

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII.

JANUARY, 1927.

No. 2.

HENRY ALEXANDER WHITE.

By GEORGE ARMSTRONG WAUCHOPE, M. A., PH. D., LITT. D.

*Head of English Department, University of South Carolina,
Columbia, S. C.*

(Dr. Wauchope is a grandson of the late Rev. William J. Armstrong, D. D., of Richmond, Va., and a college mate of Dr. White's at Washington and Lee University.)

The Columbia Theological Seminary and the Southern Presbyterian Church have suffered a severe loss in the death of the noted scholar and divine, Henry Alexander White, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D. For several years he had been in failing health due to heart trouble, the burden of which he bore with cheerful courage and a calm and Christian patience that won the admiration of all who knew him. His last illness developed as a sore throat, which at the time caused him no special concern. The ailment, however, did not yield to treatment, and a physician was consulted. Despite skilled medical care the trouble, which had seemed so slight, grew steadily worse, and in three days had created a critical condition that caused alarm to his wife and friends. This was aggravated by the fact that he had few physical reserves. The infection grew steadily worse and there was grave danger at one time that he would die from suffocation. This he escaped, but by three-thirty o'clock on Sunday morning, October 10, the end came, and

SOWERS OF THE WIND
or
MODERNISM IN HOLLAND (I).

BY REV. HENRY K. PASMA, M. A.,
Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Charleston, Miss.

(Mr. Pasma is a graduate of Hope College, Holland, Mich., and of the Western Theological Seminary, of the Reformed Dutch Church in America. He served the First Reformed Churches of Oostburg, Wis., and Lynden, Wash., and for the last four years has been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, South, of Charleston, Miss. He has written two books: "Things a Nation Lives By", Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va., and "God's Picked Young Men", Moody Press, Chicago.

Mr. Pasma's discussion of "Modernism in Holland" will be completed in the April number of the REVIEW. His purpose is to warn our American Christianity against Modernism by showing the evil fruits of Modernism in Holland. This purpose will be more clearly revealed in the April issue. In the present article, while pointing out the dangers of Modernism, Mr. Pasma also directs attention to certain mistakes which our conservative orthodox leaders should avoid in their fight against Modernism.)

To say that the Netherlands also has its Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy would be speaking in terms of anachronism. Modernism, as today, by the orthodox in America, it is correctly conceived to be a menace to the faith and the life of the Christian Church, has been with the orthodox churches in Holland ever since, in 1858 or thereabouts, the term was used to describe new tendencies in theological thinking, especially as this applied to textual criticism of the Holy Scriptures. The Modernism of Holland is possessed, therefore, of something which, as yet, more recent Modernism in America is somewhat lacking in: namely, perspective; a well defined development which clearly manifests what is the real character of Modernism; as also what is the fruitage of religious liberalism in the Christian Church today. At the present stage of

development of Modernism in the Netherlands, when one comes to regard and test its results, one may rightly apply to it the meaning of the biblical proverb, that those who sow the wind, of necessity are to be the reapers of the whirlwind.

Undoubtedly, until recent date, Modernism in the Netherlands was conceived to be indigenous only to the religious soil of the State Church. The orthodox *Gereformeerde* Churches hitherto presented a solid front to the assaults of the ancient foe of the Christian faith. But now the bane of Modernism, it appears, is making itself felt even in those churches which until recent date have been staunchly and wholesomely orthodox. The case of Dr. Geelkerken, a minister in the *Gereformeerde* Church of the Netherlands, appears to prove that no church body, no matter how much it may vaunt itself of its orthodoxy, is impervious to the influence of Modernism. The *Gereformeerde* Churches in the Netherlands are the coalition of church bodies, consisting of the greater part of the *Christelyk Gereformeerde* Church, or the Separatist Church, which seceded from the State Church in Holland in 1834, mainly because of the presence of Modernist tendencies in the *Herformde*, or State Church; which Separatist Church, some twenty-five years ago, united with another, more recently seceded part of the State Church, the Churches of the *Doleantie*, which, under the leadership of eminent theologians as the late Dr. Abraham Kuyper and others, seceded from the *Herformde* Church in 1886. While the State Church of Holland, throughout the years, has been the congenial soil in which Modernism was allowed to flourish unchecked, the *Gereformeerde* Churches, severely Calvinistic in doctrine and church polity, have remained singularly free from the taint of Modernism; until, in these latter days, the case of Dr. Geelkerken sharply drew the attention of believers in the Netherlands to the fact that no church body is absolutely safe against the attacks of the ancient foe of the Christian faith. The Synod of the *Gereformeerde* Churches of Holland, convened in the city of Assen, unqualifiedly condemned the Modernist tendencies avowed and preached by Dr. Geelkerken.

