

# The Presbyterian Guardian

November 28, 1936

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 4

One Dollar a Year

J. GRESHAM MACHEN *Editors*  
NED B. STONEHOUSE

Published semi-monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY  
1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

THOMAS R. BIRCH,  
*Managing Editor*

## THE SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AMERICA

THE outstanding action of the Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America, which met in Philadelphia November 12-14, was the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the doctrinal standards of the church without the compromising amendments and Declaratory Statement which the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. adopted in 1903, and without any new declaratory statement on the subject of Premillennialism or on any other subject. This action was taken by an impressive roll call vote of 57 to 20.

A proposal to adopt those doctrinal standards *with* those 1903 amendments, and merely to recommend that the 1903 Amendments be eliminated by the presbyteries or (after discussion) by the next General Assembly, was rejected. So was a motion made by a member of the Presbytery of California "that a Declaratory Statement be appended to the Confession of Faith to this effect, that The Presbyterian Church of America does not interpret any part of the Westminster Confession of Faith or Catechisms as being opposed to the Premillennial view."

These and other proposals being in one way or another rejected, the Assembly proceeded to adopt, by the roll call vote mentioned above, the exact form of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms which was proposed by the Committee on the Constitution elected by the last General Assembly. That form is the form in which the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. existed in 1902 before the objectionable 1903 amendments were adopted, except that

two brief statements—one declaring the Pope to be Antichrist and the other declaring it to be sinful to refuse an oath when the civil magistrate requires it—are omitted. Thus the doctrinal standards of The Presbyterian Church of America have taken over from the 1903 amendments only *omissions*. They contain not one word which those amendments *added*. The result is that The Presbyterian Church of America stands at the beginning on an absolutely square doctrinal basis—the basis of the historic Westminster Standards alone.

It is, we think, not at all correct to say that this action was hasty. On the contrary it is the action really not of one General Assembly but of two. The June Assembly definitely ordered the Committee on the Constitution to present to this November Assembly for adoption as the doctrinal standards of the church the Westminster Confession and Catechisms in the form which they possessed in the 1934 edition of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. without any changes whatever except the elimination of those 1903 amendments. The question whether those amendments should be eliminated was referred to the Committee, but no other question whatever regarding the doctrinal standards was referred to it. Thus not only the proposal to adopt all the rest of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms without change, but also the question whether those 1903 Amendments should be eliminated, has been before the whole Church ever since the time of the June Assembly.

It would have been a calamity if the adoption of the standards had been further postponed, and it would have been a still greater calamity if those highly objectionable 1903 Amendments had been adopted in

any way whatsoever. For The Presbyterian Church of America to have had those compromising amendments as part of its doctrinal standards, no matter for how short a time, would have been a very serious lowering of the flag.

As for the refusal of the General Assembly to "write eschatological liberty" into the constitution of the church, that was also a great victory for the Reformed Faith. In saying that, we do not for one moment mean that there should not be liberty for those who hold the premillennial view of the return of our Lord to enter into and remain in the ministry. Such liberty already exists, and it has never, so far as our knowledge goes, ever been denied by any human being in the church. But to put into the doctrinal standards such vague terms as "eschatological liberty" or "the premillennial view" or the like would be to insert something utterly incongruous with the whole underlying character of the rest of the standards and indeed would be to advertise to all the world that The Presbyterian Church of America has very little notion of what doctrinal standards are.

Our guiding star in this whole matter ought to be the determination to stand on the basis of our great historic standards pure and simple. This is not a creed-making age, and if we try to tinker with the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms we are pretty sure to mar the witness of our church to the things for which those great instruments stand. When the Christian Church really proceeds to define doctrine, it does so in a very different way from the way which would be followed if we should perpetuate the present unfortunate misunderstanding and suspicion in any addition to the constitution whatsoever. The proposed "liberty" planks are not only entirely unnecessary but would tend to divide the church permanently into two hostile camps. They would, moreover, be only the entering wedge for all sorts of queer excrescences and vagaries.

As it is, the Westminster Standards have been adopted in all their purity. The Presbyterian Church of America stands forth before all the world not as some strange new sect but as a true exponent of the Reformed Faith. Thus one of the commonest pitfalls into which new ecclesiastical bodies have fallen in our day has been avoided by our church. That is cause for profound rejoicing and for profound thankfulness to almighty God.

#### THE BUSINESS OF THE ASSEMBLY

Certain striking differences appear between the method of doing business which was followed by this General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America and the methods to which many of us have

grown accustomed in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Moderator, Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., President of Wheaton College, did not make partisan "speeches from the throne," but left the chair in parliamentary fashion when he desired to make a proposal to the Assembly. He did not engage in attacks upon anyone in the church. He did not breathe out threatenings of ecclesiastical discipline against those who might be in the minority in ecclesiastical councils. He did not try to be a kind of moderatorial toastmaster by making jocose remarks when commissioners arose to speak. He did not use the weapon of ridicule against speakers who might arise to oppose measures which he favored. He did not, in short, employ any of the moderatorial methods which have attained such a painful vogue in certain ecclesiastical bodies of the present day. On the contrary, he conducted his office not only with the dignity and fairness which was to be expected of so distinguished a Christian leader, but also he endeared himself yet more to his brethren in The Presbyterian Church of America who already held him in high respect and warm affection.

The Assembly itself also exhibited characteristics that were markedly different from the characteristics of certain other Assemblies that might be mentioned. Discussion of dangerous and possibly divisive questions was not postponed until the late afternoon (when everyone could be counted upon to be too tired to attend to them), but began in the freshness of early morning and went on, if necessary, straight through the day. Speeches were not limited to five minutes, or to any particular number of minutes. Commissioners were not prevented from speaking a number of times on the same subject if they had anything to say. In other words the Assembly was a truly deliberative body. An honest effort was made to let everybody have his say; and if at one point certain commissioners did not get a chance to say what they wanted to say about treatment of oaths in the Confession of Faith or about other points, we feel sure that that happened not of set purpose but because the Assembly really thought that full opportunity for debate had been given.

All that is very refreshing. It may be wearisome to listen to brethren who *will* be foolish enough not to recognize the complete and final wisdom of views that you and I personally hold; it would no doubt be refreshing if everybody would say only what you and I personally want him to say: but in the long run truth, we are convinced, will flourish only if there is the utmost freedom of speech. May the General Assemblies of The Presbyterian Church of America always be truly deliberative bodies as this one unquestionably was.

Of course this General Assembly did unquestionably

exhibit certain faults. It did seem at times as though certain commissioners, in their effort to be democratic and avoid centralization of power, were a little lacking in a brotherly recognition of what has actually been done. In their reaction against letting a "machine" do everything, it did seem as though they were inclined to be unwilling to let anybody do anything. One wondered how, on the principles enunciated by some commissioners, any business could ever by any possibility be carried on.

But such was not the attitude of the majority; and in general the faults of this Assembly were youthful faults. It must be remembered that most of these commissioners have been in a hopeless minority in the church to which they have hitherto belonged, and thus have had little opportunity for practice in carrying on administrative enterprises. They will unquestionably learn, and we may well hope that when they do learn the business of the church will be conducted in a manner both efficient and democratic.

### THE PRESBYTERY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE "CHRISTIAN BEACON"

**I**N OUR last issue we expressed the view that the actions of the Presbytery of California of The Presbyterian Church of America regarding supposed attacks upon Premillenarians by the editors of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN and others grew out of the editorial in the October 1st issue of the *Christian Beacon* criticising a paragraph in the article of Professor Kuiper which appeared in the September 12th issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. The reason why we expressed that view was that both the California actions mentioned the editorial. As a matter of fact, however, we were in error. A later communication, signed by the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of California (see p. 82 below), states that the misunderstanding of Professor Kuiper's article by the Presbytery of California was entirely independent of the editorial in the *Christian Beacon*.

We are glad to point that out in justice to the *Christian Beacon*. The editorial in that paper has plainly been not the only cause, even though it has certainly been a very important cause, of the spread of this serious misunderstanding throughout the church.

At the same time, while we say that gladly, we are inclined to take a rather serious view of the widespread state of mind which this whole episode reveals. According to the latest communication from the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of California, there are a very large "number of persons throughout the nation" who arrived at the same interpretation of Professor Kuiper's words as did the editor of the *Christian Beacon*. What

does that mean? It means that a great many people think that "Premillennialism" and the "Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible" are the same thing, so that when Professor Kuiper declared that the "Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible" is an anti-Reformed heresy he was also declaring that Premillennialism is an anti-Reformed heresy.

In view of that fact, one of the pressing needs of the hour is the sharp separation between these things that are so sadly confused. The Premillennial view of the time of our Lord's return is not an anti-Reformed heresy. A man may hold to it and be a minister in a truly Reformed or Presbyterian Church. But the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Bible is, we are convinced, just as Professor Kuiper says it is, an anti-Reformed heresy indeed. It is quite out of accord with the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

As we say that, we are afraid that many of you who are our readers will be offended. Many of you use and love the Scofield Bible, and you are grieved by even a breath of an attack upon it.

But we beg you, brethren, to look at this question calmly and clearly. Dr. Scofield's notes are not Scripture, are they? They are not sacred. They represent just the attempt of a fallible man to interpret the Word of God—no doubt a truly Christian man, but still a man who was subject to error as other men are. Well, then, if that is so, is it right to regard those notes as being above criticism? Is it right to resent every adverse opinion regarding them as though it necessarily meant an attack upon the orthodoxy of all the users of the notes? Is it not better to give patient consideration to any criticism that may be offered?

We, for our part, think the notes—though of course they contain many things that are fine and true—are in important particulars and in their underlying structure untrue to the Word of God. You, on the contrary, think they are true. Well, if that is the situation, will you not be willing at least to listen to what we have to say? If you become convinced that we are right about those notes, then you will use them—if you use them at all—with great caution. If, on the other hand, you are convinced, after careful examination of our arguments, that we are wrong, you will return to the notes with all the better conscience and with all the clearer understanding of what the notes mean. Whichever one of us is right, earnest discussion of these things can hardly be amiss. No human book should be put on a pedestal. Every human book should be ready to justify itself ever anew by a comparison of it with the one infallible Standard—namely, God's holy and unchanging Word.

# Let Us Give Thanks

By the REV. ALEXANDER K. DAVISON

*"He hath not dealt so with any nation" (Psalm 147:20).*



Mr. Davison

**A**S ANOTHER Thanksgiving Day draws near, the question that naturally comes to thoughtful people is: What lies back of this commemoration? The answer to this query should be of the utmost profit to all of our souls. The writer of the psalm from which our text is selected takes his stand beneath the shadow of a Jerusalem restored by the labors of a devoted man of God, Nehemiah. As he contemplates what God has done for His people, he utters this paean of praise and thanksgiving. No nation had been so favored by the mercy of God. She had been called out from nothing to be a unique people among idolatrous nations. Her task was to witness to the one living and true God, and to preserve for the world of humanity God's revealed will for mankind. When the travail and sorrow of Egypt's night of bondage encompassed them about, God had interfered on their behalf to work a mighty deliverance, to bring them with a powerful hand and outstretched arm through the Red Sea and the wilderness, across the river Jordan and into the possession of a land flowing with milk and honey. They had always been a stiff-necked people and God, in justice, had to deal severely with them, but even in the midst of severity His goodness shone out like a bright star in a night of fog and tempest. He would banish His beloved and chosen people but not forever. He would surely have pity upon the children for the fathers' sake and return them again to their former possession. It was no wonder that, as the psalmist looked back over the varied history of God's dealings with Israel, he cried out: "He hath not dealt so with any nation."

Now the thought that comes to our minds at this time is that we too as a people have been the recipients, in an unexcelled degree, of the favors and mercies of God. I believe we can truly say, in this fair America, that God

has not dealt so with every nation as He has with us. If we are greatly favored among the nations of the earth it is not because of anything we are or ever have been but because of the grace of God who has been pleased to deal with us in liberality far beyond our comprehension. In treating of this verse there are two thoughts that I wish to pass on. First, our national blessings are unsurpassed; and secondly, our spiritual blessings are superlative. For these reasons we unfurl our banners of thanksgiving to God.

## Our Material Blessings

First, then, I remark that our national blessings are unsurpassed. In this regard God has not so dealt with every nation. Think of the heritage which God has accorded us, a heritage born out of a titanic struggle for civil and religious freedom. We rejoice in the Christian character and fortitude of those Puritan fathers who endured the fires of persecution in the homeland, who braved the ocean's wilds and tempests in a frail bark, who endured the bitterness of winter's blast on a bleak barren shore, and all to the end that they might give birth to a heritage that has become the happy possession of the dwellers in this broad land. All of these woes they preferred and endured rather than yield to a tyrant's wish. This heritage of freedom, religious and civil, is the birthright of those who abide in this favored land. The poet has beautifully described the birth of this heritage in the well-known lines—

The breaking waves dashed high,  
On a stern and rockbound coast,  
And the woods against a stormy sky,  
Their giant branches tossed,  
And the heavy night hung dark,  
The hills and waters o'er,  
When a band of exiles moored their bark,  
On the wild New England shore.  
Amid the storm they sang,  
And the stars heard and the sea,  
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang  
To the anthem of the free.  
What sought they thus afar?  
Bright jewels of the mine?  
The wealth of seas, the spoils of war?  
They sought a faith's pure shrine.

The years passed on fleeting wing,

and the day came when the descendants of those selfsame fathers, increased manifold, were called upon to preserve that heritage alive. They erected a constitution, a verbal expression of the heritage they had enjoyed for so long, and sealed it literally in their blood. How seldom do the great masses of our people that throng the streets of our great cities and move to and fro in the busy whirl of our modern life pause to evaluate the heritage we possess and then with bowed head and reverent heart return thanks to God who has not so favored every nation.

Once more when we stop to consider the vast temporal blessings which God has given us we readily recognize that these are not surpassed anywhere on earth. It is true that the sun of prosperity has been hiding for some years behind the dark and dismal clouds of depression and hardship. But even this truth does not detract from the fact that our temporal blessings are unsurpassed. Think of the vast wealth secured in bank and treasury vaults, of the prolific mineral resources waiting to be extracted from the bowels of mother earth for the use of man, of the broad plains and fertile valleys rich with agricultural potentialities, think of the mighty industrial plants which roar and hum day and night and in which are stored up wealth beyond the wildest dreams of avarice.

