

BULLETIN
GEORGE PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
**The Church and
Sound Doctrine**

SELECTED ADDRESSES
FROM
*The Seventh Annual
Biblical Forum and Lectureship*
1947

Part of the
**Jimmie Beller
Memorial eLibrary**
www.TheCobbSix.com

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	3
DEFINING THE SUBJECT: THE CHURCH AND SOUND DOCTRINE (W.B. WEST, JR.)	4
IMPERATIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN WAY (HUGH M. TINER)	11
SOME CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS (E.V. PULLIAS).....	17
CONVERSION OF SAUL OF TARSUS (FRANK PACK)	22
THE DEITY OF JESUS (R.G. WILBURN).....	28
THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE (WADE RUBY).....	38
THE MIRACLES OF JESUS AND MODERN DISBELIEF (R.G. WILBURN).....	45
WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN? (HUBERT G. DERRICK)	57
“SOME DANGERS CONFRONTING THE CHURCH” (JOSEPH W. WHITE)	62
WHEN UNITY CEASES J. HERMAN CAMPBELL).....	68
THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: PREMILLENNIAL? (WADE RUBY).....	74
WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE? (GEORGE PEPPERDINE)	80

FOREWORD

"The Church and Sound Doctrine" was the subject of the 1949 Biblical Forum and Lectureship held at Pepperdine College. About half of the talks presented at the Lectureship were given by members of the Pepperdine faculty. In response to wide interest, certain of these talks are published in this bulletin. It is regretted that limitation of space made it impossible to publish all the lectures.

The committee on the Lectureship program has selected those talks for publication here which seem to be necessary to a reasonably well-rounded presentation of the subject and which taken together reflect the attitude of the College on this extremely important topic.

A word should be said about the meaning of the subject, "The Church and Sound Doctrine." By "the church" is meant that body of people who have obeyed the Gospel of Jesus according to the Scripture and thus, having been added to the body of Christ by God, make up the church of Christ. By "sound doctrine" is meant the will of God for man as revealed through Christ and preserved in the inspired written word we call the Bible.

The work of Pepperdine College as an educational institution rests upon the all-important foundation of Christian faith and practice. All the activities of the College, both curricular and extra-curricular, are planned to be in harmony with God's truth. These lectures on this fundamental subject are merely one expression of Pepperdine's devotion to religious truth. They are sent forth with a prayer that they will do much good.

BULLETIN GEORGE PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
VOLUME THIRTEEN MAY, 1949 NUMBER FOUR

“DEFINING THE SUBJECT— THE CHURCH AND SOUND DOCTRINE”

W. B. WEST, JR.

Introduction

On behalf of George Pepperdine College, President Tiner has welcomed you to our seventh annual Biblical Forum and Lectureship. As head of the Department of Religion and director of the lectureship, I wish to share with Brother Tiner his friendly words of welcome and to add my appreciation for your presence and interest in this very important lectureship as well as in previous ones. I trust that this week will be for all of us the most enjoyable and profitable one of 1949.

I have been requested to give the opening address of the Lectureship on a definition of its theme — “The Church and Sound Doctrine.” The purpose of my address will be definitive and to set forth in general what we hope to accomplish in subject matter. We hear and read much these days in the religious world about the church. In certain circles, especially conservative ones, and particularly in the churches of Christ, sound doctrine is a much discussed topic. What is the church and what is sound doctrine? The purpose of my address is to define the church and sound doctrine in view of Biblical teaching and to present the relationship between the two.

I shall use a catena of Scriptures for my Scripture reading and text. As recorded in Matthew 16:18, Jesus said: “And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.” Paul wrote to the church in Ephesus: “To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God.” Eph. 3:10. Paul admonished the evangelist, Titus: “Hold ing to the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers.” Titus 1:9. In Titus 2:1 he further admonished: “But

speak thou the things which befit the sound doctrine.”

The Church

The Meaning of the word “church.”

The word “church” is used 111 times in the English New Testament. It is a translation of the Greek word “ekklesia” which was used by the Septuagint translators of the Old Testament to translate the Hebrew word “qahal” which is defined by Brown, Driver, and Briggs as “assembly, convocation, congregation” with the assembly specially convoked and the congregation as an organized body. (Jeremiah 31:8; Genesis 49:6; Micah 2:5, etc.) The word, “ekklesia,” is defined by the new unabridged Liddell and Scott as an “assembly duly summoned.” It was used in classical Greek to describe the calling out of the free citizens of a city state like Athens from their homes or places of work to convene for a purpose. The word is derived from two Greek words—the preposition *ek* which means *out, out of, from* and the verb, *Kaleo. to call*. Thus the basic meaning of *ekklesia* is *the called out*. The New Testament meaning of the word is the same with the application to the church being those who have been called by God out of the world by the gospel of Jesus Christ to be His people locally and universally. (Acts 2:39)

The Church in prophecy and fulfillment.

We have learned already that the idea expressed in the New Testament Greek word for church had rootage in the Old Testament. Isaiah and Daniel predicted its establishment (Isaiah 2:2, 3; Daniel 2:44). Jesus, John the Baptist, the twelve, and the seventy referred to it as future. (Matt. 3:1, 2; 10:7; 16:28) On the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus all prophecies concerning the establishment of the church were fulfilled (Acts 2). After this Pentecost, the church is always referred to in the New Testament as being in existence. (Acts 8:1, 3; 20:28; 1 Cor. 1:1, 2, etc.)

The Identity of the Church.

The church revealed in the New Testament can be easily identified by age, name, conditions of membership, worship, organization, and destiny. The church is 1918 years old, being established

in A.D. 30, and any church younger or older than that cannot be the church of which the prophets foretold and which Jesus promised He would build. This church is called the church of Christ or the church of God. (Matt. 16:18; Acts 20:28; Rom. 16:16; I Tim. 3:15) Its conditions for membership are faith in the Lord Jesus, repentance from past sins, public confession of one's faith in Jesus, and burial in baptism for the remission of sins. (Rom. 10:9, 10; Luke 13:5; Acts 2:38) The worship of the church of Christ consists of acapella congregational singing, Bible study, prayer, weekly observance of the Lord's Supper and the contribution of one's finances to the preaching of the gospel and to the support of the needy. (Acts 2:42; Eph. 5:19; II Tim. 2:15; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2). The organization of the church is monarchical with Jesus as head and elders as overseers in each local congregation with deacons and members worshipping and serving under the elders. (Col. 1:18; Acts 20:28) Its destiny is eternal. When time shall be no more, the church will continue its eternal existence with Jesus the Groom. (Daniel 2:44; Heb. 12:28; Rev. 21:9, 10) Any church that does not have the foregoing characteristics is not the church revealed in the New Testament which is the church of Christ. When I speak of the church and sound doctrine, I speak not of a denomination but the church of the Lord Jesus for which He died, which He founded, over which He is head, of which He is the Saviour, in which all spiritual blessings are, and for which He is coming in the Saturday evening of time.

Sound Doctrine

Definition

We come now to sound doctrine. The noun "doctrine" is a translation of a Greek noun "didaskalia" which is defined as "teaching, instruction, doctrine." The Greek verb is "didasko" and the noun, referring to the teacher is "didaskalos." As a noun or a verb the Greek word translated teach appears in the Bible 268 times which indicates something of its importance.

The word "sound" is a translation of the Greek verb "hugiaino" which is defined by Abbott-Smith in his lexicon "to be sound, healthy, in good health." In the LXX it is the word used to

translate the Hebrew word “shalom” which means “peace.” The Greek noun is “hugies” and means “sound, whole, healthy.” The alternate translation given in the footnote in the American Revised Version is “healthful” or “healthy.” “Sound” referring to doctrine occurs 17 times in the Bible. We may summarize by saying that “sound doctrine” is “teaching, instruction, doctrine that is healthy or whole.”

What does sound doctrine include?

It includes the whole Bible, being rightly divided, from Genesis 1:1 through Revelation 22:21. It is to take the Bible as it is without adding to it or taking from it. I desire to state briefly what sound doctrine includes under five heads. They are:

- (a) Belief in the existence, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of God. Ps. 14:1; 139:7-10.
- (b) Belief that God has revealed Himself in divers portions and in divers manners unto the fathers through the prophets but now has revealed himself through His son (Heb. 1:1, 2) and that these revelations are given unto us through the pages of His inspired word—the Bible—which furnishes us completely unto every good work. II Tim. 3:16, 17.
- (c) Belief that faith, repentance, confession, and immersion in water for the remission of sins are essential for one to be saved. Heb. 11:6; Luke 13:5; Acts 8:37; Acts 2:38.
- (d) Belief that the church revealed in the New Testament is the only church in which there is salvation and that one must live the Christian life and worship God as it is written in order to be saved, in this life and in the world to come.
- (e) Belief in the personal second coming of Christ to deliver up the Kingdom over which he will have been reigning since Pentecost (I Cor. 15:24) unto God, to judge the world, to receive the righteous unto Himself where they will be with him in heaven forever, and to send the disobedient into an eternal hell where they will be punished. (Matt. 25:31-46)

There are many other matters of faith and teaching which could easily be included under sound doctrine but the foregoing are rather comprehensive. It should be stated again that for

teaching to be sound it must be *healthy* and to be so it must be *well balanced*. A good meal is one that is well balanced with salad, meat, vegetables, drink, and dessert. A well balanced gospel is one that has Christian evidences, how to become a Christian, how to live the Christian life, and the hopes and realities of the here-after.

There is a special sense in which “sound” doctrine is used in the church referring to some of the distinctive teachings of the Bible against the teachings of men on religious matters such as New Testament worship as opposed to vain or will worship, New Testament Christianity as opposed to sectarianism, etc. This meaning of the word “sound” is in the Bible. It occurs twice in Timothy (I Tim. 1:3-10; II Tim. 4:3) and once in Titus, 1:9-14; with the strong command for Timothy and Titus, as evangelists and preachers of the gospel, to teach against false doctrines and to guard the faith. It is true that Paul’s charge referred primarily to the gnosticism and Judaism of his day but the application must be made to any false doctrine today. In I Tim. 1:10, after listing a number of things for Timothy to teach against, he concludes, “and if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine,” which today would include modernism, premillennialism, denominationalism, and all isms and error.

What does sound doctrine exclude?

We have just learned what sound doctrine includes. What does it exclude? Preaching one part of the Bible to where it becomes a hobby. For example, one cup, anti-Sunday school, anti-college and anti everything except ante-up. A friend of mine who at one time lived in Oklahoma told me that back in the days when the college was an issue that in one Oklahoma town a certain brother would meet all the trains and if a member of the church got off, he would ask him: “Are you fur or agin the College?” The story is told of a certain preacher who every time he preached for six months preached on baptism. The elders of the church asked him to preach on something else. He promised and the next Sunday, he preached on the first chapter of Genesis and when he came to verse six where God said: “Let the waters be

gathered together unto one place” he exclaimed! “That reminds me of my subject: ‘Baptism!’” Preaching on baptism to the entire exclusion of other Bible teachings, makes the teaching situation unsound because it is not sound, healthy, and whole to teach baptism to the complete neglect of other Bible teachings. Preaching on grace to the exclusion of work makes teaching on grace unsound and the same can be said for the preaching of faith to the exclusion of baptism. To have sound doctrine when it comes to the plan of salvation from past sins, faith, repentance, confession, immersion in water for the remission of sins as expressions of the grace of God for sinful men must be preached. Let me remind you again that the Greek word “hugies” means “sound, whole, healthy.”

