

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER, 1921.

No. 12.

A Lesson in Pastoral Theology from a Tragical Leaf of American History.

REV. FREDERICK KOENIG, St. Louis, Mo.

On Wednesday, July 11, 1804, at 7 A. M., Alexander Hamilton was shot and mortally wounded in a duel with his political foe, Aaron Burr, Vice-President of the United States, at Weehawken, on the New Jersey shore, opposite New York City. He was at once carried to New York and lingered in great agony until the next day, when death came at two o'clock in the afternoon. He left a distressed wife and seven children, the youngest a babe in arms, the oldest a son, sixteen years of age, while a still older son had fallen in mortal combat only two years before., Hamilton died in his forty-eighth year, in the fulness of his great powers, and was buried in the churchyard of old Trinity on Broadway, on the side towards Rector St., opposite the site occupied in 1664 and later by old St. Matthew's, now united with our Synod.

Hamilton until then seems not to have been a professing Christian and member of a church. The loss, in so ignominious a way, of this great man, Revolutionary hero, trusted companion and aide of the unforgotten Washington, illustrious statesman and generally respected citizen, caused a revulsion of feeling throughout the country which has not subsided to this day and which makes it well-nigh impossible for the historian to judge calmly the subsequent turbulent career of his antagonist "damned to everlasting fame." All this is not only extremely interesting, but that part pertaining to Hamilton must be held in mind if we wish to measure aright the difficulties confronting any one that was to be called in for spiritual consolation by the dying man. It seems that Bishop Moore was first sent for, but left the house without complying at that time with Hamilton's wish to receive Communion; that Dr. Mason was then sent for, who, as he says, told him he could not

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Worth of Our Confessions.

Now that the *Triglot Concordia* is on the market, some means should be found to acquaint non-Lutherans in larger measure than heretofore with the excellency of our confessional writings as statements of Scriptural truth. Fair critics, also in the Reformed group of Churches, will not withhold their praise. As late as 1912 Professor William Curtis of the University of Aberdeen, in his *History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, praised the "dignified simplicity, temperate tone, and Christian spirit" of the Augsburg Confession, its "profound loyalty to the best traditions of the catholic Church and the great fathers, its faithfulness to Scripture." "No one," he says, "can read the Augsburg Confession without being deeply impressed by the sincerity of its efforts to conserve the Scriptural and spiritual

essentials of traditional Christianity." And regarding the Formula of Concord he has the astute remark: "It may be that we owe it to the undaunted efforts of these men that we have learned either to practise or at least to respect undogmatic silence upon sacred mysteries left undisclosed by Holy Writ itself." These are utterances of a Presbyterian and a Scotchman. Lutherans generally will subscribe to the following estimate of the Formula of Concord which appeared on the editorial page of the *Lutheran* in 1907: "No one who studies the errors that are masquerading in the garb of truth in the Protestant wing of the Church to-day can fail to reach the conviction that the Formula occupies the citadel of Reformation truth with Romanism and much of Protestantism at about equal remoteness at the other end. There is to-day much less difference between Rome and many Protestants on the doctrines of original sin, justification, good works, and the divinity of Christ than there is between some so-called Lutherans in certain rationalistic centers. Judged by the conclusions the Formula has arrived at, it ranks to-day among the noblest, clearest, most unequivocal statements of Scriptural fundamental truth that have yet appeared in any clime or tongue. Were its conclusions accepted to-day, there would be fewer preachers on Protestant pulpits talking of natural evolution from a state of semidepravity to a state of self-righteousness; there would be fewer to speak slightly of justification by faith and proudly of justification by works; fewer to speak of salvation by character and against salvation through an all-sufficient atonement; and fewer questionings about the divinity of Christ. While its definition of the *communicatio idiomatum* may strike the modern theological mind as a sort of dry and lifeless anatomical conception of the Person of Christ, it can be said to make Unitarianism and all forms of Socinianism impossible to one who accepts its statements."

There has been a call in various quarters of late for a new Luther to lead the world out of the confusion in which it has been weltering since the war. We need no new Luther. But we need an intense study of the old Luther and of the documents in which our Church has with incomparable clearness of definition set forth the teachings of Holy Scripture as restored to the world through the Reformer.

GRAEBNER.

Radicals and Evangelicals in the Anglican Church.

