

April 10, 1937

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 1

The Presbyterian Guardian

One Dollar a Year

NED B. STONEHOUSE,
Editor

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

THOMAS R. BIRCH,
Managing Editor

THE CREED OF OUR FATHERS

OUR decision to publish the Confession of Faith, a chapter or two at a time, beginning with this issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, is indicative of the distinctiveness of our doctrinal point of view. Christendom today is, as a whole, not much interested in creeds, and particularly not in the great creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which were formulated as the result of the epochal revival of true Christianity which is generally known as the Protestant Reformation. We, however, are committed with all of our hearts to creedal Christianity, and specifically to that form of Christianity which according to our judgment has come to its purest and most consistent expression in the great Reformed or Calvinistic creeds. Of these creeds the Confession of Faith which was formulated by the divines at Westminster is, as few will deny, the greatest, if only by virtue of its grand comprehensiveness.

THE ATTITUDE OF MODERNISM

Modernism does not look favorably even upon the idea of creedal formulation. While its representatives sometimes express reverence for the historic creeds, it soon appears that such reverence does not really go beyond the respect which one generation may show for the intellectual accomplishments of another, or the regard which a person may have for an heirloom which is without any utility whatsoever. In other words, such reverence as Modernists may show toward the historic creeds evinces merely a respect for the fathers, not an approval of the faith of the fathers.

One reason that Modernists are unwilling to accept the historic creeds as an expression of their faith is simply that they have rejected the Bible as the Word of God. Since they do not believe the Bible, they cannot be expected to look with favor upon the basic purpose of

these creeds, which is that the church should make a corporate testimony to her faith in the system of truth which the Bible contains. The insistent demand, "No creed but Christ," is a phase of the modern attack upon the authority of the Bible.

But beyond the fact of unbelief as a reason for the Modernist's antipathy toward creeds, there is an even more ultimate explanation. And that is found in the dominant philosophy which denies that there is anything permanent about truth. Truth, instead of being viewed as unchangeable and eternally valid because God is truth, becomes merely a name for a principle of action which approves itself to man for however brief a season. The view of truth as eternal is, according to the prevailing philosophy, a heavy shackle upon man's freedom, and a serious deterrent to human progress. To the Modernist's: *I do not believe* is joined the affirmation: *Since truth changes, and doctrines are merely theories, belief does not really matter.* Here then is the real root of the doctrinal indifference of our times. The modern church repeats the creed, but under its breath it makes its ultimate confession: *I believe that belief doesn't really have anything to do with the essence of Christianity.* The step from the cry: "No creed but Christ" to a "creedless Christianity" is very short indeed.

FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE HISTORIC CREEDS

The Fundamentalism of our day is very often marked by a depreciation of the historic creeds. At this point it is necessary to guard against misunderstanding. Fundamentalism is a term that has come to stand for the antithesis of Modernism. It recognizes the authority of the Bible, and takes its stand upon the great truth that eternal destiny is bound up with belief in the gospel. In that sense we gladly take our stand on the side of Fundamentalism. However, among fundamentalists gen-

that we hear no more of the Cainites. In the fifth chapter, however, a genealogy of the Sethites is given. In this genealogy also there are ten names. The question thus arises why each of the lists has ten names. Various answers may be given to this question, but the present writer is inclined to feel that the purpose of the author of Genesis is to give representative names. On such a view it would be impossible to construct a chronology. Thus, we could not say how long after Seth Noah lived. One fact stands out clearly as though to mock the words of the serpent when he told Eve that she would not die. Of each person in the genealogy except Enoch it is said, "And he died." Sin is thus taking its toll in the human race.

At the birth of Noah Lamech gives a prophecy, "This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Possibly there is here a reflection upon the promise which God had given in the garden. Perhaps Lamech was expecting Noah to be the one who would bruise the head of the serpent. The meaning of the word is interesting. It means to rest. It is instructive to compare what is said of the Lamech in chapter five with what is said of the Lamech in chapter four.

Noah was indeed in the line of the chosen people. He is described as a man who was just and perfect in his generations, and who walked with God. However, "the earth also was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence." God saw the corruption of the earth and determined to destroy it.

Of Noah it is said that he "found grace in the eyes of the Lord." This of course was not due to any inherent merit or righteousness, but was due to the fact that God had chosen Noah. While God determined to destroy the race, yet Noah was to be a remnant. The plan of God had not changed. Sinful mankind would be wiped out, but a representative remnant would be preserved through which, in the fullness of time, would come He who was to bruise the serpent's head.

