

6433
MAY 1933-R
R D 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-JANUARY 1933
Vol. 3 No. 9

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Notes and Comments

CHANGES



READERS will notice that in recent months the pages of CHRISTIANITY TODAY have undergone alterations in arrangement and subject. With this issue, still further changes are made. Four new departments have been added. These are first, the introduction of a systematic news coverage; second, a treatment of the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons for February; third, the publication of our "one page sermon," and fourth, the first appearance of our "Columnist" who will comment upon unusual

or significant happenings. While the Editors, of course, agree with his general position, the views he expresses will be his own. The news coverage is not complete in this issue, but we expect it to be so in February, and in subsequent months. When complete it is doubtful whether any American religious journal will be able to equal it. In trying to make CHRISTIANITY TODAY the very best religious paper anywhere, we will continue to add departments and make changes. At least one new feature—perhaps two—will be found in the next issue.

THE NEXT MODERATOR



THE *Newark Evening News* for December 10th contained an article that many regarded as a formal announcement of the fact that Dr. WILLIAM HIRAM FOULKES, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of that city, will be a candidate for the moderatorship of the next Assembly. "Presbyterian leaders," we read in the opening sentence, "are predicting the election of Dr. FOULKES as moderator of the 1933 General Assembly." "For several years," the article continues, "rumors have linked the name of Dr.

FOULKES with the moderatorship, but he has been unwilling, because of pastoral and denominational duties, to permit his name to be placed in nomination. Now, however, there seems to be a general impression, not alone in the metropolitan area, but throughout the church, that Dr. FOULKES time to serve his denomination as its official head begins next May."

Dr. FOULKES' campaign manager (if we may so speak) is Dr. CHARLES LEE REYNOLDS, superintendent of church extension in the Presbytery of Newark. In commending his candidate Dr. REYNOLDS said: "At this time we need a leader with special gifts; one who is spiritually minded and possessed of a strong evangelical faith, and we have such a leader in our own presbytery in the person of Dr. FOULKES." That Dr. REYNOLDS, in his effort to secure the election of Dr. FOULKES, will have the support of those who have dominated the last eight Assemblies would

seem to be indicated by the fact that Dr. CHARLES R. ERDMAN and Dr. HUGH T. KERR reacted favorably when he put to them the question: "Do you agree with me that we need, at this time, the kind of leadership that Dr. FOULKES can give?"

Dr. ERDMAN replied: "Your letter affords me the very deepest satisfaction. There is no one in our church whom I should rather have elected as moderator of the coming Assembly than Dr. FOULKES. This choice is based not only on my personal friendship for Dr. FOULKES, but on the conviction that he is better fitted to fill the office at this time than any other man in the church."

Dr. KERR replied: "I certainly think that this is the year when Dr. FOULKES' name ought to go forward and be presented to the church as the next moderator. He has earned it, he deserves it, he is worthy of it, the church needs him. I am willing to proclaim this from the house tops if necessary and I would be glad to have you tell him the way I feel. I know there is a great many in the church who feel the same way."

It is possible that some of those who approve of the tendencies that have been dominant in the Presbyterian Church in recent years will, for personal reasons, prefer some candidate other than Dr. FOULKES. We do not see, however, how they can object to him in principle inasmuch as he epitomizes those tendencies as well as any man that could be named. We do not have the happiness to approve those tendencies and hence feel constrained to oppose the candidacy of Dr. FOULKES or any other man who may be expected to further those tendencies. In our judgment, what the church needs is a type of leadership very different from that which it has had in recent years.

DID THE PUBLICITY RELEASES GIVE A WRONG IMPRESSION OF THE LAYMEN'S REPORT?



THOSE responsible for the report of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry are still being criticised because of the press releases they gave out in advance of its publication. It is alleged not only that they broke their pledge, expressed or implied, to the Boards to keep the report confidential until after November 18 but that these press releases gave the public a false impression of the report and thus aroused unwarranted dissent and opposition.