This case, as it was tried by theologians and ministers who are no novices when it concerns the knowledge and application of Reformed principles of theology and church polity, sheds a remarkable light upon problems with which the orthodox churches in America, more specifically those of the Reformed faith holding the Presbyterian form of government, are just now concerned. The findings of the Synod of Assen prominently brought into view two matters of striking importance: first, an effort to define the powers residing in the *Algemene Synode*, or General Assembly, and powers residing in the presbyteries; and, second, the manifestation of the true nature and results of Modernism; and even so the indication of a danger, to which, in its conflict with Modernism, orthodoxy lies exposed; as this danger was clearly pointed out by the criticism brought to bear upon the verdict rendered by the Synod of Assen by leaders of the Confessional, or conservative, wing of the State Church of the Netherlands.

First, then, as to powers residing in the General Assembly, to which Presbyteries, Sessions, and ministers are amenable, as defined by the Synod which tried Dr. Geelkerken. The Synod of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands convened at Assen, in the rendering of its verdict against Dr. Geelkerken, declared that it has authority to state what is the correct interpretation of the Confessional Standards of the Reformed Church, without being obliged to send its definition of the meaning of doctrine to the respective Presbyteries for ratification. The Synod offhandedly suspended Dr. Geelkerken for three months, to afford him time to change his views and recant, with the alternative of permanent suspension of himself and his Session; which sentence, upon the consequent refusal of Dr. Geelkerken, and the loyalty of the Session to their minister, has resulted in the removal of Dr. Geelkerken and his Session from the roll of the *Gereformeerde* Churches in Holland. By which act, the Synod declared itself to be invested with powers to state what is and what is not the correct interpretation of the Reformed Confessional; as also, that Presbyteries and Sessions are amenable to the rulings of the *Alge-*

meene Synode, or General Assembly. This ruling may or may not be a step in the direction of a clearer understanding of powers vested in General Assemblies. It is our impression that the genus of Reformed Church polity generally favors the delegating of such powers to the individual churches or Presbyteries.

On the part of the conservative wing of the State Church, however, a very clearly stated and, to our mind, very sensible objection is raised against the apparent autocratic spirit manifested by the Synod throughout the case against Dr. Geelkerken. The criticism points out a danger, inherent in orthodoxy of all times, namely, that of an over-zealous legalism which is the very antithesis of the spirit of Christ, the Head of the Church. Dr. A. B. TeWinkle, writing in the theological quarterly, "Under Our Own Banner", which is edited by eminent theologians of the conservative wing of the State Church of Holland, is lamenting the fact that the thing most glaringly conspicuous at this church trial was the fact that Christian forbearance and love were utterly lacking. The entire ecclesiastical procedure was shot through with bitterness, hatred, and unchristian suspicion amongst brethren. This lament may well serve as a warning to all warring factions in the American churches, who, at some time or other, have taken a leading part in present day doctrinal controversies. Lack of Christian love forfeits the very purpose of church discipline: namely, to save those who err. What is of equal importance is the statement of Dr. TeWinkle, that the Synod of Assen arrogantly presumed upon its own exclusive ability to interpret the Reformed creed. According to Dr. TeWinkle, the definition of the correct relation between faith and science is not to be decided for the Christian Church by only a group of churches. "Salve reverentia" is not to be defined by a pronunciamento from theological doctors of the Free University of Amsterdam, or the Theological School at Kampen (the two divinity schools of the *Gereformeerde* Churches of the Netherlands). Not even a Synod of the Reformed Churches of Holland is qualified to do this. Dr. TeWinkle states rightly

that at the great Synod of Dort, convened from 1618-1619, for the purpose of formulating the principles of Reformed belief effective today in the Calvinistic Reformed Churches. there were present delegates from Reformed Churches in foreign countries also, whose opinions contributed not a little to the formulation of the great Standards of the Reformed faith.

Here is a thought worthy of consideration by such organizations as The Alliance of Reformed Churches Throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System (which churches continue to be exposed to the menace of Modernism, and which are now at sea as to a clear and authoritative deliverance, representing the mind of the entire Reformed household of faith, as to many mooted points of Reformed doctrine and polity, about which the ancient standards have never declared themselves), to call together a great convention, which, after the manner and the spirit of the famous Synod of Dort, shall deliberate upon and declare the meaning of many things most surely believed among us; as the progression of time, the development of science, and other factors, have placed the Reformed Churches of the present upon vantage points, other than those of the Church of the seventeenth century, and from which vantage points we may obtain new and more complete views and estimates of the treasures of grace and mercy in Jesus Christ, contained and revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Otherwise, we shall fall victims to the danger of declaring in an arrogant spirit perhaps, that with a small section of the Reformed household of faith rest both authority and ability to decide upon the ultimate interpretation of mooted points of doctrine and polity; which presumption may easily lead us to continue to cling to narrow and petrified views, which are only the caricatures of opinions held by the fathers of the Reformed faith, from whose open mind and generous spirit we have become utterly estranged. After all has been said and done, it remains true that the Confessional Standards of Reformed belief are called "Symbols" of our faith for cause; because thereby, we humbly confess that our Confessional Standards are not the complete Truth itself, but are our representation

of the Truth, in the measure as mind and heart of interpreters past and present, have been able to conceive of it.