The method of destruction chosen by God was a flood. Noah was commanded to make an ark of gopher wood, the length of which was to be six times longer than the width. If it be remembered that the cubit is about

eighteen inches, it will be seen that the ark was indeed a large vessel. The purpose of the command is made abundantly clear (5:17). God intends to destroy all flesh. Noah believes God and obeys Him. "Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he" (5:22).

There are three things which may be mentioned with regard to the flood. In the first place its purpose was to destroy all flesh (cf. Gen. 6:7, 13, 17; 7:4, 21-23; and I Peter 3:20). The flood did not merely happen by chance; it was ordained of God for a specific purpose. God does punish sin through calamities. This flood was sent to destroy evil mankind.

Secondly, it must be stressed that the cause of the flood was the sinfulness of mankind (cf. Gen. 6:5, 11, 12, 13). Man had brought this punishment upon himself.

Thirdly, a thoroughly representative remnant was saved. This, as has been indicated before, makes clear that God does not change His purpose.

Questions arise as to the extent of the flood. Was it merely a local inundation, or did it cover the whole earth? The language used to describe the flood is indeed the same comprehensive language which describes creation in the first chapter of Genesis.

There are those who feel that the flood offers the explanation of many of the difficult problems of geology.

The story of the flood itself is well known, and we shall not dwell upon it here. The New Testament describes Noah as a "preacher of righteousness." Doubtless Noah, depending upon the promise of God, sought to convince an evil world of impending doom. But, like Amos the prophet, he met with little success.

After the flood Noah established an altar to the Lord, and from every clean beast and every clean bird he offered burnt offerings to the Lord. God looked with favor upon the sacrifice and promised never again to curse the ground. Man is by nature a child of wrath, and the imagination of his heart is evil from his youth. By means of a judgment such as the flood his evil heart cannot be changed. From this time forth there would be regularity in the course of nature.

God established His covenant with Noah. This is a new administration of the covenant of grace, by which it is declared that the earth shall never again be destroyed by a flood. The token of the covenant was the bow, ever to be a reminder of the grace of God that the "waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh."

Two Communications from Dr. Buswell

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are publishing at Dr. Buswell's request a brief statement which refers to the editorial in the issue of February 27th, and a reply to Mr. Murray's review of his book entitled *Unfulfilled Prophecies*, which appeared in the same issue.

The brief communication requires little comment. Those who care to examine the question of interpretation may compare our references with Dr. Buswell's book. While it seems to us that the argument in his book goes beyond an appeal to inexpediency, we are content to leave the final judgment in the matter to discriminating readers.

The reply to the review, in the mimeographed form in which it reached us, contained a final section, consisting of four brief paragraphs, which we are unwilling to publish since, in our opinion, the section impugns the motives of the reviewer, and is misleading in certain respects.

Dr. Buswell has been informed, of course, as to this decision, and has expressed the desire to have us publish the rest of the statement with our explanation. With the publication of this statement, and of Mr. Murray's own reply, we are closing this discussion.

The Brief Communication

I wish to protest against the misconstruction of my book "The Christian Life" in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN for February 27, 1937, page 202, column 2b. If the reader will turn to chapter three in this book he will find that the argument is based squarely upon the scriptural doctrine of inexpediency. "All things are lawful for me; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any." (I Cor. 6:12) "All things are lawful; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful; but not all things edify." (I Cor. 10:23)

In Reply to Mr. Murray

Professor Murray's article in review and criticism of my booklet, "Unfulfilled Prophecies" (PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, February 27, 1937), begins with a little

more than a column of courteous or complimentary remarks. This I appreciate. I think it should illustrate for the reader the fact that differences between us are within the bounds of Christian comity. This has always been true in private correspondence and conversation as well as in public statements. Although we differ sharply on questions of theology (eschatology) and of ethics (the separated life), I should not for the world say anything that might call in question Mr. Murray's able and courageous defense of the fundamentals of the system of doctrine taught in the Scripture.

I would not have it understood that I accept that part of Mr. Murray's words which might seem to deny that a great many premillenarians pursue the same sober and straightforward methods of exegesis which I have sought to pursue.

Now in regard to Vos and Warfield, I not only recognized that any criticism of them is on dangerous ground, but I also said, "Indeed, when one points out an inconsistency in any author one must hold himself ready to be shown that the inconsistency is really resolved in some way."

I am still waiting to be shown. I do not wish to say anything to undermine anyone's confidence in them. My whole point is that even such orthodox scholars, including Mr. Murray, do not argue against the millennium without involving themselves in contradictions and inconsistencies.