To all of these blessings we could add many more. Consider our homes, the castle and citadel of the average man, the health we possess, the food we eat, the raiment we wear, our institutions of learning. When we seek to enumerate the temporal blessings with which God has endowed this fair land we are utterly at a loss for words; like the psalmist of old we are overwhelmed, and admit they are more than can be numbered.

## Our Spiritual Benefits

Secondly, I remark that the spiritual benefits we enjoy in America are superlative in degree. As with those blessings which might be designated national so also with these which are more particularly spiritual.

We enjoy freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our con-

sciences. Otherwise we could not today enjoy the happy privilege of being in The Presbyterian Church of America. It has not been so throughout the history of the Christian world. The fires burned and the wild beasts raved for the flesh and blood of the early Christians who would not abandon their Christian faith. The soil of France was rendered sacred by the blood of the Huguenots; the Protestants of the Netherlands resigned their lives and earthly all rather than renounce the One who at such infinite cost had made them His own; the Covenanters of Scotland died amid the heather bells with the Psalms of David upon their lips; Christian missionaries have gone forth and have laid down their lives in lands where the temporal powers were hostile to the Gospel of God's Son. In many lands today the freedom we love and enjoy is absolutely forbidden. We have but to think of those countries where sinful and proud men have raised themselves up to assume the place of the only living God and are demanding that the multitudes bow the knee in man-worship. Not so is it in this land of the free where there is assured to every man, be he ever so humble, that sacred right of worshipping God as he feels directed so to do.

Furthermore, we have the priceless possession of an open Bible. Time was when few were written; time was when they were chained to the pulpits; time was when people could not read them for they were illiterate; time was when merely to read the Sacred Book was to incur the death penalty; time was when they were burned in public places. But for us these days have all passed into oblivion, and we thank God. To tens of thousands of hearts in America it is the most blessed of all books. There they find what to believe concerning God and what God requires of them, His creatures. There they recognize that God has come from out the darkness and has spoken finally and fully. There they find the story of One who came from out the Father's presence to die a shameful and ignominious death for them and for their salvation and in that great fact they find rest for their weary and sin-sick souls.

But above all else we rejoice that we are favored in America with the glorious privilege of preaching and

receiving a free and full offer of salvation in Christ Jesus. For many things we are thankful—for our national heritage, for our temporal possessions, for gifts and graces without number—but for this beyond all else are we thankful, namely, that Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that He lived to acquire for us a glorious righteousness and that

through Him we have entered into the possession of an endless life. Truly God has not so dealt with every nation and we sing aloud in national thanksgiving:—

"Ten thousand thanks, ten thousand thanks,

We'll praise Him o'er and o'er,  
And for the life with Him to come,  
Ten thousand thousand more."

## A Revolutionary Discovery or a Gigantic Hoax?

A Book Review by Professor ALLAN A. MacRAE, Ph.D.  
of Westminster Theological Seminary

GOSPEL LIGHT, by George M. Lamsa, B.A., "Ethnologist, Aramaic Language Expert," A. J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, 1936.

A NEW AND ENLIGHTENING TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPELS according to the EASTERN VERSION, translated from the ARAMAIC, "the language Jesus spoke," by George M. Lamsa, Author of *My Neighbor Jesus*, A. J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, 1933.



Dr. MacRae

**D**URING the last few years newspaper headlines have frequently declared that remarkable discoveries regarding the original Gospels had been made—discoveries so remarkable, indeed, as to revolutionize our understanding of many Bible verses. Great publicity has been given to these claims. Newspapers in every part of the country have joined the chorus, while at least one national radio hook-up has declared on the basis of these assertions that our idea of the story of Jonah and of many of our Lord's miracles must now be completely altered. We are told that the gospels as we have them represent translations of a Greek version which is itself not the original but a very poor translation of an Aramaic original. After almost twenty centuries of their use, we have now the opportunity to learn their true meaning, since Mr. George M. Lamsa has at last appeared to give us the correct explanation, based on what he declares to be the original Aramaic version of the scriptures. This version he claims to be able to interpret correctly because

of his knowledge of the language and customs of his Eastern home, which, he asserts, have scarcely changed since the days of Christ.

These are tremendous claims. They cannot be treated with indifference. If they are true, an advance in Christian knowledge is possible, greater than any since the Reformation. In this case it is our duty to forward them with all our strength. If they are not true, a gigantic hoax has been perpetrated upon the people of our land. In this case it is our duty to expose it mercilessly. When claims so stupendous as these are made and widely publicized, no middle ground is possible. It becomes our duty to examine them dispassionately, and to announce our decision firmly.

Mr. Lamsa's claims may be summarized in three heads: first, that our Gospels represent a very poor translation of an Aramaic original; second, that he has access to that original; third, that he is supremely qualified to interpret that original.

Since the first of these claims is dependent for its effect upon the second and third, and since the third is the one which has been most widely advertised, we shall examine them in reverse order. On what does Mr. Lamsa base his claim to be a supremely qualified interpreter? Certainly it is not on the basis of great scholarship or extended education that he considers himself entitled to be designated as "Ethnologist, Aramaic Language Expert." The only education he claims is that provided by undergraduate departments of a

mission college in Persia and of an American theological seminary. He puts no higher degree than "B.A." after his name. His claim to be an expert is based entirely on his knowledge of the language and customs of his early environment.

### Distance from Palestine

This being the case, it is important to notice that the region from which Mr. Lamsa comes is over five hundred miles by air line from the nearest border of Palestine. A region of varied topography intervenes, with many racial types, a number of different languages, and all sorts of customs. The language and customs of Mr. Lamsa's people would throw little light on those of present-day Palestine. What right has he to assume that the two were identical in ancient times?

Indeed, such an assumption is quite contrary to fact. The language which Mr. Lamsa quotes in his books is the Syriac of Edessa in northern Syria. It was the most widely used literary dialect of ancient Aramaic. *But it was definitely not the dialect which Jesus spoke.* The Aramaic of Palestine can be studied as it occurs in the Jerusalem Targum (a translation of sections of the Old Testament into Aramaic by ancient Palestinian Jews), and in the Palestinian translation of the Gospels into Aramaic, of which parts have been preserved. The Western Aramaic dialect which these present—the language which was spoken by Jesus and His disciples—is quite different from the dialect of the Syrians of Edessa.

### Is the Language Unchanged?

The assumption which Mr. Lamsa makes that the language of his people has not changed since the time of Christ is a large one. Two thousand years is a long time for a language to remain stationary. In no other case has a language remained unchanged for even a far smaller period. Among the many and varied dialects of Aramaic it is hardly to be expected that exactly at the time of Christ this one would have stopped the long development which it had already undergone and that it would have remained unaltered ever since. When we examine some of Mr. Lamsa's translations in the light of other portions of the Syriac Bible, we shall see how far indeed the language must have been changed. For it is easy to demonstrate that the

ancient Syriac language, in which a capacious literature has been preserved, gives no warrant at all for most of the interpretations which he presents.

Before we examine some of Mr. Lamsa's actual translations, let us look briefly at his second claim, that he has before him the original Aramaic scripture, from which he alleges that the Greek gospels were translated. He makes no claim to have discovered a new manuscript. According to his definite statements, the version on which he bases his translation is the Syriac Peshitta, which he calls the Eastern Version. Now this version was translated from the Greek at the direction of Bishop Rabbula, bishop of Edessa in the early part of the fifth century. It is a well-known fact of history that this bishop ordered that the Peshitta should be used in all the churches. The so-called Old Syriac, which had been previously used but had become corrupted, was discarded. Within the last century certain manuscripts of this Old Syriac have been found. They differ in many places from the Peshitta, which Lamsa uses as his basis. Dr. F. C. Burkitt of Cambridge has demonstrated that the quotations from the scriptures found in Syriac writings before the fifth century are not from the Peshitta, but from the Old Syriac, while in Syriac writings subsequent to that time the Peshitta is regularly quoted. No one asserts that the Old Syriac gives us the original Gospels. The Peshitta cannot possibly do so, since it was unknown before the fifth century. Moreover, Mr. Lamsa's use of the Peshitta must have been confined to one or two manuscripts, or, more likely, to printed copies. Had he made any extensive use of ancient manuscripts of the Peshitta, he would have noted the fact that almost all of them definitely state that Matthew composed his Gospel "in Hebrew in Palestine," Mark "in Latin at Rome," Luke "in Greek at Alexandria the Great," and John "in Greek at Ephesus." Such statements in the very manuscripts of the Peshitta decisively exclude any possibility of its claiming to be itself the original form of the Gospels.

### Unwarranted Interpretations

If space permitted it would be easy to show that the ancient Syriac language itself gives no warrant for

most of Mr. Lamsa's interpretations. If they represent the modern dialect of his people, it must have changed tremendously since ancient times. One of his most widely publicized emendations is the case of Matt. 27:46: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Here Lamsa would substitute for the words "Why hast thou forsaken me?", the following: "for this I was kept." In *Gospel Light*, pp. 151-5, he gives his detailed argument for his rendering. Much of it consists of a consideration of the nature of God. It is unnecessary to enter this phase of the matter here, since the question before us is not, "What do we think the Bible ought to say?" but "What does it say?" We are interested in his linguistic arguments for his rendering. It can be safely asserted that they are not valid, as far as ancient Syriac is concerned. *Lmana* is never used to mean "for this." In the Peshitta it always means "for what?" or "why?" *Shbakthani* cannot mean "I was kept." It is not passive, but active. He endeavors to prove that the root *shbak* can mean *keep* by referring to I Kings 19:18, Romans 11:4, and Joshua 8:35. Actually the word does not occur at all in the Peshitta (Walton Polyglot Edition) of the first or last of these three passages, but only in the middle one. There it means *to leave*, and not *to keep*. It never occurs in the Peshitta in the sense of *keep*, but always of *leave, forsake, loosen, allow*, etc. "Why hast thou forsaken me?" is an accurate translation of the Syriac expression. Moreover these are exactly the words used in the Peshitta in Ps. 22:1, where the meaning of the Hebrew original from which the Syriac was translated is absolutely clear. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that in the parallel to this very passage, in Mark 15:34, the Peshitta gives unmistakable proof to anyone who can read Aramaic at all that it is a translation from the Greek and not the reverse (by giving the words twice, to represent the Aramaic words spoken and the Greek translation that follows).

### Did Christ Walk on the Water?

On pp. 338-340 of *Gospel Light* Mr. Lamsa asserts that the Aramaic preposition *al*, as used in John 6:19, Matt.

14:25, and Mark 6:48, though literally meaning *on*, is properly translated *by*. He quite overlooks the fact that even in his own translation of the Peshitta Matt. 14:24 says "the boat was many miles away from the land" and that when Peter tried similarly to walk "al the water" he sank (Matt. 14:28-31). Clearly here the interpretation which Lamsa would give is utterly impossible in view of the context. The same criticism obviously applies to his interpretation of "Jonah in the whale" (*Gospel Light*, pp. 90-91).

Similarly on pp. 316-319 he gives a long interpretation of the saying of Jesus in John 2:4, "mine hour is not yet come," which at first sight appears greatly to simplify the entire matter. However, the fact that in vv. 9-10 the master of the feast calls the bridegroom and speaks to him in such a way as to show that he considers him responsible for the excellence of what has been served proves Lamsa's entire interpretation to be untenable. It is an application of a custom with which he is familiar to a situation that is entirely different and demonstrates the utter falsity of the oft-repeated references to "unchanged Eastern customs." A careful reading of the passage designated should convince any intelligent English reader that there is not the slightest reason to consider either that the customs of Mr. Lamsa's people are identical with those of this region two thousand years ago, or that the customs of that region have at any time had any close similarity to those of ancient Palestine.

### Ignorance of True Facts

Thus we see that the version which Lamsa translates is not the original of the Gospels at all, but a translation from the Greek, and that his claim to be qualified to interpret it is based on no solid evidence. His knowledge of the Syriac of the Peshitta is utterly untrustworthy. No one who had more than a very elementary knowledge of languages could possibly say, as he does on p. 385 of *Gospel Light*, "Hebrew was primarily derived from Aramaic. The two languages are so alike one can hardly make distinctions." One might fully as well say that Spanish and Italian are so alike one can hardly make distinctions!

In view of the results of our investigation of Lamsa's second and

third claims, it is hardly necessary to examine the first. Even a glance at the evidences for and against the possibility that an Aramaic original underlies some parts of our Greek Gospels would require far more space than is at our disposal. Whatever the result of such a study might be, it would not alter the situation before us: no such original is available to the author of *Gospel Light*.

Aramaic has much to teach us that will be of value in the interpretation of the Bible. It needs to be studied scientifically, not in the slipshod and unscholarly fashion of Lamsa. When we observe what a stir his half-baked

theories and extravagant assertions have made, we are bound to admit that Barnum's characterization of humanity was correct. A gigantic hoax has been perpetrated. It is to be feared that it will dispose people to be slow to accept the real contributions that scientific study of Aramaic has to make to the understanding of the Bible.

*Gospel Light*, like its predecessor, *The Four Gospels according to the Eastern Version*, is published in very attractive form. The A. J. Holman Co. has done a fine job of printing. One wishes the content were worthy of it.

## A Presbyterian Exodus

By the REV. A. FRANKLIN FAUCETTE



Mr. Faucette

**A**N INCREASING number of conscientious Presbyterians are deliberately forsaking the church of their fathers; and the reason is not far to seek. As the full significance of recent rulings in the courts of the church dawns upon its members, many more will undoubtedly join in a movement not unlike the Biblical Exodus of the people of God.