"This is the beginning of a tremendous controversy," is the opening sentence of a British correspondent's discussion of the Cambridge Congress of Liberals, writing in the *Living Church*. Lovers of the truth must hope that it will be the beginning of a "tremendous controversy," since it will be either that or the beginning of the end of Evangelicalism in the Church of England.

We confess to a feeling somewhat of dismay as we notice the half-hearted, compromising manner in which the Evangelicals of the episcopacy are meeting the challenge of the infidels who were gathered at Brixton. In the *Living Church* of October 29 the gathering of Evangelicals at Cheltenham, September 26—28, is reported. At the

opening meeting the chairman adverted to the "unhappy divisions at present prevailing within the Church of England," and stated an obvious truth by saying that the attempts at church union which have been put forth by Anglicans must fail "when we ourselves find it difficult to rebut the charge that there are at least three different 'religions' within our own Church." Other speakers dwelt with much emphasis on the same point, that Anglicans cannot urge reunion of separated Christians when they in their own communion are hopelessly divided. With these sentiments every Protestant will find himself in agreement. If anything is apt to convince us that the Briton is completely lacking the gift of humor, it is the spectacle of Anglicanism inviting the Churches to accept its leadership in the movements for union. One of the priests, however, attempted to find one common ground upon which all Anglicans can meet and unite — the *Book of Common Prayer*. The suggestion is a desperate one when it is considered that the entire doctrinal contents of the *Book of Common Prayer* has been scrapped by radicals. Still it is suggested that "the using together of its prayers ought to bring mutual confidence."

An attempt was made at one of the sessions to formulate three great principles on which the warring factions ought to find it feasible to become united. These principles, as stated by Canon Glazebrook, of Ely, are the following: "(1) That all truth forms a unity. (2) Religious knowledge is progressive as the ages go by. (3) Faith, not belief, is the cardinal fact of religion." It seems incredible that an attempt should be made to build up shattered religious unity on a foundation like this. There is not a tenet of Ritschlianism that will not find ample quarters in these three sentences. Lest, however, the liberal attitude of Evangelicalism should fail to impress the radicals of the communion, Canon Glazebrook, according to the report before us, outspokenly criticized the infallibility of the Bible. "In matters of belief the old formulas have ceased to satisfy the instructed, and to the uninstructed they present no meaning at all." The *Living Church* correspondent records the Cheltenham Conference as a noble attempt to remind men of variant convictions "of the littleness of their differences in view of the great end which they were seeking"!

In an editorial of November 12, the *Living Church* discusses "The Liberals and the Bible" and quotes from one of the British liberal divines the following description of the preachers of this type: "They are preaching something entirely alien from what was once meant by Christianity. They are really preaching an entirely new religion and concealing the fact, even from themselves, by disguising it in the phraseology of the old. . . . Nowhere in the New Testament does the Jesus of liberal theology show Himself. The simple Jesus of liberal Christianity cannot be found." The *Living Church* editor then adds: "This quotation is not a criticism of the liberal point of view by a hostile outsider, but a summary of the condition of affairs from one inside the camp. Could the case be much more clear? Is there anything further to be said of the tendency and results of the liberal point of view than what is here set down? Is the function of the Church to seek after truth, discarding the precious treasure committed

to her of God's revelation of Himself in Holy Writ, or to expound the 'faith once given'? It is high time for us again to assure ourselves of the truth and the permanence of that position on which our faith rests — the authority of God's holy Word vindicated and established by that of His Mystical Body, the Church of God." With the position of this editorial no Evangelical will quarrel. Unfortunately it is grounded upon an idea which must lead, as it has led many Anglicans, to Romanism, — the authority of the Word "vindicated and established by the Church," a conception which is as unhistorical as it is unbiblical.

GRAEBNER.

The Line between Rationalism and Evangelism.

The *Presbyterian* (September 8, 1921) contained the following statement as regards Modernism: "The line is clearly and distinctly drawn between Rationalism and Evangelicism, and Modernism is Rationalism." In reply to the question, "Who drew this line?" the editor of the *Presbyterian* (October 20, 1921) says: —

"We answer, Rationalism and Evangelicism are two opposing historical views. The line is drawn between them by their own nature, as much as there was a line of battle drawn between the Central Alliance and the Entente. Rationalism takes for its standard of authority in religion and morals the human reason, using reason in its broadest sense. In this case the reason, either through the senses or by demonstration, or by consciousness, determines what is true religiously and what is right morally. As each individual reason is independent and each mind thinks for itself, each person becomes a law unto himself in religion and morals.