In columns two and three Mr. Murray objects to my interpretation (p. 52 f.) of Vos (p. 146 ff.)* My point indeed would have been clearer if I had included an explicit statement of the fact that Vos is here referring to Pauline vocabulary. I should also have included the following sentence from the same passage,—"His [Christ's] role is throughout that of the *terminus* upon which God's resurrective action works. . . ." Vos follows this by a list of Pauline references in which the passive of the verb "egeirein" is used of Jesus, the active of God the Father. The point is not that Vos says something contrary to a word of our Lord, but that he seems to imply that Paul does, which is far worse. Vos in the same context says, "The creative aspect of the act [resurrection] standing in the foreground, this is what we should naturally expect." Vos does not expect Paul to ascribe creative activity to Christ, in spite of John 1:3 and Hebrews 1:2. The sentence "Nowhere is it said of Jesus that he contributed towards his own resurrection, far less that He raised himself," stands as an unguarded and almost unqualified description of Pauline usage. I know that Vos also believes the word of Christ recorded in John 10:17, 18. My point is that his view of the person and the role of the Messiah is disjointed and inconsistent.

My inclusion of Vos' p. 237 in the list of references near the top of p. 53 was an error due to a blunder of my own in handling my reading notes. I am surprised that this is the only real error in my booklet Mr. Murray mentioned. There must be

*Page references to Vos are all in "The Pauline Eschatology." Italics within quotations are usually mine.

others. I discovered this one some time before I saw Mr. Murray's review. The list of references should have included instead p. 113 and p. 118. Here Vos argues that we cannot regard the "man of sin" (II Thessalonians, chapter 2) as claiming to be or acting as a Satanic Messiah, not only because the Messianic *office* is a subordinate one, but because claiming to be a Messiah "would involve abdication of his pretension to *being* God." This can only be understood as meaning that Vos is not consistently clear on the fact that the Messiah is God in the flesh.

Mr. Murray (columns three and four) objects to my intentional reference to Vos' pp. 73, 74, and 79. It is the "whether . . . or" to which I object on Vos' page 79. One would conclude from Vos' statement that if "the Lord" is intended as a translation of "Jahweh," it could not at the same time refer to Jesus.

The material to which I object on Vos' pp. 73, 74, is of the same nature. Vos is discussing the "coming of the Lord." He refers to "the Lord's (God's) coming" and then informs us, "In the teaching of Jesus and particularly with Paul the terminology undergoes a *deep change* in this respect. While the description of the end-crisis as a signal *interposition* of God is never entirely in abeyance, . . . on the whole it *gives way* to that of the *coming of Christ*." This is a "change" a 'giving way,' not merely in "terminology" but in meaning and thought content, for Vos continues, ". . . this whole complex was *bodily shifted* from Jehovah-God to the Messianic circle of thought."

Vos does proceed to say that this ". . . transference was facilitated by the attribution of the Kyrios-title to Jesus, which made it *almost unavoidable* to identify the "coming" of Jehovah-Kyrios with the advent of the Messiah." Thus his own words ought to have reminded Dr. Vos that not only was the Kyrios-title attributed to Jesus but also the Kyrios-title *when used to translate "Jahweh"* is attributed to Jesus. Thus in Jesus as Messiah dwells all the fulness of deity. Thus the 'deep change,' the 'giving way,' the 'bodily shift,' the "transference" is unreal; for the coming of Christ and the coming of God, the Messianic and the Jehovah-God circles of thought with reference to the "coming," are identical. Mr. Murray is so conscious of the nucleus of this truth that he thinks that Vos states it "on pp. 73 f." It is interesting to hear Mr. Murray (column five) suggesting "a little careful reading of Vos at this point."

But the accurate reader has no way of knowing by this passage that Vos admits this identity as real. Vos says "nevertheless the significance of the phenomenon [the bodily shift of the circle of thought] remains. Etc." He then continues to argue as though the coming of Jehovah-God and the coming of Christ were two different concepts.

Mr. Murray (column five) takes exception to my remarks (p. 52) on Vos' pp. 230-232, but his summary of Vos' material is quite inaccurate. Vos introduces, as a suggestion from "recent writers," the idea that the "provisional Messianic kingdom 'should be looked upon as a compromise