From many indications it appears that a revision and re-statement and emendation of Reformed doctrines and symbols would prove as beneficial as it appears necessary; provided, this were done not by a self-appointed and small part of the Reformed household of faith, but by a body of trained leaders representative of all the Reformed church bodies in the world. There is no reason to decry the advocacy of such revision and emendation as disloyalty to our faith. The Reformed fathers themselves advocated it. They made it their business to frequently test out and prove the symbols of faith which they had formulated. One need only note the frequent convocations of Synods in the Netherlands during Reformation times (the great Synods of Antwerp in 1566; of Wesel in 1568; of Embden in 1571; of Dort in 1574; of Middelburg in 1581; and again the important Synod of Dort in 1618-1619; and the Westminster Assembly in 1646), to realize how clearly the formulators of our doctrinal standards recognized the danger of stagnation and petrification, and how deadily in earnest they were to at all times state intelligently to living generations their beliefs, and to fit into the peculiar exigencies of their times and prevailing modes of thought, Reformed doctrine.

There is no doubt that the pressure of a need for revision of our doctrinal standards is felt at present. Tentative efforts in this direction by the *Gereformeerde* Churches in the Netherlands seems to point out the fact that such a need is felt there. Among the Protestant church bodies of America the need for credal revision is clearly felt. Modernism itself could not have been averted, it is true, because it is a species of unfaith that is both ancient and modern, and is likely to be permanent until the end of the present dispensation. But much of the bitter controversy between Modernist and Fundamentalist could have been spared us if there had not been so much diversity of opinion, or, rather, lack of consensus of opinion with regard to the true meaning of Reformed doctrine on the part of not only the laity, but even so of the ministry, of our Presby-

terian and Reformed Churches; and if, for the benefit of the laity, our Reformed Symbols could have been expressed in simple language and drawn up in attractive style, calculated to encourage rather than discourage, reading and study of the contents of Reformed faith by the congregations of our Presbyterian and Reformed Churches. The influence of Modernism is best counteracted, not by bans hurled by cynic but inadequately informed defenders of the faith, but by a continuous study and development of Reformed doctrine on the part of the ministry and laity of our churches.

Our statement as to the lack of agreement among even the Reformed-Presbyterian ministry, as to actual contents and teaching of our Reformed Symbols, need not go begging for an illustration. Consider, for instance, from among the many, the example of religious controversy which for some years now has stirred the Christian Reformed Church in America. This church body seceded in 1857 from the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. It prides itself upon its aptness for and its zeal to maintain doctrinal purity. Many of its ministers are theologians in a real sense of the word. In a recent book, "As to Being Reformed", by Rev. R. B. Kuypers, the author, undoubtedly in good faith, makes the generous suggestion that to the Christian Reformed Church be entrusted the custody, defense, and development of genuine Calvinistic Reformed doctrine. Which suggestion might be entertained were it not for the fact that this theologically conservative church body itself is very much at sea as to the true and exact meaning of our Reformed symbols of faith. Witness only the record of doctrinal controversy in this Calvinistic church, as stated by the author of "As to Being Reformed". After asking the question, "What ails the Christian Reformed Church anyhow?" the author continues: "It cannot be denied that the Christian Reformed Church has in recent years had what would seem to be much more than its proper share of doctrinal debate. To pass over minor conflicts in silence, inside a single decade a minister was deposed for denying the unity of the Church of the old and new dispensations and the Kingship of Christ over

the Church; a professor of theology was deposed, when he refused to give an account of himself before Synod, though he was charged with heresy on the basis of certain students' notes which detracted from the divine authority of Holy Writ; several ministers were deposed because they categorically denied the Reformed doctrine of Common Grace; and a minister was deposed for giving too liberal an interpretation of Lord's Day 38 of the Heidelberg Catechism, which explains the Sabbath commandment. That is surely some record. It would be remarkable for a much larger denomination. And as given it is not even complete." . . . And the writer laments the fact that these doctrinal controversies proved the fact that his church was not well enough posted on Reformed doctrine. For leading men in his denomination first highly recommended a book in which one of the men, later deposed, set forth his peculiar views, while later these same leaders condemned this minister for the views which they themselves first had recommended; and one of the ministers, deposed because he denied the Reformed doctrine of Common Grace, previous to his suspension stated his peculiar views for a long time in the church publications of the Christian Reformed Church, without ever being challenged.