The analogy is not altogether inept. For just as God's ancient people chafed under an alien rule, so the people of God today groan under the heavy hand of a Pharaoh that "knows not Joseph," the Auburn Affirmationist that knows not an infallible Bible, a supernatural Christ, an omnipotent God of justice and truth. Certainly the tenets of the Modernist are as alien to the Gospel of Christ and as destructive to essential Presbyterianism as the religion of Pharaoh was alien and destructive to the religion of Israel. This at least is clear. Consequently there can be no choice but separation. As far back as 1924 a keen observer of the trend of events within the church warned in a little book: "If the liberal party really obtains control of the Church, evangelical Christians must be prepared to withdraw no matter what the cost." No doubt that time has now come. Obviously the alien now effec-

tually controls the counsels and destinies of the church. Hence the exodus. Presbyterians are counting the cost and paying the price of loyalty to the Word of God and faithfulness to historic Presbyterianism.

And what of the whips of the taskmasters? More than once in recent months the courts of the church have lashed unmercifully those who would not, in obedience to the "mandate," build up the treasure cities of the Boards. And no Presbyterian is exempt from this oppressive service no matter how broad and inclusive the official policy, how concessive to unbelief, how steeped in Modernism. And when the ecclesiastical slaves cry out in protest the burdens are only increased, and the bonds tightened. Against these intolerable tyrannies true Presbyterians are beginning to rebel.

Again, the same seductive compromises suggested by Pharaoh of old are assiduously proposed by false leaders now. "Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land." The modern version is: "Go worship your God, but preserve denominational regularity"—as though true worship were compatible with the unequal yoke with unbelievers. "I will let you go," said Pharaoh, "that ye may sacrifice to the Lord your God in the wilderness; only ye shall not go very far away." "We will let you go," say the present denominational autocrats, "only go not too far in challenging unbelief."

"Go," said Pharaoh, "serve the Lord your God: but who are they that shall go?" To such an arrangement the oppressors of this day would gladly assent, so long as the youth of the church remained under un-Christian propaganda of the Boards and agencies. "And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and said, Go ye serve the Lord; only let your flocks and herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you." Today the question of church property ensnares many a minister and many a church in a net of dishonorable compromise with unbelief. But if the snare be broken, and every compromise refused, the luckless offender is forcibly evicted from the church—persecuted, suspended, deposed.

But lo, when the inevitable march towards the wilderness begins, the persecutors change their tactics and dash in wild pursuit. They summarily deny the right of any harassed minister to resign or of any troubled soul to leave the misery of a deadening servitude. Pharaoh, however, did not go so far as to forbid the fugitives to use their traditional name. He did not think of that as others have. He thought only to hound the people of God in the way God had opened up, until he met his doom in the retributive waters. Let the pursuers beware!

But the final break with a corrupt and worldly regime brings inevitably the crisis of Kadesh-Barnea. And here the counsels of the conservatives diverge. The minority group urges drastic and heroic action: "Let us go up at once and possess it, for we are well able to overcome it." They do not by any means discount the difficulties that confront them any more than Caleb and Joshua did in their day, but they count on the faithfulness of God. The land before them is an exceedingly good land, rich with the great principles and glorious traditions of Presbyterianism; and they would enter at once into their heritage. The majority group, however, objects: "We be not able to go up against the people, for they are stronger than we." These see only the walled strongholds, the formidable antagonists, the giants of intellect and prestige. They cannot for the life of them see how so venturesome an enterprise as the launching of a new denomination, free from compromising alliances, can hope to prosper.

So the debate rages in the camp on the question of spiritual conquest or return to the fleshpots. Some would stone their leaders and choose a captain for the inglorious return to the tyranny of the Taskmasters. "Let us submit ourselves to the situation," they plead; "let us submerge doctrinal differences. Perhaps in the course of twenty-five years or so we will have our way. Something will surely happen to dispossess the alien." So they argue.

But as they argue they forget that, aside from the impossibility of reforming "Egypt," something is happening to them. Did not Christ solemnly declare that if a man's eye be single his whole body shall be full of light, but that if his eye be evil his whole body shall be full of darkness? Thus if a man's will is undivided to do God's will, he will know the truth and readily detect error. On the other hand, the exponent of a vacillating policy loses the seeing eye, the vision, and the faculty of discrimination.

The light within him becomes darkness. "And how great is that darkness!"

Israel refused to go forward under the clearest and most explicit direction of God, and Israel wandered in the wilderness forty years. May not a similar fate befall those who fail to listen to the voice of God in the present hour? Twenty-five or forty years of unfaithfulness to the Word of God, or futile battle against impossible odds, would be tragic enough to contemplate.

But thank God there are those who have not chosen so hopeless a course as that. Thank God there are those who are willing to count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, and who have gone forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. Surely He has signally honored their faith and their testimony, as the events of the last few months have abundantly shown. The glory of the Lord has appeared! God has spoken!

## A Very Ancient Bible Fragment

A Review by the REV. EDWARD J. YOUNG  
Instructor in Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

TWO BIBLICAL PAPYRI in the John Ryland's Library, Manchester, England. Edited by C. H. Roberts, M.A. The Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1936.

IN THE John Ryland's Library of Manchester there has been found a papyrus which is believed to be the oldest fragment of any extant Bible manuscript. The discoverer of this important fragment is Mr. C. H. Roberts, a specialist in the field of papyrology. In his very interesting account Mr. Roberts states that his attention was drawn to a large, unexamined collection of papyri which had been purchased for the Library in 1917 by the great Syriac scholar, Dr. Rendel Harris. Here he found a considerable number of theological and literary texts, and among them an envelope containing two pieces of cartonnage (the wrapping of papyrus which was used for the mummies of human beings or, in some cases, of the sacred crocodiles).

It was the custom to make cartonnage of papyrus only during the three centuries preceding Christ. After the

papyrus was cut into sheets or strips of varying sizes, three or four thicknesses were glued together. The exterior was then coated with plaster and placed on various parts of the mummy outside the cloth wrappings. In the case of the sacred crocodiles, found at Tebtunis in Egypt, the cartonnage was used as stuffing in the throat.

The larger piece of cartonnage found in the envelope consisted of six layers, small scraps with one or two larger pieces, torn and placed haphazardly one on top of the other. The fragments were in such a mutilated condition that part of Deuteronomy was found with a strip of a roll containing a section of the first book of the Iliad. Difficult, indeed, was the separation of these various fragments. By means of acetic acid the plaster on top of the cartonnage was removed. Such, however, was the resistance of the gum binding the leaves together that the usual methods of moistening with warm water or applying a hot iron failed to separate



them. This was accomplished only by their immersion in boiling water for one full minute. This process, which fortunately did not damage either the papyrus or ink, was successful in separating the various layers in each cartonnage.

The result obtained was truly interesting. Aside from various small Demotic (a simplified form of character used in Egypt) and Greek fragments, there appeared the following: 1) Fragments of at least four separate columns of a roll containing the book of Deuteronomy; 2) several Greek fragments, among which was a section of the Iliad; 3) an account; 4) several Demotic fragments, six of which offer a legible text.

The account list mentioned above is written in a large, sprawling hand on the verso, *i.e.*, the back, of the Deuteronomy roll. This fact should be noted, for the general presumption is that the accompanying Greek and Demotic fragments are contemporary with this account.

Although no precise information either of date or provenance is forthcoming, yet the following facts do determine the date approximately. Of the Demotic texts six are legible, probably being parts of lists of names, and not literary texts. According (p. 17) to Sir Herbert Thompson, an expert authority, the Demotic fragments are undoubtedly late Ptolemaic, *i.e.*, between the accession of Philometor in 181 B. C. and the death of Soter II in 80 B. C. The only indication of their provenance is the double occurrence of a proper name beginning with the letters St— (the remainder being lost). During this period the place referred to, so we are told, would undoubtedly be Setwoti, a name common in the Fayum district. The Greek fragments, likewise, are regarded as contemporary with the account on the verso of the Deuteronomy roll. The account itself mentions a "second year" which may possibly be that of Ptolemy Soter II (116-115 B. C.).

But what about the fragments of Deuteronomy themselves? These are carefully written in a book hand, somewhat formal and elegant. Most closely resembling this hand is a second century B. C. manuscript of the Odyssey from Tebtunis. In color our Deuteronomy papyrus is light, and of fine texture and even surface. The text contains chapters 23:24 to

28:33 and includes the verse 25:3 regarding punishment by forty stripes, upon the basis of which the Apostle Paul was beaten (cf. II Cor. 11:24). There is no attempt at punctuation, although at the end of a sentence and at the end of a group of words a

space is left. This interspacing does not seem to follow the sense of the passage, and may possibly be due to Aramaic influence, since in Aramaic papyri of the fifth century B. C. word division does appear. Probably our  
(Concluded on Page 88)

## A Forward Look

By the REV. CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE

Chairman of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension

**T**HE Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America is past. But the work of that church has only just begun. With hopeful hearts we face the future. Our Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension has now arrived at the second stage of its career.

### The First Stage

The first stage was that of organization. The Committee had to set up its office. It had to find fields of service for ministers who, because of their stand for the gospel, were without positions. It moved forward with alacrity and faith, nothing doubting that the Spirit of God had raised it up for such an hour as this.

In a marvelous way the Lord supplied the Committee's financial needs during these initial months. With thankful hearts we reported to the Assembly that all our bills were paid and that we were free from debt.

From June to November over \$7,000 reached the office of the Committee, and its ministry reached from coast to coast.

### The Second Stage

Now the Committee is a "going concern." The arms of its testimony reach out in many directions. From Washington, D. C., in the east to the state of Washington in the west its influence for the cause of Christ is felt.

Two words characterize this second stage. The first word is *expansion*. New congregations of The Presbyterian Church of America are emerging. They are looking to the Committee for help. We must stand ready to serve these loyal groups to the utmost of our ability. Further, congregations which have reached the venerable age of four or five months are growing steadily. The Lord con-

tinues to add to the church such as should be saved.

The second word is *self-dependence*. Increasingly the infant congregations, despite the weight of their swaddling-clothes, are thinking in terms of self-support. With some these thoughts are finding concrete expression. With others they are still nebulous dreams.

### Our Responsibility

In the meantime days have a strange way of passing into weeks, and weeks into months. Our Committee has undertaken the support of over a score of men. Salary checks must be mailed on certain days of the months. As a matter of fact, an additional \$1,000 is needed by the Committee to meet its obligations which fall due on December 1st.

Hitherto it may have sufficed for us to use the "emergency appeal" method in soliciting funds for this worthy cause. The Lord was able to use these appeals.

But now another method is needed. As members and congregations of The Presbyterian Church of America we need to remember that the Committee's work can be sustained only if there is *regular, systematic* giving on the part of the entire church.

### The Value of a Budget

To that end may we urge that congregations which can possibly do so include in their benevolence budgets the work of the Committee.

And individual donors—how we thank God for you—your *sustained* interest in the testimony of the Committee is needed in this our hour of opportunity.

The work of the Committee is the work of the church. May the Lord quicken us all to a new desire to share in this important work.

## The Second General Assembly Of The Presbyterian Church of America

**T**HURSDAY, November 12th, was a day not soon to be forgotten by the more than four hundred members of The Presbyterian Church of America who gathered at 10 A. M. in the large auditorium of Philadelphia's Manufacturers' and Bankers' Club. The church itself was just five months old, yet the very atmosphere of this, the Second General Assembly, spoke eloquently of the rich blessing of the sovereign God upon the little group who last June bravely chose loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ rather than any earthly considerations. There was a new virility, coupled always with humble thanksgiving that God, in His grace, had reached out the hand of benediction to those who had trusted Him. Not the least of the blessings received at the Assembly by the delegates was the almost universal exchange of encouragement and cheer. One member reported a phenomenal growth in his church membership; another told of a new field of labor; still another reported the breaking of ground for a new church building. These are but isolated samples of the many stories of blessing, some told from the floor of the Assembly, the rest in the welcomed periods of relaxation between sessions.

It was truly said of the First General Assembly that it was "a deliberative body." That commendation was even more true of the Second General Assembly. At times the deliberation became lively, even to the point of excursions into irrelevancy, but "deliberative" it certainly was. A kind of mental hangover from the days of General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was occasionally evident in the reactions of some of the delegates. In an effort to be truly Presbyterian and unequivocally democratic there was a tendency to lean over backward and become actually the negation of those very essential characteristics. The proposal to delegate to a committee any matter that could be properly handled by the Assembly itself met with hearty disapproval from many members, even when the matter was of such a nature as to be cumbersome and unwieldy if presented to the entire Assembly. A

casual and unintentional reference to a "General Council" produced a chorus of lusty, heartfelt, but courteous groans. And moderatorial rubber-stamps were noticeably absent from the podium.

### THURSDAY

The first morning of the Second General Assembly was to many the high-spot of the entire session. Promptly at 10 o'clock, with the large hall comfortably filled, the familiar strains of the Doxology rang from the hearts of men and women who really meant what they sang. The Rev. J. Edward Blair, of Albany, Oregon, commissioner from the Presbytery of the Northwest, read the Scripture lesson and Dr. Albert B. Dodd, Independent Board missionary to China, led the Assembly in prayer.

The sermon that followed, by the Moderator of the previous General Assembly, the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., will probably never be wholly forgotten by any commissioner or member who heard it. Dr. Machen took as his text II Cor. 5:14, 15: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

Weaving a perfect exegetical whole, keeping always in mind the needs of those whom he addressed, and looking forward constantly to the Lord's Supper about to be observed, Dr. Machen seemed to hold his audience spellbound. He spoke first of the love of Christ as a constraining force, not in this instance man's love for Christ, but Christ's love for man. Nothing, he said, can be so precious to us that we cannot give it up for Him who died for us. He pointed out that when Paul said, "One died for all," the context makes it clear that he meant that Christ died for all *Christians*, not all *men*, and with simple, clear, forceful logic he expounded the doctrine of the Limited Atonement. He showed its transcendent glory in the full system of revealed truth, and pictured graphically the bitter, gloomy creed that

must result from any attempt to embrace an Arminian belief in a so-called universal atonement.

As we leave this General Assembly, said Dr. Machen, we shall be constrained by the love of Christ not to weaken in the stand we have taken; we shall be constrained from seeking unworthily our own preferment over our brethren; and we shall be constrained from stifling discussion for the sake of peace. But the love of Christ will do more than restrain us from living to ourselves; it will constrain us to live unto Him. That love alone can save us as individuals and as a church.

