

"The heroic past challenges us; the needy present pleads with us; the awful future warns us that we  
deny not our faith nor fall in our trust."—Edward Mack.

VOL. XXXVI.

OCTOBER, 1924.

NUMBER 1.

... THE ...  
**UNION SEMINARY  
REVIEW**

A PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

---

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTES:

New Editorial Staff—The Laymen—Study of Hebrew—  
B. B. Warfield—Religion and Science—Geo. L. Christian—Our Next Issue.

A GREAT BOOK.....	<i>C. L. King</i> .....	4
GEORGE L. CHRISTIAN.....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .....	6
THE MILLENNIUM AND THE APOCALYPSE.....	<i>B. B. Warfield</i> .....	26
CHARLES CAMPBELL HERSMAN.....	<i>T. C. Johnson</i> .....	48
THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY.....	<i>J. C. Siler</i> .....	52
UNFINISHED ASSEMBLY BUSINESS.....	<i>J. S. Lyons</i> .....	56
THE SPIRIT'S PLACE IN PERSONAL WORK.....	<i>J. S. Albertson</i> .....	62
THE MINISTER AND HIS HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT.....	<i>R. F. Gribble</i> .....	70

---

EUGENE C. CALDWELL, *Editor-in-Chief*

F. E. MANNING, *Business Manager*

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

RICHMOND, VA.

---

*Published October, January, April, July*  
*\$1.50 a Year; Foreign, \$1.75; 40c a Copy*

RICHMOND PRESS, INC., PRINTERS

*Entered at the Post Office at Richmond, Va., as second class matter.*

Digitized by Google

THE LIBRARY  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF TEXAS

# THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

---

---

VOL. XXXVI.

OCTOBER, 1924.

No. 1.

---

---

EDITORIAL STAFF—EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EUGENE C. CALDWELL; ASSOCIATE EDITORS, JAMES SPRUNT AND T. LAYTON FRASER; MISSIONARY EDITOR, W. B. PATTERSON; BOOK EDITOR, ERNEST T. THOMPSON; REVIEW EDITORS, EDWARD MACK AND W. TALIAFERRO THOMPSON.

*Entered at the Post-office at Richmond, Va., as second-class mail matter. Published quarterly during the year—October, January, April, July—by the professors and students of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia in the interests of the whole Southern Presbyterian Church.*

*Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive THE REVIEW promptly and regularly should be reported to the Business Manager.*

Subscription—\$1.50 a year in advance; foreign, \$1.75; single copy, 40c.

F. E. MANNING, Business Manager

J. C. WOOL, Ast. Business Manager

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW, being the only publication of its kind in the Southern Presbyterian Church, is an open forum where any one who stands for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" is welcome to present his views on the great questions of the hour. Each contributor is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article.

---

## EDITORIAL NOTES

---

### NEW EDITORIAL STAFF.

The Union Seminary Review Association has elected a new editorial staff, as follows: Editor-in-Chief, Eugene C. Caldwell; Assistant Editors, James Sprunt and T. Layton Fraser; Missionary Editor, W. B. Patterson; Book Editor, Ernest T. Thompson; Review Editors, Edward Mack and W. Taliaferro Thompson; Business Manager, F. E. Manning; Assistant Business Manager, J. C. Wool.

For two years Dr. W. Taliaferro Thompson has served as Editor-in-Chief with signal success, and his resignation is accepted only at his earnest insistence, in order that he may devote more time to extension work. From all over our Church calls are coming for his services. Only by being released from the duties of Editor-in-Chief can he answer these pressing and

going book, still it has an interest all its own in its reverent Christian faith and in its spirit of confidence that the truth of Christ will prevail. It is shown here how this supposedly antagonistic psychology is bringing to light the reasonable grounds of New Testament teaching by showing the necessity of repentance, confession, faith, and making more evident the power of sin. The chapters on "Psychology and the Religious Life," "The Danger of Subjectivity to Religion," "Christian Power and Resources," "Psychology and the Christian Faith," are strong and convincing. I feel that in view of this prevalent type of psychology every minister should read this book.

We arise from this study of current Psychology with the feeling that the hand of God is in it all. It is God's all-wise Providence that this New Psychology is proceeding from sources antagonistic to Christianity. It is well-known that both Freud and Jung are anti-Christian, yet their work is revealing the great need of humanity for the religion of Christ, and it will be found that no other religion will meet this need. This New Psychology cannot be laid to Christian propaganda.

---

### UNFINISHED ASSEMBLY BUSINESS.

BY REV. J. SPROLE LYONS, D. D.,  
*Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga.*

Practically every General Assembly adjourns with the consciousness that some matters of importance have failed to receive the consideration which they deserved. The San Antonio Assembly was not an exception in this respect. It is the purpose of this paper to mention a few matters which in the judgment of the writer deserved more consideration than they received. On the principle that nothing is settled until it is decided properly, I will venture to speak of some questions which were voted upon by the Assembly, and may be generally accepted as settled, which are not settled.