Hence it must be concluded that events in the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands and pressure felt in our own churches of the Reformed faith in America clearly point out the desirability not only, but even so the necessity of a re-statement of what we understand by Reformed doctrine; re-statement, however, which does not aim at elimination of anything the fathers have said, but rather a redistribution of points of emphasis; the employment of phraseology which is popular rather than scholastic; and emendation and extension of the truth of God as it was in the mind of the fathers of our Reformed faith, whose noble aim it was that the Reformed Churches should always manifest their true origin and character by continually being conscious of the need of reformation of creed and church polity.

It would undoubtedly strengthen the courage of many a

timid conservatist, when a diligent study of the mind and the methods of the Reformed Fathers were made by him, to notice how truly progressive were these great men; how keenly alert these great scholars were to the fact that the Word of God is a "living" Word, and that, consequently, God's revelation is a growing revelation; and how humble was their submission to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, Who uses not only the instrumentalities of God's special grace, but even so instrumentalities of God's common grace to bring forth both old and new treasures of knowledge with regard to God's being, and His plan of salvation with man, and the results of His mercy and love among the whole human race. And that kind of research would prove a genuine surprise to those who call themselves "modern", when they would discover that orthodox truth is not identical with repristination and ancient and outworn thought-forms, but, because it is the truth of God, has in it the element of life, and is, therefore, always progressive and always genuinely scientific.

To continue: in his discussion of the Geelkerken case, Dr. TeWinkle makes another suggestion which is worth considering, namely, how in the trial of Dr. Geelkerken the zealous Synod of Assen out-Reformed the Reformed Church fathers. For Dr. Geelkerken, when brought to trial, declared unreservedly his faith in and his adherence to the authority of the Holy Scriptures. The question at issue did not touch upon fundamentals: such as the origin of sin; the position of man in Paradise; the significance of man's fall—fundamentals about which the Netherland Confession of Faith has very clearly and definitely expressed itself. But the question at the trial concerned itself with the exegesis of a part of Scripture (the manner of speaking of the serpent in Paradise), about which the confessional standards of the Reformed Churches never declared themselves. Dr. TeWinkle appeals to the generous mind of the fathers of the Reformed faith, when they spoke of the "*Libertas profetandi*", the liberty of interpretation and testimony, which also belongs to the office of the believer; interpretation of Scripture passages about

which the Confession of Faith does not declare itself explicitly. Eminent theologians of Holland, as the late Drs. Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck, and at present Dr. B. Wielenga and others, have never hesitated to lay claim to what they considered the inalienable right which the fathers claimed, that of the "*Libertas profetandi*", with regard to "numerous separate passages of Holy Scripture, the meaning of which has not been defined by the confessional symbols". Dr. Abraham Kuyper, when he enlarged upon the meaning and scope of the doctrine of regeneration as also including the children of believers, even though, at death, they had not been possessed of the power of discernment of the meaning of the Word of God, met in his day with much opposition. But his larger and more generous view is undoubtedly the more correct and scriptural.

Hence it is interesting to note the generous attitude of mind as to matters of Scripture interpretation of great Reformed theologians as the late Drs. Kuyper and Bavinck. They were men who studied Reformed theology in its minutest detail. During a long lifetime they wielded their weapons of faith against the Modernist foe in the Netherlands: a foe as scholarly and more strongly intrenched in its positions because of a long period of development, and more subtle, arrogant, and hostile than Modernism in America. It is interesting to compare the opinions of these truly Reformed theologians with the opinions of present day church men in America, whose minds not infrequently appear to have been poured into and hardened in unyielding molds. We are to guard against the danger of posing as protagonists of the Reformed faith in our conflict with Modernism, when we may easily be found ignorant of or deny the "*Libertas profetandi*" which the fathers of the Reformed faith claimed as their own.

In a following article, we wish to point out two principal weaknesses of Modernism, both European and American, which seem to render impossible its system of religious thought, and expose it to the most serious moral and spiritual consequences.

(To be continued.)

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII.

APRIL, 1927.

No. 3.

A SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF REV. HENRY ELIAS DOSKER, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D.

*(Professor of Church History, Louisville Presbyterian
Theological Seminary, 1903-1926).*

BY REV. JOHN M. VANDER MEULEN, D. D., LL. D.,
President of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

For those not well acquainted with Dr. Dosker, it may be well, before my expression of appreciation of him, to give, in a few words, the data of his life.