"Evangelicism finds its authority for religion and morals in the Bible, a revelation from God. The function of the reason is to receive this revelation on its evidence, and he who receives it becomes a believer. As the Bible testifies of Christ, they who believe the Bible receive Christ, and so become the children of God. The rationalist is not a child of God, he is a stranger to Him. God says to him, 'I never knew you.'

"A correspondent says, 'The *Presbyterian* is not popular with thinkers.' Yes, that is true when thinker is used in the sense of 'free-thinkers.' But it is popular with *believers*, and believers think upon the Word, the Law, and the Son of God. We expect those who follow their own thoughts and wisdom to be opposed to us, because we stand by the Word of God, and the wisdom of man is foolishness with God. The Greeks call the Gospel foolishness, and the Jews call it a stumbling-block, but it is the power of God and the wisdom of God to them who believe. There can be no fellowship in religion between the rationalistic thinker and the believer in the Gospel or the evangel. They have no fellowship one with the other. Our correspondent claims to be orthodox, evangelical. If so, then he believes the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practise, and with him the *Presbyterian* is one in all essentials."

The fight of the *Presbyterian* is the fight of every believer in the Bible, just as it was, the fight of Jesus two thousand years ago. In

His struggle with the Rationalism of the Pharisees, our Savior very clearly and distinctly drew the line between Himself and His free-thinking opponents by saying: "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world." John 8, 23. Even so the theology of the believer is from above, the work of the Holy Ghost, while the Rationalism of modern skeptics, both in the Church and outside the Church, is from beneath, earthly, carnal, devilish. The *Presbyterian* is right in declaring that there can be no fellowship in religion between the rationalistic thinker and the believer in the Gospel, because they have no fellowship one with the other. "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." 2 Cor. 6, 14.

MUELLER.

Sidetracking Evangelistic Work in the Mission-Fields.

Relative to a report, published in a circular sent out from the Board of Foreign Missions, to the effect that, as claimed by some, purely evangelistic work is being sidetracked on the mission-fields for the more attractive medical, higher educational, social, and other forms of work, the *Presbyterian* (October 20, 1921) admits the truth of this information and deplores the growing tendency to belittle the evangelistic work. We read: "Evangelistic work is clearly defined in the Scriptures, in the history of the Church, and in the modern terms used in the Church, and is held to signify the preaching of the Gospel for the salvation of souls. Many devout believers have therefore been grieved and vexed because they have facts which show a growing tendency in the missions to belittle the evangelistic work and to supplement it with the processes of charity and civilization. At Seoul the plan is first to educate the heathen, whether converted or not, and then by extra-curriculum work and by sufferance, outside the school, some time an effort may be given to Christian instruction and evangelistic work, which is thus sidetracked. The pressure of these times demands clearness and frankness. Inasmuch as they (the secretaries and members of the Foreign Board) have been notified of the state of the case, the Church holds them responsible for the proper expenditure of her funds and the pursuit of her high purpose and commission to preach the Gospel to every creature and to teach all nations whatsoever He has commanded her." In calling attention to this sidetracking of evangelistic work, we wish to say that Christ has ordained but one means for the conversion of man, namely, the preaching of the Gospel, and that every other form of work, such as the medical, educational, and social, will not in itself convert a single soul, as has been proved time and again. Hence these activities must remain *ancillae*, and must never become *matronae*. Let Christian missionaries go forth with the light of the Gospel as the supreme blessing of God and the only divine means of benefiting man spiritually and eternally. Let them bring to the heathen world the choicest gifts of modern civilization and learning, but let them also clearly point out that education and civilization are not identical with the Gospel of Christ, which alone can save perishing souls from perdition.

MUELLER.

Radicalism in India Missions.

Certain responsible agents of the London Missionary Society in Bangalore, India, last year prepared a *Hymn- and Prayer-Book* for the use of Indian students who have not accepted Christianity, and deliberately omitted any appeal to the name of Christ. None of the hymns and prayers are distinctively Christian in theology. The object of the compilers was "to lead Hindu and Mohammedan students to the practise of prayer to God the Creator and Father, in the hope that in this way they will make religious progress and be brought nearer to Christ." It is said that a few "leading" missionaries of other societies have adopted this practise, with the same aim.