All Bible subjects are to be preached on and all Bible teaching on any given topic is to be used in discussing any subject or we may become unbalanced and unsound and be in the class of hobby riders. It should be stated that there are places and times when certain Bible teaching needs to be emphasized. For example, preachers of the gospel have *rightly* stressed the Bible teaching on baptism because denominational preachers have not done it. Another example, there may be certain conditions in a church which will call for strong, emphasized teaching on certain aspects of Christian living. Whatever is the special need or crisis, it must be met as illustrated by every New Testament letter which was written to meet specific needs.

The Church and Sound Doctrine

1. The church is to teach positively. Matt. 28:19; Eph. 3:10. The church is to give what the Bible says on every topic such as Christian evidences, the plan of salvation, the church, the Christian life and worship, and the hereafter, Paul commanded Titus: “Holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching that he doctrine and to convict the gainsayers” may be able both to exhort in the sound (Titus 1:9) and “But speak thou the things which befit the sound doctrine.” (Titus 2:1) This must be done by the church of our Lord in every generation.

2. The church is to teach negatively. (II Tim. 4:1-4) Not only is

the church to teach the evidences of the Christian religion, the plan of salvation, the New Testament church, the Christian life, and the hereafter, but she must point out the false teaching of agnostics and skeptics, denominationalists and brethren who are in error and who are teaching false doctrine, even to the point, when needed, of calling names as did Paul when he called the name of Hymenaeus and Alexander (I Tim. 1:19, 20) and Alexander, the coppersmith. (II Tim. 4:14) The Church must, also, after a second or third admonition, withdraw from those who teach contrary to the doctrine taught in the Bible. (Titus 3:10; Romans 16:17)

One can talk about undenominational Christianity and it be understood as inter-denominational. A preacher can preach on the plan of salvation and it not be clearly understood that baptism is essential to salvation. One can talk about the second coming of Christ and what shall occur when He comes and his auditor not be taught out of his premillennialism. One can preach in such a way concerning the church that those who hear may not know the difference between denominationalism and the church of the New Testament. In all these matters the church must not only preach the Bible but must point out error and refute it. The good farmer clears the land, cleans out the fence corners before sowing the seed; so the gospel preacher often has to do the same for human hearts before the gospel of the kingdom will find lodgment.

3. “The Church and Sound Doctrine”—the theme of the lectureship.

The purpose of those who planned the lectureship of this week at Pepperdine College was to have presented a whole, healthy, and well-rounded program on “the Church and Sound Doctrine” with emphasis on sound doctrine, from Christian evidences to the hereafter, with each speaker being given full freedom to present his subject as he would like within the limits of Scripture. I believe that we have such a program and that all of you and others to come, are looking forward, as I am, to each meeting and to each speaker.

IMPERATIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN WAY

HUGH M. TINER

No sincere Christian will question the need for sound doctrine, since doctrine is the basis of all thoughts, words, and actions. True Christian living is closely related to sound doctrine. One cannot live right unless his doctrine is right. It is indispensable for Christians continually to check up on their doctrine, the basis of all their living. It is also necessary for Christians diligently to check up on their living, because one's doctrine, regardless of how sound it is, does not necessarily guarantee sound living. There has always been great need for men to evaluate their lives from the standpoint of their doctrine, as well as the effect of their doctrine on their thoughts, words, attitudes and actions.

In this message it is assumed; first, that sound doctrine is indispensable to sound living, second, that unsound teaching and living are an abomination to the Lord, and third, that the perpetuation of the Christian way or the true church of Christ depends on emphasizing certain imperatives all of which relate directly to the matter of sound doctrine.

The movement to restore New Testament Christianity in the world today is a most significant and challenging one; but it is likewise fraught with dangers from without and within. It appears that the greatest danger is over-crystallization. It is most difficult to keep any movement, regardless of how dynamic and virile it once was, from degenerating into sectarianism— either in spirit or doctrine or both.

The spirit of restoring and seeking after truth is not peculiar to the nineteenth, twenties, or any other century. It is the fundamental spirit which Jesus emphasized so diligently.

In each generation—as a matter of fact in continuous process—there needs to be a restudying, rethinking, restating, reevaluation of and rededication to the Christian Way of Life. This process of continuous restoration will assure: (1) a dynamic and virile, rather than a static concept of truth and of the church; (2) a church as free as possible from the dangers of slavishly following

uninspired customs and traditions of those who have gone on before; (3) a spirit of enthusiasm and zeal which is characteristic of the pioneer of a movement who has a dynamic message he wants all to hear.

If this great movement to restore New Testament Christianity in the world today is to succeed as it should, we must keep clearly before us several emphases which are absolute imperatives. In addition to faithful adherence to New Testament doctrine, which includes faith, repentance, confession, baptism and the Lord's Supper, there are several vital imperatives which are of great importance. A few of these imperatives of the Christian Way will be discussed briefly.

1. *The first imperative is: a greater love for the truth.* It is not enough to be vitally interested in what someone has said about the truth, or in some logically arranged sermon outline which looks as if it might serve as a good oration or debate. Our love must be for the truth as revealed in the Scriptures. Such a love is a fundamental attitude of a true Christian. Numerous scriptures enjoin upon Christians the obligation to love truth, to seek truth, to follow the truth, and make it a part of their lives.

One fundamental attitude of mind which we as learners must maintain is the realization that God's truth even though revealed for us and being perfect, is not thoroughly understood by anyone, but that we must all be seekers after and learners of the truth. When one develops the belief that God's truth is simple, that the most finite mind can readily and fully comprehend all of it, and that every Christian knows all about the truth, his respect for truth diminishes and he cannot love truth as he should.

The Christian studies diligently that he may come to a clearer knowledge of the truth, realizing all the while that there are depths which he will never be able to fathom. He loves truth, because to him it is vital, dynamic, living, and virile. It is something closely related to his present living, and not just something argued over by his predecessors. Our Lord pronounces quite a condemnation upon those who accept the truth and who use it, but have no love for it.

It is not enough merely to contend intellectually for sound doctrine. Much depends on one's attitude toward this truth. A Christian possesses a threefold attitude toward truth; a zeal for knowing the truth, the courage to face the truth; and the wisdom to be guided by the truth.

The Christian loves sound doctrine and hates false teaching. There is great need for this spirit in the religious world today.

II. *A second imperative of the Christian Way is: a deep and abiding concern for humanity.* From the outset it might seem that all men, innately, have great concern for humanity, but this is not true. Even those who have called themselves Christians have not always been as interested in the welfare of humanity as they should be. Doctrinal soundness and concern for others do not always go hand in hand. The fact was beautifully illustrated by Jesus in Luke 10.

The movement to restore New Testament Christianity in the world today will not get far if we do not relate the Gospel message to the needs of humanity. The Gospel, as powerful as it is when it comes into contact with proper material, is dead and static in a vacuum. Vague generalities and platitudes will never have much effect on a practical world.

The true and final test of the genuineness of one's religion is the relationship between truth or doctrine and practice or contributing to the welfare of humanity. Matthew 25 pictures the judgment scene, and gives the real crux of the judgment in Christ's own words. The judgment was spelled out in terms of helping humanity, feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, and visiting those who are sick or in prison.

The creeds of the Scribes and Pharisees were beautiful and high sounding but they didn't make better people out of their devotees. This imperative involves the Christian attitude toward all men of all conditions, races, color, and relationships.

(1) *First, we need greater concern for one another.* Christians are to "love each other," to be tenderly affectioned one to another," and to be humble, "in honor preferring one another." In this world of sin and tribulation each needs very much the help and

encouragement of the other. *Jesus said that* people would know of the genuineness of our movement throughout “unfeigned love of the brethren.” He said, “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if you have love one for another.”

(2) *Second, we need concern for those who are not measuring up to the tenets of the New Testament.* We find sectarianism, denominationalism, and all kinds of religious error in so called Christendom. We need to be concerned enough to help them. There are thousands who are dissatisfied with the narrowness and bigotry of denominationalism. The Christian Way as revealed in the New Testament, emphasizing undenominational Christianity, will appeal to them.

(3) *Third, we must have a burning zeal for humanity all over the world.* We need to accompany this vision with a sense of evangelistic mission and a sense of urgency.

We need somehow to catch this sense of urgency and evangelistic mission if our movement to restore New Testament Christianity is to be perpetuated as a virile and dynamic one— else it will degenerate as all movements eventually do into a narrow and bigoted formalism. God forbid that we should go in that direction. It means death and destruction, not only for ourselves, but for all those who “know not God” and have “obeyed not the Gospel.”

III. *A third imperative is: a restoration and maintenance of the sources of spiritual power which characterized the church in the beginning.* Our churches degenerate into merely social organisms, interested primarily in beautiful and pleasing church buildings and surroundings and in having socially good times, if we are not careful.

What was the secret of the spiritual power of the Church in Jerusalem? With all its human faults and failures, it was successful in winning souls to Christ. The Christian Way progressed at a rapid rate. What was the secret?

The New Testament states that “They continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in breaking of bread and the prayers. (Acts 2:42)

The spiritual power of the early church was due to four Chris-

tian acts on the part of individual Christians:

(1) First, "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching." This teaching made them Christians and kept them Christians, even though they were not called Christians at this time. This teaching kept "their spirits fresh, their consciences sensitized, their hearts aglow with the remembrance of the teaching and redeeming work of their Great Friend and Lord." It produced a vigor and vitality in their living.

(2) Second, "they continued steadfastly in fellowship." Their fellowship was sincere and heartfelt. Their relations together impressed the observing world by their love for one another.

(3) Third, in their worship there was fellowship. They were companions of the Lord, breaking the bread and taking the cup each Lord's Day in remembrance of Him whose love and forgiveness and grace had been vouchsafed then.

(4) Fourth, they had their regular and their special seasons of prayer in which guidance and insight and power from on high became theirs. And it was out of this warm, glowing experience at the center of their lives that they grew to know more of the Christian Way and that their evangelistic fervor developed.

The result of the development of their spiritual power was that "the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."

If we can emulate the example of those early Christians in "loving one another," in their devotion to Christ, in praying to Him "without ceasing," we can today revitalize the Christian Way and we can encourage many people to accept Christ's way of salvation and life.

Let us all be challenged to implement these imperatives of the Christian Way. Let us more earnestly and sincerely "contend for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints," while at the same time give serious thought to the matter of Christian living, realizing in the words of James that "he knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin." (Jas. 4:17.) Let us continually check up on our lives with regard to these imperatives of the Christian way: a greater love for the truth, a deep and abiding

concern for humanity, and a restoration and maintenance of the sources of spiritual power which characterized the church in the beginning.