Whether its sponsors acted unethically in giving the series of releases to the press before the report had been formally presented to the Boards we have no means of knowing. Be that as it may, it does not seem to us that these press releases were fitted to give a wrong impression of the actual character of the report. We read the releases as they appeared in the press from time to time. Our later reading of the report as a whole only tended to confirm the impression we obtained from the releases. At no time did we have the feeling that the press releases had misrepresented or even given a wrong slant to the Com-

A New Princeton Apologetic

By the Rev. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D.,
Professor of Apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary

A Discussion in Two Parts

Part I

SINCE the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary Dr. John E. Kuizenga has occupied the chair of Apologetics there. When Professor Kuizenga entered upon his work it became apparent at once that a new type of Apologetics was to be introduced. His inaugural address, which appeared in the Princeton Seminary Bulletin for November, 1931, served as a manifesto of the new course to be followed. His articles on "Religious Education," which were published in recent issues of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, contained a further development of the new policy already on its way. But we pass these by in order to call attention to an address which has been printed in the Princeton Seminary Bulletin of November, 1932.

The subject of this address is "The Remaking of Human Nature." Professor Kuizenga seeks to answer three questions: (a) "What is this human nature which may be remade," (b) "What is the power which can do this work," (c) "How may we know when the transformation is actual fact." We propose to look in turn at the answers given to these three questions.

Professor Kuizenga tells us in effect that many modern psychologists and the Bible are agreed on the answer to be given to the first question. Both speak, he says, of a lower and a higher aspect of man. The lower aspect is that which we have in common with the animal and the higher is the more specifically human. On the basis of this supposed agreement between modern psychologists and the Bible, Professor Kuizenga feels warranted in defining the moral issue of the day as follows: "The question of the day is whether we shall regard the animal powers as the essentially human, whether we shall build our lives around the animal powers only, and use the higher powers so far as they are not utterly delusive to build the life of humans as glorified animals; or whether we shall take seriously our higher powers, subordinate to them the animal, and so build our lives thru time to God." Both the psychologist and the Bible teach us, according to Professor Kuizenga, that man is made with a "capacity for God" and that what is needed is the development of this capacity.

By means of this unsatisfactory way of putting the matter Professor Kuizenga has succeeded in adapting the Bible to the needs of modern non-Christian psychologists and philosophers. He has done so chiefly by significant omissions of the specifically Biblical teaching on the question of human nature as it is today. The Bible does indeed teach

that man has a body as well as a soul. This body we may speak of as the lower aspect of man if we will. We may even say that since our bodies are physical and the bodies of animals are physical that we have something in common with the animal. But the Bible nowhere teaches that this "lower" aspect of man is evil merely because it is lower. On the contrary it is characteristic of pagan thought and of pagan thought only to teach that matter is inherently evil. Christian theology has fought for ages to have this pagan doctrine ousted from the church. And now at this date Professor Kuizenga does not even think it necessary to argue that the pagan and the Christian doctrines are identical but simply takes for granted that they are.

This assumption of the identity of the Christian and the non-Christian view of human nature leads Professor Kuizenga to a thoroughly non-Christian formulation of the moral issue of the day. That issue is, he says, whether the lower or the higher aspect of man is to conquer. But this exactly is not the main issue according to Scripture. Scripture nowhere teaches, and least of all in Genesis one, to which Professor Kuizenga appeals in proof of his contention, that the chief object in man's moral strife is to overcome the evil naturally inherent in the body first and in the soul afterwards. If anything is made clear in the first chapter of Genesis it is that man's "lower" as well as man's "higher" aspect were equally perfect when they were created by God. There could be no strife between them. Scripture teaches not that man had originally merely a "capacity" for God but that he was in actual and full communion with God. It was this perfect man, perfect in body as well as in soul, who wilfully, self-consciously, insulted God by breaking His law. Thus man became a sinner. Hence sin is primarily guilt before God. That in man as he is today the "lower" often dominates the "higher" is the *result* and not the *cause* of the guilt of man. Such is the doctrine of original sin. The individual man may add to his guilt by yielding to his "lower" self but he is guilty before he has done one self-conscious deed.

What then is the moral issue for man? Is it merely to overcome the "lower" and to strive for the "higher"? It is thus that all non-Christian systems of thought, interested as they are in denying or making of non-effect the Christian conception of guilt, have constantly put the matter. It is thus that evolutionary philosophy speaks when it says that the idea of guilt before a creator-god is a primitive notion that the race has naturally outgrown. It is thus

(Continued on Page 12)

A New Princeton Apologetic—Concluded

that the higher critics speak when they deal with the "blood-theology" of Paul. It is thus that Pelagian theologians speak when they wish to remove the offense of the cross in order to make it palatable to the natural man. It is thus, finally, that Modernism, heir to all this patrimony, speaks when it wishes to lead poor benighted Fundamentalists on to higher things.