between two heterogeneous eschatological ideas.'" That Vos himself accepts this idea is indicated in what follows. Vos does reject Bousset's teaching that the "higher [non-chilastic] eschatology of Judaism is not a native growth on the soil of the Old Testament, but an importation from Babylonian (ultimately Persian) sources." But in fighting the robbers he burns down the house. Vos says (p. 231) "This peculiar assumption [Bousset's] . . . is by no means essential to the theory [introduced on p. 230 as a suggestion from recent writers]. The *cleavage* and *heterogeneity* which mark the Jewish eschatology would invite reduction to a system quite as much if the disharmony were due to *indigenous development*, as if due to a foreign influence." Vos in the last quoted sentence is speaking of the total Jewish eschatology including the apocrypha and pseudopigrapha. But he then proceeds to derive and explain the "cleavage . . . heterogeneity . . . disharmony" from "canonical prophetism," in which he says, "we find a *twofold* representation, on the one hand . . . a Messianic King, and on the other hand . . . God himself, so that the *two conceptions* [,] . . . a Messianic Kingdom [,] and a Kingdom of God [,] appear at this early stage [canonical prophetism] side by side *without any attempt at harmonizing*, . . . it would seem that in this ancient [canonical] prophetic diversity, we have a *fully adequate explanation* of the origin of the two successive kingdoms." Mr. Murray says "Dr. Vos does not argue that there is inconsistency or contradiction in canonical prophetism." Although Vos does not use the actual word "contradiction," I think I was justified in saying that he "apparently regards" the matter as such. "Unharmonized diversity" in the *Old Testament* (p. 232 line 34) as the source of "cleavage and heterogeneity" is expressly taught.

Let it be made clear that I would not charge Dr. Vos with being Arian in his theology viewed as a whole. I am told by those who have studied under him that the total effect of his teaching is orthodox trinitarianism. However, there is a confusion in Vos' teaching concerning our Lord in his writings on eschatology, which is very near to the heart of the amillennial error.

Mr. Murray (column six) says "We are at a loss to know what Dr. Buswell includes within the 'Final State.'" On pages 13 to 16 I discussed this matter briefly. See especially the footnote on page 14. The content of that period described as "the end" "the day of the Lord" "the final state" "eschatological events," depends upon the point of view.

Thayer's lexicon (p. 620) says "What 'end' is intended the reader must determine by the context; thus, to telos denotes the end of the Messianic pangs (dolores Messiae; see odin) in Matthew 24:6, 14, (opp. to arche odinon); Mark 13:7 (cf. 9); Luke 21:9; to telos in I Co. 15:24 denotes either the end of the eschatological events, or the end of the resurrection i.e. the last or third act of the resurrection (to include those who had not belonged to the number of oi tou

christou en te parousia autou), I Co. 15:24 cf. 23; . . ."

The phrases designating the end apart from their context should be regarded as interchangeable in extent though not necessarily so in emphasis. From the usual Old Testament point of view eventualities began when Jesus came. From the usual New Testament viewpoint, eventualities begin when Jesus comes again. See Vos' diagram p. 38. When once it is recognized that the viewpoint must be ascertained from the Scriptural context, many difficulties are avoided. "The end," or any of the several phrases used to denote that idea in the original languages of Scripture, indicates a process of logical resolution of whatever is under discussion. Thus to argue that two things which are said to occur at "the end" of something, must occur at the same point of time, is absurd unless eschatology is timeless.

Mr. Murray (column six) says, "What amillennialist, we ask, holds that the final state will be without sequence?" The answer is that no rational mind could consistently hold this view. They hold it here and they deny it there. Mr. Murray's own article illustrates the point. Just below the middle of column six (cf. column nine) he argues from Vos that the parousia is "coincident with the end" as though there is to be an end absolutely, as though the eschatological kingdom of God could not possibly contain a millennium. Toward the end of the same column he says, "What Dr. Vos is emphasizing is the properly eschatological character of the advent-complex of events." This means to me that it is Mr. Murray's idea of finality, not any "exact exegesis" which excludes the millennium from the advent-complex of events.

There is in the circle of amillennial teachers to which Mr. Murray belongs (men whom on other points I greatly respect and admire) a non-Scriptural teaching in regard to time and eternity which they admit to be a paradox, but which I declare to be an algebraic contradiction. I am supremely interested in the opinions of young men who go out from this teaching to shepherd the Lord's flock. Several of these very well educated amillennialists have argued with me that to admit that there could be a thousand years within the advent-complex of events,—that "the end" may be a logical resolution including what the plain man finds on eschatology in his Bible,—this would be "to mix eternity and time." This is not merely the opinion of graduate students, but, brethren, I find it in your writings.

I deny that Vos' exclusion of the millennium in the passages cited from pp. 316 and 246 depends solely on what Mr. Murray calls "exact exegesis." It depends very largely upon a non-Scriptural idea of finality.

This idea of absolute finality is so strong in Mr. Murray's mind that he actually refers to the events which John says (Revelation 20:7 ff. cf. also Ezekiel 38) follow the millennium, as a *postulate* of the premillennialist. Now one thing that this is *not*, is a postulate. The Bible teaches it; we believe it. It harmonizes with all the Bible has to say and with all

that we believe. But to call this teaching a *postulate* of anybody, reveals how far a priori considerations have driven a scholarly mind away from valid methods of exegesis.