SOME CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS

E. V. PULLIAS

Those of us who are actively engaged in religious work or who have close contact with religious people are often unaware of the main currents of thought in our time. Engrossed in our work and constantly associated with people of like mind, we conclude that all people think essentially as we do. This conclusion prejudices our minds and oftentimes causes us to make false judgments. Although as a result of two world wars there appears to have been an increased interest in matters of faith, the deeper and wider evidence seems to indicate that religious faith is at a very low ebb in modern times.

Reliable observers from the European nations report that the churches are tragically empty and that rank disbelief in religious fundamentals is alarmingly common. It is difficult to know just how many people in a country like the United States still hold to the basic Christian truths, but probably a much larger number of people than we like to imagine no longer believe what we as Christians hold to be eternal and essential truth.

As a result of this world wide situation, I believe that Christian people everywhere should make a systematic effort to strengthen and deepen faith in the Christian fundamentals. This effort should be applied first to the nominal believers—that is, to those who have their names on church rolls and attend formal services with a degree of regularity, and then it should be applied to the wider audience of the general community.

If we should attempt a program of emphasizing these fundamentals, what would we emphasize? The following list may not be all inclusive but certainly these things would be included:

1. God exists. Reliable evidence indicates that an increasing number of people simply do not believe that God exists. They have been influenced by the materialistic attitude toward the world and the universe which has been prevalent and prominent for upward of three hundred years. They thus have come to conceive of the universe as a cold, purposeless machine without di-

rection or meaning. An individual who bases his life on this material faith will naturally seek material gain for himself in this life. He will measure his and other people's success in terms of his ability to secure, enjoy and hold things. A godless world is inevitably a cruel, blind, harsh world.

2. God is a person in whose spiritual image all men are made. There is probably nothing more fundamental in the Christian faith than our belief that we as human beings of all races and climes are offspring of a spiritual person who is the living God. This fact makes possible our relationship with God as sons and daughters. It dignifies and makes of great worth every individual man and woman the world over. Believing that this living God who is a person has great and eternal purposes in this world and in the universe gives meaning and direction to life. Our spirits being a part of this great person are restless, fearful—in a word, lost—until they find their peace in the Living God.

3. The nature and will of God is expressed through Jesus, the Christ. This fundamental fact means that it was impossible for us to know God except as he has been incarnated and thus revealed to us through the living Word which became flesh and dwelt among us. If then it is man's eternal need to be in harmony with the will of God, the Gospel of Christ, which through the life and teachings of Jesus offers a way for this union, becomes the satisfier of man's most ultimate and important needs. To know and live the will of God is the central need and purpose of man in the world and the central Gospel fact that Jesus reveals this will to man is all important to his earthly and eternal welfare.

The New Testament is an adequate and accurate account of Christ's life and teaching. The third Christian fundamental which we have mentioned —namely, that we learn about God through the incarnate Word, would be relatively meaningless for practical salvation if we did not have the inspired written word which gives us an account of God made manifest through the living Word. With a dependable and accurate account provided as it is in the New Testament the Christian soul has a permanent, unerring guide in its search for harmony with God. The nature of God ex-

pressed through Jesus' life and teachings is thus forever made available in simple, understandable language to men and women everywhere.

It is of prime importance that this will of God be respected and followed closely in regard to all things pertaining to the welfare of men's souls. The Scriptures are God's inspired word; they are, to the Christian, the final authority. Man's will should never be substituted for this divine will. Any teaching, therefore, that is contrary to God's will is extremely serious in God's sight. There are many scriptures bearing on the seriousness of false teaching, but the following one from Galatians will be sufficient to quote at this time: Gal. 1:6-8:

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

Time does not permit even a survey of the teachings of the New Testament, but there are certain general areas of teaching where drifting has often occurred. These should be emphasized in speaking of the fundamentals of our faith.

(a) The lost condition of man, immediately and eternally, outside of Christ; (b) the nature of primary obedience as described and illustrated in Acts: faith, repentance, confession, and baptism. These are cornerstones which must never be neglected; (c) the will of God concerning church organization and public worship. In any generation there is great tendency to drift away from God's will on these points. It was chiefly here that the great schism that became the Catholic Church occurred; (d) the great demand for purity and righteousness of life which appears throughout the New Testament.

My point is simply this—in all religious matters we should follow the teachings of the New Testament. It is a fundamental of our faith that it matters little what you believe or I believe, what

this generation or the last held to be true, but everything depends on our knowing and obeying the will of God as expressed through the Christ and given to us in the New Testament. It is fundamental that every Christian, every congregation, every generation study with all diligence the inspired word of God to the end that they may obey it completely and fully.

5. The nature of God in its deepest essence is love—the bond of unity and of perfection. We all remember that when the Apostle John came to the climax of his description of the nature and will of God, he gave the brief and all inclusive definition when he said, “God is love.” It was this love that prompted the infinite living God to pour out himself in the living word, Jesus Christ. It was this love that was the moving power in the life of Jesus while he was upon the earth. From the earliest days of his ministry through to the giving of the Great Commission and the ascension this deep, abiding concern for the welfare of the souls of men and women characterized every act and word of Jesus. This central theme is found in his sermons, in his prayer before the crucifixion, in his intimate talk with the disciples—indeed, everywhere in his life. The spirit of the Christ—the spirit of love and good will—can and does transform the world when it is manifested in the words and actions of the disciples of the Master. It was not an accident that the Holy Spirit in the New Testament guided writers to say, “And above all put on love.”

6. The deepest and most important needs of man are fulfilled when man’s spirit is in harmony with its true Father—that is, the living God. The turmoil of the troubled world now and throughout the weary centuries that have passed can be attributed to man’s blind attempt to satisfy his needs apart from God. The unnecessary fervor which is modern living rising steadily in speed and intensity threatens the very existence of mankind. This great uneasiness, this overwhelming tendency to struggle after meaningless goals can be adequately explained only by the truth that man unguided seeks things that do not satisfy, or if they satisfy at all, merely give temporary relief. Modern man—indeed, man of every age—has deep hungers of the soul which can be satisfied only

thru spiritual food and drink, but they desperately seek to satisfy this uneasiness of soul by striving after passing material things.

7. Individual men and women thru Christ who is their brotherly and eternal high priest can be well pleasing in the sight of God. Many religions have sought to deny this direct approach to God and have established hierarchies of priests through which common man must go to know God and be well pleasing to him. It is fundamental to our faith that every individual can come to God without any further help whatever except Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament.

These, in my judgment, are some of the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. It is these truths that have sustained and supported Christians for more than nineteen centuries. These fundamental faiths should be the foundation of the teaching program of every true church. As the springs of faith dry up in the hearts and lives men and women the world over, we as Christians should strive anew and with greater energy and vision to proclaim and live the fundamentals of our faith.

CONVERSION OF SAUL OF TARSUS

FRANK PACK

The conversion of Saul is recorded three times in the Book of Acts, once in the language of Luke in chapter 9, and twice in the language of Paul in chapters 22 and 26. Saul was born in Tarsus, one of the leading cities of the East, at one of the strategic places of the ancient world. The city had long been a center of trade and commerce between Mesopotamia and Syria to the south and the Aegean coast lands to the west, for it stood guard over the famous pass through the high Taurus Mountains known as the "Cilician Gates." In Saul's day it was also a center of ancient learning and philosophy, rating in importance second only to Athens and Alexandria as a university center. How much the Greek learning of his native city influenced the young Jew we may not be able accurately to tell, for he was brought up in the strictest manner, and as a young man sent off to Jerusalem to be taught at the feet of Gamaliel according to the law of his fathers. Saul was a Pharisee he tells us, and a strict one at that. His tribe was that of Benjamin, and he could boast to the Philippians that he was a "Hebrew of the Hebrews." (Phil. 3:5.) He was earnestly seeking the righteousness of God through the keeping of the law, and was as sincere as any man could possibly be.

There is no evidence that Saul ever saw our Lord during his earthly ministry, but on the contrary the evidence indicates that he had come to Jerusalem as a young student after the days of Jesus' public ministry. He was soon confronted as a young and zealous Jew with a rising church, made up at first entirely of his own fellow-countrymen, proclaiming against the traditions and teachings of the priests and Jewish sects that one Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah. This Jesus had been God-approved by his mighty works and words, and had been crucified and slain by the Jewish people themselves in their ignorance. He had been resurrected from the dead and had commanded that repentance and salvation should be preached by his authority. Saul keenly felt that this group must be stamped out at

all costs, for he said years afterward before King Agrippa, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. And this I also did in Jerusalem." (Acts 26:9.) No doubt Saul came into contact with some of the most powerful preachers of "the Way," probably Stephen among others, since Acts records that Stephen's major argumentation was done in the synagogues of the Cilicians and Alexandrians and other Grecian Jews. Saul had no doubt felt the force of his oratory, the weight of his argument as he took the Old Testament and set up his case that Jesus fulfilled the prophecies of the Messiah. Saul couldn't stop his argument, nor stay the force of Stephen's preaching. It isn't strange therefore to find that the first mention of Saul in the Book of Acts is as the garment holder at the stoning of Stephen, the first martyr of the cause of Christ. If the gospel couldn't be stopped by argument, it could be stopped by killing the proclaimed of it.

This was the spark that lighted the torch of persecution against the church, and it was Saul that was the torch-bearer. "But Saul laid waste the church, entering into every house, and dragging men and women committed them to prison." (Acts 8:3.) No one approached this task with more zeal than he, and when later he was converted the entire persecution collapsed.

Teacher and pupil had evidently parted company somewhere in Saul's student years, for he had come to Jerusalem to study with Gamaliel. But Gamaliel was the one member of the Sanhedrin that had vigorously argued to prevent any persecution from arising. He had said that if the Christians or disciples as they were then called were of God the Jews would be found fighting against God, but if their message came from man, then it would come to nothing of itself. While some were persuaded by his argument, his own pupil Saul was in entire disagreement with him, and no doubt there was a complete break between them. Saul's whole attitude was diametrically opposed to that of Gamaliel.

Saul's methods of persecution were those of a police state, for he searched, he entered houses, he imprisoned, he scourged publicly. Not only did Jerusalem feel the fury of his wrath, but even

the surrounding territory felt it. Finally he desired to have letters of authority from the chief priests of Jerusalem empowering him to search out and arrest the disciples in Damascus and bring them back to Jerusalem for trial and punishment. This journey was the fateful journey on which the persecutor met the persecuted Christ and was overcome.

It should be noted in passing that we have for our study a man who was intensely religious, following his faith, the faith of his fathers with fanatical tenacity. He was an utterly sincere man, believing that his course was right and that he must protect Judaism from the inroads of the early Christians. He not only thought he ought to do these things, *he did them*. Saul was not one to think that a thing should be done, but lacked the courage to actually follow through with it. Yet regardless of how sincere and honest he was, or how religious and devoted to his father's faith he was, he was dead wrong and fighting against God. In the face of the present day idea that seems so prevalent in the thinking of people that regardless of what one believes it is all right just so he is sincere, the case of Saul comes as a refreshing warning. Beliefs do matter. They matter in every realm of life, how much more in religion. We don't think that it is all right for a sincere Communist, who really believes he is right to follow his creed, and argue that because he is sincere it makes no difference what he believes. We spent a considerable portion of our natural resources and manpower to overcome nations dominated by false ways of life, because we believe it does make a difference what a man believes. The man who thinks he is right, but is wrong may be ever so sincere and be all the more dangerous because of his sincerity. Saul was as honest as any man ever gets to be about religion, but just as dead wrong. Never let any one deceive you into thinking that it doesn't matter what one believes just so he is sincere about it. No greater deception ever lulled men of good will into lethargy than this one!