Following the sermon the Lord's Supper was celebrated by the entire Assembly and attending friends. But how different was this solemn service, here celebrated by brethren united in love for one common Lord, from the abortive attempt of former Assemblies of the old organization to reconcile at the Lord's Table the mutually exclusive concepts of faith and unbelief, affirmation and denial, fire and ice! Here was a true and blessed communion, unmarred by any alien presence, undimmed by the taint of Modernism.

After the noon recess the Assembly was constituted with prayer by Dr. Machen, who presided as temporary Moderator. The roll was called by the clerk of the previous General Assembly, the Rev. Professor Paul Woolley. Present were 64 ministers and 26 elders, representing all 10 presbyteries and 19 states. The docket was adopted and nominations were entertained for Clerk of Assembly. The Rev. Leslie W. Sloat, of Knox Church, Washington, D. C., and the Rev. Peter F. Wall, field representative in Iowa of the Home Missions Committee, were nominated. Mr. Sloat was elected by a vote of 40 to 31.

### Dr. Buswell Chosen Moderator

When nominations for Moderator were called for at least four men were promptly on their feet. Dr. Cornelius Van Til, professor of Apologetics in Westminster Seminary, in a simple, brief, but forceful speech nominated the Rev. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D.,

President of Wheaton College. The nomination was seconded by the Rev. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Collingswood Presbyterian Church and member of the Presbytery of New Jersey. In his seconding speech Mr. McIntire took the opportunity of intimating that there are factions or groups that are seeking to assume undue power in the church. He said he rejoiced that he could second the nomination because Dr. Buswell was a premillennarian and his election would reassure those who felt that premillennarians were not welcome in The Presbyterian Church of America.

When Dr. Buswell was elected by a vote of 65 to 9, defeating the other candidate, Dr. John Burton Thwing, Moderator of Philadelphia Presbytery, the retiring temporary Moderator, Dr. Machen, in his speech of welcome re-emphasized the point apparently well-known to most of the commissioners, that the presence of premillennarians in the ministry and eldership and diaconate had never been opposed in any way, shape or manner by anyone in the church. Dr. Buswell, in his brief speech of acceptance, made it unmistakably clear to the entire body that he represented no party or faction or group, that while he did not oppose parties *per se* he did most heartily oppose any division that would cleave the church asunder in this work of Jesus Christ.

Greetings were then read by the Clerk from the Mayor of Philadelphia, from the Irish Evangelical Church and the Westminster Presbyterian Church (Independent) of Sydney, Nova Scotia. Dr. Van Til also brought the greetings of his former denomination, the Christian Reformed Church.

### Report of the Home Missions Committee

The report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension was then read by the Chairman, the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge. It is here printed in the form in which it was adopted, after one minor alteration:

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension has endeavored, to the best of its ability, to carry out the instructions of the First General Assembly.

At the first meeting on June 12th, 1936, the Committee elected the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, Chairman; Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D., Secretary; and the Rev. Paul

Woolley, Treasurer. The Rev. Edwin H. Rian was appointed General Secretary to serve on a part time basis, beginning with June 15th, 1936. Mr. Rian accepted this position and then resigned as a member of the Committee.

Office space was rented at 1212 Commonwealth Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a stenographer employed, and the work of the Committee carried forward.

#### Printing of the Minutes

One of the first actions of the Committee was to order the printing of 1,000 copies of the Minutes of the First General Assembly and to have these copies distributed to all ministers in the church and to all other persons who might request them.

#### Registration of the Committee

The Committee deemed it wise to register under the Fictitious Names Act of Pennsylvania. Accordingly this was done on August 5th, 1936, so that the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of The Presbyterian Church of America is duly registered under the provisions of the Fictitious Names Act, at the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to promote the work of The Presbyterian Church of America. This enables the Committee to conduct business under the laws of Pennsylvania.

#### Erection of Presbyteries

In accordance with the powers granted to it by the First General Assembly, the Committee has erected the following presbyteries, in addition to the presbyteries of Philadelphia and New York and New England, which were established at the First General Assembly:

- (1) The Presbytery of California, to include the State of California
- (2) The Presbytery of Chicago, to include the State of Illinois
- (3) The Presbytery of the Dakotas, to include the States of North and South Dakota
- (4) The Presbytery of Iowa, to include the State of Iowa
- (5) The Presbytery of New Jersey, to include the State of New Jersey
- (6) The Presbytery of the Northwest, to include the States of Washington and Oregon
- (7) The Presbytery of Ohio, to include the States of Indiana and Ohio
- (8) The Presbytery of Wisconsin, to include the State of Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan

These presbyteries have been convened and moderators and stated clerks elected. They are functioning as regular courts of the church.

#### Missionaries Under the Committee

It was determined that all the missionaries who labor under the auspices of this Committee shall receive salaries under the following arrangements:

- (1) Single men shall receive \$50.00 to \$100.00 per month
- (2) Married men shall receive \$100.00 to \$200.00 per month

- (3) In each case the salary shall be determined according to the need and location of the missionary

The following men have been appointed as missionaries and are now serving under the auspices of this Committee:

- Rev. Carl Ahlfeldt, Missionary in Indianapolis, Indiana
- Rev. Samuel J. Allen, Missionary in North Dakota
- Rev. C. A. Balcom, Missionary in North Dakota
- Rev. Robert K. Churchill, Missionary in Washington and Oregon
- Rev. Edward B. Cooper, Missionary in Pittsgrove, New Jersey
- Rev. A. Franklin Faucette (Under appointment)
- Rev. E. E. Matteson, Missionary in North Dakota
- Rev. D. K. Myers, Missionary in South Dakota
- Rev. J. L. Shaw, Missionary in Kentucky
- Rev. Leslie W. Sloat, Missionary in the District of Columbia
- Rev. Robert L. Vining, Missionary in Rochester, New York
- Rev. E. Lynne Wade, Missionary in California (Los Angeles)
- Rev. Peter F. Wall, Missionary in Iowa

#### Aid-Receiving Ministers

In addition to the above-named full-salaried missionaries, the following men have been granted aid according to their needs and according to the Committee's ability to give such aid:

- Rev. John Davies—Work among Indians in Wisconsin
- Rev. David Freeman — Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Mr. Donald Graham—Westfield, New Jersey
- Rev. George W. Heaton — Bancroft, South Dakota
- Rev. Walter J. Magee—Hamill, South Dakota
- Rev. Robert Marsden — Middletown, Pennsylvania
- Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell—Field work in Ohio
- Rev. Leonard S. Pitcher—Wildwood, New Jersey
- Mr. Stanley I. Ray—Norristown, Pennsylvania
- Rev. V. V. Wortman—Le Claire, Iowa

#### Ministers and Churches

Beginning with 34 ministers just five months ago, the number has now grown to 103, and more are being added each week. These ministers reside in 23 states and 5 foreign countries, China, Ethiopia, Japan, Korea, Peru.

There are regularly constituted congregations situated in 16 states. In addition, there are many groups which are in the process of being organized into congregations.

#### Contributions to Committee

It has been encouraging to the Committee to receive funds from practically every group and congregation of The Presbyterian Church of America. Such sacrificial giving and missionary spirit augur well for the future of this church.

In addition, individuals in many parts of this country have sent in contributions

for the work of the Committee. The treasurer's report gives the total amount of these gifts.

The budget for the work of the Committee is over \$2,000 per month.

At the present time the needs are very pressing. Unless hundreds of dollars are received this month the work will have to be greatly curtailed and some men who are living on extremely small stipends will be without food and shelter. But we are convinced that the work must not only be maintained but greatly increased. The Committee calls upon the General Assembly to consider this need and opportunity and to pray that the Lord will put it upon the hearts of many to give generously.

#### *The Civil Suit*

On August 13, 1936, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., acting through certain officers of its General Assembly, certain individual members, and the trustees of its General Assembly, filed a suit in equity in the Court of Common Pleas No. 5 in Philadelphia, against the officers and members of The Presbyterian Church of America, for the purpose of obtaining an immediate injunction restraining The Presbyterian Church of America from the use of that name now and forever.

Acting under the general power granted to this Committee by the First General Assembly, namely, "it shall have power to engage in the presentation of the cause of The Presbyterian Church of America, and to take such measures as may be necessary for the prosecution of its work before the next General Assembly," the Committee asked the well-known Philadelphia law firm of Saul, Ewing, Remick and Saul to act as legal counsel for the defendants, and employed the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, D.D., to act as Ecclesiastical Counsel, for three months, beginning October 1st, 1936.

The case is now pending before the Court of Common Pleas No. 5 in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

#### *General Policy*

It has been the general policy of this Committee as far as possible to localize in the presbyteries and the individual congregations, responsibility for the extension of the church, in accordance with true Presbyterian practice.

This Committee has labored with the cooperation and support of the presbyteries where the missionaries have been stationed.

#### *Vote of Thanks*

The Committee desires to thank the ministers and members of The Presbyterian Church of America for their fine support and confidence.

The treasurer's report, which was presented as a supplement to the above, was subjected to considerable criticism by a few commissioners. One felt that a committee should be appointed to investigate the overhead expenses of the Home Missions Committee. It was discovered, however, that the objector was indulging in the very unbusinesslike procedure of lumping under the name of "overhead" a host of items which were not overhead in any sense of the word. Another member wished to see the Committee run entirely by volunteer office and secretarial help. The motion to appoint an investigating committee was tabled.

The Rev. Peter F. Wall, of Iowa, and the Rev. Carl A. Ahlfeldt, of Indianapolis, spoke briefly of the work they are carrying on under the supervision of the committee. The Rev. Edwin H. Rian, General Secretary of the committee, reviewed briefly the

sweep and scope of the committee's work.

The Home Missions Committee submitted six recommendations for the consideration of the Assembly. Space does not permit us to record much of the detail of that consideration. Two of the original recommendations were tabled and their purposes were covered by an amendment providing for a nominating committee—avowedly in order to avoid even a hint of that bugbear of the old organization's committees: self-perpetuation. The four remaining recommendations, with the amendment, are here printed in the form in which they were finally adopted:

#### *Recommendation 1:*

That the General Assembly appoint a Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to consist of 21 members, at least 11 of whom shall be ministers of the gospel.

#### *Recommendation 2:*

That the Moderator appoint a Nominating Committee to present names of 12 ministers and 9 elders for the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to the Assembly, that the voting be by ballot, that the membership of the Committee be divided into three classes: the four ministers and three elders receiving the highest vote to be in the Class of 1939, the four ministers and three elders receiving the next highest vote to be in the Class of 1938, and the four ministers and three elders receiving the third highest vote to be in the Class of 1937.

#### *Recommendation 3:*

That the Committee be given power to receive and disburse contributions for the



A View of The Second General Assembly

support of home missions and pastors who require aid. Further, that the Committee be given power to engage in the presentation of the cause of The Presbyterian Church of America and to take such measures as may be necessary for the prosecution of its work before the next General Assembly.

#### Recommendation 4:

That the Committee be given power to erect such presbyteries as may be necessary after the adjournment of this General Assembly and until the convening of the next Assembly. That this committee be empowered to readjust names and boundaries of existing presbyteries in cooperation with those presbyteries.

The meeting adjourned after considering only the first two recommendations.

The evening session was addressed by the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the Rev. John J. DeWaard, of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin.

### FRIDAY

After the devotional service opening the Friday morning session prayer was requested by Dr. Charles G. Sterling for the Rev. Arthur F. Perkins, who was reported seriously ill. Prayer was offered by Dr. Sterling and the Clerk was instructed to convey to Mrs. Perkins the sympathy and concern of the Assembly.

A further consideration of the recommendations submitted Thursday by the Home Missions Committee became the first item of the day, and the third and fourth of the above recommendations were adopted. The nominating committee appointed in accordance with recommendation number 2 was not yet ready to report.

A resolution to the effect that no member of this committee elected for a three-year term should succeed himself without at least a year elapsing before re-election was lost, but another resolution concerning "interlocking" committees was carried:

In order to avoid interlocking committees, it is the desire of this General Assembly that no man be allowed to serve at the same time on more than one standing committee, board or agency, except where an emergency may so demand.

#### Report of the Committee on the Constitution

The next item on the docket was the all-important consideration of the report of the Committee on the Constitution, appointed by the First General Assembly. It is doubtful whether any future Assembly will have before it a matter of more profound significance:

The adoption of the doctrinal standards of The Presbyterian Church of America.

For the duration of the consideration of this report the privilege of the floor was extended to Murray Forst Thompson, Esq., a member of the committee but not a member of the Assembly. The following report of the committee was then read by its chairman, Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse:

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

##### To the Second General Assembly:

The Committee on the Constitution desires to make the following report of its work and recommendations:

I. The charge to the Committee was as follows:

A. It "shall present for adoption to the General Assembly meeting in the autumn of 1936 the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the confession of the faith of this church. The committee shall take as the basis of its consideration the particular form of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms which appears in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1934 edition. The committee shall have power to recommend the elimination, from that form of these Standards, of the changes made in the year of our Lord 1903, but it shall not have power to recommend any other changes. The committee shall also have power to recommend what relation this church shall bear to the Declaratory Statement of 1903."

B. It "shall also prepare for submission to the next General Assembly a Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Directory for the Worship of God."

II. With respect to I. A. the Committee reports that it has carefully considered the changes made in the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1903, and that it is unanimous in recommending to the General Assembly the adoption of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms in the form which they possessed before these changes were made, with the following two exceptions:

A. We recommend the retention of the change which was made in Chapter XXII, Section III by the omission of the sentence: "Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority"; and

B. We recommend the retention of the change made in Chapter XXV, Section VI *in so far* as it involved the elimination of the words: "but is that anti-christ, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God." If this recommendation is adopted, Section VI will read as follows: "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof." In connection with this recommendation, it may be well to point out that questions of copyright seem

to make it advisable not to use certain material added in recent years.

III. The recommendation under II. involves the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms without the following changes which were made by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1903:

A. Chapters XXXIV and XXXV of the Confession of Faith with their Preamble.

B. The Declaratory Statement of 1903.

C. The revision of Chapter XVI, Section VII. In the unrevised form, the section reads:

"Works done by unregenerate men, although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet, because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful, and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing to God."