Scripture, however, does not define the moral issue in this way. Isaiah said that all our strivings after higher things are in themselves as filthy rags before God. Paul strove mightily for "higher things" till he met Jesus on the way to Damascus. Then he learned that Christ's righteousness must be the foundation of our striving if our striving is not to be in vain and sinful in the sight of God. The taproot of sin remains untouched so long as man strives for "higher" things unless his guilt has been atoned for. "How shall a man be right with God?" That is primarily the moral issue for man as he is today.

From these considerations it appears clearly that a new type of Apologetic is being taught at Princeton. One could not possibly think of Professor Wm. Brenton Greene, formerly Professor of Apologetics at Princeton, speaking or writing in the way that Professor Kuizenga does. Professor Greene's Apologetics sought to be in harmony with the Systematic theology of the great Reformed theologians such as Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield. The numerous articles of Professor Greene all attest his anxiety to point out not only the distinctive character of orthodox theology but also the distinctive character of Reformed theology. He pointed out again and again that Christianity teaches while modern evolutionary philosophy denies that man was originally created perfect. He taught clearly that man as a sinner is subject to the wrath of God unless the substitutionary work of Christ has reinstated him into God's favor. Accordingly he boldly spoke forth against the modern evolutionary philosophy whether it appeared in the current pragmatic philosophies or in the more subtle form of idealism. Indeed it was Professor Greene's constant concern to show clearly that the idealist type of philosophy, which speaks in terminology that resembles the terminology of Christianity, is often a greater enemy of Christianity than the crassest materialism just because the difference between Christianity and idealism is for the untrained mind difficult to detect.

The new Apologetic, then, differs from the old, we believe in two important respects. In the first place the old Apologetic was *clear* and the new is *obscure*. No one could read the articles and lectures of Professor Greene and not know precisely what the difference is between Christianity and non-Christian types of thought. In contrast with this no one can read the writings of Professor Kuizenga and discover from them clearly that Christianity has any distinct teaching at all.

In the second place the old Apologetic was *strongly defensive* of and the new Apologetic is *weakly apologetic* for

Christianity as a distinct message for the world. Professor Greene contended boldly for the utter insufficiency of the "naturalist" interpretation of human life and the complete sufficiency of the "supernaturalist" interpretation. Professor Kuizenga, so far as he at spots seems to indicate that the supernaturalist and the naturalist interpretation of human life differ at all, hastens to apologize for the implied affront to the natural man by showing that the best of non-Christians have really always held to the same thing that Christianity holds to.

What, we now ask, is the practical significance of this difference between the old and the new Apologetic? The practical difference is that the old Apologetic was a *help* and the new Apologetic is a *hindrance* to the spread of the gospel. The gospel needs to be clearly understood and boldly proclaimed if it is to bring men to Christ. If it is scarcely distinguished from and meanly apologized for, it chloroforms men already asleep.

The new Apologetic is dangerous to the church especially at this time. The report of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry tries to show that there is really no difference between Christianity and other religions. According to the recommendations of this report the highest and best that is in Christianity should unite with the highest and best in other religions in a common battle against the tendency of man to yield to the lower aspect of his being, to the merely animal within him. According to this report Christian missionaries should no longer go to heathen lands with the claim that they have a distinctive religion but should join the other religions in a common fight against irreligion: "The case that must now be stated is the case for any religion at all." (p. 33). Will the church agree with such a proposal? Modernism will, of course. The only hope, so far as human agency is concerned, lies in an outspoken opposition on the part of orthodox leaders in the church. But in the present emergency the church will look in vain to the Apologetic of Princeton for help. If they look there for help they will be dismayed to find that in the writings of professor Kuizenga there is the same vague indefinite talk about the "lower" and "higher" aspects of man, the same idea that man's chief struggle everywhere is against mechanism and materialism that one finds in the report of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry.