Gathering his company together and armed with letters of authority, Saul set out on the road that led northeastward to Damascus. About midday as they travelled a bright light shone

around them above the brightness of the noonday sun, and as they fell to the ground they heard a voice speaking, although its words were distinct only to Saul himself. This voice called out, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." And Saul asked, "Who art thou Lord?" and He said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." His next question was, "What wilt thou have me to do Lord?" And the reply from heaven said, "Arise, go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee all things which are appointed for thee to do."

It was a blinded Saul that arose groping for guidance and was led into the city of Damascus into the street called Straight for lodging. He had seen the Lord Jesus in all of His blinding glory, his eyes were so blinded by the light of His presence that he could not find his way without help. He had come to realize in all of its crushing weight the fact that Gamaliel had been right, and he had been fighting God. For a man as sincere and as earnestly trying to follow God's will as Saul, this was a tremendous blow. All that he had worked for and stood for must now be left if he would be true to the heavenly vision. Three long days were spent in fasting and in prayer. All desire for food fled, and earnestly praying for God's direction in his search for salvation, he prayed contritely and humbly. Probably no greater example of repentance is found in the New Testament than this incident from the life of Paul.

Then Ananias, one of the disciples of Damascus came guided by the Spirit to Saul's house, and stood before him and said, "Brother Saul receive thy sight." And there fell part like scales from his eyes, and his sight returned. Then explaining to him the reason for the Lord's appearance to him in the way, he said, "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord."

Here was a man who had seen the Lord and had talked with him in a conversation that was meaningful. He had been blinded by his glory and had spent a period in fasting and prayer. Nothing about this was a sham experience, it was all genuine and true. Yet talking with Jesus did not save his soul, nor did seeing Jesus in this great manifestation of divine glory save Saul. It turned him in the

right direction by making him stop and consider his course and realize that he was fighting against God's way, but it did not save his soul. I have met individuals who say they have had conversations with the Lord and that He spoke peace to their souls. But I'm wondering if He did for them what He wouldn't do even for Saul. Is God a respecter of Persons? Did He have one procedure with Saul and another for persons in our day? Here was a man who had seen the Lord and had talked with Him, had spent three days in prayer and fasting, yet was still in his sins. He was commanded to arise, and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Only when he had done what God commanded was the promise his to claim.

God didn't make any exception in the case of Saul, for Saul had to do what every person in New Testament times was called upon to do, namely to obey the gospel by being baptized for the remission of their sins, having already believed on Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the Living God, and sincerely repented of their sins.

Saul didn't quibble about the command, he did just what God commanded, and having been baptized he took food for his body and was strengthened from his fast. Joy was in his heart in his new found faith and he began immediately to proclaim his new gospel among the people.

Saul's faith was grounded upon his vision of Jesus and his conversation with Him, his penitence was shown in his fasting and prayer for three days and nights waiting for further instructions, and his complete obedience through baptism washed away his sins and placed him in union with Christ. He could later say, "Wherefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature: The old things are passed away and all things are become new." (2 Cor. 5:17.)

One can become a Christian today just in the same manner as Saul did. The vision of Saul enabled him to become Christ's apostle as an eyewitness of the risen Lord. But the obedience was just the same as with us. Regardless of whatever the vision that any person may say he has had from God, this does not remove the

force of Jesus' commands to us, as it did not in Paul's case. If one states that in such a vision God has told him something other than what He has commanded men in His word, I know that the vision cannot be genuine, for God cannot lie, nor does He change His will to suit the whims of men or women.

THE DEITY OF JESUS

R. G. WILBURN

My purpose in this article is twofold: (1) to show the absolutely central position which a belief in the deity of Jesus occupies in the Christian religion and (2) to set forth four basic meanings of this fundamental belief.

It has often been said, rightly, that the vital center of the Christian religion is the unique personality of Jesus. Indeed, Christianity is essentially distinguished from all other religions by the fact that everything in it is related to the redemption wrought by Christ. Everything is made to turn finally upon our relation to God thru His only begotten Son, for it is God's plan "that in everything he might be pre-eminent" (Col. 1:18).

Christianity's negative reaction, therefore, to the biblical criticism of Modernism is well founded. If one reads carefully and critically the many "lives" of Jesus which have been produced since David Friedrich Strauss published his *Life of Jesus* in 1835, he can scarcely avoid the feeling that the reason for the colorful variety of concepts of Jesus in this literature of modernism lies in the fact that each writer was endowed with a fertile imagination and biased by certain philosophical assumptions at the outset. To be sure, they all claimed to be "scientific". In seeking to go behind "the Christ of faith" to "the Jesus of history," they believed that they were pioneering in an impartial and objective study of historical facts. It is of the utmost significance, however, that each author found buried in the gospel history *just the kind of Jesus* which his own personal faith or religion would lead him to find. The biblical pronouncement "according to your faith be it unto you" is peculiarly descriptive of these labors.

During the 19th century the science of history bogged down in the philosophy of rationalistic naturalism. The ruling tendency was to abandon the writing of literary history, such as that of Carlyle and Macaulay, and to develop a "scientific history," i.e., reduce the study of history to a pure fact-finding discipline. The historian's task is not one of interpretation, it was argued, but just a

bare piling up of facts. Be objective; be disinterested, be scientific!

We of the 20th century, however, believe that we are gaining a clearer understanding of the nature of history than that under which the “scientific” historians of the 19th century were laboring. It is now being clearly perceived and widely recognized that these “scientific” historians were laboring under a delusion. They were attempting to achieve an impossible kind or degree of objectivity and which, if possible, would be of no value. Such complete disinterestedness is impossible even in the first step of the scientific task, namely the *selection* of data. History presents the student with an infinite mass of data, and the historian proceeds to select certain data from among the mass. But on what basis is the selection made? The historian *judges* that events A, B, and C are relevant and significant and that events P, Q, and R are not. Is this scientific objectivity? From whence does the historian derive the measuring stick *by which he judges* certain facts to be relevant and significant, and others to be insignificant? Not from the facts themselves, obviously; they are plain, bare facts, and as facts they are all of equal significance.

But again, when the historian proceeds to *classify* his data, some principle of classification must be adopted. Bare facts do not fall into classes of themselves. And, of course, in *writing history* the historian offers an interpretation of the significance or meaning of the data of investigation. Otherwise his accomplishment remains meaningless. Thus in selecting, classifying, and interpreting his data, the historian’s personal attitude, values, and philosophy of life or religion are involved as determinative principles in the study of history.

In our day these two aspects of the historian’s task are being generally recognized: (a) the hard grind of collecting facts, and (b) the interpretation of their meaning. Consequently, it is being clearly recognized today that the Christian view of history which involves faith as a basic principle of interpretation is really just as *objective* and *scientific* as any other way of interpreting history. For the Christian view is fashioned out of the solid fact of Jesus Christ—his life, death, burial, and resurrection—plus the spiritual

meaning of this event as construed by the Apostolic Witness of the New Testament. That Christ died, for example, is a fact. That he died “for our sins according to the Scriptures” is the spiritual meaning or truth of this fact.

We hold, therefore, that one should either believe in *the whole Christ* according to the New Testament, or reject the Christian point of view entirely. The real alternative to the Jesus of the New Testament faith is not “the Jesus” of Strauss, “the Jesus” of Ferdinand Bauer or “the Jesus” of Rudolf Bultmann. These and other modernistic pictures of Jesus were the products of historical imagination and peculiar philosophical assumptions. As Alan Richardson well says, “The alternative to the Gospel portrait of the Jesus who showed His power in mighty acts of mercy... is not—as liberal Protestants supposed—a picture of Jesus as the good man who taught a lofty ethical ideal and died for it, the greatest perhaps of the prophets and a sublime religious genius: the alternative is historical skepticism about Him” (*Christian Apologetics*, p. 171). The logic of the liberal interpretation of the Jesus of history leads inevitably to a hopeless skepticism.

For our part we boldly cling to our faith in *the whole Christ* of the New Testament. We believe with John that “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us...” (II Cor. 5:19). We believe in the deity of Jesus or, as the Nicean church fathers expressed it, “in one Lord Jesus Christ the son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, that is from the substance of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God... of one substance with the Father...” We believe in *the Whole Christ*.

As soon as we begin to ponder this dynamic center of our faith, however, we become aware of the vastness of the scope of our theme. The deity of Jesus is relevant to every single phase of the Christian religion for it is indeed the absolute center. I wish here only to set forth four basic meanings or truths about the deity of our Lord.

(1) That God was incarnate in Jesus means, first of all, “revelation”: a unique and supreme self-disclosure of God.

The incarnation means that in the personality of Jesus, God has disclosed to man His infinite mercy, His fatherly care, His forgiving grace. “*God was in Christ*” said Paul. (II Cor. 5:19.) Christ is *himself*, therefore, a *revelation* of God’s goodness, and Christian faith is an experience in which one finds himself confronted by the Lord-ship and Deity of Christ and responds affirmatively to the call and the challenge of this divine confrontation.

It is important that we bear in mind the dynamic character of this revelation. The full revelation consists not merely in the fact that Jesus taught a new truth *about* God, extremely important though Jesus’ teaching certainly is. The revelation was not merely a formal message; it was the living Word of Christ himself. The verbal teaching was only part of it. “The Word became flesh and dwelt among us,” John writes, “and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only Begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth” (John 1:14). Jesus reminded Philip: “he that hath seen *me* hath seen the Father” (John 14:9). Again, he said: “I and the Father are one” (John 10:30). “Revelation” finds its full meaning, then, not merely in a formal message but ultimately in the *person* of our Lord himself, in the *deity of Jesus*.

Had a formal prophetic message been man’s only need, one who was no more than a prophet would have been adequate for the task. Something more than the spoken word was needed, therefore, to bring man into personal relationship with the infinite God. Hence, “God gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth *on him* should not perish, but have eternal life” (John 3:16). The *living Word, God himself* in human flesh appearing, the *actual presence of God* in the personality of a man was needed, one in whose very person man could see the “effulgence” of God’s glory and “the very image of his substance” (Hebrews 1:3).

We say, therefore, that the New Testament view of Jesus as a unique revelation of God consists chiefly in the fact of Christ’s de-

ity and in the *fact* that in *Christ* we actually find ourselves confronted by *God*. God has come very near to us in the person of His only Son. We are thus called of God and find ourselves standing in a face-to-face relation with Him, thru Christ. The deity of Jesus means first a supreme and unique revelation of God.

(2) That God became incarnate in Christ means, secondly, “illumination”: an inspiring demonstration of God's ideal for man.