The London Missionary Society's Board had to consider whether the method in question could be approved by "a society avowedly and sincerely evangelical." After carefully studying the devotional book adopted by the Bangalore missionaries, the Society's India subcommittee came to the conclusion that "there is no occasion for the interference of the Board with the liberty of method in evangelism which has always been recognized in the L. M. S., so long as the ultimate aim of that evangelism, the bringing of men and women to Christ, is fully kept in view." The committee recognized the intention of the compilers to use the form of daily prayer as a means of bringing non-Christian students to a knowledge of Christ, but expressed the opinion that to each of the books of prayers should be added a section containing prayers specially intended for the use of Christian students in high schools and hostels, or of students who are "approaching the Christian position." The predominant feeling was that liberty should be extended to the authors of "this experimental method in missionary service," and by a majority of more than seven to one the resolution of the committee was finally adopted. Evidently, then, only one out of eight on this occasion thought it necessary to attach any importance to the sayings of our Lord regarding the condition of access to the Father.

The *Hymn- and Prayer-Book* of the London Missionary Society is not the only one that refrains from mentioning the name that is above every name, in order that the unconverted may not become conscious of the gulf that separates them from the Father. The Friends Settlement at Calcutta has published a *Book of Prayers, written for use in an Indian College* which does not once mention the name of Jesus Christ. There is no recognition of the fact that man has departed from the living God, and has sinned against the Most High. The standpoint is that of the baldest evolution. Witness the following:—

"O Thou who dost deliver us from ourselves,
Purge us to-day from all that is of the beast within us,
Drive from us all the leering and plausible devils of sin,
Which have been born within us of the sore struggle upward of our race,
And which in the past by our own grievous fault we have pampered and
encouraged.

.....
This body which by a million years of agony
Has been bought for us and built for us,
This body wherein dwell groveling the survivals of that animal past
Whereby it was created and fashioned, . . ."

Again:—

“We stand here, O Father,
Heirs of all the ages of Thy creative effort,
Fruit of all the laborious progress, the sacrifice, the agony of the past;
We stand erect—for one brief moment—on the crest of history.”

The prayer proceeds, not to ask for the gracious benefits of redemption; that would be too humiliating; but:—

“Help us to pay honestly, unstintingly, and bravely
Our part of the great price
Which of old and forever Thou, O our God,
Payest in man for man.
Ennoble us this day with a share in Thy work of redemption.”

The attitude of the suppliant is almost that of one who is approaching God as an equal, but is weighted with the flesh. The *Harvest Field* of Mysore City, commenting on these prayers, says, all too mildly: “When evolution in its crudest form is being rejected by the best science and philosophy of the day, it seems hardly the time to make a book of prayers from that standpoint.” GRAEBNER.

Getting Along Agreeably with Everybody.

The *Methodist Times*, as quoted in the *Biblical Review* (October, 1921), writes: “The modern Church has become afraid of the charge of Puritanism—not because it is more religious than the Puritans, but because it has lost their fervent religion. It has become broad and tolerant. It has also become largely impotent in a time of universal chaos. Compromise, the lowering of the ethical implicates of the Faith, looking with a blind eye at incipient evil: these play into the hand of the devil. The Church may gain the friendship of the world by it, but at the cost of losing the fellowship of God. She is not called to make friends with the world, but to challenge the world and change it. The desperate need of the world to-day is a church blazing with moral passion, unafraid of the sneers of those whose vision of the things which make a nation great or small is lamentably defective.” Certainly, it is not the business of the Church to please the world, but to rebuke it where it is wrong and to preach to it the righteousness of God as attained through Christ. The reason why churches have, in many instances, lost influence and power is, however, not because they have failed in denouncing sin in general. It is hardly fair to accuse the churches of not having exposed the vices prevalent in our times. The main fault of the churches lies in their refusal to preach the pure Word of God, both to the world without and within their midst, and to denounce the sin of sins, unbelief. The *Methodist Times* commits the same mistake which the churches have made by uttering generalities; by not mentioning what churches have failed, where they have failed, and why they have failed. If the editor of the *Times* really wishes to help the churches, let him locate the trouble, point out the festering sores, and prescribe the necessary treatment. Let him honestly say: We have not preached the pure Word of God, nor have we applied the Word of God, nor have we insisted upon the Word of God as the only norm of faith and life. It is only in this way that any good will come out of criticism such as the *Times* offers.

MUELLER.