He was born in the Netherlands in February, 1855, at Bunschoten. His father was the Rev. Nicholas Herman Dosker, pastor of the Christian Reformed Church at Bunschoten, and his mother was Wilhelmina De Ronden. Henry Elias, for that was the name given him, was educated in the Dutch Gymnasium, a school of secondary education that corresponds roughly to our academy or high school. The family came to this country in 1870, the Rev. Nicholas Dosker having accepted a call to take the ministry of the Second (Dutch) Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Henry E. was sent to Hope College, Holland, Michigan, from which he graduated and of which he was one of the most distinguished alumni. He then entered McCormick Seminary without, of course, leaving the membership of the Dutch Reformed Church in America. His first church was a country pastorate in Ebenezer, near the city of Holland, Michigan. His second church was the First Reformed Church of Grand Haven, Michigan,

Moses was read, "a veil was upon their heart". Many of us, too, alas, have a veil, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life", upon our hearts. O that this veil may be taken away! that "with unveiled face" each of us "beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord", may be "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord".

But to the individual believer there is an evidence of a different kind from that which observation of these general effects affords—an evidence which he does not see *around* him, but which he feels *within* him. To the mere observer, this internal evidence is unappreciable; but to one who believes in Christ—the central subject of the Bible from end to end—it is unspeakable. In its full force it enables him to say, "I know Him whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him (literally 'my deposit') against that day". It is a matter, not of observation, but of experience, and he who, by faith, has gained this experience, has found a pearl of great price for which he would not accept the whole world in exchange.

SOWERS OF THE WIND,
or
MODERNISM IN HOLLAND (II).

BY REV. HENRY K. PASMA, M. A.,
Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Charleston, Miss.

This second article concludes Mr. Pasma's discussion of "Modernism in Holland". The first article appeared in the January number of the REVIEW.

"We may confidently expect that the backbone of Fundamentalism is broken." In this sentence a writer in one of the religious weeklies summed up the diagnosis he had made of the decisions reached by the annual conferences and assemblies of various church bodies in our country regarding the doctrinal controversies which have disturbed Protestant Christendom in

America for the last half-dozen years. The writer in question apparently felt vastly relieved, and marked the decisions of the various church bodies as a clear proof of a mellowing spirit born lately within the orthodox churches toward a more liberal interpretation of the things that pertain to the orthodox faith. To him the heart of the present day doctrinal controversies appears to centre in Fundamentalism, in the difference of opinion, perhaps, between Modernist and Fundamentalist.

We think, however, that the difference between Modernism and Orthodoxy is a difference which goes far deeper than a peculiar view, perhaps, of the Second Coming of Christ, or the question as to what should go into the Canon of Scripture, and what should be eliminated or barred. The question plainly deals with something vastly more important, namely, the reality and meaning of the supernatural.

In a former article we pointed out how leaders of the orthodox churches, who earnestly desire to preserve the Christian faith, as they are being enmeshed constantly in doctrinal strife, might well emulate the fathers of the Reformed faith, in their breadth of mind and generosity of viewpoint, as they manifested this in their zeal to maintain what they called the "Libertas profetandi". However, it must be admitted at once that it is not very difficult to see how this very generosity of mind of the fathers has even so been cleverly taken advantage of by Modernism, and by it has been employed as an instrument of license. This is shown very plainly in two outstanding defects today of Modernism, both European and American: first, a lack of clearness in the definition of the faith that is said to be "new" and "modern"; and, second, ambiguousness, bordering upon insincerity in the employment of the time-honored terminology of the orthodox by the Modernist.

First, then, lack of clearness in the definition of the Modernist faith. One need only be a casual reader of contemporaneous Modernist literature to know that the stock phrase of both Modernist catheder and pulpit is "*the beliefs which we no longer hold*". But the tragic part of this declaration is that nothing definitely new has taken the place of the dis-

carded things of the faith which is declared obsolete by the Modernist. This is a very serious indictment against the liberal faith. In this respect Kingley's counsel is of infinite meaning, "Never take away from a man even the *shadow* of a truth, unless you can give him *substance in return*". That, to our mind, is the tragedy of Modernism. It has its Fosdicks, its Merrills, its Mathews, who appear wonderfully skilled in the art of iconoclasm, but who have done nothing as yet to produce anything new and substantial in religious thought, to take the place of the discarded things of the orthodox faith. One of the staunchest supporters of Modernism, sensing its sterile character, has said of it, "Loads of philosophical mint, anise, and cummin has been weighed, measured, and tithed by men who knew well enough that the bread of life could never be kneaded out of such thin flour. Demonstrations in favor of liberalism have been for the most part of the variety the old-time politician used to favor—with banners and brass bands. Had they been of the kind the apostle mention—'demonstrations of the spirit and of power', the present discord between conservatives and liberals would be already ended."

With naive ignorance, it would seem to us, does the Modernist scoff at the orthodox, when the latter professes a faith which is steadfast and sure; which assurance of faith is ridiculed by the Modernist who says of it that "only a beggar knows how rich he is". But we are fully confident that in this respect the beggar deserves praise because he knows where he stands, while the man who only *imagines* himself a multi-millionaire may, in fact, be a bankrupt. One million pounds of the tinsel of doubt cannot weight against the simple statement of the devout believer, "I know Whom I have believed, and am persuaded".