I make no reference to *ad interim* matters. *Ad interim* is

frequently a welcome refuge for wearied or perplexed Assemblies, which hope that a breathing space will bring more light or less interest, or some other kind of relief. But I must be permitted to say that no *ad interim* Committee in recent years has rendered such splendid service as the Committee on Revision of the Book of Church Order, which made its final report to the San Antonio Assembly. The lengthy report of this Committee required much of the Assembly's time; but be it said to the credit of the Commissioners, they gave the closest and most intelligent attention to the great number of details presented. Dr. Lingle's fine spirit of patience in explaining difficult points of proposed change, and his readiness for any really helpful amendments to the report, coupled with a consciousness on the part of all that they were engaged in a service of the greatest significance to all the churches and church courts for the years to come, gave to this business a sense of supreme importance and sanctity.

We have often heard solemn discussions in church courts about "Now what did the Fathers mean by this clause?" The implication being that the "Fathers" had a definite and a necessary meaning for every phrase, clause and word of "The Book," and that they could foresee all that was to come to pass in the subsequent development of the church. In other words, that a kind of verbal inspiration was inherent in the "Book of Church Order," largely because it was written by those whom we have by an affectionate and common consent canonized and placed in the ranks of Presbyterian "Saints." Years ago I was irreverent enough to come to the conclusion that, when we were wondering and sweating and fighting over what subtle bearing the language of the Book of Church Order was intended by the Fathers to have upon problems which were not in existence in their day, they were as innocent of any such intention as we were helpless in trying to force an intention upon them.

This point of view could be fully enjoyed, as we practically made over the Book of Church Order under the leadership of one who is an ideal type of Church Father. What does Dr. Lingle lack of being a Church Father? Nothing but a

few more years. He is wise enough, works hard enough, is universally loved enough, and looks solemn enough to be a "Father" in any age of the Church. He may have some sense of humor; but how "funny," or "odd," or "diverting," or whatever term of time and sense may be appropriate for those who have left these limitations behind, it must be for many of the saints of the early Christian ages to learn that their words have been invoked to support doctrines, institutions and practices of which they never dreamed!

There are some features of the report open to objection and further amendment; but it is so wonderfully well done, and is such an advance upon our present Book of Church Order, that every Presbytery should heartily approve it. Opportunity will then be open for consideration of any minor faults which may need attention. *But adopt it as a whole now.*

While one is speaking of distinguished and useful service rendered by special committees, due recognition should be given to the special Committee on Conditions in the Foreign Mission Field appointed by the last Assembly. Every member of that Committee should be returned to the Assembly of 1925, because they spent four-fifths or more of their time in their arduous and trying work in the Committee room, and were denied any real attendance on the sessions of the Assembly. Moreover, they should be sent to the next Assembly as *qualified experts* in the event the same issues are before the Lexington Assembly. It would provide a practical experiment in carrying over the experience of one Assembly to the next Assembly. There is no reason why the only members of one Assembly to be found in the succeeding Assembly should be the retiring Moderator and the untiring candidates for the Moderatorship.

The "Woman Question."

I was present as a visitor at the 1923 Assembly when action was taken on this subject, and was a member of the 1924 Assembly. I had no privilege of discussion in the former Assembly, and had taken so much of the time of the 1924 Assembly in the discussion of reports and resolutions to which I sustained a personal relation that I determined not to trespass

upon the patience of the Assembly upon other matters to come before it. I include this subject in the "Unfinished Business" of the 1924 Assembly for several reasons:

1. It has never been adequately discussed. Very earnest and feeling addresses have been made upon it. But I think I can truthfully say, in the light of all that was said upon the subject in both Assemblies, that the *real*, and for Presbyterians the absolutely decisive and final argument, has never been *mentioned*, much less examined and discussed. That is to inquire what is the *Scriptural teaching* on this subject? Arguments of a practical nature, and every conceivable play upon the courtesy due to the feminine, have been pressed with unction and fervor. But not once have I heard any one raise the question of Scriptural teaching. It may be that every speaker felt that it was so clearly in favor of the affirmative that it was useless to spend time upon it. But this matter will have to reach the stage of discussion just mentioned before it can be taken out of the class of "Unfinished Business."

2. The form in which the question has come before the Church is not its final form. It involves far more than membership on Executive Committees. It certainly involves the probability of facing the erection of Women's Executive Committees in the fullest sense.

3. It involves and leads to the question of office-holding, of full participation in the teaching, directing and ruling service of the Church, including ordination.

A question of radical importance and of far-reaching expansion has been handled very lightly. Every element of chivalry for the women of the Church, of courtesy and of gallant appreciation of their wonderful service, has been eloquently urged, but any one can see that it remains "Unfinished Business."