Then too Buchmanism threatens to overrun the church. In effect it denies the centrality of the cross of Christ. It maintains in effect that Christians and non-Christians can have genuine spiritual fellowship with one another. Ministers as well as Laymen are led astray by it. They need guidance. Will they get it from the new Apologetic at Princeton? Certainly not! From the new Apologetic no one could learn that the cross is central to Christianity at all. Paganism from without and paganism from within are besetting the church. Yet we look in vain for a clear note of warning from the new Apologetic. That Apologetic is useless not only but dangerous to the church in the present emergency.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-FEBRUARY, 1933

Vol. 3

No. 10

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Notes and Comments

"EVANGELICAL"



THE Christian Century, in its issue of January 18th, attempts an editorial reply to a correspondent who inquired as to the meaning of the word "evangelical" as applied to an individual or church. A more floundering reply it would be difficult to imagine. That the reply is so unsatisfactory finds its explanation, if we mistake not, in the fact that our contemporary feels constrained to define the word in a way that will make it possible to employ the word to describe its own position. As a result it ascribes

a meaning to the word quite other than its historical meaning.

It begins by saying that evangelical is an "ex parte word like 'heretic,' 'orthodox' and 'bigot'" and ends by saying that "to be evangelical is nothing more or less than to be a Christian." The opening statement is equivalent to saying that it is a word without definite meaning. The closing statement has meaning only if we are agreed as to the meaning of the word "Christian." Such statements, therefore, throw no light upon what is meant when we speak of an "evangelical" Christian or an "evangelical" Church.

As a matter of fact, as *The Christian Century* rather grudgingly admits, the word has been employed historically to designate a type of individual or church distinguishable on the one hand from the Roman Catholic and on the other from the Unitarian. For instance the third volume of Dr. SCHAFF's great work "The Creeds of Christendom" is entitled "Evangelical Creeds" and an examination of its contents shows that it contains all the creeds of Protestantism other than those of the Unitarian type that appeared before its publication. This means that as over against the Roman Catholic the Evangelical rejects its sacerdotalism and maintains the immediacy of the soul's relation to God in the matter of salvation. But it means also that as over against the Unitarian the Evangelical rejects its doctrine of salvation by works and maintains the soul's dependence on the grace of God and the grace of God alone for salvation. Hence the word is used in its historical and proper meaning only when it is used to designate those whose religious experience is grounded in the following convictions: (1) that the relation between the soul and God is immediate; (2) that the soul is dependent on God and on God alone for salvation, that nothing that we are and nothing that we do enter into its grounds; and (3) that the salvation that the soul receives as a free gift from God was made available through the incarnation and atoning death of the Second Person of the Trinity.

The Christian Century came near to expressing the only proper meaning of the word when it referred to the fact that "we find the word 'evangelical' used with reference to a type of religion

which stresses the inner and personal experience of salvation, holds fast to a theology which is essentially Nicene with reference to its view of God and Augustinian in reference to its view of man and his sinful estate, and resists on the one hand the institutionalism of Catholicism and on the other the rationalistic individualism of liberal theology."

The Christian Century no doubt holds to the first of the three convictions mentioned above. It has no sympathy with sacerdotalism. It, however, rejects the second and the third of these convictions, and thereby advertises the fact that it has no right to call itself evangelical. Men may or may not approve of its position but it should be clear to all that it is not an organ of Evangelicalism.

THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY



SINCE the discontinuance of the *Princeton Theological Review*, as a result of the reorganization of the Seminary in 1929, there has been no publication in this country having as its aim and purpose a scholarly exposition and defense of the Reformed Faith. This does not mean, however, that such a publication is not available. Fortunately "*The Evangelical Quarterly: A Theological Review, International in Scope and Outlook, in Defence of the Historic Christian Faith*" was launched in England

shortly before the discontinuance of the *Princeton Review*. Under the able editorship of Professors JOHN R. MACKAY and DONALD MACLEAN of Edinburgh it has gone on from strength to strength so that it is recognized today as the one publication that discusses in scholarly fashion, from the standpoint of the Reformed Faith, the issues that are being raised in the realms of history, philosophy, theology and scientific research. It seeks not only to defend and propagate the Reformed Faith in the face of assault and misrepresentation but to bring the strength and comfort of its Biblical and historic system to the relief of prevailing religious and social distress. Its associate editors include Professors G. CH. AALDERS of Holland, O. T. ALLIS of America, A. LECERF of France, DuTOIT of South Africa and Drs. W. KOLFFHAUS and E. C. UNMACK of Germany and England respectively. It is published by James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 9 Essex Street, London, W. C. 2, price ten shillings per annum. It may be obtained through Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 234 Pearl Street, N. W., Grand Rapids, Michigan, price \$2.50 per year, seventy-five cents per copy.