The second weakness of Modernism is insincerity of purpose when it attempts to define the relation of the respective positions of the orthodox and the Modernist. Some years ago Professor Eerdmans, of the University of Leyden, a Modernist, attempted to identify the orthodox position with that of

Modernism, by saying that the only difference between the two views consisted in a difference of form of expression in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. The orthodox, said Professor Eerdmans, clings to the old word-forms of the fathers, but with these he means approximately what is in the mind of the Modernist.

We beg to differ with this view advanced by Dr. Eerdmans. In our opinion there is a real difference between the orthodox view and that of Modernism. Even when, in matters of secondary importance, the orthodox does not hesitate to claim his ancient "*Libertas profetandi*", it nevertheless is not true that, when it concerns the great fundamentals of the orthodox faith, he plays fast and loose with the right of interpretation which the fathers of the Reformed faith claimed for their own; or, because of fear and favor, resorts to ignoble mental reservation. Dr. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leyden University, co-laborer, in his day, of Wellhausen, and one of the leaders of early Modernism in the Netherlands, was much more candid in this respect than present day Modernist leaders; for Dr. Kuenen stated the position of Modernism very frankly and clearly, and did not hesitate to point out the radical difference existing between him and the orthodox believers when he said: "No matter how great may be the differences of opinion in Modernist circles between groups and individuals, yet a feeling of unity cannot be denied to exist between them, a consciousness of belonging to one generation, to the same family, since this family trait is found in this, *that all Modernists are united in their denial of the supernatural.*"

This defect of present day Modernism, its efforts to confuse terms and meanings, appears, upon close study, to be much more than inconsequential weakness. It seems to point out the fact that either Modernism has not studied sufficiently the contents of the orthodox faith; or that Modernism is spiritually unable to discern the things which are of the Spirit; and, hence, discards as superficial that which is concerned with principles of the first magnitude, and consequently declares that the difference between Modernism and Orthodoxy is merely

one of the different use of terminology, the meaning of which is identical for Modernist and Orthodox. It is in this spirit that Modernist leaders in America appear to do their utmost to maintain their connection with the Christian Church, employing the term "supernatural" in their own modern way; which term may then mean a hundred and one things, but none signifying the one essential meaning which the orthodox church of all times has attached to it.

How subtle a danger this confusion of terms by Modernism really is was clearly brought out recently in his inaugural at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, by President James Oliver Bushnell, Jr., when, in defense of the faith of the fathers, he stated: "But when any one tells me that all the difference between Fundamentalist and Modernist consists in difference of terms, I put that man down in my mind as a superficial dealer in words that have no meaning. The differences are as real and as great as the difference between accepting the crucified and risen Son of God and rejecting Him, the difference between eternal life and eternal death. . . . Of course, I know that meanings of words do change as usage may determine. But I know also that there is a much neglected science of lexicography, by careful, painstaking use of the laws of which the meaning of a word in any given literary setting may be determined with some degree of accuracy. For a scholar in the modern world to disregard the laws of lexicography in his use of established theological terms is negligence which amounts to dishonesty."

Keeping this weakness of Modernism in mind, the cleavage between it and orthodoxy is seen best when it concerns the great questions, for instance, of the imminence and the transcendence of God; the question of miracle; the question of prayer; and the hearing by God of prayer. Upon these and other fundamentals the orthodox stand united, and for the definition of these great doctrines they feel no need of making use of the "*Libertas profetandi*" of the fathers. They reject energetically alike the heresy of the deist, and the more recent heresy of the Modernist-pantheist. The orthodox are not in-

consistent in their attitude toward the miracle as Modernism is; as Dr. Arthur Pierson, half a century ago, pointed out this inconsistency in the case of Modernism by saying that its faith allows it to pray for a "clean heart", but disallows it to pray for the recovery of a sick person, because this last would imply the possibility of a physical miracle. But the orthodox believes that God is almighty in the realm of the material as well as in the realm of the spiritual; that the physical miracles performed by Jesus were symbolical of the coming of the Kingdom of God amongst mankind, a restoration from the power of sin which ruins in man the image of God and causes its blight to fall upon man's world; that Jesus' resurrection from the dead was the culmination of miracle. Prayer is still for the believer the most important part of his life of gratitude; in it and through it he recognizes and becomes conscious of the personal relation existing between him and God.