Mr. Murray objects (column seven) to my comment (p. 50 footnote) on Warfield's argument with reference to the phrase "the end" (Biblical Doctrines, pp. 621 ff.) Mr. Murray says, "Now what Dr. Warfield is dealing with is not the words that may be translated by our English word 'the end' in our English version, but with the term 'the end' (Greek to telos) in its eschatological use . . . Dr. Warfield is dealing simply with the eschatological use of the Greek word to telos—singular in number and *absolute* in construction—not at all with the expressions used in the passages cited by Dr. Buswell."

There is nothing in the context to indicate that Mr. Murray is correct in saying that Dr. Warfield meant to deal with "the Greek word 'to telos'—singular in number and absolute in construction." There are several perfectly obvious reasons for stating that Mr. Murray is mistaken.

(1) Dr. Warfield as a scholar probably knew that the Greek word "to telos" does not occur in the entire New Testament in any absolute grammatical construction.

(2) Dr. Warfield as a scholar must have known that two of the passages which he cites in this context employ "telos" in the genitive with a preposition "eos telous" (I Cor. 1:8, II Cor. 1:13, 14). This is certainly no absolute grammatical construction.

(3) Dr. Warfield as a scholar would have been expected to cite his word in Greek if he had had any precise form in mind. There are many Greek words in Greek letters with correct accent marks in the pages preceding and following this passage. But he simply says "the end" in English.

(4) Dr. Warfield plainly tells us that it is "the end" as "the standing designation of the 'end of the ages' or the 'end of the world,'" which he has in mind. As a scholar he probably knew that "telos" is used only once with the word "world" in the sense of "age" or "ages," and in that case the plural is used, not the singular as Mr. Murray says, "ta tele ton aionon."

(5) Dr. Warfield as a scholar probably knew that the usual word for "end" in conjunction with "ages" or "world," is not "to telos," but "e sunteleia."

It was the idea contained in the English words which Dr. Warfield has in mind. Although I have at my elbow in my study an exhaustive Greek concordance of the New Testament which I have been using for about twenty years, it was much better to refer the reader to his concordance by citing the words "the end" in English as Warfield used them. The three passages which I cited employ three different Greek words for "end," used significantly with two words, "ages" and "days," denoting periods of time.

Mr. Murray might say that in the sentence I have quoted above he did not intend to use the word "construction." In

fact the grammatical context in his sentence may have caused him psychologically to use the word "construction" inadvertently. He might have meant to say that apart from the question of grammatical construction, Warfield used the word "the end" in an absolute sense with reference to time as a whole.

This is of course the point which I have discussed above. I feel that amillennialists inadvertently and inconsistently use the word "the end," and other such phrases, in a sense to imply an absolute end beyond which there can be no sequence. It is my contention that this use of the word begs the entire question. Not only does the New Testament actually contain no instance of the word "to telos" in an absolute grammatical construction, but I deny that the Bible anywhere uses any phrase referring to the end in any absolute sense or in any sense which legitimately rules out the millennium as a part of the eschatological complex.

It is precisely here that Dr. Warfield's syllogism breaks down. He assumes that the end is a point of time in such a sense that events which are said to take place at "the end" must be simultaneous. (See Romans 6:22 where the end "to de telos" is said to be "eternal life.")

With reference to Mr. Murray's argument at the top of column eight, let me briefly say that it seems to me the post-millennial view that the world will be entirely Christianized before the return of Christ decidedly weakens, if it does not exclude, the definitely cataclysmic, catastrophic feature of the Lord's return. Dr. Machen believed that Christ would return "and be the instrument in judging the world." Dr. Warfield would agree of course that Christ will return to judge the dead, but he would have to say that there will be very little to judge upon this world, since he argues that the world will be Christianized before Christ comes again.

In column eight (see also column two) of Mr. Murray's article I find a compliment which I cannot accept. "In his interpretation of the scope of the reference in the phrase 'all in Christ shall be made alive' in I Cor. 15:22, he feels the force of the argument for the restricted usage, that is to say that the resurrection referred to here is that of the righteous."

I cannot accept this compliment for the reason that in the passage cited Paul did not say "All in Christ shall be made alive," but Paul said, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." A scholar like Vos does not favor the inversion of the order of the words, and would not presume to change it without an explanation. He refers (p. 240) to Charles' opinion that the passage should be rendered, "As all *who are in Adam* die, so all *who are in Christ* shall be made alive," as "a possible view." On theological grounds (p. 238) Vos feels that the "all" does not refer to all mankind. I too feel the force of this theological argument, but I cannot on that account violate my sense of the obvious syntax (Vos *ibid.* p. 241 "the more usual construction") to change the order of the words. As the sentence stands the phrases "in Adam" and

"in Christ" modify the verbs and not the nouns "all," unless strong reasons to the contrary can be produced. I cannot justify as a scholarly procedure Mr. Murray's inversion of the syntactical order of the words, without informing the reader that the citation of the passage is an interpretative paraphrase and not a quotation. But this he does *four times* (columns two and eight) in full quotation marks.

