the view advanced by most commentators that Scripture teaches that the pilled rod scheme of Jacob was the effective cause for this large increase. He repudiates the "pre-natal influence theory of animal marking" from embryological, physiological, and hereditary considerations; claims that Gen. 30 does not teach that the pilled rods laid by Jacob in the water troughs produced the speckled offspring; and holds that the explanation for this phenomenon is given in the dream of which Jacob speaks to his wives in Gen. 31:10-13. "The vision informed him that Laban's apparently plain-colored he-goats . . . were really spotted, streaked, and grizzled" and that "the invisible spots of Laban's animals were the physiological causes of the visible spots of their offspring." (p. 89.)

After this thesis has been established in the first half of the book, he devotes the second half to a discussion of various aspects of the study of heredity and of the character of Jacob. Lest anyone should take this to be just a biblical homily, we hasten to say that this book can also be characterized as a treatise on the theme that "hereditary characteristics of all

organisms are predetermined by factors in the germ cells of the parents." In the chapter on modern biology such subjects as the following come in for brief treatment: bi-parental reproduction, Galton's stirp theory, the preformation theory, the theory of epigenesis, particulate inheritance (Francis Galton), "dominance," varietal hybridization, hybrid vigor, reversion, telegony, saturation, and Haeckel's "biogenetic law". In this connection the author also makes an interesting suggestion for a biological explanation of the origin of the races of mankind (p. 134), a suggestion which one would like to see him work out and motivate more fully some time.

There is one possible misapprehension which the reader might readily get about this book which the reviewer would like to correct. Although one would almost get that impression from the author himself at times, one should not suppose that the value of this book stands or falls with the correctness or plausibility of the interpretation which Dr. Van Haitsma offers of the pertinent Genesis passage and which he holds to be not only original but almost a godsend. It is fortunate that the intrinsic value of this book does not depend upon the correctness of this view. Persons who—like the present reviewer—may not be particularly impressed with the cogency of the proposed new bit of exegesis (any more than with the old) should not feel that the book has no great value for them. Such a conclusion would be a regrettable one. By far the greater part of the book has its value irrespective of the acceptability of the proposed new interpretation of Gen. 31:10-13. The "new exegesis" is worth weighing upon its own merits, but whatever value one may attach to it, Dr. Van Haitsma's book has a value and merit that is largely independent of its plausibility or non-plausibility.

The real value of this book lies in its approach, in its informative material on the subject of heredity, in its attempt to combine scientific scholarship with devout Scripture study, in its contribution toward the understanding of the relation of general and special revelation, nature and Scripture. One is impressed by the careful investigation, the keen observation, and the sustained attempt to harmonize many outstanding conceptions of biology and heredity with the teaching of Scripture. To this task Dr. Van Haitsma brings the equipment of a painstaking scientist of years standing, the patience of a careful research worker, and the passion of a believing scholar who honors God's Word and seeks to make a serious contribution to the harmonization of scientific study and scriptural interpretation.

The writer enlivens and enriches his pages with poetical quotations from a Whittier and an Emerson, a Scott and a Pope, a Cowper and a Milton, a Blake and a Wesley, a Dryden and a Tennyson.

We are thankful to Dr. Van Haitsma for this production from his pen and express the hope that he may some time give us a book on the subject of Evolution. The fine paragraph on p. 140 in which the teleological view of the creationist is contrasted with the non-teleological conception of the evolutionistic naturalist might well be made the theme or "text" for such a work. And when that next work is put on the market, may we suggest that there be no repetition of the Roman Catholic attempt to obtain the imprimatur of any such dignitary as the President of the Executive Committee of Calvin's Board of Trustees, who (so we read almost unbelievably in the Preface) "assured the writer that the thesis of this essay was approved"? One does not know whether to laugh or to weep over that sentence. At any rate, we have no ecclesiastical "boekencensuur" either at Calvin College and Seminary or in the Christian Reformed Church. We are happy to be able on this point to reassure the unsuspecting reader of this strange paragraph in the preface. C. B.

Look for the next issue of THE CALVIN FORUM not in the early but in the latter part of June. It will be an enlarged issue and, as in recent years, will be combined for the months of June and July.

A HISTORY OF ETHICS

GESCHIEDENIS DER ETHIEK. Door Dr. J. Severijn. Publisher: J. H. Kok, Kampen (Netherlands), 1940. pp. 240.

THIS is a brief history of Ethics, with special emphasis upon Christian Ethics, and written from the Reformed point of view. The author is professor at the University of Utrecht and is of Calvinistic persuasion. It is a real merit of this book that it offers a survey of the history of thought in the field of morals within limited compass. This, however, is also its handicap. In 240 pages one can hardly do justice to the history of ethical thought, both theological and philosophical, from earliest classical antiquity to Emil Brunner. Much of the discussion is sketchy and very brief.