In recommending the elimination of the sections which are enumerated in the preceding paragraph, the Committee desires to state that it does so on the ground that these changes seriously impair the testimony of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to the system of doctrine which is taught in Holy Scripture.

IV. With respect to I. B. the Committee reports that it has been unable to complete the task which was assigned to it. It has not been able to prepare a Directory for Worship. It is not prepared to recommend for adoption a Book of Discipline, although it has prepared a preliminary draft of a considerable portion of a Book of Discipline. If the Committee should be continued, it would be able to complete its work, and present a Book of Discipline and a Directory for Worship a reasonable time before the next General Assembly.

The Committee does however recommend the adoption of the Form of Government which is submitted herewith. Since the draft was printed, in response to suggestions made to the committee, three changes have been made in the proposed Form of Government:

1. In Chapter X, Section I (p. 9), the substitution of the words "consisting, as it does, of" for the words "being divided into."

2. In Chapter XI, Section II (p. 12), adding the clause: "and two or more elders from every collegiate church in proportion to the number of its pastors."

This addition will bring this section into harmony with Chapter X, Section III.

3. In Chapter XVIII (p. 31, line 8) adding the following after the words "the parties appointed": "and that the parties appointed shall speedily place themselves and their work under the jurisdiction of any presbytery within whose bounds they may be laboring."

In making this recommendation the Committee desires to call attention to the fact that the proposed Form of Government is to a large extent the Form of Government which has been in use in

the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. for over a hundred years. The most substantial changes have been in the interest of eliminating the provisions for synods, and other matters which obviously can not be included in our Form of Government. Some of the principles set forth in the new draft have been revised and restated in view of questions of copyright. Some sections have been altered in the interest of lucidity. The revision has been a very conservative one on the whole, and material changes have been dictated by the desire to present a Form of Government that is true to the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government.

*Respectfully submitted for*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION,  
N. B. STONEHOUSE, *Chairman.*

Immediately after the reading of the report the two overtures bearing upon the question of the 1903 revision were called for and read. The overture from the Presbytery of California, printed on page 61 of the November 14th issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, was received and filed. An overture from the Presbytery of New Jersey calling for postponement of the adoption of any doctrinal standards and urging the church to remember that it was the true spiritual succession of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., was eventually lost. Opposing the recommendations of this second overture Dr. Machen protested that nothing new was being proposed, that every minister was thoroughly familiar with the Confession of Faith, that five months had already been allowed for the consideration of the 1903 revision, that in spite of allegations to the contrary the committee had done only what it was told to do. "It would be," said Dr. Machen, "a calamity beyond all words not to adopt our doctrinal standards."

Mr. Thompson spoke forcefully of the necessity of tying The Presbyterian Church of America up to the Westminster Standards and thus to historic Presbyterianism. He cited the immense advantage of this move in view of the civil suit now pending. Mr. McIntire, in reply, admitted that the 1903 revisions were "weak" but pleaded for the adoption of the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. because "it is the normal thing to do." Mr. McIntire went on to say that the adoption of those standards would be of immense help in the retention of church property, since we could then say that we still had exactly the same creed as before. To this Dr. Cornelius Van Til promptly replied by saying, "Shall we be Ar-

minians before the courts this year, with the full expectation of being Calvinists next year?" Debate was cut off by the moving of the previous question, and the New Jersey overture was, to the gratification of many, lost.

Although debate seemed lively in the morning session it was little more than a few casual whispers in comparison with the whirlwind of discussion that occupied the entire afternoon. The occasion was the question of what action, if any, the General Assembly should take on the issue of "premillennialism." The overture on this subject from the Presbytery of California (printed on page 55 of the November 14th issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN) was read. This contained a request that "definite, emphatic, and unambiguous eschatological liberty be written into the constitution of our beloved church," in other words, that a guarantee of this liberty be added to the Westminster Confession of Faith. This overture had been concurred in by the Presbytery of Iowa but rejected by the Presbytery of New York and New England. A letter was also read from the Stated Clerk of California Presbytery that threw further light upon the reasons for the original overture and upon the attitude of the California brethren. The letter follows:

November 11, 1936

To the Commissioners of  
The Second General Assembly of  
The Presbyterian Church of America  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Our Brethren, Beloved in the Lord:

The late November 14th issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN makes it quite clear that we have pierced to the heart some brethren we love very dearly. Therefore, the knowledge of their grief grieves us. With Paul we would say, "For if I make you sorry, who is he then that maketh me glad, but the same which is made sorry by me? And I wrote this same unto you, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all. For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you." II Corinthians 2:2-4.

We are praising God that our interpretation was a misinterpretation of Professor Kuiper's words as they appeared in the GUARDIAN. Also, we are praying most earnestly that God may order recent discussion pertaining to Pre, Post, and Amillennialism (among those who are equally supernaturalists, and true to the Reformed Faith) in such a way as shall

be clearly seen to have been for His glory and the well-being of our Church.

It is only fair to Rev. Carl McIntire and the "Christian Beacon," to say that our misinterpretation was entirely independent of his editorial, "Premillennialism" appearing in that paper. That editorial was cited merely because its words accurately set forth our own independently-arrived-at-understanding of Professor Kuiper's words. It seems to us that there are a sufficient number of persons throughout the nation who arrived at an identical interpretation with Rev. McIntire's (and that prior to the time of his editorial) that it would appear that either Professor Kuiper was certainly less explicit and clear in his phraseology than he might have been, or else, that a host of persons must be charged with mental vacuity. We are all fallible men, despite being saved by grace. We "misinterpreters" are glad to make such confession in every such case as this. And, it is our hope that every man in our Church is so adorned with Christ's own beauty of humility as makes him constantly aware of his capacity for mistake in word and deed.

God bless you each and all. Though absent in person, we are with you continually before the Throne of Grace for each moment of this General Assembly. Our Lord be glorified and rejoiced in and through each of us!

Yours fraternally,  
The Presbytery of California,  
WM. HARLLEE BORDEAUX,  
*Stated Clerk.*

Another overture from the Presbytery of New Jersey demanded no such drastic action as that proposed by the California body, but asked merely for a *resolution* which of course would have no constitutional standing whatever.

Following up the California overture the Rev. Milo Jamison, a member of that presbytery, proposed that a declaratory statement be appended to the Confession of Faith to the effect "that The Presbyterian Church of America does not officially interpret any part of the Westminster Confession of Faith or Catechisms as being opposed to the premillennial view."

Many held that such modification of the doctrinal standards would be contrary to the purport of the First General Assembly as evidenced by the charge given the committee: "The committee shall have power to recommend the elimination . . . of the changes made in the year of our Lord 1903, but it shall not have power to recommend any other changes." It was held that these words contemplated no such tinkering with the Confession as that proposed by the California brethren.

Dr. Buswell, speaking from the floor, said that as a premillenarian he could

accept the Westminster standards, that he did not favor the inclusion of any such declaratory statement, but moved as an amendment the adoption of the standards as they existed in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1934, and the subsequent elimination of the objectionable revisions by vote of the individual presbyteries. Dr. Machen delivered a logical indictment of this entire proposal. "Let us start absolutely clean in this movement," he said. He pleaded that the Assembly should not include for any purpose of expediency the compromising 1903 revision. He reiterated the well-established fact that no one has ever felt that a premillennialist cannot subscribe to our doctrinal standards. He deplored any line-up of individuals or churches on the millennial question, and suggested the now famous resolution of Philadelphia Presbytery as a solution to the immediate problem if a statement of some sort were insisted upon—the resolution to be, not a part of the constitution, but merely an expression of the attitude of the Assembly. As a direct response to this speech the substitute amendment of Dr. Buswell was laid on the table, and the amendment of Mr. Jamison was defeated.

### Adoption of the Standards

The Rev. Robert Strong moved the previous question, thus forcing the Assembly back to a consideration of the report of the Committee on the Constitution in so far as that report concerned the recommended doctrinal standards—that is, all matters pertaining to the charge in Section I: A of the report.

When the vote was taken by roll-call on this all-important matter the result was the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, without the obnoxious 1903 revisions, by the decisive majority of 57 to 20.

### Consideration of Resolutions

The Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge then introduced the resolution of Philadelphia Presbytery on the millennial question (quoted in each of the last two issues of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN). A substitute motion was proposed by the Rev. David Freeman, characterized by generous quotations of those sections of the Confession of Faith that treat of eschatological matters, interpreting those quotations as not teaching the premillennial view,

but declaring that the premillennial view was in the area of permitted liberty within the system of doctrine. The Assembly adjourned for the day without discussing either of these resolutions.

The Rev. John P. Clelland, of Wilmington, Delaware, and the Rev. Samuel J. Allen, of Carson, North Dakota, addressed the evening session.

### SATURDAY

At the beginning of the session on Saturday morning the Clerk was instructed to record the names of any who voted negatively on Friday's adoption of the doctrinal standards but who now desired to record the fact that they were in hearty accord with the standards that the church had adopted. A very large proportion of those who had so voted asked to have their names recorded in that manner.

The Assembly then discussed, with considerable fervor on both sides, the two resolutions that were before the house at the time of adjournment on Friday. Dr. Buswell, speaking from the floor, opposed the adoption of any resolution on the ground that it was entirely unnecessary and that the liberty which he needed as a premillennialist was guaranteed to him in the Standards themselves. Dr. Martin Luther Thomas, another staunch premillennialist, also spoke against the adoption of a resolution, urging that in the face of the challenge of present world conditions the church forget divergences of opinion and devote herself to the supreme duty of evangelization. Dr. Machen likewise opposed any action on the matter, and said he had favored the adoption of the Philadelphia resolution only if the Assembly insisted on adopting some resolution.

After it became clear that the temper of the entire Assembly was decidedly in favor of adopting no resolution at all the two original movers offered to withdraw their resolutions. Both proposals were tabled, and no further action was taken.

The report of the nominating committee appointed by the Moderator in accordance with the second amended recommendation of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension was then read and additional nominations were freely added from the floor. The final result of the balloting is of great significance in view of the earlier criticism expressed by a

few commissioners who were dissatisfied with the committee's report. The Assembly re-elected to the committee all but two of the previous members, one of whom stated his inability to serve. Of those re-elected five received the highest number of votes and were placed in the Class of 1939, and three were chosen for the Class of 1938. This represented an overwhelming vote of confidence in the committee as originally constituted.

The result of the balloting was the election of the following committee:

CLASS OF 1937: *Ministers*, Charles G. Sterling, Samuel J. Allen, John H. Skilton, W. Harlee Bordeaux; *elders*, John W. Dulles, Bert W. Tennant, Donald M. Perkins.

CLASS OF 1938: *Ministers*, Paul Woolley, Everett C. DeVelde, J. Edward Blair, R. Jackson Vaughn; *elders*, Harry A. Worcester, Harry Fraser, Edward B. Cooper.

CLASS OF 1939: *Ministers*, J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Charles J. Woodbridge, Clifford S. Smith, J. Gresham Machen; *elders*, Gordon H. Clark, Peter Stam, Jr., C. W. Holbrook.

At this point the order of the day was suspended in order to receive the following protest:

November 13, 1936,  
To the Second General Assembly of  
The Presbyterian Church of America:

We should like respectfully to protest the action of the Second General Assembly taken on the afternoon of November 12, 1936, when that Assembly adopted the report of the Committee on the Constitution thus adopting a confession of faith of our Church without, as we believe, adequate debate on certain sections of that report, namely: II. A. referring to the Confession of Faith, Chapter XXII, Section III, and II. B. referring to the Confession of Faith, Chapter XXV, Section VI. There was, it is true, prolonged discussion of amendments offered to that Committee's report, but opportunity was not allowed for any discussion of II. A. and II. B. of that report. Rather, immediately after amendments to that report touching entirely other matters were defeated, discussion on these sections and the remainder of the report was silenced during the late hours of an afternoon session by a motion for the previous question. Such action the undersigned wish respectfully to protest.

R. LAIRD HARRIS  
DEAN W. ADAIR  
THOMAS L. HODGE  
J. F. MINOR SIMPSON

### Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions

The Committee on Foreign Missions reported to the Assembly certain suggestions, and recommended the appointment of a committee of five. The report itself was brief, in

view of the fact that it urged the church to promote its foreign missionary activity through the program of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The committee chosen by the General Assembly is as follows: *Ministers*: Franklin S. Dyrness, William T. Strong, George W. Marston, Carl McIntire; *elder*, John S. Wurts.

### Report of the Committee on Christian Education

The Committee on Christian Education through its secretary, the Rev. John P. Clelland, submitted its report, which was amended in a few small details. The report, in the form in which it was finally adopted, follows:

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

In presenting its report, the Committee on Christian Education wishes to express its conviction that the triumph of unbelief in the old organization was due in no small measure to the prostitution of existing educational agencies through compromise with unbelief, on the one hand, and to the lack of a full-orbed and consistent system on Christian education, on the other. Consequently, if The Presbyterian Church of America is to be a truly Reformed church, activities in the sphere of education, however humble, can not be initiated too soon. Certain truly Evangelical and Reformed publications and projects which are already available can be utilized, but it will be necessary also to take steps toward the development of a comprehensive program of Christian education. With the prayer that our God may guide The Presbyterian Church of America as it enters upon this great task, the following recommendations are presented:

I. That the General Assembly urge sessions to supervise carefully the materials used in the Sunday School in view of the fact that so much literature designed for the Sunday School is tainted with unbelief or is defective in its presentation of the doctrinal position of our church. Favorable attention is called to the materials published by the Instructor Publishing Company of Zeeland, Michigan.

II. That the General Assembly urge pastors and sessions to advise with young people's societies in their particular churches in the interest of securing the attendance of the young people upon the regular services of the church; the adoption of a positive program of study of the Scriptures and of the doctrines of the church, and of Christian fellowship and testimony; and the avoidance of all modernistic or other compromising alliances.