Mr. Murray's argument in columns eight and nine assumes that in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians the three orders "aparche" "epeita" "eita" must be contained within the subjects of resurrection described in verse twenty-two in the words "In Christ shall all be made alive." Since I admit that verse twenty-three does not necessarily include the resurrection of the unrighteous dead, therefore he argues, the third order is excluded.

Now my point is simply that in verse twenty-two Paul introduces the subject of resurrection. Can there be any possible doubt that when he says, "Christ the first-fruits," he means the first in resurrection? But now most obviously Christ himself is not included in verse twenty-two, "In Christ all." In fact it seems rather obvious to me that verse twenty-two is not the point to which we must look for the inclusive phrase in which the three orders are to be found. This inclusive phrase is found in verse twenty-three itself. "But each in his own order." The word "ekastos" includes the three orders, not the phrase "en to Christo."

In column nine Mr. Murray again argues upon the basis of the familiar amillenarian assumption that "the end" is an absolute end beyond which there could not conceivably be a thousand years.

Paul specifically applies the victory over death described in I Corinthians 15: 50-58, to believers. This is a matter of comfort and admonition. It is indeed a great victory over death when all God's elect are alive in the presence of Christ, but it is not at all legitimate to assume that this means the last and final victory over death.

It would not be reasonable for me to argue at greater length on Mr. Murray's last criticism. I seriously believe that what he calls "inconsequential" is of considerable consequence but Mr. Murray has not grasped the consequences. In all such matters I shall merely refer the reader to the book itself.

There remains one question which I think I ought to discuss. Mr. Murray has accused me of 'gross misrepresentation' 'not deliberate distortion but serious incompetence to deal carefully and fairly with an opponent,' "gross unfairness and misrepresentation."

I have proved that in every point I have correctly and truthfully represented the opinions of those whom I have quoted.

J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR.

A Reply by Mr. Murray

Limitations of space prevent us from making as full a reply to Dr. Buswell as we had contemplated. Furthermore, it does not appear necessary, nor edifying to our readers, to enter upon a detailed an-

swer to all of Dr. Buswell's defence. We shall content ourselves with a few remarks on some salient points and leave the remainder to the judgment of informed and discriminating readers.

With respect to my criticism of his misrepresentation of Dr. Vos on p. 52f., it is not sufficient for Dr. Buswell to say, "My point indeed would have been clearer if I had included an explicit statement of the fact that Vos is here referring to Pauline usage." It was indispensable that he should have told the reader just that. He made Dr. Vos appear to say something he never said at all.

We must deny that Dr. Vos in the footnote concerned "seems to imply" that Paul "says something contrary to a word of our Lord." He is simply taking cognizance of a feature of Pauline usage, and he thinks that that is accordant with the creative character of the resurrection. Dr. Buswell may disagree with Dr. Vos in this latter suggestion, but if this is the point of his disagreement it is just precisely this that ought to have been made clear in his book. Instead something very different was done.

In the allegation with respect to sentiment almost Arian in its flavor (p. 53) Dr. Buswell acknowledges that p. 237 was an error and substitutes pp. 113 and 118. We must say a word on this new charge against Dr. Vos.

Dr. Vos is dealing there with the Man-of-Sin of II Thess. 2, and he argues against the possibility of regarding the Man-of-Sin as a pseudo-Messiah. His reason is that the Man-of-Sin is represented by Paul as assuming a role wholly inconsistent with the idea of subordination inherent in the office of Messiahship—he opposes and exalts himself against every one called God or worship. That means, in Dr. Vos' language, an "openly irreligious, antichristian state of mind." He is the "anti-religious and anti-Messianic subject *par excellence*" (p. 118).

Messiahship, on the other hand, implies a "subordinationistic function," the economic subordination every orthodox interpreter recognizes (cf. John 14: 28). So, Dr. Vos concludes, "the Antichrist-idea and the Messianic idea are at this point mutually exclusive" (p. 113). Now it is in that light that Dr. Vos' statement to the effect that the Man-of-Sin "cannot pretend to be the Messiah because that would involve abdication of his pretension to being God" is to be understood. The context determines the sense. It is, that Messiahship as such necessarily excludes the claim and pretension to the exclusive supremacy and Godship the Man-of-Sin arrogates to himself.