The incarnation of God in Jesus means that God acted in history in a special way and gave man a demonstration of ideal humanity. God has here set before our very eyes a supreme exhibition of what love, good will, righteousness, and god-likeness mean in terms of human relations. The incarnation means that humanity at its highest and best, ideal humanity, is embodied concretely in a historic person. “For in him,” Paul says, “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9). Here at last appeared one “who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth” (I Peter 2:22), or “one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15).

Jesus *lived* God’s ideal for man before our very eyes, “taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross” (Phil. 2:7-8).

It is always a tragic loss when men forget the inspiring example of Jesus, because, as Peter says, Christ suffered for us leaving us an example that we should follow in his steps. (See I Peter 2:21-23). The tragic loss which results from forgetting this great New Testament truth about the divine-human Jesus may be illustrated by a tendency in Roman Catholicism, in which for the average member the value of Christ is concentrated in the Christ of the mass. The raising of this magic moment of the mass to a place of supreme dominance in Catholic piety dulls the warmth and obscures the beauty of the Jesus who walked and talked among men, who suffered and endured, who lived and died, showing us the Way.

If one had the task of teaching a child how to make the Letter

"A," and he were allowed to use only spoken words to do the job, he would find himself engaged in an extremely difficult task. But if, forgetting words, one had a blackboard and a piece of chalk and could *show the child how* to make an "A," its face would immediately brighten and the child would say "Oh, I see, I can do that."

There is something profoundly illuminating and inspiring about a person who steps out and *shows* the way by his example. In comparison with the power of a living example, words seem abstract and inadequate. As Emerson says, "Do not say things. What you are stands over you the while, and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary." How could the mere words even of an angelic messenger ever have done what God's Word, clothed in human flesh, has actually done by way of clarifying the human situation and showing the way? To Thomas' question "Lord... how can we know the way?" Jesus responded: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me" (John 14:5-6).

Here in the fields of time, God's eternal love has assumed human form and we see, we no longer argue about it, we see before our very eyes what God's love means in the dimension of human relations. We read our gospels and get the vision of a Christ praying for Peter's feeble faith, loving and blessing little children by the roadside, comforting Mary and Martha in their bereavement, forgiving a sinful woman, pointing the disciples to a pathway of humility by pronouncing justification upon the humble heart of the penitent Publican. In Jesus the eternal Spirit of the universe becomes incarnate in the form of a servant, washing the disciples' feet. The divine love at the heart of eternity is revealed in the suffering heart of the crucified Christ which met the executioners with a final prayer: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34).

What would Christianity be should we ever forget this supreme clarification of the nature of the good life. What incalculable loss for men never to know Jesus or, having known him, to forget the way of life which God so beautifully pictured through

him on the canvas of human flesh! As Dostoyevsky says, “Even those people who have attacked and renounced Christianity betray an inner awareness of the superiority of the Christian ideal, because in their zeal and ardour they have failed utterly to create a higher ideal of humanity than that portrayed by Christ. Each attempt to do so has resulted only in something grotesque” (Fyodor Dostoyevsky: *The Brothers Karamazov*, Part II, Box IV, Ch. I).

The deity of Jesus includes his humanity. The Jesus of the New Testament was born of a virgin (Luke 1:34-35), “born of a woman” (Galatians 4:4). He was a divinely originated portrayal of human life as God has always intended it. The deity of Jesus means “illumination.”

(3) That God became incarnate in Christ means also “atonement”: redemption from judgment under sin and reconciliation with God.

“God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto himself, not counting their trespasses against them...* (II Cor. 5:19). Paul’s description here of the saving work of Christ means that the deity of Christ is the means through which God posed and effected a solution to the predicament of man’s sin. Christ is “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29).

That Christ is a sacrifice for our sins is one of the most moving and valuable New Testament truths about the divine character of the event of “Jesus Christ and him crucified.” In the cross of Christ we are confronted by a divine sacrifice, for our sins. “Christ died *for our sins*, according to the Scriptures,” we read (I Cor. 15:3). Again, God freely bestowed His grace upon us, in the Beloved, Paul wrote. “In him we have redemption through his Blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace which he lavished upon us” (Eph. 1:6-7). And in the Roman letter the same Apostle wrote that “Since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith” (Rom. 3:23-25).

How then, we ask, can anyone who claims to be Christian de-

ny the vital and important biblical truth of divine judgment on human sin, since in the very sacrifice of Christ, God's judgment or man's sin is overcome by an act of God Himself, *in Christ*, the *divine* side of reality bearing the burden of suffering entailed by our sins and saving us from the tragic "wages" which we all had earned. Jesus Christ and him crucified means, then, an atonement for our sins. It means that the Father graciously forgives our sins, for Christ's sake, and reconciles us unto Himself, that is, re-establishes us in His grace and favor, and brings our hearts and lives into harmony with his eternal purpose of love for us.

(4) Finally, that God became incarnate in Christ means "inspiration": the accession of moral and spiritual power.

We do not fully understand the meaning of the incarnation until we see the power of God in it and experience that power through it. Christ is "the power of God," said Paul (I Cor. 1:24). Through the event of Jesus Christ the *power of God* entered the realm of our humanity to redeem and liberate the hearts of men from the tyranny of sin and wrong. As Jehovah "redeemed" Israel of old from the bondage of Egypt and from other oppressors (See Deut. 7:8 ; Is. 51:11), so He has acted mightily through Christ to redeem us from sin and death.

The New Testament teaches us to view the state of sinful man as one of ethical bondage. There is what Paul calls "a law" in one's members "warring against" the law of one's mind, and bringing one into "captivity under the law of sin" (Rom. 7:23). Sinful man, therefore, needs to be *delivered* "out of the body of this death" (Rom. 7:24). This deliverance or liberation is effected, Paul declares, "through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7:25).

This redemption reaches further, however, and saves us also from the law and from death. The law proved to be the occasion through which sin slew us, says Paul (Rom. 7:11). Indeed, he calls the law "the power of sin" (I Cor. 15:56), and sin is "the sting of death" (*Ibid*, vs. 56), "But thanks be to God," cries Paul, "who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 15:57). *Victory through Christ* is a keynote of the New Testament Gospel.

This victorious power is a fundamental part of the deity of Christ. Whatever else the message of Christ crucified and risen says, no word could excuse the oratory with which it declares that none of the evil powers of this world can destroy the kind of love and good will which moved Jesus to become obedient even unto death. We must never forget, of course, that Jesus *voluntarily* laid down his life. The decision was his to make. "No one taketh it away from me," he told his disciples, "but I lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (John 10:18).

The rulers of evil, to be sure, thought that they were putting an end to Jesus and his influence when they crucified him. But instead, it was only the beginning, and the end is not yet. Something of the majesty and the divine almightiness of God's working in Christ is seen in that Jesus was able to face and take upon himself all the suffering that an evil world could heap upon him and by bearing it in patient love, he triumphed over it and transformed what seemed to be the world's greatest tragedy into a luminous revelation of the non-defeatable power of God.

The Christian thus lives and grows in increasing likeness to Christ through the inspiring strength of this power. "I can do all things," wrote Paul, "in Him who strengthens me" (Phil. 4:13). To the same church he also wrote: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," but never forget that "it is *God who worketh in you both to will and to work*, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). With Paul, therefore, we too should possess the humility to "glory in our weakness, that *the power of Christ*" may rest upon us (II Cor. 12:9).

The incarnation of God in Christ means the accession of moral and spiritual power which helps us as we hear and humbly strive to heed "the upward call of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:14).

This is the fourfold meaning of the deity of Jesus, our Lord, which I would leave with the reader for further prayerful thought:

- (1) *Revelation*: a unique and supreme self-disclosure of God;
- (2) *Illumination*: an inspiring demonstration of God's ideal for man;
- (3) *Atonement*: redemption from judgment under sin and

reconciliation with the Father; and

(4) *Inspiration*: the accession of moral and spiritual power.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE

WADE RUBY

I should like to open this study concerning the inspiration of the Scripture by quoting from Charles H. Spurgeon:

The turning point of the battle between those who hold “the faith once delivered to the saints,” and their opponents, lies in the true and real inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. This is the Thermopylae of Christendom. If we have in the Word of God no infallible standard of truth, we are at sea without a compass, and no danger from rough weather without can be equal to this loss within. “If the foundations be removed, what can the righteous do?” and this is a foundation loss of the worst kind.

Spurgeon is indeed right. If we do not have the Word of God to light our path, there is no lamp to show our feet the way. If the Bible is not indeed the Word of God, then we have no certain source of direction; for surely it is not within us to direct our own steps.

As we begin this discussion of the inspiration of the scriptures, let us look at the word *inspiration* itself. *Inspiration* is a Latin word, meaning literally *breathe on* or *breathe-into*. The Greek word translated by the word *inspiration* is *theopneustos*. *Theopneustos* is a compound of *Theos*, meaning *God*, and *Pnew* meaning *to breathe*. *Theopneustos* is the word used in the famous passage in 2 Timothy 3:16. In that passage “Every scripture inspired of God” can be literally translated “Every scripture *God-breathed*” Thus the scriptures to which Paul refers are God-breathed writings, they are inspired of God.

First, I should like for us to examine the claims of the scriptures themselves. Familiar to us all is the statement of Peter: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of scriptures is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” That Peter is speaking of the written word is made clear by his use of *propheteia graphes*. This statement by Peter is the claim made in the New Testament for the inspiration of the Old Testament, particu-

larly of the prophetic utterances.

But what about the claim of the Old Testament itself. I present now a group of statements collected throughout the Old Testament: Repeatedly in the prophetic books and also in books chiefly historical appear the words, "The mouth of Jehovah hath spoken," or "Jehovah hath spoken." David declared, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." Repeatedly we are told that the word of the Lord came to Nathan, or Hosea, or Haggai." "And unto Moses, Jehovah said, Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak."

In the prayer in Acts 4, after Peter and John have been released from prison, the following words are used, "O Lord,... who by the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of our father David thy servant, didst say...." And in Acts 1, Peter, addressing the group awaiting the promise of the Holy Spirit, said: "Brethren, it was needful that the scripture should be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David concerning Judah..."

Thus we see that both the Old Testament and the New acclaim the inspiration of the Old Testament. The Old Testament is included in Paul's well known statement to Timothy: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

Turning now to the New Testament, we examine first of all the promises of inspiration made to the disciples by the Lord. When Jesus was ready to ascend to the Father, he said to the Apostles: "And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." And in Acts I He repeats: "But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the Earth."

Thus the disciples had the promise of the Spirit. But what was the gift of the spirit to accomplish with them? In the farewell address in the upper room Jesus said: "These things have I spoken

unto you, while yet abiding with you. But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.”

John 16:13 adds: “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come.”

Thus Christ explains the function of the Holy Spirit, as regards His effect upon and work with those inspired by Him. The Spirit was to deliver to men the Word of God, and these men were to commit that word to other men. And during the personal preaching and work of these men, the inspiration was to be so complete that they did not need to be greatly concerned about what they should say, for the words were to be given to them in the very hour.