III. That the General Assembly call the attention of the churches to the need of caring for the training of Sunday School teachers and other Christian workers in a knowledge of the Bible and of the doctrines of our church. Individual churches or, where it is practicable for a

number of churches to co-operate in such an endeavor, groups of churches, may establish a Bible School (or Schools) on a distinctively Reformed basis to accomplish these purposes.

IV. That the General Assembly urge that in the worship of the church, hymns and hymnals be selected that are in harmony with the teachings of Scripture and of the Reformed Faith. While not recommending every hymn found in *The Hymnal* published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, which was published in 1895 and revised in 1911, it recommends this hymnal as the best available to meet the needs of our church until such a time as it may be feasible to publish our own hymnal. Attention is called to a Christian song book which is true to the Reformed Faith and is suitable for family worship and popular meetings, *The Christian Hymnal*, published by Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

V. That the General Assembly urge pastors and congregations to support Westminster Theological Seminary with their prayers and generous financial gifts.

VI. That the General Assembly recommend to pastors and members of the church the formation of Christian School Societies which shall have as their purpose the establishment of Christian daily schools.

Respectfully submitted,  
ROBERT L. ATWELL, CALVIN K. CUMMINGS,  
GORDON H. CLARK, R. LAIRD HARRIS,  
JOHN P. CLELLAND, NED B. STONEHOUSE,  
J. GRESHAM MACHEN, *Ex Officio*.

The Assembly instructed the committee to continue. At his own request Dr. Machen was removed from the committee, and the name of Dr. Van Til added to complete the roll.

### Consideration of the Form of Government

Deliberation on the second part of the report of the Committee on the Constitution occupied a large portion of the day's session. This concerned the Form of Government proposed by the committee for adoption by the General Assembly. A few weeks prior to the Assembly it had been printed and mailed to each minister for leisurely examination. Additional copies were available at the Assembly. After re-reading those sections of the report that had not previously been acted upon, Dr. Stonehouse moved the adoption of the proposed Form of Government, with the changes designated in the report. He said, however, that while the committee strongly recommended the adoption of the Form of Government both to guard the standards of the ministry and to provide a basis for administration, it did not regard the necessity for such adoption as comparable with the impera-

tive duty of adopting the doctrinal standards of the church.

At this point an overture was received from the Presbytery of California urging action by the Assembly to insure particular churches the permanent retention of their properties. No action was taken, since it seemed to many that the declaration on this matter adopted by the First General Assembly and incorporated into the proposed Form of Government adequately met the requirements of the California overture.

Attention returned to the consideration of the Form of Government, and discussion was free, frank and plentiful. In general, it was evident that the draft proposed by the committee was received with great cordiality. Only one additional recommendation was added by amendment to the three changes proposed by the committee under Section IV of its report. This recommended in Chapter XIV, Section V, beginning at line 4, the deletion of the following words: "except that the examination in the languages of Scripture may be waived upon the presentation of a transcript showing that creditable work has been done in these subjects."

### Adoption of the Form of Government

It was moved to adopt the proposed Form of Government provisionally, and in the interests of avoiding any further confusion this was amended to read in its adopted form: "That the Form of Government be provisionally adopted with the changes recommended by the committee, to be binding until the next General Assembly provided that existing organizations need not be re-adjusted during that period to conform with it."

This form of the motion seemed advisable since, in the new Form of Government, the personnel of the Board of Trustees of a particular church was designated to "consist of the acting ruling elders and deacons in that church." It was felt that churches already having a different membership in their Boards of Trustees could not reasonably be expected to conform to the new requirements until those requirements are finally, and not merely provisionally, adopted.

The Committee on the Constitution was continued in order to complete its work on the Book of Discipline and the Directory for Worship. It was



further asked to send the provisional Form of Government to all prospective members of the next General Assembly who have not already seen it.

The call for miscellaneous business produced a volume of lesser details to be cleared up before the Assembly could adjourn. A resolution of appreciation of the work done by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, which had been brought before the Assembly earlier in the day, was adopted. The Moderator and Clerk were appointed a committee to receive monies to defray the expenses of the next General Assembly, which will be held in Philadelphia from Tuesday, June 1, 1937, to Friday, June 4.

The following protest was also received from the Rev. Milo Jamison, a member of the Presbytery of California, who had strenuously pleaded for the inclusion of a statement guaranteeing liberty to premillennialists:

#### A PROTEST

To the Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America:

We respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly in refusing to include in the doctrinal standards which it adopted the following "declaratory statement to be appended as part of the Confession of Faith":

"The Presbyterian Church of America does not officially interpret any part of its Confession or Catechisms as opposed to the Premillennial view."

In support of this protest we present as our reasons the following:

1. Because it is our deep conviction that the Premillennial view is clearly taught in the Word of God which is the supreme standard of our Church.

2. Because, though the Premillennial view is in nowise incompatible with the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster standards, there are many who consider the wording of these standards to be opposed to the Premillennial view, thus raising in acute form the question of the right of Premillennials to be received on equal terms with those holding other views.

3. Because the declaration presented did not make the slightest change in the standards of the Church, but merely assured Premillennialists that the Church does not officially interpret the standards as being opposed to the Premillennial view.

4. Because nothing short of some such constitutional safeguard could reasonably set at rest the widespread and well-founded fears which are abroad that Premillennialists are not welcome in the Presbyterian Church of America.

5. Because we believe that the Presbyterian Church of America can never adequately fill its proper place in the work of God's Kingdom if it permits its standards to be so interpreted that it refuses to receive on equal terms those who hold that viewpoint which has been so signally

blessed of God as a tremendous incentive to missionary enterprise, holy living and personal evangelism.

MIL0 F. JAMISON.

It is earnestly to be hoped that all who attended the General Assembly, and also all other members of the church, will now definitely and finally understand that the implication contained in items 4 and 5 of this protest, that premillennialists are unwelcome in the ministry, is entirely unfounded in fact.

Following prayer by Mr. McIntire and the benediction by the Moderator, the Second General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America adjourned. In a farewell message to members and friends at the closing mass meeting on Sunday evening, Dr. Buswell spoke on the subject: Ambassadors for Christ. He placed The Presbyterian Church of America in the forefront of the battle to preserve the historic witness of the Reformed Faith.

Much had been accomplished in these three short days, and the causes for general thanksgiving were legion.

The church now had clearly defined her doctrinal position and had adopted Standards true to the Word of God and uncompromisingly Calvinistic. At the close of the First General Assembly only thirty-five ministers had been enrolled; at the opening of the Second General Assembly the list had grown to one hundred and seven. Home missionary work was flourishing in many widely separated fields and progress was reported on all sides. By its choice of a moderator and by its very apparent attitude in many recurring situations the General Assembly had reassured those who had misconstrued the position of the church regarding premillennialism. The words read from the third chapter of Revelation by the Rev. Clifford S. Smith at Saturday morning's Devotional Service can truly be made the watchword of The Presbyterian Church of America:

"I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name."

—T. R. B.

## The Sunday School Lessons

By the REV. R. LAIRD HARRIS

### December 6th, Paul's Parting Counsels. I Tim. 6; II Tim. 4; Titus 2.



Mr. Harris

PAUL'S parting counsels are so numerous that we must single out a few for special mention. One so rich in experience and so advanced in the faith as he, could, in his last few words, open to us years of profitable study. The time of his death was approaching for in the Rome of Nero's day no life was safe, much less the life of one who preached the gospel. It is thought by most that after the two-year Roman imprisonment mentioned in Acts 28: 30 Paul was set free for a while and tradition says he went to Spain, as Romans 15: 24 says he had hoped to do. At least II Timothy was evidently written while he was awaiting trial and expecting death in Rome. I Timothy and Titus perhaps were

written only a little while before this. Here are Paul's last words.

It may be best to select just two aspects of Paul's parting counsel, since much of it we must of necessity leave untouched. And first let us notice his advice to Timothy. I Timothy abounds in little details of advice for Timothy's guidance in pastoral work. Paul deals with questions of the form of worship, government, conduct and care for the poor. All these details are important and should be studied, but in the last chapter he grounds them, as he always did his ethical commands, squarely in the Gospel of redemption by our wondrous Saviour. Flee unrighteousness, follow after godliness, fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, witness a good confession, and why? Simply because this same Jesus who was crucified by Pilate will return made manifest as the blessed and only Potentate (*Dynastes*), the King of kings, and Lord of lords (II Tim. 6: 15). Why should

Timothy do Christ's commands and suffer if need be for Him? Simply because this Jesus is God over all, blessed forever. Christ as an ideal, Christ as an example, Christ as a catch-word for goodness has no real power over men, especially young people. But Christ Jesus as very God of very God can command our fealty to the last. Paul bases his counsel on that high Christology that orthodox Christians have always held to be our dearest element of faith.

Paul goes further than our modernist contemporaries and asks Timothy to hold a complete creed. He specifies in II Tim. 1:9, 10 what salvation is. It is not just psychological or subjective, but was purposed by grace, in Christ, before the world began and is now made manifest in our Saviour, who has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. This is the doctrine which Paul, the prisoner, counsels Timothy (and us) to hold dearer than any and every thing on earth. How are we to preserve this gospel? Paul tells us at the end: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" (II Tim. 4:2).

Finally at the close of Paul's life which we have been studying several months, he leaves not only advice but also a testimony. Life had lost its peculiar charm for he had seen a heavenly Canaan far better than we can imagine. Death had lost its terror, for he had seen it conquered by Him who burst the bands of death and made it but the gateway, for those who trust in Him, of entrance into the beauties of holiness. There was no longer fear nor fond regret, but only a calm awaiting of the crown of glory that fadeth not away. Paul testifies that he has done the things which he desires Timothy to do now in his place. He has fought the good fight. Are we doing it? Or are we letting others take the hardship and do the work while we attend a convenient church occasionally and try to feast upon the spoils of war? The trouble is that this fight is individual and we must ourselves strive if we would gain the prize. To be a strong Christian you yourself must work at it. Paul has finished the course like an athlete running down the home stretch. The end is in sight and it is an end of full reward. Surely the goal of Paul is worthy enough that Timothy should

run with patience the race that is set before him (Heb. 12:1). Paul has kept the faith. Like those in Philadelphia he had "kept my word and . . . not denied my name" (Rev. 3:8). We have a faith to keep, a God to glorify; may the Lord grant that we too, when we come before His throne, may be able to say that we have not denied His name.

Paul's biography is not finished on earth and neither is ours. For him there was laid up a crown of righteousness, but even here after a long and blessed life of service Paul refuses to say that he has earned the crown which is even to Paul the gift of grace. Rather he says that you and I, though we are far behind Paul the great, yet may have a similar crown, being saved by the same merciful God and Saviour who has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.

#### **December 13th, John's Vision on Patmos. Revelation 1-3.**

For just one Sunday we take up the study of the Book of Revelation, dealing with the opening chapters only. It might seem that today's subject has not much relation to the study of Paul's life and work which we have been pursuing, but it does come as a fitting conclusion to the life of that great apostle who knew so well the same Lord whom John saw in Patmos. Too, the vision of the glory of Christ is the proper introduction to the study of His birth. For if Christ be not the Lord of John's vision then Christmas has no real meaning.

Revelation is generally regarded as one of the most difficult books of the Bible. Famous scholars have differed radically as to its true interpretation. We shall not attempt, in our limited space, even to touch on the problems involved. But we do believe that many Christians, in adopting a hopeless attitude toward this book, miss a very precious part of God's Word. Naturally you will not at once understand all the symbols used, but you will at once, upon serious reading, find here many gems of consolation and help and encouragement in the Christian struggle. Also, although many references are obscure, all who read here can see the principles of God's dealing with men—how that salvation is by grace through faith in the blood and that God's purposes

will triumph in the finale of history. Our advice then is to read and re-read this book.

We must confine ourselves to the vision itself of Christ presented in the first chapter. To the apostle—himself in exile, perhaps at hard labor—and to his persecuted friends Jesus shows Himself as the Lord of Glory, great in His exaltation, with power above all and coming at last as the Master of history and Lord of circumstance. Jesus constantly had affirmed His power to His apostles while He walked the earth. On the night of His betrayal He had declared that He gave up Himself willingly although He had at His command more than twelve legions of angels. Now to His own sorely tried saints He exhibits the effulgent glory of His Person. As Moses had gained new strength by a sight of the glory of God (Ex. 34:5-9) so John was strengthened in tribulation by the sight of Deity unveiled. We have here not a mere picture of Jesus nor John's conception of God. It is not Jesus as John liked to think of Him, but a description of Jesus as He actually *was*, indeed as He is and shall be forever. John heard the voice, saw the glory, and fell at His feet as one dead.

The vision presents a picture of One who is Life itself. When John described His head and His hairs white like wool and His voice as the sound of many waters he was describing a sight too glorious for earth. The vision may be appreciated by contrast. The Lord speaks in His strength as the One who yields the victory to none. With Him there is no weakness. He faints not nor is weary, and that strength is not such as must be renewed by others, but proceeds from Himself as the Creator and Sustainer of all things in heaven or earth or hell. And before this mighty God is the aged apostle. Weak he is, helpless, caught in unjust oppression and aged and ready to die or faint under the frailty of humanity. Is anything more puny than man? Even the youths shall faint and be weary, says Isaiah 40:30. How much more necessary for the arm of flesh to make its boast in the power of the Lord God and in that power alone!

Take another contrast. Nero, or possibly Domitian, was on the throne at Rome. How would the world's emperor compare with the Lord God?

Corrupt, weak, he was in such constant fear of death that a slave had to sample all his food. Truly the proudest man is a sorry spectacle to see. "Who art thou," said God to Israel, "that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die?" (Isa: 51:12). And this was the reason for the vision which was given to John: To show that even the iron hand of heathen Rome in her glory and strength and wickedness is as nothing compared to the illimitable reserve of power of the eternal God. And the Lord must smile from the parapets of heaven to see our great ones hold their courts. God lightly laid His hand on Rome as He had on Sennacherib of Assyria when, as Byron said, "the might of the Gentile, unsmote by the sword, hath melted like snow in the glance of the Lord." A sword goes out of His mouth, wielded by His will alone; His visage puts the sun to shame. This Jesus who looks down upon you today wherever you are is the Lord God omnipotent. Truly, it is for us to

make haste and bow our heads to the ground and worship (Ex. 34:8).