“Better to Remain Divided.”

Reformed churchmen who are so anxious to bring about church union that they are willing to sink fundamental differences to bring it about should peruse with all diligence what one of their own number, Dr. A. C. Headlam, says in his recent book, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*. Dr. Headlam is keenly alive to the evils of a divided Christendom, but he writes:—

“From time to time reunion is discussed as if it were an economic or business proposition. The waste of division and overlapping is dwelt upon, the loss of efficiency or the weakening of power. All such questions in relation to Christianity are secondary. For the fundamental point to remember about it is that it claims to be a revelation of the truth, and to teach the truth. However much worldly motives or human frailty have prevailed among the causes of Christian disunion, yet ultimately the causes of division have been differences as to what is true. . . . The evils of disunion are great; but a far greater evil would be compromise with the truth. It would be better that we should remain divided than leave problems unsolved. If we are to come together, it must be by wider knowledge and deeper thought, and not by evading the issue.”

Discussing the Presbyterian move for organic union of Protestant churches which violently agitated the churches last year (but is defunct now), Rev. Maitland Alexander, writing in the *Presbyterian*, characterized the movement as an attempt to “compel Christians to come together on the plains of Dura and submit to the authority of a supergovernment,” and then adds these pertinent thoughts, which state the principle more effectively even than the passage from Headlam’s book just quoted:—

“Then I think we should remember that no true unity can be brought about except on the basis of the *whole truth*. Any unity produced by the sacrifice of great principles or surrender of convictions is impossible. How much can we let go to secure unity? How much of our doctrinal position ought we to surrender in order that we may unite with those who cannot accept it? We are bidden to join this great movement where ‘service’ shall be the watchword. ‘The task of the whole Church,’ say these advocates, ‘is more important than the faith of the whole Church.’ What Jesus taught is said to be of greater importance than who Jesus is. There can be no true unity when a church unites with another on the basis of service according to the principles of Jesus, when one church believes him to be ‘the world’s best man,’ and the other, God, the eternal Son.

“It is a dangerous and divisive thing to have creedal statements, hastily gotten together by illy prepared men, which are capable of two interpretations or which do not explicitly mention the cardinal doctrines of our Presbyterian faith. If we are so blind that we cannot see the fact that it is these very doctrines which have made our church what it is; if we are so foolish as to state our faith in a blanket resolution endorsing the creeds of Christendom; if we leave the door open by reason of our carelessly worded statement written by near theologians of a liberal type, so that anybody can come in, we will pay too big a price for a unity which is no true unity and, like a shorn Sampson, our strength will be gone.”

Then follows this concluding paragraph, a very model of strong writing:—

“May God help us, instead of listening to the calls of those who would minimize these things, to disconnect ourselves from all these extra-ecclesiastical organizations and self-appointed uncontrolled bodies, whether they

be councils, federations or associations, and let us reaffirm our apostolic faith, work under our apostolic government, and practise our apostolic methods. When we are called by Arabians, Ashdodites, and Ammonites to meet on the low levels of the plains of Ono, let us answer, as Nehemiah did: 'I am doing a great work so that I cannot come down.'"

GRAEBNER.

Three New Bibles.

There have been three suggestions for a new Bible under public discussion of late. A new Bible, not in the sense of a revision of old translations, or of a new rendition into the common speech of to-day, but a new Bible in the sense of a new collection of sacred *biblia*, which shall take the place of the Bible of the past nineteen centuries.

Comparatively little commotion was caused by the suggestion of a missionary that in foreign lands the ancient religious books of those lands should take the place of the Old Testament in the canon of Scripture. To any one who is acquainted with the mythological farrago of the Vedas and with the dull moral droning of Konfutse, this suggestion has something of the *baroque*. But it was cited with appreciation by a speaker at the recent Episcopal conference at the Cathedral in New York. (*The Church and Its American Opportunity*, Macmillan.)

Much greater import, due to the author's distinction as a man of letters, has been attached to the series of articles by Mr. H. G. Wells, which ran in the *Saturday Evening Post* a few months ago. Mr. Wells asserted that our present Bible had "lost its power to influence men," that it dealt with conditions that no longer exist, breaking off eighteen centuries ago and passing in silence over the social problems of this day. Hence its influence has waned and "it has lost its grip." Mr. Wells pleads for a new and better Bible, which he will name the "Bible of Civilization." It will contain a history of the whole world, and its science will be strictly up to date. Genesis is to be supplemented with the latest findings of geology, anthropology, and archeology. Leviticus is to be improved by recording the latest discoveries in medicine and the latest methods in sociology. The historical books are to be supplemented by the great facts of the world's history during its "100,000 years" and up to the present time. The books of the Hebrew prophets will be supplemented by the shrewd predictions of our great public men, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Clemenceau, and others.