And at this point we note that there is no reason to believe that when inspired men did their teaching through the written word they were any less under the direction and guidance of the Holy Spirit than when they spoke. No, the men both spoke and wrote under the inspiration of the Spirit of God. And what they wrote has become our infallible guide, thoroughly furnishing us unto every good work, making the man of God complete.

Now let us note the claims made by the apostle Paul concerning the source of his knowledge and teaching, concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in and through him as he taught. First, this very illuminating and convincing statement from I Corinthians 2:6-13:

“We speak wisdom, however, among them that are full-grown: yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, who are coming to nought: but we speak God’s wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory; which none of the rulers of this world hath known: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory: but as it is written, things which eye

saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words."

Thus Paul, like the apostles to whom the Lord promised the Comforter, received the truth of God "through the spirit." Concerning his inspiration Paul says further: "For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ."

In other passages Paul speaks of what he "received of the Lord," and of going "up by revelation." He speaks of preaching to the Corinthians the gospel which he "received."

There need be no detailed reference made here to Peter and James and John and other writers of the New Testament; for it is obvious that if God directed Paul, giving unto him the revelation of Jesus Christ and his word, there is no reason to think that Peter and John and the others did not enjoy the same direction and guidance through the Holy Spirit.

Finally, we come to the question of the *how* of inspiration, the method or manner of communication to the inspired writers. Concerning this problem I should like to present the following rather long quotation from Gaussen's book *Theopneustia*:

"The power then put forth on those men of God and of which they themselves were sensible only in very different degrees, has not been precisely defined to us. Nothing authorizes us to explain it. Scripture has never presented either its manner or its measure as an object of study.

What it offers to our faith is solely the inspiration of what they say—the divinity of the book they have written. In this respect it recognizes no difference among them. What they say, they tell us, is theopneustic: their book is from God. Whether they recite the mysteries of a past more ancient than the creation, or those of a future more remote than the coming again of the Son of man, or the eternal counsels of the Most High, or the secrets of man's heart, or the deep things of God—whether they describe their own emotions, or relate what they remember, or repeat contemporary narratives, or copy over genealogies, or make extracts from uninspired documents—their writing is inspired, their narratives are directed from above; it is always God who speaks, who relates, who ordains or reveals by their mouth, and who, in order to this, employs their personality in different measures: for “the Spirit of God has been upon them,” it is written, “and his word has been upon their tongue.” And though it be always the word of man, since they are always men who utter it, it is always, too, the word of God, seeing that it is God who superintends, employs, and guides them. They give their narratives, their doctrines, or their commands, “not with the words of man's wisdom, but with the words taught by the Holy Ghost;” and thus it is that God himself has not only put his seal to all these facts, and constituted himself the author of all these commands, and the revealer of all these truths, but that, further, he has caused them to be given to his Church in the order, and in the measure, and in the terms which he has deemed most suitable to his heavenly purpose.

“Were we asked, then, how this divine inspiration has been accomplished in the men of God, we should reply, that we do not know; that it does not behove us to know; and that it is in the same ignorance, and with a faith quite of the same kind, that we receive the doctrine of the new birth and sanctification of a soul by the Holy Ghost.”

Jesus himself indicated that there was to be the double witness of himself: the witness of the Holy Spirit and the witness of his disciples, what they had seen and heard. Note Jesus' words: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me: and ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."

And we have seen that at the ascension Jesus said, "But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Peter declared that he and others did not "follow cunningly devised fables," but that they were "eye-witnesses of his majesty." John also wrote that what they had heard and seen and beheld and handled concerning the word of life they declared unto men.

Yes, there is present both man and God in the process of speaking the word of God in apostolic times and in writing the word that future generations might know the word as it came from God. It is true that David records with lyric beauty and power his own experiences, but also, as David said, the Spirit of the Lord spake by him, and God's word was in his tongue. It is true that Paul spoke and wrote of his own experiences, as did Peter and John; Paul's own mental and emotional reactions are captured by the reader from Paul's words, but so also is the Spirit of God present. God's message comes through men, through their related experiences and through God's revelation to them. God speaks through Paul, and through Peter, and James, and John.

The presence and functioning of both man and God in the writing of God's word, with God always directing and inspiring, account for such matters as differences of vocabulary and of style, so very obvious in both Greek and translation. The man who writes is not a de-humanized, nonfunctioning automaton, with no personality or characteristics as he speaks or writes. This is quite obvious from even the most superficial reading of the various New Testament writers. But the presence of individual tempera-

ment or style does not at all invalidate the function of the Holy Spirit of God in guarding the truth of God, in protecting against false words or false statements, and in delivering what is to us, as it is indeed, the Word of God, living and active, power of God unto salvation.

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS AND MODERN DISBELIEF

R. G. WILBURN

Introduction

No aspect of the Christian religion is more essential to its innermost spirit than miracle. Yet strange to say, this is the one aspect which the modern mind finds it most difficult to accept. In this article we shall be concerned with the idea of miracle generally, and specifically with the miracles of Jesus as he is portrayed by the gospels of the New Testament and the early witnesses of the faith. This Jesus is one whose ministry was accompanied by divine attestations. He was “attested” to the people by God, as Peter says in his first sermon, “with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him...” (Acts 2:22).

(1) Definition of “miracle.”

It is important that we clarify what we mean by the word “miracle”. The word is frequently used loosely. The meaning of the Latin root word from which it is derived is of some help. The Latin is “miraculum” from “mirari,” to *wonder* at, and “mirus,” meaning *wonderful*. Our first definition, therefore is: an event which inspires *wonderment* or which arouses in one the feeling of awe. A miracle is a wonderful event, an event which fills the observer with a sense of wonder.

In this sense the starry heavens above and the moral law within are “miraculous,” for not only Immanuel Kant and the Psalmist of old but every sensitive soul is filled with increasing wonder and awe as he sees reflections of God’s glory throughout Nature. The geometrical design of the snowflake with angles always only 60° or 120°; the cells manufactured by the bees, constructed so as to hold the greatest amount of honey with the least expenditure of wax; the delicate balance between the centripetal and the centrifugal tendencies in the force of gravitation; the birth of a human being and the development of personality and mind—our universe is full of miracles. A mystery surrounds us on

every hand which inspires the soul with a sense of wonder.

The *entire universe* itself, in fact, is miraculous in this primary sense of the term, for the more science enables us to know about it, the greater our wonderment and awe. As our knowledge of nature increases, the world becomes more and not less miraculous. As Augustine has well said, all the miraculous things which happen in this world are not so miraculous as the universe itself, our whole heaven and earth and all that is in them; and all the miraculous things which man by his skill and science can work are not so great a miracle as is man himself (*De Civ. Dei*, Bk. X, Cr. XII).

We must refine our definition of “miracle” further, however, for when we characterize some of the deeds of Jesus as “miraculous,” we really mean something more than the fact that the performance of these deeds filled observers with a sense of wonder. We mean thereby also to distinguish them in a very important way from the “natural” deeds of men and even from the “natural” deeds of Jesus himself, such as his eating, drinking, walking, and working, as all men do.

In the more specific sense, Webster defines the word “miracle” as “a deviation from the known laws of nature” or “a divine interposition.” As C. S. Lewis puts it, a miracle is an event which, to be sure, is interlocked with the natural process, *in the forward direction*, just like any other event, but its peculiarity is that “it is not in that way interlocked backwards, interlocked with the previous history of Nature” (*Miracles*, p. 73).

Miracle in this more specific sense, however, is not an event, which happens contrary to all law whatsoever. It is not an event wholly without any cause. Such an event would be absolute nonsense. On the contrary, it is an event which occurs according to the operation of those laws or principles of God’s universe which are as yet unknown to us; i.e, a miracle is an unexplainable event, or, it is explainable only by reference to the direct interposition of God. As Augustine was fond of repeating, “miracles are not contrary to nature but only to *what is known by us* about nature.” So much, then, for a definition of “miracle”.

(2) The Importance of Miracle in Christianity.

It must be clearly borne in mind that “miracle” is of the very essence of Christianity. The Christian religion stands or falls with the issue of the miraculous. I myself fail to see how one can be a Christian in any significant sense and disbelieve the miraculous power of Christ, our Lord.

Belief in the truth of miracle stories in other religions is not nearly so important as it is in Christianity. All the essentials of Hinduism would remain intact if one subtracted the miraculous. And the same may be said of Buddhism and, I think, of Mohammedanism. But one cannot do away with the miraculous in Christianity without completely undoing it, for *at its very heart* Christianity is the story of the greatest miracle by far in the entire course of mankind’s history, the miracle of God becoming man, the miracle of the Incarnation of the Eternal God of the Universe in the lowly man from Nazareth.

“God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself...” says Paul (II Cor. 5:19). The Word which was in the beginning with God and which was God “became flesh and dwelt among us,” says John (John 1:14). This, my friends, is the greatest miracle conceivable by the human mind! And where there is no belief in this, the miracle of miracles, there can be no genuinely Christian faith, no faith of saving value.

Here in our midst is One who is uniquely divine, a miraculous One: born of a virgin—miraculous in his origin; in intimate union with the Father—miraculous in his relation to God; and overcoming death in his resurrection — miraculously “designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 1:4).

Furthermore, none of the miracles which our Lord performed during his lifetime are any more miraculous than the amazing redeeming power which He exercised and still exercises over the hearts of men. The power of the Eternal and Living Christ to save the souls of men and to lift them to increasingly higher levels of god-likeness is also part of the supreme miracle of Christ, the miracle of Incarnation and Redemption.

All the other miracles of Jesus pale into insignificance when compared with this, the supreme miracle of Christianity. I do not mean that the miracles that Jesus performed are insignificant, but changing the water to wine, feeding the multitude with the five loaves and two fishes, and restoring sight to the man born blind—these are all subordinate to and dependent upon their relation to the supreme miracle of *Jesus Himself*. As John says, they are the “signs” which Jesus did, signs by which God attested the uniquely divine authority vested in His only begotten Son.

(3) The Source of Modern Disbelief in Miracles.

When now we come to view the significance of this central conception of the Christian religion in the light of present day thought, we become aware of the peculiar character of our Modern scientific age. One of its most interesting peculiarities is the wide-spread disbelief in miracles and disbelief even in the *possibility* of the occurrence of a miracle in history. This is indeed a strange prejudice. It is a prejudice which has grown out of the intellectual arrogance produced by scientific naturalism. It has somehow grown to be popular to believe that one cannot be “scientific” and still believe in miracles, that the idea of miracle is outgrown, and that our scientific knowledge of the “firm and unalterable” laws of nature relegates the idea of miracle to the limbo of childish absurdities and mythological folklore.

The intellectual development of the Western world which lies casually behind this modern disbelief is long and complicated. It stems in large measure from the impact of the Renaissance and what is called the 18th century Enlightenment. The glorification of philosophical reason in the Enlightenment proved to be an embarrassment to cultured Christians both in England and on the Continent. Hence, the conception of a “true, rational Christianity” was born. Men like Immanuel Kant in Germany and William Whitson, Anthony Collins and David Hume in England began trimming away the miraculous aspect of Christianity and boiling the Christian religion down to a *natural, rational residum*. The intellectual demand and social pressure for a rationally respectable Christianity were exceedingly strong. Christianity, as a religion

centering in the idea of the supernatural, was hard put to survive. Deism became a very popular movement both in England and in America.