One last brief contrast might be mentioned. We separated from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., many of us, because we felt it had officially dethroned Christ. Now how do we take Him as our Head? I take it we make Him our Head not by official declaration but by abhorring all pride and counting ourselves as less than the offscouring of the earth. We are scholars. What is that compared to the light of God's truth? We have suffered for His name. But who of us has resisted unto blood? Men look up to us as leaders. So did they to the Pharisees. And to the proud Pharisees this same Jesus said "ye . . . are within full of dead men's bones" (Matt. 23:27), but to those who in deep humility have caught the meaning of this vision of the glory of the Lord, He says: "Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith the Lord, and thy redeemer, the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. 41:14).

God's all-glorious work of redemption causes us to marvel at "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God" (Rom. 11:33).

### Power

God has limitless power. He is able to perform whatever He wills and more than He at any time chooses to perform. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places" (Ps. 135:6). "With God all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26).

God, of course, cannot sin, change, perform contradictions, or do anything that is opposed to His nature. If He could He would not be God.

Like God's wisdom, His power is manifested in His works of creation, providence, and redemption. "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light" (Gen. 1:3). Our Lord upholds all things by the word of his power (Heb. 1:3). "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16).

### Holiness

The Hebrew verb "to be holy" suggests separation. As applied to God it indicates His separation, His distinctness from all other beings. It may thus embrace all of God's attributes. Although capable of this very general meaning, the term holiness may also denote a specific attribute of God: His separation from evil and His moral perfection. It is in this sense that it is used in the Shorter Catechism.

Being holy, God hates sin and commands His intelligent creatures to be separate from it and to live in purity. Unrighteous men, made aware of His holiness, must exclaim with Isaiah, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts" (Isaiah 6:5). Only through Jesus Christ, the holy Lamb of God, can we be delivered from our unrighteousness and state of separation from God and brought into fellowship with the Holy One of Israel, who is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity (Heb. 1:13).

### SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Do you note anything in the laws of nature and in the diversity of cre-

## Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

### LESSON 8

QUESTION 4. *What is God?*

ANSWER. *God is a spirit infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.*

**G**OD is a spirit infinite, eternal, and unchangeable not only in His being or substance, but also in the attributes, perfections, or virtues of His being.

### Wisdom and Knowledge

God has full knowledge of Himself and of all things actual and possible. He knows even the essence of things, the relationship of all things, and the future thoughts, decisions and acts of men. He does not view things partially or in succession, or have to develop His knowledge by reasoning. All things are always present to His view.

"All things are naked and opened unto the eye of Him with whom we have to do" (Heb. 4:13).

"O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off." (Ps. 139:1-2.)

See also I Kings 8:39; Ps. 44:9; Ps. 139:12; Ps. 147:5; Prov. 15:3, 11; Isa. 40:28; 46:10; Ezek. 11:5; Matt. 10:30; John 21:17; Acts 15:18; Rom. 8:29; Eph. 1:4, 11; I Cor. 2:10; Luke 22:31-34.

Closely related to God's knowledge is His wisdom. He selects, with infinite wisdom, glorious ends to be attained and ways to attain them that will give Him most glory. He produces the best possible results with the best possible means.

A contemplation of God's handiwork in the universe created by the word of His power, and a reflection on the way in which He preserves and governs all His creatures, should cause us to glorify Him for His unbounded wisdom. See the answers to Questions 6 and 11 of the Catechism. See also Psalm 104.

"O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all" (Ps. 104:24).

"And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28).

ated beings that reveals the wisdom of God?

2. In what works has God manifested His wisdom? How?

3. In what ways does God's knowledge differ from the knowledge that men possess? Could men know all things and yet be men? Do you think that believers in their eternal state will know all things? Do unbelievers have valid and certain knowledge? See Lesson 2.

4. Has God power to do more than He has done? Are there any things that He cannot do?

5. With the help of a concordance find several verses teaching the holiness of God.

6. Select a hymn exalting God as holy.

7. What impression did the holiness of God make upon Isaiah?

8. What impression should the revelation of God's wisdom, power, and holiness make upon us? Can we find any comfort in them?

## LESSON 9

QUESTION 4. *What is God?*

ANSWER. *God is a spirit infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.*

### Justice

The holy God, separate from sin and infinitely righteous, is the author of the moral law, the establisher of holy requirements of His intelligent creatures. In accordance with His infinite, eternal, and unchangeable justice He rewards and punishes. "He maintains Himself over against every violation of His holiness, and shows in every respect that He is the Holy One." "The judge of all the earth" cannot fail to "do right" (Gen. 18: 25). "He shall judge the world with righteousness" (Ps. 46: 13). It would be impossible for God not to require punishment for sin. The demands of His justice must be met. "The Lord trieth the righteous: but the wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth. Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup. For the righteous Lord loveth righteousness; his countenance doth behold the upright" (Ps. 11: 5-7). "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6: 23).

The hatred of God for sin and the necessity of punishment for it are

evidenced in the fact that no one could be justified apart from the satisfaction of the divine justice made by Jesus Christ with His own precious blood. If the Lamb of God had not given Himself for the sins of God's elect no one could have escaped God's just wrath.

### Goodness

God is good in His relationship to His creation. Benevolently He created a universe that could serve the happiness of His creatures and benevolently He provides for them (Matt. 5: 45). He reveals His goodness in His gracious love to sinners who merit only condemnation and by giving them eternal life. He is merciful toward the suffering, full of pity and compassion, and very patient with evil doers.

The existence of suffering in the world by no means indicates that God is not infinitely good. Suffering is one of the effects of sin. Man, though a creature, is completely responsible for sin. With our limited knowledge we may not be able to tell why God has permitted sin: but we cannot presume to deny either the fact that God is good or the fact that sin does exist. We must leave the solution of the problem raised by these two facts to God, who is infinite in His knowledge.

### Truth

God is the only true God. He is the only genuine, living deity. He is all that He asserts Himself to be—His word is truth. There is no falsehood or inaccuracy in His revelation of Himself. His promises are entirely reliable. He knows all things as they really are. Without Him we cannot find truth.

Before our God, a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, we must kneel in awe and wonder. He is unutterably glorious. Indeed, our chief end could be nothing except to glorify Him and to enjoy Him forever.

### SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION

1. *Find several passages of Scripture illustrating God's justice, goodness, and truth.*

2. *Determine what attributes of God are praised in at least five of your favorite hymns.*

3. *Do men have any qualities resembling in a small degree some of the attributes of God? If so, what are*

*they and how do you account for their presence in man?*

4. *What are some of the effects of sin?*

5. *Are any men righteous in the sight of God?*

6. *Does the fact that the wicked appear at times to prosper in this life and the children of God sometimes appear to suffer indicate that God is not just?*

7. *What is the difference between chastisement and punishment? Consider Psalm 11.*

8. *In what ways does the truth of God give believers hope and joy?*

9. *If God is just how can any sinful man be saved?*

10. *How is it that there cannot be any conflict between God's justice and His goodness or love?*

## A Very Ancient Bible Fragment

(Concluded from Page 77)

papyrus belonged to the Jews, as they were in Egypt during the Ptolmaic period.

But wherein lies the importance of these fragments? The answer to that question is plain. Their importance lies in the fact that they are probably the oldest fragments of any extant Bible manuscript. We have seen how the accompanying documents have brought us to the second century before Christ. Such is the date, indeed, of the writing on the verso of the Deuteronomy roll. But it is extremely unlikely that a newly written copy of the Law would be so degraded by writing on its verso at any time immediately following its first appearance. It is quite probable, then, that the text of Deuteronomy is somewhat earlier. Indeed, our author feels safe in assigning the fragments to the early half of the second century B. C. They thus apparently antedate by three hundred years the extant manuscript of any part of the Bible, having possibly been written about one hundred years after the Septuagint translation at Alexandria.

Interesting is the fact that our fragments seem to favor Codex A (Alexandrinus) in their readings rather than Codex B (Vaticanus). They have been carefully edited by our author, who well deserves the thanks of the Christian world for thus making them accessible.

## THREE PRESBYTERIES REPORT STEADY GROWTH AND PROGRESS

### New Presbytery of Iowa Convenes for First Meeting

THE Presbytery of Iowa, the tenth presbytery under The Presbyterian Church of America, was organized at the Walnut Street Baptist Church, Waterloo, Iowa, on November 2nd.

After a devotional service in the morning, the afternoon meeting was called to order by the convener, the Rev. Peter F. Wall, of Waterloo. The Rev. V. V. Wortman, of Princeton, Iowa, was elected Moderator and Mr. Wall was made Stated Clerk. The roll was as follows: the Rev. V. V. Wortman, the Rev. Peter F. Wall, and Ruling Elder David Paul, of Princeton.

An act of association was adopted similar to that of the First General Assembly, and it was voted to concur in the overture of the Presbytery of California in requesting that eschatological freedom be safeguarded and guaranteed in the constitution to be adopted by the Second General Assembly. The presbytery voted not to take any action concerning the overture of the Presbytery of California in regard to the 1903 revision of the Confession of Faith.

The presbytery adjourned with prayer to be reconvened at the call of the Moderator.

#### Presbytery of Ohio

The Presbytery of Ohio held its second meeting in Cincinnati, on October 27th. Its business included the reception of two churches and one mission—the Covenant Church of Indianapolis, the Trinity Church of Cincinnati, and the Community Chapel of Newport, Kentucky.

A call from the Trinity Church to the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde was approved and arrangements were made for his installation as pastor.

At Indianapolis the Covenant Presbyterian Church of America was organized on October 15th with a charter membership of 29. Two ruling elders were elected: Maurice Rooker and David Hipes. This congregation,

under the leadership of the Rev. Carl A. Ahlfeldt, has been growing steadily since its first meeting on June 28th. A Sunday School has been organized and cottage prayer meetings are held weekly at the homes of the members. Sunday services are conducted in the auditorium of the Arthur Jordan Conservatory of Music.

Two candidates came before presbytery to be taken under care — Samuel P. Riccobene and H. H. Hamilton. Mr. Riccobene was duly taken under care of presbytery. Mr. Hamilton withdrew his application upon discovering that the requirements for licensure would prove difficult for him to meet.

The presbytery approved the request of the Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell of Mineral Ridge, that he be advised to labor in the vicinity of Cleveland and Youngstown. Mr. Mitchell will endeavor to found a work there with such aid as the Committee on Home Missions can give him.

#### Presbytery of California

The Presbytery of California and about 100 friends of The Presbyterian Church of America in that state met in Los Angeles, on Monday evening, November 2nd. The meeting was opened by the Moderator, the Rev. Donald K. Blackie, of Los Angeles, with a devotional message.

Presbytery received into its membership the Westminster Church of Highland Park, which is in charge of the Rev. E. Lynne Wade, and the following individuals: The Rev. George Arthur Hutchison, and Ruling Elders J. Addison Campbell and Jack M. Sumner.

Representatives were present from Pasadena, Glendale, Hollywood, San Pedro, and Los Angeles, and the entire three-hour session was marked by great enthusiasm and real Christian fellowship.

#### Presbytery of New York and New England

At a meeting of the Presbytery of New York and New England, held at Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, on November 12th, the Covenant Church of Rochester, N. Y., was received into The Presbyterian Church of America. The pastor, the Rev. Robert L. Vining, is already a member of the presbytery.

The church was organized six weeks ago with a charter membership of 21. The following officers were elected: Ruling Elders: Charles F. Wray,

Louis H. Jacobs, Addison Root; trustees: Charles F. Wray, Will E. Wright, John R. Armstrong.

Mr. Vining's name was erased from the rolls of the Presbytery of Northumberland of the old organization, on September 28th, three months after he had renounced its jurisdiction.

## OLD SYNOD OF NEW YORK SPECIALIZES IN CONTRADICTIONS

### Lauds Free Speech But Proceeds to Try Independent Board Member

THE Synod of New York of the so-called Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., at its meeting on October 23rd, played Jekyll and Hyde for the benefit of the assembled commissioners. Like the little girl with the curl, when it was good it was very, very good and when it was bad it was horrid.

The report of the Committee on Social Service warned of "danger in a blind belief that our form of government will automatically continue" and called all denials of free assembly and expression the indications of a "dictator philosophy."

It was obvious that no member of the committee had attended or even heard of the Syracuse General Assembly, for the report went on to say that "free speech means nothing at all unless it means freedom for those with whom the majority differs. The Church, which is concerned not with man's transient political and economic opinions, but with basic considerations of justice and good-will, must reaffirm at every point this fundamental human right."

However, with an agility and versatility that would have produced a warm glow in any sleight-of-hand artist, the Synod then appointed, in conformity to General Assembly's order, a special judicial commission to try Ruling Elder James E. Bennett of New York's Fort Washington Church for his refusal to join in the official goose-step by resigning his membership in the Independent Board. Mr. Bennett, unperturbed Manhattan attorney, still retains his Independent Board membership, still retains also his membership in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

## AUSTRALIA'S DR. ANGUS GIVEN RIGHT HAND OF FELLOWSHIP

### General Assembly of Australia Adopts Evasive Pronouncement

**T**HE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, according to a report from Brisbane, has apparently put an end to the efforts to bring Professor Angus to trial for heresy. In spite of Dr. Angus' denial of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity (see THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for October 10, 1936), the General Assembly ruled that it was inadvisable and unnecessary to enter further upon the matter of the petitions and appeals in reference to his teachings, and instructed the Presbytery of Sydney and all other courts of the church accordingly. A long resolution, which apparently weaves together several motions that had been presented, is typically modernist in its juxtaposition of professions of loyalty with evasive and vague declarations on the issue. The resolution follows:

(1) That this Assembly, in view of the theological unrest within the Church, and for the assurance of those who have expressed deep concern as well as for the strengthening and peace of our whole Church, hereby affirms its adherence to the historic Catholic faith.

(2) That this Assembly holds that the real function of the Church is to be found in the teaching, preaching, and practice of a vital religion which seeks to express the mind and spirit of Christ, and affectionately enjoins all members and adherents of the Church through fellowship in worship, witness, and life, to work and pray for the fulfillment of the Church's high vocation, which is the advancement of the Kingdom of God in the lives of men, in the morals and institutions of nations, and in the brotherhood of mankind throughout the world.