But the true nature of Modernism may be seen even more clearly in the development, amongst Modernists in the Netherlands, of views concerning Jesus Christ. In America Dr. Fosdick, in the chapter on Jesus in his "Modern Use of the Bible", is very disappointing when he treats the Person of Christ, Who, according to Fosdick, is, at His best, only the Messiah of a numerically small nation of the Jews. But, serious as is this departure from the orthodox conception by Dr. Fosdick, his opinions appear immature when compared with those of the older and more developed Modernism of the Netherlands. In "*Christus-Beschouwingen Onder Modernen*", or, "Views of Jesus Christ Among Modernists", written some time ago, six eminent Modernist theologians attempt to pare down the divine greatness and glory of the Christ to make Him fit in with the Modernist conception of Jesus.

The result is both curious and tragic. The opinions of these Dutch scholars range all the way from a bald deism, through the vagaries of Pantheism, to a point of view where still an echo of the orthodox conception of Jesus Christ may be heard. Throughout the discussion the boast occurs repeated-

ly that Modernism is outgrowing Modernism; that the younger generation of Modernists are free from the taint of naive traditionalism which continued to color the opinions and views of the promoters of early Modernism in Holland.

In "Views of Christ Among Modernists" Dr. Bruning contends that faith in the authority of the Word of God is impossible for the Modernist; even though Christ may have held to the authority of the Scriptures. The Modernist of today is far ahead of Jesus, "who did not face the necessity of having to do battle with the mighty enemy which makes onslaught upon the soul of modern man; for that enemy did not exist as yet for Jesus". Jesus was tucked away in the artless simplicity of Nazareth, where nothing of the intellectual and industrial conflict of the present was known. Jesus, for the Modernist, is the "ideal" Jesus. The Modernist delights to speak of Him as the "Jesus-concept".

Thus one may note at once the striking fundamental difference in the meaning of terms as employed by Modernists and Orthodox, and how utterly at variance is the Modernist conception of Christ with that held by the orthodox; as also the manifest leaning of Modernism toward an unsound mysticism; for throughout his discussion Dr. Bruning shows a recurring consistency, namely, his insistence upon the fact that one does not come into the possession of religion or the certainty of faith by tradition merely; that "each one for himself" must become assured.

Dr. Hugenholtz insists that the childish conception of Jesus of things moral and spiritual can no longer be held by the Modernist. The Gospels are full of contradictions, which, when touched upon by prejudiced theologians, are shuffled out of sight by sleight-of-hand trick; but which, when considered seriously, appear irreconcilable. Jesus' obscure origin is studied parallel with the Grecian hero-myth of Herakles. Paul invented a Christ of his own notions. Dr. Hugenholtz cleverly causes the historical Christ to disappear; and, as a substitute, counsels faith in an "innerlyke" God; which means that the Person of Jesus Christ, for the Modernist, must first be sub-

jected to the process of attenuation into a religious mystic idea before its worth can be appreciated.

Dr. VanWyck treats of the important question touching Modernism, "What we have lost and what we have retained". Bible characters, according to Dr. VanWyck, are mostly mythical. Abraham has not brought forth ancient Israel, but the mind of ancient Israel has created the symbolic figure of Abraham. Historical criticism, at its inception, found the hard and fast legendary concept of Jesus. However, through the aid of historical criticism *every one of the supernatural traits of the orthodox Jesus has been made to disappear*. The fall of man in sin is impossible, not only because of the probability of the unhistoricity of Gen. 3, but more so because the eyes of the Modernist have been opened to the psychological impossibility of a being that is possessed of the blessedness of perfect knowledge of and association with God, and which then wilfully would reject all this. Moreover, the Modernist regards as impossible a God who cannot manifest His father-affection, unless first His creditor-instinct has been satisfied with a blood sacrifice. Nobody will consider the losses of a legendary Christ and of an impossible Christology as sad losses; they must be looked upon rather as fortunate eliminations. The elimination from experimental religion of the thought that the wrath of God must be appeased is no loss; in reality, it is a great gain, since, through more modern views, there is in the individual a diminishing and a removal of his own suspicion and mistrust of the love of God. We don't know anything of Jesus of Nazareth; but this is reliable, that since the days of His legendary existence God has enriched the world with the revelation of a genuinely healthy human life—let Him have done it in whatever way He willed to do it—the fact is here.

Dr. VanWyck makes the important statement that Modernism can never hope to become the religion of the masses; first, because it lacks the authoritative element; and, second, because it is unable to cast its opinions into dogmatic forms. There is little possibility for Modernists ever to arrive at a harmonious view of Jesus Christ. But this does not matter. The call of

the Modernist is not to again establish a sort of Church, an outward symbol of visible union. The call of Modernism consists of being in the world, manifesting the living piety of the heart and the inner experimental faith—the call for the organization of a body of persons finding satisfaction in the unity of a spiritual brotherhood relationship.

If this indeed is Modernism, then, in our opinion, it is in process of preparation for a twofold degeneracy: first, amalgamation with the Unitarian faith; and, second, a lapse into vague and ill-defined mysticism, which tendencies are not very difficult to note in Modernist writings in America.