However, even so one is thankful for a book like this. There is not very much material available on the history of Ethics written from the point of view of the Reformed Faith. The author throughout presents and evaluates the various thinkers and schools from this standpoint. However brief and sketchy at times, there is a real point of view running through the entire discussion. It is also a distinct merit of this book that it treats the ethics of Calvin as fully as it does. Even though the proportions are slightly distorted, in that no less than 73 of the 240 pages are devoted to the ethics of Calvin, one gladly overlooks this in his joy over the fulness of treatment of this particular subject.

The author divides his material into five chapters, as follows: 1. Morals in Paganism; 2. Israelitish Ethics; 3. The Philosophical Ethics of Classical Antiquity; 4. Christian Ethics up to the Reformation; 5. History of Ethics up to the Present. It will be noticed that in some of these periods the author offers a history of Ethics in general, whereas in others it is a history of Christian Ethics. The author, who has specialized in the Philosophy of Religion rather than in Ethics, leans very heavily upon secondary sources, especially Luthardt's *Geschichte der Christlichen Ethik*, which he acknowledges throughout. This indebtedness does not hold for his extensive treatment of the ethics of Calvin. That discussion is based upon the *Institutes* and the references to that work are very full. These 73 pages on Calvin are by far the most valuable part of the book. C. B.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD, OR, THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST AMERICAN CALVINISTIC CONFERENCE. Edited by Jacob I. Hoogstra, Th.D., President. Grand Rapids, 1940, Zonderwan. \$1.50.

FOR a while we feared the addresses delivered at the First American Calvinistic Conference, held at Paterson, N. J., would not appear in print. This would have been very regrettable. Addresses delivered at a conference such as this are of permanent value. Many who could not be present surely will wish to know what was spoken. Happily, though somewhat belated, we now have all these addresses in print before us. I am sure it was through no fault of the alert editor of this volume that the book did not appear in print until more than a year after the conference, and I am equally certain it was only due to an oversight that no volume for review came into our hands until 1941. We are the more happy we can review it now.

Let no one be frightened by the term "Proceedings" in the sub-title. These are not proceedings. Who wants to buy "Proceedings"? But, I repeat, these are not proceedings. They are the addresses of the Conference. We can sit down of an evening in the spring of 1941 in our homes and hear again the exalted thoughts and ideas propounded by Calvinists of two continents and some eight different Calvinistic bodies. And they certainly are worth re-reading. There are three "Foundational Studies", three "Applicatory Studies", and four "Public Addresses".

As could be expected, not all of these addresses are of equal value. The first two addresses are by Professor John Murray of Westminster Seminary and Professor John Macleod of the

Free Church College of Edinburgh. They are solid material, both of them dealing with the doctrinal basis and implications as well as the defense of the sovereignty of God. Murray offers a good deal of biblical material, as the formulation of his subject required. Macleod devotes some space to the discussion of the problem of human freedom and divine sovereignty. Both of these addresses are valuable, but we wish they could have been cast in a form that is less traditional and stereotyped. If we are to make the great verities of the Reformed Faith a living force in the thinking of our day, we must get away from musty and dry formulations and presentations.

The discussion of Professor Kromminga of Calvin Seminary on "The Sovereignty of God and Barthianism" is very interesting, penetrating, and stimulating. The subject, of course, has the advantage of being actual and up-to-date. Kromminga does a nice piece of work in the few pages allotted to him. Under eleven headings he advances some pointed criticism of Karl Barth's theology, yet without being too dogmatic in his own conclusions about this system of "Reformed" theology which is still on the way and has not yet arrived. Kromminga knows his Karl Barth. This chapter is one of the more valuable in the volume.

These are termed the "foundational" studies. Then follow three "applicatory" studies of the same subject. The implication of Divine Sovereignty are exhibited for the three fields of political science (and action), for the study of philosophy, and for the science of ethics. Dr. Garrett Heyns, who both as a student of the subject and as an active participant in affairs of government has a good background to draw from, writes interestingly on "Politics", advancing some of the fundamental positions first propounded chiefly by Abraham Kuyper. One could wish that Dr. Heyns might some day give us a book in which fundamentals like these are given fuller application to the actualities of the American political scene. The practical directions offered by him toward the close of the address as to the advisable procedure in the actual application of Calvinistic principles to political life are to the point.