The absentee God of Deism, however, turned out to be a negligible factor for human thinking and living. And, other forces being involved too, of course, the spirit of modern Naturalism was born. Naturalism may be defined, in brief, as the belief that "the ultimate Fact, the thing you can't go behind, is a vast process in space and time which is *going on of its own accord*" (Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 16). *Nature* is the whole show. There is no other cosmic ultimate. There is no other reality which holds meaning for the human mind. There is no God *outside* the natural process; there is no *Creator* of Nature, for then Nature would not be the whole show; it would not be the one ultimate self-sufficient reality, which Naturalism conceives it to be.

Now if this basic premise of Naturalism is true, then miracles are, of course, impossible, for miracle is an interposition in the natural process by a divine power *from without*, which power would be, by definition, nonexistent. It is thus the *logic of the naturalistic position* which lies behind the wide-spread modern disbelief in miracles, in our scientific age.

It is very important that we remember this, remember that the reason why people are skeptically oriented toward or dogmatically inclined to deny the possibility of miracles is *a philosophical one*. The prejudice which has created this blind spot in the modern mind is fundamentally *philosophical* in character. One holds a philosophy of the world which implies that there are not and that there can never be any such things as miracles. It follows inevitably that even if Jesus performed 10,000 miracles, our naturalistic friend, could never accept them as real. He is philosophically prejudiced against them.

We believe, however, that naturalism is an inadequate and false philosophy. We can only mention here briefly our reasons for this belief. Naturalism is inadequate first because it fails to provide a ground for the ultimate validity of human thinking. Some Naturalists have become aware of this weakness of their

philosophy and have developed the notion that the ultimate ground of human mind and thought is a vast, irrational sub-nature. This idea, however, fails miserably to provide a satisfactory principle for the *validity* of the operations of the human mind. When hard pressed at this point, most naturalists seek to evade the issue by resorting to pragmatism. They admit that there *is no ultimate* ground for holding our thought to be valid, but that this is of no consequence so long as our ideas work. We are not interested in *truth* anyway, they say, in that philosophical sense. So long as our ideas enable us to *live* and be well adjusted to society, we are happy. To this we can only reply that some of us *are* interested in *truth* as well as *life*.

Naturalism is, therefore, caught in an inescapable dilemma. It frankly confesses its inability to deal with truth in any ultimate sense, it thereby admits that it is a superficial solution of the problem of human thinking since it supplies no answer to one of man's greatest longings, the longing to understand man's place in the scheme of things entire. And if Naturalism does claim that its own view of things *is* the ultimate truth about human life and thought, it becomes involved in a self-contradiction, for one cannot consistently argue that the ultimate ground of rational processes lies in a sub-personal, irrational force. But either Naturalism must confess its inability to deal with truth in the ultimate sense, or it must claim that its own view is the ultimate truth about man. Therefore, either Naturalism is an oversimplified solution of the problem of the validity of human thinking, or it is caught in an inevitable self-contradiction.

Secondly, we believe that Naturalism sells us short religiously by failing to provide an adequate object of religious devotion and commitment. The naturalistic reduction of the personal, transcendent God of the Bible to a sub-personal irrational force contained *wholly within* Nature can only end by *reducing* the religious relationship to something less personal than the communion and fellowship of God with man made in His own image. The experience of worship is lost and no ground remains for a religion which can call forth *the full spiritual* power of man's religious devotion

to the good, the true and the beautiful. Nothing short of an intimate personal fellowship with a God whose personality transcends Nature is adequate religiously.

A third reason why we believe Naturalism is an inadequate philosophy is that it fails to provide a basis for a meaningful and purposive interpretation of the process which we call "nature." The supernatural God of Christianity makes ample provision for an understanding of the world in terms of a central meaning of over-all purpose in the scheme of things entire. Indeed, if God be conceived as the divine purpose of the world, He must *of necessity* be conceived as transcending the natural process, for the interpretation of historical events in terms of a divine *purpose* means something more than the awareness of a sequence of incidents along the line from past to future. It means that the process of events is in some way determined and shaped by some *purpose* or *goal* which lies *beyond any immediate context of events in the process itself*. Naturalism is inadequate, then, because it fails in the final analysis to provide a metaphysical framework of reference for a purposive view of the world.

For these reasons we reject the philosophy of Naturalism and suggest an abandonment of it. And, of course, if one eliminates the philosophical basis from which the modern prejudice against the possibility of miracle stems, he has thereby removed the ground for the modern objection to miracle.

(4) The Positive Character of the Historical Evidence for the Miracles of Jesus.

When, now, one turns to consider the "historical" aspect of the problem, it becomes clear that the *Historical* evidence for the miracles of Jesus is all positive in character.

The people of Jesus' day were in no sense philosophically prejudiced against miracles. They were not naturalists in the modern sense of the term. Hence belief in the possibility of miracles pervades all the cultures of the ancient world. As a matter of fact, throughout the first 19 centuries of the Christian era, practically everyone identified with the Christian movement, Catholic and Protestant, believed that the revelation of God in Jesus Christ

was divinely substantiated and attested by Jesus' miraculous power.

It is not "historical" considerations, therefore, which give the modern mind pause in believing in miracles; the reasons are philosophical. As Alan Richardson says, "It is indisputable that all the *historical* evidence that we have goes to show that Jesus worked miracles of the kind described in the Gospels. There is no historical evidence to show that Jesus did not work miracles. It cannot be disputed upon historical grounds that all the people who came into contact with Jesus during His ministry in Galilee believed that He worked miracles; even His enemies believed it. If our judgment were to be decided by strictly historical considerations and by nothing else, we could not avoid the conclusion that Jesus worked miracles. The evidence that Jesus worked miracles is just as strong, and is of precisely the same quality and texture, as that He taught that God is Father and that His disciples should forgive one another. We cannot on *historical grounds alone* accept the evidence for the one and reject that for the other. The evidence that Jesus healed a dropsical man on the Sabbath day is just as good as the evidence that He told the story of the Good Samaritan or the Prodigal Son" (*Christian Apologetics*, p. 170).

The modern mind, however, has not been satisfied with such a Jesus. The Jesus of the Gospels is too disconcerting. He rubs modern philosophical prejudices the wrong way. Hence modernism has operated on a "selective" basis. It has chosen to retain the truth-value of the *teachings* of Jesus and to discount the miraculous *works* of Jesus as unhistorical and mythological. But this is a terribly arbitrary procedure, for by the same method if I perchance find some of Jesus' *teaching* incongruous with my philosophical ideas, I may still profess faith in Jesus, all the while discounting that portion of his ideas and teaching which I do not like. Perhaps, indeed, the Jesus of one's faith will in this fashion be whittled down finally to a skeleton of only two or three ideas. Once this whittling method of procedure is adopted, there is no logical terminus this side of absolute skepticism about the historical Jesus.

No, my friends, it must be squarely faced: if our Gospels of the New Testament do not give us a reliable picture of the Jesus of history, then we cannot gain any *genuinely historical* knowledge about Him. As Richardson says: “The alternative to the Gospel portrait of the Jesus who showed His power in mighty acts of mercy, who caused the blind to see and the deaf to hear, who fed the hungry multitudes in the wilderness and calmed the storm with His word, is not—as the liberal Protestants supposed—a picture of Jesus as the good man who taught a lofty ethical ideal and died for it, the greatest perhaps of the prophets and a sublime religious genius: the alternative is historical skepticism about Him. The only historical evidence that we possess is that of a Jesus whose deeds as well as His words led His disciples to perceive that He was the Christ, the Son of God” (*Op. cit*, pp. 170-1).

(5) The Unwarranted Dogmatism of Modern Scientific (?) Disbelief in Miracles.

It must be pointed out also that not only is the “historical” evidence for miracles positive, but that the modern so-called “scientific” objection to them is really based upon the fallacious naturalistic philosophy with which modern science has been unfortunately all too closely aligned. The popular dogmatic belief in the impossibility of the occurrence of miracles on scientific grounds is really completely without scientific foundation. David Hume, an 18th century English skeptic, was one of the first ones to champion such a dogmatic disbelief in miracles. (See his “Essay on Miracles”). “A miracle,” says Hume, “is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined” (Part I). But mind you, it was Hume himself who set the pace for interpreting natural law as mere correlation of antecedent and consequent. And the tendency of the human mind to make these correlations absolute and without exception, Hume charged up to an unjustifiable psychological propensity. He writes “... all our evidence for any matter of fact, which lies beyond the testimony of sense or memory, is derived entirely from

the relation of cause and effect. We have no other idea of this relation than that of two objects, which have been frequently *conjoined* together. We have no argument to convince us, that objects which have, in *our experience*, been frequently conjoined, will likewise, in other instances, be conjoined in the same manner. Nothing leads us to this inference but *custom*, or a certain instinct of our nature, which it is indeed difficult to resist but which, like other instincts, may be fallacious, and deceitful" (*An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Sec. VII, Part II). If Hume's conception of the laws of nature was based upon the notion of causality as he here construed it, we wonder just how his mind was operating when in his essay on miracles he argued that natural law is based upon "a firm and unalterable experience." Hume perhaps just had a lapse of memory on the idea of causality when he penned the essay on miracles.

Following Hume, all modern scientists have come to think of "natural law" as merely *descriptive* and not *prescriptive*. Natural law is simply a general classification of one's observation of the data of sense experience. At best, therefore, scientific knowledge can only reach a relatively high degree of probability. Scientific knowledge of natural law has nothing whatsoever to do with absolutes. There is no absoluteness about any scientific conceptions of natural law.

If, then, the "scientific" mind thinks in a straightforward and honest manner, it must admit that there is nothing absolute, nothing *universal* and *necessary* about scientific knowledge and "natural law". Universality, (i.e, no exception is allowable) and *necessity* (i.e, the opposite is inconceivable) are categories of thought to which the scientist, *qua* scientist, attaches no validity. In fact, naturalistic Empiricism, the philosophy which has gone hand in hand with our scientific enterprise, is at its heart an adamant denial of the claims of universality and necessity in the cognitive situation. All knowledge, it says, arises out of, is analyzable into, and verifiable only in terms of the data of sense experience. Such knowledge, obviously, can have nothing to do with absolutes.

It should be obvious, now, that the modern scientist has less valid reason than anyone to deny the possibility of miracles. "Laws" of nature are simply applications of the law of averages. The basis of Nature is in the random and the lawless. The scientist deals with such an enormous number of units, however, that the behaviour of the data (like the behaviour of very large masses of men) can be calculated with a fairly high degree of probability but still *only probability*. "Impossible" events in science are, therefore, merely events so overwhelmingly improbable, on the basis of our experience to date, that the scientist feels no need for taking serious account of them.

As C. S. Lewis says: "The assurance (science) it gives us is of the same general kind as our assurance that a coin tossed a thousand times will not give the same result, say, nine hundred times: and that the longer you toss it the more nearly the number of Heads and Tails will come to being equal. But this is so only provided the coin is an honest coin. If it is a loaded coin our expectations may be disappointed. But the people who believe in miracles are maintaining precisely that the coin *is* loaded. The expectations based on the law of averages will work only for *undoctored* Nature. And the question whether miracles occur is just the question whether Nature is ever doctored" (*Op, cit*, pp. 68-9).