With respect to the discussion of Dr. Vos' pp. 230-232, we insistently remind Dr. Buswell and readers what the main point of our criticism was. It was that no intimation was given to the reader that, when Dr. Vos speaks of "compromise between two heterogeneous eschatological ideals," he is dealing with apocryphal literature. Dr. Vos does not even suggest—we say it emphatically—that "the cleavage and heterogeneity" which mark the

*Dr. Buswell in his reply has a wrong page reference. It should be p. 231, lines 30 and 31.

Jewish eschatology" is resident in "canonical prophetism." He does say that in "the ancient prophetic diversity, we have a fully adequate explanation of the origin of the two successive kingdoms" (p. 232). But Dr. Vos as an amillenarian rejects the solution offered by "the early Jewish Theology" of "this ancient prophetic diversity."* Indeed it is to the thesis that the New Testament does not place the stamp of its approval upon this solution that his book *The Pauline Eschatology* is devoted. It was a false solution, he thinks. But it was an attempt at solution of diversity. Now since a solution in terms of "cleavage and heterogeneity" was, in his judgment, false, how conceivably can Dr. Buswell continue to allege that Dr. Vos "apparently regards" "cleavage and heterogeneity" or contradiction as inherent in the "prophetic diversity"? The charge is unreasonable.

Dr. Buswell seems to be fully persuaded that our eschatology is bound up with *a priori* and unscriptural notions of finality.

Now our point with respect to finality is simply that exegesis requires us to exclude an earthly millennium after our Lord's advent. And why? Because we believe that the coming of Christ brings us to the end, that is, to the final judgment and the introduction of the new heavens and the new earth. What possible preconceived notions of finality can be bound up with that insistence? Dr. Buswell himself as a premillenarian surely believes that there will be no earthly millennium, no judgment, no cataclysmic catastrophic event, no eschatological finale after "the end," that is to say, after the complex of events bound up coincidentally with "the end" spoken of in I Cor. 15: 24. Even on premillenarian presuppositions, then, there is surely some kind of finality attaching to the events that come at "the end" when Christ delivers up the Kingdom to God and to the order of things introduced by them—some kind of finality such as, for the premillenarian, is not true of the events and order of things introduced by Christ's coming. May we not use the term "final consummation" to express it?

Now when we speak of finality and consummateness as attaching to the advent-complex of events, or when we speak of the properly eschatological character of our Lord's coming, we mean that the finality and consummateness which premillenarians themselves attach to "the end" (I Cor. 15: 24) and to the order of things ushered in by it is brought with the coming of the Lord rather than at the end of the millennium. We think so just for the reason that, in our judgment, these consummatory events are brought, in the teaching of Scripture, into coincidence with the coming of the Lord. What we mean by "coincidence" is simply what the premillenarian would mean when he would say that the resurrection of the just and their judgment is coincident with the coming of the Lord, or that the beginning of the millennium is coincident with the advent. Coincidence does not exclude sequence either on premillenarian or amillenarian or postmillenarian premises. Paul says, for example, that the dead in Christ

*For phrases in quotation marks cf. p. 232.

shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air.

We can respect much of the chiliastic exegesis but we cannot understand why Dr. Buswell hurls against us charges of "algebraic contradiction," of *a priori* and unscriptural notions of finality. Neither can we be in the least disturbed by them.

In connection with the word "the end" Dr. Buswell says that there is nothing in the context to indicate that "Dr. Warfield meant to deal with the 'Greek word *to telos*—singular in number and absolute in construction," and he proceeds to give several reasons. Well, the answer is that there is everything in the context to indicate that that is precisely what Dr. Warfield is dealing with in the passage referred to in Dr. Buswell's footnote. Dr. Warfield is dealing with I Cor. 15:24 and its context. It is *to telos* that occurs in that passage. Dr. Warfield says, "The term (the end) is a perfectly definite one with a set and distinct meaning and from Matthew (e. g. XXIV. 6, cf. 14) throughout the New Testament, and in these very epistles (I Cor. 1:8; II Cor. 1:13, 14), is the standing designation of the 'end of the ages,' or the 'end of the world.'" (p. 621 f.) He is dealing with the term "the end" that occurs in the passage of which he is treating as well as in every other citation given to illustrate its use, the Greek term *to telos*—singular in number and absolute in construction.

Now what I mean by absolute in construction is what should be familiar to those acquainted with grammatical terminology, namely, that it is not construed with a genitive. It stands absolutely, grammatically speaking, not as the end of the resurrection or of the millennium or the end of anything else. It is significant that in every instance of its use as a precisely eschatological designation* with one exception (I Pet. 4:7) it stands in this construction that we may grammatically speak of as "absolute in construction."