It is pointed out by a Presbyterian editor that one's faith in this new product "is somewhat shaken by the fact that Mr. Wells holds the exploded fallacy that knowledge is the instrument of the moral salvation of the race. Such a great historian should have discovered that ignorance was not the sole cause of the evils that oppressed the race, and that education has not been a moral regenerator." The same editor regards the claim of Mr. Wells that the Bible has lost its hold on men as scarcely in accord with the fact that the demand for the Bible was never so great as now. "It is now being printed in 700 languages, 160 of which have been added since this century began. The

gospels are being translated into forty more languages. Last year 8,655,781 copies of the whole or part of the Scriptures were sold, being a great increase over the previous year. Japan, Korea, India, and Ceylon are asking for 500,000 more copies of the entire Bible than last year, and 3,000,000 copies of the gospels. This does not look as though the Bible has 'lost its hold on men.' The type of religion which this new Bible will represent if Mr. Wells's idea is carried out in the spirit of its author can be established from the expression of Mr. Wells on the Christian doctrines of atonement and the Lord's Supper. To Wells the doctrine of the atonement consists of "barbaric traditions and ceremonial surgeries, blood sacrifices, and the maddest barbarities of thought." The Lord's Supper was an innocent memorial feast, as given by Jesus, but the "fearful, limited, imitative men whom He left to carry on His work soon restored all the abominations of the antiquated religion, theology, priest, and sacrifice . . . and turned the supper into a horrible blood bath and a mock cannibal meal" —! Reading this, do we wonder that Mr. Wells wants to rid the world — and himself — of the Bible?

More sparing in his criticism of Christian doctrine, yet imbued with a hatred of the Bible more intense even than that of Mr. Wells, is an article entitled *Shall Progress Reach the Bible?* which was contained in the *North American Review* of October, 1921. The author, Herbert D. Miles, a retired business man, has read enough of the higher criticism to become convinced that a need for "reverent, but fearless expurgation" of the Bible must be recognized. "A need for expurgation cries to heaven." People should "face the problem of the Bible's deficiencies, inconsistencies, redundancies." Vast multitudes, possibly fifty millions, in this country alone, remain outside the Church because "the Church and the Bible ask them to believe, and to subscribe to, much that they cannot believe." So let us first remove from this Bible "that which is plainly unifying" — "the obsolete and confused ritual regulations of Leviticus and Deuteronomy," "Jonah and similar pure fiction," "accounts of a fierce and savage warfare; endless genealogies." Then there should be "a decided condensation of the prophets." Most of the miracles, etc., ought to go by the board. People have been "victims" of a "Holy Bible" and "hence have ceased to pray." "They have learned of Noah and his Ark; of Lot, Samuel, Samson, Jezebel, David, Jonah. They have learned of a Virgin Birth and of other wondrous events." All this they can no longer believe. So let us cut it out of the Bible. The Resurrection story, the Ascension are accounted for by Mr. Miles on the ten times shattered myth hypothesis of Strauss.

Now, "how shall we go about the work?" Mr. Miles suggests a high commission of ten men, to be made up of four ministers and two Protestant laymen, four "earnest and scholarly" men to represent the "partly agnostic" element, and possibly two Roman Catholics. The new Bible would have a first part containing what is best in the Old Testament, — "Legend put as legend, its 'holiness' removed." The second part would contain selections from our New Testament, but

omitting the "controversial matter" (— anything that offends the unbeliever). To this part would be added a section which Mr. Miles calls a recapitulation, "in no sense a creed," (oh, dear, no!) "a constitution for all churches and all peoples, the principles of Christianity." This section would undoubtedly contain space for what Mr. Miles elsewhere calls "the ancient and inherently noble ideas of religion and pantheism," which he had once discussed with Mr. Burroughs.