Dr. C. J. Niemeyer brings the Modernist-Christview to bear upon the idea of religion. He discusses the question whether or not the Modernist ought to proceed to discard the name "Christ", since the Old Testament prophecies have not become fulfilled in Christ. According to Dr. Niemeyer, the Modernist conception is this: whether we believe in the coming of the Kingdom of God; that is, expressed in present day language; whether we believe in the moral-religious progress of humanity; and whether we believe that this progress is due to the further penetration of the principles and beliefs for which Jesus lived and died, and can be made through no other way. That is to believe in "Christ".

In the discussion by Dr. Vanden Bergh Van Eysinga, of "The Reasonable Conception of the Old-Christian Dogma", one becomes acquainted with a frankness of mind, a sincere confession of the weaknesses of Modernism, which appears to be in startling contrast with the arrogant and supercilious spirit displayed by many Modernists in America and Europe; when, as occasion demands, they deign in a patronizing manner to touch upon the orthodox position. Dr. Van Eysinga expresses his surprise that lately Christology has come to be considered by Modernism; whereas Modernism at one time was attracted almost exclusively by the Idea of God and the cognate questions of Determinism and the Freedom of the Will, Personality of God and Pantheism. Not so very long ago, avers Dr. Van Eysinga, Christology was considered by Modernism as super-

fluous. However, he discovers some lamentable and dubious characteristics cropping out in present day Modernism. According to his views, Modernism of today is thoughtless and superficial, and has a weak, philosophic foundation, and is possessed of a piety which is altogether irrational. His arraignment of the taunt of Modernism, that the thought-concepts of orthodoxy are hard and unyielding, sheds a curious light, for instance, upon the "mental frameworks" mentioned by Dr. Fosdick in his "Modern Use of the Bible", by which Dr. Fosdick tries to prove the superiority of the Modernist faith over that of the orthodox.

Dr. Van Eysinga contends that Modernism must be liberal-minded enough to acknowledge in the orthodox position the elements of truth. Really, he argues, *a priori* it may be expected that Christian experience is more correctly expressed in the doctrines of the orthodox church than in the irresponsible and haphazard whims of the mind of the first and best Modernist in our time. One might just as well demand of a child that it create its own new language, as to expect Modernism to express itself in a brand-new tongue when it begins to discourse on the subject of religion. The orthodox has the right to demand that Modernism know what it is talking about, and that it justify in a scientific manner its characteristic use of existing terms. With regard to the future development of Modernism, Dr. Van Eysinga counsels it to hold fast to the historical connection in religion, but this connection must not be ill-fitting—it must not smart. He quotes Tiele, a former Modernist professor of theology at the University of Leyden, as saying that the doctrines of the Trinity and that of the divinity of Jesus Christ are one and the same. Tiele confesses that for centuries these doctrines have been valued as being the very heart of religion, and that the acceptance thereof from time immemorial by believers has been considered as the mark of a Christian. And with commendable courage Dr. Van Eysinga asks, why Tiele neglects to state by virtue of what consideration the definition of the Modernist concept of Christianity ought to be put differently today.

Thus one may notice the variegated and confusing character of Modernism in the Netherlands, where it is far older, and has reached a more mature stage than Modernism in America. There are in it the elements of extreme rationalism, which, according to its own promoters, is a rationalism which is thoughtless, superficial, and unphilosophical. And there are also manifest today in the Modernism of Holland the remnants of the old faith, of conservatism, which remnants are nevertheless decried and ridiculed by the sons of the same Modernist household as obsolete anachronisms. Modernism is still far removed from the possibility of ever coming to a unity of faith. And by signs and tokens one may judge that it will never come to this, because its face is turned in the wrong direction. Is it saying too much, as we stated at the beginning of these articles, that when one studies the character of Modernism in the Netherlands, where it has outgrown characteristics of immaturity which still mark Modernism in America—as, for instance, the ornamentation of a confusing play of words; ambiguous terminology; and the supercilious chauvinism of youth—that Modernism is sowing the wind, bequeathing to the generations following the tragic task of reaping the whirlwind?

MIND IN THE REMAKING.

By D. MAURICE ALLAN, M. A., Ph. D.,

*Professor of Philosophy and Psychology, Hampden-Sidney
College, Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

(Dr. Allan was graduated from Hampden-Sidney College with the degrees of B. A. and M. A. Later he attended the University of Virginia, Columbia University and Harvard University. The major part of his graduate work in Philosophy and Psychology was done at Harvard, from which university he received his Ph. D. last year. Since 1923 he has been professor of Philosophy and Psychology in Hampden-Sidney College.)

Of Psychology the most startlingly true assertion that can be made today is that there is literally no such thing. There