We take pleasure in commending *The Evangelical Quarterly* to the more scholarly of our readers. It seeks to do in scholarly fashion what we are attempting to do in more popular fashion. It is rendering an important service to the cause of Calvinism throughout the world and should have the support of those who value our Reformed heritage.

(A Table of Contents will be found on Page 24)

F. S. DYRNES
MAY 1933-R
R. D. 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

8433

A New Princeton Apologetic

By the Rev. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D.,
Professor of Apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary

A Discussion in Two Parts

Part II



IN his address on "The Remaking of Human Nature" Professor Kuizenga seeks to answer three questions: (a) "What is this human nature which may be remade?", (b) "What is the power which can do this work?", and (c) "How may we know when the transformation is actual fact?". In the last issue of this paper we discussed the answer given to the first question.

We found that the answer Professor Kuizenga gives is scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from the answer given to this question by the evolutionary and idealist philosopher, the negative critic and the Pelagian theologian. We propose now to look at the answers given to the second and third questions.

The second question is of great significance. There are two and only two answers that can be given to it. Christianity says that God through the atoning blood of Christ and the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit must initiate and complete the remaking of human nature. Non-Christian thought says that man can remake himself. The alternative is in itself simple enough.

A difficulty appears, however, when we observe that much of modern idealist philosophy, though giving the non-Christian answer, gives this answer in terminology that resembles the Christian terminology. As an illustration we offer such a book as "Human Nature and its Remaking," by Professor Wm. Ernest Hocking, chairman of the Appraisal Commission sent out by the "Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry." Hocking accepts the current evolutionary view of the origin of man. He denies the supernatural at every point in the remaking of human nature. He does not believe in the Christian view of the atonement through the blood of the cross. He has no place for the church's doctrine of regeneration. Yet he uses practically all of the ordinary Christian terminology. For this reason many people are greatly confused. They are tempted to think that idealism and Christianity are in agreement on the interpretation of life.

Now it is upon this confusion between idealism and Christianity that Modernism largely feeds today. Christian theologians ought therefore to flee this confusion as the plague. Their language should, as far as possible, never allow of an idealist as well as a Christian interpretation. The church cries out for a clear-cut, unmistakable testimony to the teachings that distinguish Christianity from an idealism such as that of Hocking.

Yet if Hocking were minded to prove that the church has no reason to complain of the report on missions unless it also complain of the new Apologetic at Princeton he could make out a very good case indeed. As in the answer to the first question asked by Professor Kuizenga there was not a word of man's guilt before God, so in the answer to the second question there is not a word about the removal of that guilt through the atoning blood of Christ. As from the answer to the first question one could not clearly learn that Professor Kuizenga believes that "sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God," so from the answer to the second question one cannot clearly learn that the removal of sin must be accomplished by Christ's "once offering up of himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice." Such omissions are fatal. Brevity cannot be pleaded. If nothing else was said that much should have been said. To omit the fall of man and the substitutionary atonement from a summary dealing with human nature and its remaking makes such a summary as ambiguous as a summary dealing with the differences between the white and the colored race would be if it omitted to tell us that the white race is white and the colored race is colored.

And what is true of the omission with respect to the objective work of redemption is equally true of the omission with respect to the subjective work of redemption. Does Professor Kuizenga believe in the church's doctrine of regeneration? We take for granted that he does, just as we take for granted that he believes in the substitutionary atonement. From the article under discussion, however, one cannot learn clearly that regeneration is necessary for the remaking of human nature. Professor Kuizenga does say that "human nature cannot be remade without the gospel of the grace of God and the present power of the Holy Spirit." This may be given an orthodox interpretation, if taken by itself, but may equally well be given a Modernist interpretation. The Modernist interpretation would, moreover, be more in accord with the context. There is not one spot in this section of the article where it is made clear that the initiation of the work of redemption, in the heart of man, is exclusively the work of God. On the contrary it is said without any limitation or qualification that: "If in the end 'it is not of him that wills nor yet of him that runs,' neither is it of him that wills not nor of him that runs not." Does Professor Kuizenga, in such words as these, teach that in regeneration, as well as in sanctification, man is active? We take for granted that

he does not wish to do this. Such teaching would be out of accord with the Reformed Faith. Such teaching is in perfect harmony with idealism but wholly out of accord with Christianity. Yet Professor Hocking could more fairly interpret the article on this point in an idealist fashion than we could interpret it in a Christian fashion.