Now, lest some one shall do me the injustice of setting me down as a crusty opponent of due recognition of the work of our women, I am going to close my reference to this subject by giving the readers of the Review a response to an inquiry which I directed to one of the wisest ministers in our Church. He was my classmate at Union Seminary; we finished our course there with the closing of Dr. Dabney's term of service

at that institution. We of that class have always felt that we had incomparable opportunities in his department, not to speak at present of other teachers. I wrote to Dr. C. T. Thomson, of Centreville, Miss., telling him that I was thinking of writing for the Review upon the subject of the action of the Assembly upon the placing of women upon the Executive Committees, and requesting a brief in his own opinion of the Scripture teaching on this subject.

I was really expecting what might have been a characteristic "R. L. Dabney reply," and was to a degree surprised, not at his goodness in giving a prompt reply, but in the point of view taken by him. I can do no better by way of opening the discussion of the teaching of the Scriptures upon this very present and very pressing question than to publish his brief just as he sent it to me:

1. "The original constitution of said committees (Alexander's Digest), 'a secretary, a treasurer and nine other members, three of whom at least shall be ruling elders or deacons or *private* members.' This provision was for Foreign Missions, Home Missions, etc. It is perfectly evident that the Fathers in 1861 thought that other than ministers and elders could serve on Executive Committees. It meets the point that the Executive Committees can rightly have only membership as the Assembly itself.

2. Does the Bible, by direct statement or good and necessary inference, forbid women doing such work?

(a) First Corinthians 14:34-35 is the usual quotation. If taken literally women should not sing or teach in Sunday school or speak in teacher or worker conferences or take part in undenominational meetings for missionary or Sunday School work.

If there be speaking, how far can it go?

(b) 1 Timothy 2:1-15.

Waiving the argument that Paul used the ordinary word for teaching "*didasko*" instead of the ones ordinarily used for preaching, *karusso*, etc., it is certain that he was urging against authoritative power or service, such as ordination to office.



I do not find that woman is prohibited from other than office to which she must be ordained.

By parity of reasoning, if the deacon must be ordained, why is the deaconess not entitled to some form of ordination?

3. What passage of Scripture can be quoted by the opponents of women workers that the women shall speak only in meetings of women?

4. If we consistently applied the principle of limiting the public teaching or speaking of women, then the greater part of our Foreign Mission workers, the women, would have nothing to do. If it is wrong to address mixed audiences at home it is wrong to address them in the foreign field.

5. If the Assembly Training School at Richmond does what is expected of it, then it will prepare women to do public teaching in Sunday School classes of *mixed* sexes, lead the organized work, etc.

6. The greater part of our Church work is done by the women, furnishing the workers at home and abroad, raising funds, educating the people concerning the needs and possibilities of our resources, praying out of difficulties, etc.

Is it reasonable to exclude them from the highest committee work of the Church which is not a court of the Church at all?

If the membership of the Executive Committees is to be made up of ministers, elders, deacons or private members, the burden of proof is on the opponents to the women."

Now we are brought to the heart of the question, and we can see that most of what has been said can be considered as only introductory. I am expressing no approval or disapproval of Dr. Thomson's courageous point of view. Until the Assembly acts from such a consideration as that suggested by Dr. Thomson's argument, my reply to an esteemed friend who asked me at the San Antonio Assembly about my interest in the question is appropriate. I replied to this inquiry by saying, "I do not think the Assembly gave the matter the serious consideration which it deserved; and if I were in the place of the women of the Church, I would not have as a courtesy what must stand on a stronger foundation if it is worth having at all."



*Change in Church Year.*

A further illustration of Unfinished Business due to inadequate discussion was the change in the Church year. The discussion on this very important question came late in the proceedings of the Assembly, when there is a disposition to rush for the conclusion of business. The motion to change the Church year was made and was discussed by several who favored it, one of whom at the close of his remarks moved the "previous question," which had to be put to a vote, and was carried. This might be said to have been an expression of the judgment of a majority of those present. But it prevented the presentation of the other side of the question, and that is not a just way to discuss and decide so important a matter. It is fair to assume that overtures will bring this business before the Lexington Assembly.

It was my purpose to mention some other matters which were before the Assembly and failed to receive the careful consideration which their importance deserved. But it is too much like fault-finding with a great body of diligent and earnest men, and I do not wish to appear in that light. This brief article is not intended to be a kind of Assembly "back-fire"—a futile explosion of gas which expresses itself in noise instead of in propelling power.

---

 THE SPIRIT'S PLACE IN PERSONAL WORK.

BY JAMES S. ALBERTSON, III,  
Belimore, L. I., N. Y.

*"Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself to this chariot."*—Acts 8:29.

Sermon preached before the Junior Class of the Seminary April 23, 1924.

The book of the Acts contains many references to the work of the Holy Spirit. In the first chapter the words of Christ are recorded, commanding His followers to tarry at Jerusalem until the promise of the Father is received. The Saviour then