The Christian world will not go into paroxysms about these blasphemous proposals. They belong to the still-born monsters of anti-christian thought. They possess neither power nor spirit nor beauty. Long after the world has forgotten that there has been a retired business man by the name of Miles or even an author known as H. G. Wells, long after the magazine which contained the article of the one, long after the books of the other have been dumped into a rubbish heap of defunct literature, the Bible will remain the message of God to a sinful world, "moveless as Gibraltar amid its ocean tides."

GRAEBNER.

Ordaining Women as Deacons.

As regards the overture sent down to the presbyteries this year on ordaining women as deacons, the *Presbyterian* (September 29, 1921) recommends that the overture be answered in the negative, and that for two chief reasons. Quoting in part, we read: "The ordaining of woman to any office in the Church is placing upon her grave duties and responsibilities which God never put upon her, and in so far as she is faithful to these vows and obligations, in just so far must she neglect other duties which rightly belong to her. There is the work of the deaconess found in the early Church and provided for in our own Church at present, which affords her an orderly way of carrying on work for which she is eminently fitted and which is intimately associated with, and strengthened by, her experience in the home. But to ordain and obligate her to the full work of the deaconate as described in Scripture and in our Form of Government is to put upon her burdens not intended for her. The women of the Church are doing noble service now, and they have done nobly through ages, and the modern attempt of abnormal women and weak men to put more obligations on them should be rebuked. If women are to be ordained, faithfulness will mean decidedly more obligation, or else ordination means nothing. If ordination is appointed for one office, in the nature of the case it becomes open for other offices. We are persuaded that the present overture is intended as a door-opener on both the eldership and the ministry.

"In the second place, ordination is appointed of God. He determines its significance and its application. God has honored woman in all the history of the Church, and while He has accomplished through her greater things than He ever accomplished through man [?], yet there is not a single explicit case of a woman being ordained by divine authority. It is presumptive, therefore, for the Church to attempt what God has never instituted."

In 1 Cor. 14, 34, 35 and 1 Tim. 2, 12 Paul has clearly outlined the restrictions which God has placed upon woman's place and work in the Church, and these restrictions obtain as long as churches are composed of both men and women. In 1 Cor. 14, 34, 35 Paul declares it a shame for women to speak in the Church, because in so doing they step out of their proper place, act in this respect as if they were men, assume what does not belong to them, and hence do what God forbids. "It is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law." In 1 Tim. 2, 12 Paul identifies public speaking with public teaching, which he forbids because by undertaking to teach publicly woman usurps authority over man. "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The lesson set forth in both passages is precisely the same, and in determining the issue involved in the aforementioned discussion, proper emphasis ought to be laid upon the clear truths pointed out in both. Neither abstract discussion nor philosophic argumentation will settle the matter. Scripture alone must decide the issue.

MUELLER.

Psychoanalysis and Vigorous Evangelism.

"At first thought there would seem to be little in common between psychoanalysis and the vigorous evangelism that preaches the awfulness of sin and its eternal consequences," says the *Biblical Review* (October, 1921). "However, the *Christian Century*, a journal entirely free from excess in the direction of theological conservatism, finds that they agree as to the peril of sin lodged in the depth of the soul, and editorially makes this comment:—

"Psychoanalysis is the latest fad among the sciences. Without discussing here its merits or its demerits, it is interesting to consider one particular in which the psychoanalyst and the old-fashioned evangelical preacher agree. It pays to give attention to one's sins. The psychoanalyst says that so long as perverted desires are concealed in the bottom of our minds and half forgotten, they constitute a continual moral menace to us. If they are brought out into the light of day and given their just sentence, they will soon be robbed of their power. The old-fashioned preacher thought that it was worth while to preach against sin. Sinners in the past were made to tremble in the presence of an angry God. Too many modern preachers have thought that a true and adequate psychology of virtue lay in directing the thoughts toward the beautiful. Without knowing it many of these modernists have practised Christian Science on sin, if not by denying its existence, then by completely ignoring it as a factor in individual and social life. The older evangelical preacher made the starting-point of all his work the arousal of the conscience of his hearers. Without the sense of sin there could be no repentance and no forgiveness." We know that modern preachers who ignore sin in their preaching are altogether wrong both as to their theology and their psychology. However, also the old evangelical preacher of the brain-

storm, revivalistic type was wrong, for he confounded feeling with faith. Rightly dividing the Word of God by properly applying Law and Gospel is both good theology and good psychology, and the only way to convert sinners.

MUELLER.

An Admission.