I said also "singular in number" just because I was aware that in one passage that has eschatological significance the plural occurs (I Cor. 10:11)—"the ends of the ages." This passage Dr. Warfield would not consider as having the same signification. That was precisely why I said "singular in number." The one instance of the occurrence of the plural belongs to a different category.

Now Dr. Warfield says that it designates the "end of the ages" or the "end of the world." When he said just that he knew well that he was not giving a translation of the use of *to telos* in construction with "the ages" or "the world" for it never occurs in that construction. Dr. Warfield was apparently using these expressions—the "end of the ages," the "end of the world"—to point out what he understood its significance or reference to be.

Dr. Warfield as a postmillenarian would believe that in this respect it is synonymous with the phrase "the consummation of the age" that occurs five times in the Gospel of Matthew. But there is in this

*As a term of eschatological destination it does occur with a genitive in construction.

discussion of Warfield no reference to the occurrence of this other phrase. The phrase "the end of the ages" is indeed a good translation of Heb. 9:26 which Dr. Buswell cites, but there is no evidence that Dr. Warfield was alluding to that phrase as synonymous with *to telos*. The expression in Heb. 9:26 has surely different significance even in premillennial eschatology.

The reader can now judge how much force there is in Dr. Buswell's reasons and argument.

Dr. Buswell takes me to task for the inversion of the words occurring in I Cor. 15:22 in the clause, "so also in Christ shall all be made alive." I spoke twice of the phrase "all in Christ shall be made alive" and twice of the phrase "all in Christ." I am thoroughly aware that the phrase "in Christ" modifies the verb and is to be construed with it rather than with the "all." The latter rendering would be indefensible as translation whatever the precise meaning or reference of the clause is. I had no intention, therefore, of foisting such a construction upon the reader. I think that the reason why I rendered the

phrase in this way was considerations of euphony in English composition. If my discussion is read carefully, as also the discussion by Dr. Vos, it will be observed that the argument for the restricted reference of the clause does not rest upon the paraphrase Dr. Buswell regards me as adopting. I do regret now, however, that I rendered the phrase in this way because I do see that it is liable to create the impression that I was adopting this construction. But let me also disavow any intention of so doing.

Dr. Buswell takes umbrage at some of my characterizations of his book as a whole as well as of some of his specific arguments. He may have thought I was indulging in a personal attack and so may some readers. May I disabuse all concerned of such a notion. I am not without admiration for many excellent qualities in Dr. Buswell. But I was reviewing his book, and all that I have said has been dictated by considerations of scientific evaluation of its character. It is surely by forthright criticism, where such is necessary, that the cause of truth is to be advanced.

A SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS NEWS

Germany

THE current issue of *Der Blitz*, official publication of the neopagan movement known as "German Action," contains a striking compari-

son between the tenets of National Socialism and those of Christianity. Twenty-five contrasting teachings are presented in this graphic and highly prejudiced manner:

- | NAZI | CHRISTIAN |
|---|---|
| 1. A positive attitude toward life. | A negative attitude. |
| 2. Awareness of self. | Consciousness of guilt. |
| 3. Pride. | Humility. |
| 4. Physical culture. | Self-castigation. |
| 5. Wrestling for new knowledge. | Reliance on opinions as old as mankind. |
| 6. The seeing mind. | Blind faith. |
| 7. Devotion to race and people. | Reverence for the idea of mankind. |
| 8. Mastery of earthly life. | Absolute priority for religious ideas. |
| 9. Devotion to the "people's community." | Devotion to the hereafter. |
| 10. Vigorous fulfillment of professional duties. | Absolute submission to the Church. |
| 11. Self-reliance. | Dependence on divine grace. |
| 12. Readiness to fight. | Peace at any price. |
| 13. Energetic rejection of all that is bad. | Unconditional tolerance. |
| 14. Revering of blood and soil. | Denial of blood and soil. |
| 15. Standing up wholly for people, pride and family. | Predominance of Church interests over all ideas. |
| 16. Unity of people. | Doubt in faith. |
| 17. Culture of race. | Muddling of race. |
| 18. Elimination of the eugenically unsound. | Equal rights for the eugenically unsound. |
| 19. Birth increase of eugenically valuable elements. | A fight, through celibacy, against an increase in these. |
| 20. Rejection of Jewry as hostile to the people. | Recognition of the Jews as the chosen people. |
| 21. Rejection of the ancient Hebrew tribal god Yahweh. | Adoration of Him as the Supreme Being. |
| 22. Freedom of creed. | A coercive creed. |
| 23. Reliance upon the senses. | Religious speculations. |
| 24. Joy in living. | Fear of life. |
| 25. Confidence in mastering life through one's own efforts. | Distrust of the man in one's self, because of the burden of original sin. |