To the omissions just discussed we must now add that Professor Kuizenga constantly uses the subjective instead of the objective form of statement in what he says about the remaking of human nature. He speaks of "our faith to Godward," that is to be "the hope of the new man and of the new humanity." Again he says that he does not see how we can love men unless we first love God and how we can love God "unless we believe that he first loved us; unless we believe that he sent his only begotten Son. . . ." Why does Professor Kuizenga put the matter this way instead of saying simply that man and humanity are hopeless unless God has actually sent His Son? Is it in the interest of bringing the old truth in the language of the day? That were laudable indeed. Unfortunately it is the Modernist who prefers the new language because he does not believe in the objective facts of historical Christianity. Consequently an orthodox theologian cannot afford to use the subjective language unless he makes it plain that it is not because he agrees with the Modernist but for some other reason that he uses it. But since Professor Kuizenga has omitted from his summary the most characteristic doctrines of Christianity and has nowhere unequivocally asserted his belief in regeneration, the subjective language only adds to the general confusion and obscurity.

We see then that at the point where we should certainly expect a Christian theologian to indicate clearly the difference between all the schemes of self-salvation on the one hand and Christianity on the other hand Professor Kuizenga has at best been obscure. His trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound that will call no one to war against the mission report or against Buchmanism.

In answer to the third question as to how we may know that human nature has actually been remade, Professor Kuizenga says: "The marks of Christianity in conduct are at least these three, love of the kingdom, zeal for righteousness, and power to overcome the conventionally respectable sins of our day." Professor Kuizenga does not tell us directly what he means by "the kingdom." He only tells us a story of a "Christian minister" a native of India, who came to America, and who, while here, hastened to express his gratitude to "a little ordinary Dutch woman" who had supported him "that he might be educated and become the Christian man he was." Can any one learn from this story whether the Modernist or the orthodox conception of the kingdom is meant? For all the reader can see it may mean just what is meant by the "kingdom" in *Rethinking Missions* when it is there said that perhaps the most perfect way of describing the goal of missions is found in the phrase, "Thy kingdom come."

Again in the section dealing with the "zeal for righteous-

ness" no distinction is made between the righteousness of the "natural man" and the righteousness of the regenerated man. Does Christian character need the righteousness of Christ for its foundation or does it not? We cannot tell from the article under discussion. That we have no right to presuppose that in this section the truly Christian conception of character is meant is plain from the fact that in the answer to the second question there was no clear-cut division made between justification by works and justification by faith.

Professor Kuizenga does indeed say that he does not see how we are to have a zeal for righteousness unless we believe that God has sent His Son into the world; but even here the phraseology is subjective and might as fairly be given a Ritschlian as a Christian interpretation. The net result is that in an age when salvation by character is the motto of Modernism and when blurring of distinctions is the order of the day we have, at best an uncertain sound from the new Apologetic at Princeton.

Finally we note that the same ambiguity meets us in the idea that it is a mark of a true Christian to have power to overcome the conventional sins of our day. We take for granted that what Professor Kuizenga means is that a good Christian may to an extent be distinguished from a poor Christian by a great sensitiveness of his Christian conscience. Yet as far as the article is concerned it is not clear at all that this is meant. Professor Kuizenga has not even made clear to us the difference between a poor Christian and a non-Christian. Many a man who is not a Christian claims to have power to overcome the conventional sins of the day. There are many "good moral" people who are not Christians at all. Yet for all we know from the article they ought to be accounted Christians.

We conclude then that in the answer to the second and third questions Professor Kuizenga has been just as vague as in his answer to the first question. The Scripture quoted near the end of the article would, if interpreted in the orthodox sense, imply those teachings which we have found to be omitted from the article. The mere quotation of texts tends but to confusion. The texts quoted in the article are not woven into the warp and woof of the argument.

We think we have adduced enough evidence to prove that in the present crisis of the church, when we so sorely need to unite the orthodox forces in defence of the true presentation of Christianity, the new Apologetic introduces a split into the orthodox camp by making men waver on the question whether there is any profound difference at all between the idealism of the mission report and the Christianity of the Westminster Confession. Such writing as that of Professor Kuizenga gives aid and comfort to the enemy and paralyzes those who are truly in Christ. We reiterate that the new Apologetic, as it appears in the article now under review, as well as from other articles of Professor Kuizenga, is not merely useless but dangerous to the church.