(3) Inasmuch as the basis of union, in giving liberty of opinion on all doctrines taught in the Subordinate Standard not essential to Faith, declared that in regard to the doctrine of redemption, the love of God to all mankind, the free gift of His Son to be the propitiation of the sins of the whole world, and the free offer of salvation to men without distinction on the ground of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice, are essential to faith; and the historic facts of the incarnation; the atoning life and death, and the resurrection, on which the faith is based must be taught

by all who are admitted to the office of the holy ministry as formulated in the Subordinate Standard, until the formulation is altered in the prescribed manner.

(4) And as any denial or discarding of the facts as so formulated, by any person admitted to the holy ministry, constitutes a breach of trust with the Church.

(5) And as the Rev. Dr. S. Angus has frankly and openly with obvious sincerity, in "Truth and Tradition," acknowledged himself to be in conflict with the formulations of the doctrines of the incarnation, the propitiation, and the resurrection, as they are set forth at present in the Subordinate Standard, and laid down in the Declaratory Statement, claiming that they are at variance with the Supreme Standard, such doctrines, however, being among those parts of the doctrine of redemption which the Basis of Union has declared to be essential to faith and must be taught as set forth in the Subordinate Standard, and laid down in the Declaratory Statement, unless and until altered in the prescribed manner.

(6) Therefore, the Assembly instructs state assemblies, presbyteries, and all who have been admitted to the office of the holy ministry, that the laws of the Church must be obeyed, and draws their attention in particular to the clause in the Basis of Union declaring that the doctrine of Redemption is essential to faith and must be taught as set forth in the Subordinate Standard, and laid down in the Declaratory Statement unless and until altered in the prescribed manner.

(7) The Assembly also draws the attention of Dr. Angus, various appellants and petitioners and all other parties directly or indirectly concerned in the case to the above instruction, and, feeling confident that it will be obeyed by all, resolves that unless it be disobeyed hereafter, no further action is necessary.

The resolution was adopted unanimously. Then prayers were offered by the Moderator-General (Dr. MacKenzie) for future guidance to prevent a recurrence of any further disputes and unhappiness.

Opponents of Dr. Angus withdrew any words "which might have been unkind in the heat of the controversy," and Dr. Angus, addressing the full Assembly, thanked his opponents and the others for their chivalry, "as, after all, they were all one in that living faith in the living God, and they had found their religion in things which were unseen and eternal."

"This Church has decided," he said, "that it is not divided, and I shall be glad to unite with those who have differed with me and work in our loyalty to maintain that unity."

"Praise God," fervently shouted a member of the Assembly in the body of the hall when Dr. Angus had com-

pleted his brief speech, and had walked up to the Moderator-General to shake hands, amid cheers from the Assembly.

Although the decision of the Assembly was unanimous, some ministers of the church were not in agreement. Unfortunately, none of those who had sought to bring Dr. Angus to trial had been elected as Commissioners to the General Assembly.

## THREE CHURCHES REPORT ENCOURAGING PROGRESS

### Norristown, Pa.

**T**HE Valley Forge Presbyterian Church, organized about three months ago by twelve former members of the Port Kennedy Church, now meets regularly in the Odd Fellows Hall, of Norristown, under the student pastorate of Mr. Stanley I. Ray. Although the present membership is only fifteen they expect to add about ten more by the first of December. They have already become self-supporting, have purchased fifteen hymnals and a pulpit Bible, paid all bills, and boast a small balance in the treasury. A special series of evening evangelistic services are planned for the week beginning Sunday, November 29th.

### Middletown, Pa.

The Calvary Church, of Middletown, whose pastor is the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, has completed a two weeks' series of evangelistic meetings under the leadership of the Rev. George W. Marston of Kirkwood. Mr. Marsden reports a number of conversions and a time of real blessing in the church.

### Willow Grove, Pa.

When the charter membership rolls of the Calvary Church, of Willow Grove, were recently closed 240 members were enrolled, making this by far the largest church in Philadelphia Presbytery. At the services on Sunday, November 8th, 217 attended the Bible School and, for the communion service that followed the morning worship, the Memorial Hall of Willow Grove was crowded to the doors. At this impressive service a new communion set, the gift of the senior Christian Endeavor Society, was dedicated.

## INDEPENDENT BOARD MEETS, ELECTS OFFICERS, REPORTS TWENTY-THREE MISSIONARIES

**A**T THE meeting of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions held in Philadelphia on Monday, November 16th, the Rev. Harold S. Laird, pastor of the First Independent Church of Wilmington, Delaware, was elected president of the Board, replacing the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., who had been president since the Board's inception in 1933. The Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, pastor of Philadelphia's independent Church of the Open Door, was re-elected Vice-President; the Rev. Paul Woolley succeeded the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, D.D., as Secretary; and Murray Forst Thompson, Esq., was re-elected to the office of Treasurer.

The Executive Committee of the Board now consists of the above officers and the following four other members: Miss Mary Weldon Stewart, Mr. Frederic M. Paist, Mr. Roland K. Armes, and Dr. Machen.

The Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, General Secretary, reported that there are 23 missionaries under the Independent Board. The roll of these missionaries is as follows:

### *China:*

THE REV. EGBERT W. ANDREWS, MR. AND MRS. RICHARD B. GAFFIN, all of Haichow, Kiangsu.

### *Ethiopia:*

THE REV. AND MRS. JAMES L. ROHRBAUGH, P. O. Box 105, Addis Ababa.

### *India:*

THE REV. AND MRS. FRANK L. FIOLE, care of Miss Louisa Lee, Neotani, Unao, United Provinces.

### *Korea:*

THE REV. AND MRS. FLOYD E. HAMILTON, Pyengyang.

### *Manchoukuo:*

DR. AND MRS. ROY M. BYRAM.

THE REV. AND MRS. HENRY W. CORAY.

THE REV. AND MRS. BRUCE F. HUNT.

THE REV. R. HEBER MCILWAIN.

Temporary address for all: c/o the Rev. Henry W. Coray, 22 Post Street, Harbin.

### *Peru:*

THE REV. AND MRS. LON D. HITCHCOCK, Apartado 156, Iquitos. (3 cent stamp.)

### *On Furlough:*

THE REV. AND MRS. ALBERT B. DODD, 922 N. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

### *Sailing Delayed:*

THE REV. AND MRS. BRUCE COLE, Columbus, New Jersey.

## DELAWARE CHURCH MINORITY SEEKS TO OBTAIN PROPERTY BY CIVIL COURT INJUNCTION

### Those Loyal to Old Presbytery Attempt to Bar Majority

**R**ECENT efforts of New Castle Presbytery of the old organization to oust the congregation of the Head of Christiana Church of Newark, Delaware, and its pastor, the Rev. Henry G. Welbon, from their church property reached a new high on October 28th. At that time a minority group in the church, who refused to withdraw with the majority from the old presbytery, filed a bill of complaint in the Court of Chancery in Delaware seeking to obtain possession of the church property. Although the plaintiffs name only themselves in the bill it was quite clear, even to the local press, that they sought to regain the property on behalf of the Presbytery of New Castle.

The bill includes a lengthy but not very satisfactory description of the Presbyterian form of church government in an effort to prove that the property belongs to the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. With customary obtuseness it ignores the doctrinal differences that led to the split in the denomination, but with rare detail it recounts the activities of Mr. Welbon and his group in refusing to recognize the authority of the old organization. Commenting on the bill, Mr. Welbon said:

"It states this church was received into the presbytery of that denomination and therefore was under the jurisdiction of that denomination. It is hardly necessary to point out that when Head of Christiana Church joined that denomination it did so with the understanding and belief that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. would be loyal to the Word of God and to Jesus Christ, the true Head of the Church. When that denomination had denied these cardinal truths there was nothing else for us to do but withdraw from it."

Those named in the bill of complaint have been subpoenaed to appear by counsel in the Court of Chancery in Delaware within twenty days.

## CHURCH LAYS CORNER-STONE OF NEW BUILDING AT IMPRESSIVE SERVICE

**T**HE corner-stone of the first new church building of The Presbyterian Church of America was laid on Friday, November 6th, at the site chosen for the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin. A large number of members and friends witnessed the simple but impressive ceremony.

The Rev. John J. DeWaard, pastor of the church, presided, read the Scripture lesson and offered prayer. The Rev. Oscar Holkeboer, pastor of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, at Oostburg, Wis., was the guest speaker and gave a stirring address. He chose as his text Psalm 127:1: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

"You, the people of Calvary church, began well," said Mr. Holkeboer. "The structure of which the corner-stone is now laid will in God's Providence be completed next year. But it is not so important that you grow in numbers. It is important that as the salt of the earth you keep your savor—that you preserve the faith 'once for all delivered to the saints'—that you continue jealously to guard the truth—that you courageously keep up the fight. It is important that you let your light shine—that it be set upon a candlestick and not hid under a bushel."

After the singing of the Doxology and the repeating of the Apostles' Creed by the gathering, the corner-stone ceremony took place, with Henry Voskuil, 82-year-old member of the church, officially placing the stone. The closing prayer was offered by Mr. DeWaard.

The documents placed in the sealed compartment of the corner-stone contain the history, not only of the Calvary Church, but of all the events of major importance since the Syracuse dénouement. A copy of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for September 12, 1936, is included among the honored papers.

The Calvary Presbyterian Church of Cedar Grove goes steadily forward in its vigorous witness to the Reformed Faith, in spite of very bitter opposition from a hostile presbytery.

## MISSIONARIES LEAVE FOR INDIA UNDER INDEPENDENT BOARD

The Rev. and Mrs. F. L. Fiol  
Send Last-Minute Greetings  
to Friends in America

**T**HE Rev. and Mrs. Frank L. Fiol, missionaries to India under The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, sailed from New York on Sunday, November 8th, aboard the S.S. "New York." All plans had originally been made to sail from Baltimore on the S.S. "City of Hamburg," but a shipping strike necessitated a last-minute alteration of the schedule and swift preparations to leave from New York.

Writing to THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN from the pier only a few short hours before sailing, Mr. Fiol said:

"Our only thought now is a note of praise to God for the privilege we have of preaching the glorious gospel of salvation to those who sit in darkness in India.

"The thought of leaving home and friends is a sobering one, but God's grace is sufficient for us in all things and in every circumstance. His peace is filling our hearts, and it is a very wonderful thing to know that as we go He has gone before and prepared the way, and He will be with us always.

"We count it a great privilege to be called of the Lord for service in India and we pray that He will use us in His vineyard to bring precious souls into the Kingdom. What a joy it is to know that we have the *only* message of salvation and that, as we preach to the people in India, the Holy Spirit will cause the Word to accomplish that whereunto it is sent."

Mr. Fiol was ordained to the ministry at the First General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of America. Upon their arrival in India Mr. and Mrs. Fiol expect to go at once to Lucknow to study the language.

The Rev. and Mrs. Bruce Coie, who planned to sail for the same field with Mr. and Mrs. Fiol, are temporarily detained in this country by the illness of Mrs. Coie.

## DR. JONATHAN GOFORTH, MISSIONARY EVANGELIST, DIES IN TORONTO

**T**HE Presbyterian Church in Canada and the missionary work of all denominations in China have suffered a great loss in the death of the Rev. Jonathan Goforth, D.D., who died in Toronto on October 8th.

Dr. Goforth heard the missionary call while a student in college, and with his wife was sent to China in January, 1888. The Canadian Presbyterian Church was just founding its mission in the northern province of Honan, and Goforth and his colleagues were assigned to the city of Changtehfu. For twelve years they labored there and in the surrounding country, until the bloody Boxer rebellion in 1900, when all missionaries in the interior of China were forced to flee for their lives.

Dr. Goforth with his family and colleagues tried to escape to Tientsin,

but the Boxer militia everywhere cut off retreat. The Canadian missionaries were soon surrounded by a howling mob, brandishing guns and swords, and shouting, "Kill! Kill!" Stooping down to help one of his little children, Dr. Goforth was struck on the neck by a Boxer's sword, and narrowly missed being decapitated. By what seemed little short of a miracle the party finally escaped and reached Shanghai.

This dangerous experience brought Dr. Goforth a special blessing. He devoted himself to evangelistic work, and the blessing of God rested on him. Simple and quiet in his manner, avoiding all sensational methods, he held services throughout China for about thirty years. Churches of all denominations were revived and thousands of souls saved through his preaching.

When the union of Canadian churches was effected, Dr. Goforth remained with the continuing Presbyterian Church and opened a new field of work in Manchuria. In 1931 his eyesight began to fail, and soon he was totally blind. He continued to work, however, with Mrs. Goforth as his efficient and devoted helper.

In his death the cause of evangelical Christianity and missionary enterprise has lost a true ally, a servant of Jesus Christ whom God chose signally to bless.

### "This Week in Religion"

**B**EGINNING Saturday, December 5th, and continuing each Saturday evening from 5.30 to 5.45 P. M., "The Presbyterian Guardian" will broadcast up-to-the-minute news of the religious world over Station WIP, Philadelphia (610 kilocycles).

"This Week in Religion" will not be limited to Presbyterian news alone. From the vantage-point of our Reformed heritage it will reach out to every denominational and national sphere to interpret for its listeners the wealth of religious news now on the horizon.

Those living within the area reached by Station WIP are urged to listen regularly each week and to tell their friends of this exceptional opportunity.

## OLD ORGANIZATION MOVES AGAINST NEW JERSEY CHURCH

**T**HE Rev. Leslie A. Dunn was deposed from the ministry by the Presbytery of Monmouth, at its meeting in Freehold, N. J., on November 9th. The members of Mr. Dunn's Church, the First Presbyterian Church of Columbus, N. J., were cited to appear on November 30th, at the next meeting of the Monmouth Presbytery to show cause why the church should not be dissolved.

The Columbus Church unanimously withdrew from the old organization on July 7th, and since that time the presbytery has vainly attempted to turn certain delinquent members against the church in order to use them in opposing the actions of the pastor and congregation.