Possibly the disappointing address in the book is that of Dr. De Moor on "The Sovereignty of God and Philosophy". The address is lacking in unity, no doubt because it consists of two articles put together, the one offering some pointed critical remarks of certain ideas advanced by Professor T. V. Smith of the University of Chicago, the other a discussion of the subject of Revelation originally written as an article for THE CALVIN FORUM. It is regrettable that Dr. De Moor has not risen to the occasion in dealing with so significant, so live, and so engaging a subject as the implications of the doctrine of divine sovereignty for the study of Philosophy.

Matheson's is a good address on the ethical implications of divine sovereignty. He lays down a theological basis for ethics and makes a number of sound applications of this God-centered position to some concrete moral issues.

Then follow the four public addresses, which were delivered to evening audiences and are hence of a more popular and inspirational nature. It should not, however, be concluded that these addresses do not contain solid food. In an inspiring address on "The Sovereignty of God and American Attitudes", Professor Wm. Childs Robinson of the Southern Presbyterian Church sets forth the glory of Calvinism and its doctrines of the priority of God as over against pragmatism, humanism, finitism, and opportunism in American philosophy, theology, and ecclesiastical life. Principal Macleod next gives what he confesses is a sermon on "God's Sovereign Choice of the Younger Son", dealing with Jacob and divine election in the light of Romans 9. Dr. Greenway discusses the matter of human responsibility in relation to divine sovereignty. This is a helpful address, practical, sensible, and somewhat apologetical. It is written in interesting fashion. Professor Aalders of Amsterdam in the closing address says some good things about a Reformed scholar's attitude toward Biblical Science, criticism, and related subjects.

Let no one conclude that this is a dry and uninteresting volume for scholars only. I wish I could quote some of the live and challenging paragraphs scattered throughout the book. Here is just one of them, taken from Dr. Hoogstra's opening address at the Conference. Said Hoogstra: "Should we, in 1939, entertain fears that our faith is possibly wrong? Across the mountains, miles of telephone poles carry wires from central station to the farthest hamlet. Across the ages, from the publican before the Temple and the harlot at Jesus' feet, the giant St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Kuyper, Bavinck, and all the saints of God in the sacred moment of prayer, stand like huge telephone poles across the mountains of history, bearing this one wire that unites them all—'Saved by grace.' I thank Thee, Lord, for every iota of salvation. I love Thee because Thou hast first loved me. God chose me: I did not choose Him. And this *is* Calvinism."

All lovers of Reformed truth should read this volume. A vote of thanks to the Eastern Ministers' Conference (Rev. J. J. Hie-menga, President) which sponsored this first American Calvinistic Conference. This volume will be a fitting living monument to the success of their efforts.

C. B.

UTILIZING LIFE'S EXPERIENCES

FACING LIFE AND MAKING THE BEST OF IT. By Clarence Macartney. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 184 pages. \$1.50.

MACARTNEY is generally recognized as one of the country's most outstanding Presbyterian preachers. It is said that "he has the special gift of illuminating the Scriptures through life and life through the Scriptures." His exegetical powers do not strike the reviewer as being exceptional. As I try to analyze the success of his preaching by the volume before me, I get the impression that he excels along other lines. For instance, he knows life—life as it is in all its moods. He has lived with people. He has read widely and has been able to put to use much of the materials that he has gleaned. He has the knack of using the Bible text to introduce something of intensely practical value. His first aim is not apparently to interpret Scriptures, but to mold happier, better, and higher lives. In *Facing Life*, the preacher calls upon his readers to face courageously everything that life may have to give, and then to interpret the experiences of life in such a way as to have them count for the improvement of life here on earth. He would have us get victory out of defeat, joy out of sorrow, and life out of death.

H. S.

ZWEMER WRITES AGAIN

THE ART OF LISTENING TO GOD. By Samuel Zwemer. Zonder-van Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 217 pages. \$1.50.

DR. ZWEMER is a prolific writer. This is his 27th volume. Yet he never wearies the reader as he reads on. This book contains seventeen articles on as many disconnected themes. They run all the way from Mahatma Ghandi and Suicide to the Choir Loft. The title of the book is borrowed from the first chapter. If there be any unity in this book it must be found in the consistent conservative approach and in the practical religious objectives. Each chapter brings the reader into a new field, gives him the benefits of an active mind enriched by seventy years of crowded experiences, and lights up for him many a problem with a new illumination. Among all these gems there are some that seem to the reviewer to possess more brilliant lustre than the rest, for instance, such as Life Begins at Seventy, Is Suicide Sin, Why Preach Christ to the Moslems, Other-worldliness in Missions, and The Cost of Spiritual Leadership.

H. S.