In an article on "The Rise of Rationalism among Northern Baptists" the *Watchman-Examiner* of September 29, 1921, says:—

"Our present battle is a fight for our very existence—a fight for the foundations of faith—an attempt at a tremendous grappling with subtle philosophical and theological heresies. And we are none too well prepared for the struggle intellectually. But just as we have won against ecclesiastical tyranny, against Protestant prejudice and Roman contempt and against dissensions in our own ranks, so we shall win the fight with the present soul-destroying rationalistic movement. The Congregationalists have largely lost this fight and have no consistent evangelical character left as a denomination. The Presbyterians, with their higher *per capita* of educated people, have avoided most of the pitfalls of the hour and, while still struggling, have practically won the hard conflict. The Methodists are in the balance. The Baptists are awakening to the deadly poison at work, and they will win another victory to add to the goodly record of a people over whom evidently the living God keepeth guard."

FRITZ.

Spiritual Healing and Demoniactal Possession.

The movement for the revival of spiritual healing in the Church is growing. At least two organizations have come into being within the Church of England for that purpose—the Guild of Health and the Spiritual Healing Fellowship. The chairman of the former, the Rev. H. Anson, considers that the clergy should be healers as well as preachers. Courses in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, he says, ought to be included in the training of divinity. "Broadly speaking, this would be a logical development of the traditional Christian religion, which has always recognized the power of suggestion. This power in effecting cures was extensively employed by priests in earlier days. They were psychotherapists, although the credit of the cures may have gone to the bones of the saints, which were in some cases no more than mutton bones." The Spiritual Healing Fellowship is founded on the belief that "the recovery of the attitude of mind and spirit which is able to appropriate the divine benediction of Christ's healing, will bring with it new vision and faith for the healing of all other scourges." The Fellowship proposes to establish a London center, with "an open chapel as a sanctuary of divine peace and healing, frequent spiritual ministrations, and offices for clerical help and interviews"; and also, if funds can be obtained, "a hostel under proper medical supervision in which those in mental darkness may receive spiritual healing as well as necessary medical treatment."

At a conference at the church house, convened by the Spiritual Healing Fellowship, Dr. Montague Lomax, the mental specialist,

whose recently published *Experiences of an Asylum Doctor* has attracted much attention, declared his belief that "insanity is something much more than the uncontrolled riot of the subconscious mind. In many cases, especially those of epilepsy and acute mania and melancholia, the subconscious mind of the madman is not uncontrolled, but I believe that it is controlled by an evil and obsessing discarnate entity, that insanity is often what is called in Biblical language 'demoniacal possession.' This is not a fashionable belief among men of science and psychologists to-day. In most medical circles it would be laughed out of court. Even some clergymen, I am told, no longer believe in demoniacal possession, and regard Christ and His early followers as victims of delusion in this matter, a delusion which modern science has outgrown. None the less, I hold it firmly." Dr. Lomax warns people of the danger of probing in the subconscious mind. His experience is that they may raise ghosts that they cannot lay. True spiritual healing, he says, does not content itself merely with driving out unclean spirits, but fills the soul with the indwelling Christ, healing in the real sense, because it "makes whole." — *The United Presbyterian*.

Psychology.

Psychology is a high-sounding, mouth-filling word, and it seems to be claiming and receiving place in a good many sermons nowadays. All right, brethren! Put it in if you really think it belongs there. But do not overwork it. Do not let it take up too much space or be too strongly emphasized. After all, it is not half so soul-filling a word as the old-fashioned word grace. We have an idea that not a few sermons would be improved if they had in them less psychology and more grace. — *Watchman-Examiner*.

Exegesis and Eisegesis.

"It is a fine point to determine in many a sermon where the exegesis ends and the eisegesis begins — just where the preacher ceases to bring forth that which is in his text and begins to put something into it. Exegesis has the authority of the divine, depending no whit on the human expositor. For eisegesis no authority can be claimed except such as inheres in the knowledge, ability, wisdom of the preacher. Possibly one element of the 'dropped note' of authority in many of the sermons of modern times is the fact of a preponderance of eisegesis over exegesis in the preaching."

The Watchman-Examiner.

Some Truth in This.

A distinguished minister from abroad, now visiting our country, is availing himself of every possible opportunity of hearing our outstanding American preachers. At a luncheon recently we heard him say: "It seems to me that the men who are preaching the 'larger gospel' are preaching it to the 'smaller congregations.'"

Watchman-Examiner.