It must be frankly confessed, then, that the modern dogmatic disbelief in the possibility of miracles is wholly unwarranted and unjustifiable on scientific grounds. The Christian belief in miracles is scientifically respectable and feasible.

(6) *Credo Ut Intelligam*,

Finally, I would cite the famous Augustinian slogan as an expression of the true Christian attitude which should be maintained in realms of thought and belief where the issues are complicated and where much time and experience are needed in thinking through the issues involved. Augustine struck out in the slogan *credo ut intelligam*, Translated it means: I believe in order to understand.

It should be clear to all that *to believe*, to have faith does not necessarily mean completely to *understand* rationally what one

believes. *Believing* in the miracles of Jesus and the supreme miracle of Jesus Himself does not of necessity imply my ability to explain rationally the detail of *how* the miracle occurred. The *how* is no mystery to God, since His knowledge is complete and perfect, which means, of course, that there are no miracles to God. But we are men. Our knowledge is finite and limited. We must, therefore, find our way by *faith*. Faith precedes; understanding follows.

WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN?

HUBERT G. DERRICK

A great deal of confusion has resulted from the various interpretations of the term "Christian." In a geographical sense, it has been used to differentiate one nation from another; at other times, it has been identified with the mere use of the English language, as in the well-known anecdote of the lost traveler who, when he heard voices quarreling and cursing in English, exclaimed "Thank God I'm in a Christian country." For the most part, the public in general identifies a Christian as one who believes in Christ as the Son of God and makes some attempt to follow His teachings and ideals, or, as most people put it, "to be a good, honest neighbor or citi zen..." We often hear the statement that one can be a good Christian without being a church member, while others believe firmly that the two describe an identical state. There are those who think that all who have uttered certain shibboleths and have submitted to certain steps or rituals have thereby earned the right to the name, and that the title attends them in the mind of God no matter what may be the trend or quality of their subsequent living. It is interesting to note, too, that at some time in its history nearly every religious group has claimed exclusive rights to the name "Christian."

In the midst of such confusion surely the wisest course is to find a common source of information on the subject, one upon which all concerned will agree. This source is, of course, the New Testament record of the beginnings of Christianity, for where could one obtain a clearer picture, one freer of human opinion and misconception, than from the writings of those very men who associated with Jesus or lived during His time?

According to these scriptures, just what did constitute a Christian? From the beginning of His ministry Jesus had certain followers who came to be known as His disciples, or those who were in the process of learning about Him and His message. Eventually at least, these people came to be identified as "Christians" to their neighbors, for they followed this Christ person and took upon

themselves His way of life. Thus, the term came to mean literally “Christ-ian” or “Christ-one.” or “one-with-Christ.” The apostle Paul rather strikingly describes this condition as that of “putting on” Christ to become a “new creature,” quote, “Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.” And, “We are children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many as have been baptized into Christ have *put on* Christ.”

Before Jesus ascended to the Father, he gave his apostles the commission to go teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. They were instructed, however, to tarry in Jerusalem, which city should be the starting point for the carrying out of this divine injunction. When we review the wonderful events that transpired on that day as recorded in the second chapter of Acts, here, indeed, do we find a people whose lives had begun to take on a “newness” that they had never known before. The apostle Peter revealed to them the facts of the death, burial, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, the very man of Nazareth whom they had crucified, they believed his message and with smitten consciences cried out, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Peter said unto them, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Then the record goes on to say, quote, “They that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added daily to the church such as should be saved.”

As we move on through this historical record of the first Christian groups, we find seven or eight other cases mentioned in which this gospel story was received in like manner. Men heard of Christ and His way, they believed in his divine and saving power, they repented of their former sins and ways, and they submitted to baptism for the remission of past sins.

This was not the end of the matter, however, nor was it *of itself* the only thing that seems to have identified them in the minds of their neighbors as “Christians.” The real power that served this end was the transformation of life that had come about within this group, an actual “putting on” of the Christ-like character so that a member of His group came to be known as one who dealt with his God and his neighbor always with the spirit of the Nazarene as a point of reference. Matters of personal character, family, business and political problems were solved by the Christian always in reference to this “newfound” life in Christ, so that this spirit within the individual or group came to touch the life of the pagan world in a very realistic fashion.

By far the major part of the New Testament, especially the teachings of Jesus Himself, is concerned with this new way of living. Perhaps the one scripture that gives as good a picture as any of this one newly born into the family of God is to be found in Colossians 3 where the newly baptized are admonished, quote, “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry. Put off anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him. Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as is fit in the Lord... Husbands, love your wives, and be

not bitter against them. Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged. Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, pleasing God. Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in Heaven. Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving.”

It is noteworthy that the sermon on the mount and the 13th chapter of First Corinthians both emphasize nearly to exclusion these same moral and spiritual concepts in the description of Christ’s disciples. It seems that Christ and Paul both were stressing a great truth that subsequent history has so often demonstrated, namely, that if Christianity cannot hold us at the place of ethical conduct, if it loses at that place, then what is left over is not worth fighting for; or, as James explained it, “Faith without works is dead.” As someone has said, an emphasis on doctrines which leaves unaffected our way of life might cause us to accept as Christian the emperor Constantine, who, after his alleged conversion murdered his brother-in-law, Licinius, sentenced to death his 11 year old nephew, killed his eldest son Crispus, brought about the death of his second wife, and took the nails that were supposed to come from the cross of Christ to use in one of his war helmets. He was canonized by the Greek church and his memory celebrated as “equal to the apostles.” He talked and presided at the opening of the Council of Nicea and was hailed as a “bishop of bishops.” All this because the church as it then existed had come very largely to think of “sound doctrine” as the adherence to and defense of a creed or properly formulated and man-authenticated set of rituals. While in the New Testament sense “sound doctrine” certainly involved intellectual and volitional assent to the sole authority of Christ and His teachings (II John 7-9; I John 5:1-3) and a Christian should oppose any contrary doctrine, the term itself is used in reference to ethics and morals. For example, in I Timothy, Paul condemns murderers, whoremongers, liars, and, quote, “any other thing contrary to sound doctrine,” while the little book of

Titus is given just about entirely to an enumeration of these personal qualities of life which characterize, quote, "sound doctrine"... And indeed the term is well chosen, for time has shown that only this kind of "soundness" can give to an individual, nation, or civilization that stability and strength which will allow it to endure. Our modern world with its problems of labor, divorce, juvenile delinquency, racial segregation, and war is realizing the very realistic truth of Christ's conclusion to this ethical emphasis in the sermon on the mount when he said that the man who built his character on God's word should be like the house built on rock, unshaken by the buffetings of the storms of life.

To free ourselves then of the confusion that has arisen over the misuse of the term "Christian," we can do no better than to return to the original picture presented in the inspired writings. The apostle James admonishes our continual attendance to this mirror of the perfect law, lest we build up for ourselves images that reflect a distorted picture through forgetting what manner of men we are. And when men begin to return once more to drink regularly and deeply of this fount of life, their vision shall become clearer, greater Christians shall walk the earth, and mankind shall again know the sense of security and satisfaction that can come only from building upon the sound doctrine of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

“SOME DANGERS CONFRONTING THE CHURCH”

JOSEPH W. WHITE

Fifty years ago, when radical criticism seemed to be sweeping everything before it, someone said to the late, great Henry Van Dyke: “Dr. Van Dyke, Christianity is at a crisis.” Quietly Van Dyke replied: “Christianity is always at a crisis.”

When this program was planned, among other problems which invited consideration, was the fact that there are some dangers facing the church today. But from the establishment of the church in Jerusalem down to 10:30 a.m. on January 27, 1949, no child of God has ever seen the single day when dangers have not confronted the kingdom of God on earth. And I venture to predict that not even in the roseate future will such a day dawn, until the holy city comes down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband. No more than individual Christians, can the church expect to “be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease.”

So long as Satan exercises his sway over men, the world will war upon Zion and oftentimes it will find a weak spot in the walls and labor mightily to breach it. And in every generation, perhaps in every circle of Christians, sooner or later there will arise a Judas, an Ananias or a Sapphira, a Diotrephes, the Pharisee, the Judaizing teacher, the dogmatist and that most bigoted and intolerant of all creatures—the anti-dogmatist who becomes dogmatic about somebody else’s dogmatism—the ignorant who know not their own ignorance, and those who have a knowledge which is falsely so called. Perhaps, right here, we college people should pay homage to the ignorant, for “God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise.” An ignorant man may some day through the grace of God, become aware of the abysmal emptiness of his mind and acquire a thirst for knowledge, but the one who is “wise in his own conceit” cannot be taught anything.

The church never can afford to relax. It is as true in the body of Christ as it is in a democracy that “eternal vigilance is the price

of liberty.” Too often the enemy loses a frontal attack and retires from the field of combat. Joyfully we rush forth to celebrate and gleefully drag an innocent-looking Trojan horse within our walls, only to discover that the enemy has more horse sense than we have.

Thus far in my lifetime I have heard controversies over many questions: women teachers, one cup, the order of worship, laying the contribution upon the table, dividing into classes, literature in classes, rebaptism, Christian colleges, premillennialism, instrumental music in the worship, missionary societies, and even whether we should pray while standing or kneeling. In every single issue there were extremists on both sides, like ten-year old boys, calling each other names. Sadly enough, in too many cases, the epithets were applicable and each side was telling the truth about the other.

In a sense, none of these issues was fundamental, but was symptomatic of an attitude of mind. It is doubtful whether anyone ever introduced an organ into a church of Christ as the result of a conviction that loyalty to the New Testament demanded it. It is more likely that there was a desire to please the flesh or to be like the Joneses. On the other hand, it is possible that some have opposed as un- scriptural, every conceivable way of doing benevolent work, missionary work, or any work simply because they were too stingy to pay for it. Last night there should have echoed through this auditorium a resounding chorus of “amens” when Brother Scott said that we needed to learn that “the body of Christ needs arms and legs as well as a mouth.”

Probably by now, everyone of you knows just where this speech is headed. They say that the fundamental requirement for a Ph.D. is to learn to hardly ever say “never.” So I am going to say that *almost* every issue which has confronted the church in the past one hundred years, has reflected the two extremes: those who want to *do* nothing and those who will *stop* at nothing; those who find it painful to think and those who exalt human reason above God’s word.

To my mind, these are the two ever-present dangers con-

fronting the church in every age. I cannot say which is worse. One will destroy the church by sleeping sickness, the other by suicide. Only one completely sane, sound, secure, thoroughly integrated, individual—Jesus of Nazareth—has ever faced and conquered the problems of human life. But surely those who abide in Him can balance their several weaknesses, insecurities and inadequacies to produce a body that has strength, security and effectiveness. No individual Christian will ever be perfect; he will never be able to solve all his problems. But I believe that the body of Christ, as seen in the world at any given time and place, can “attain unto the unity of the faith... through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part... till we all attain... unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.” If you think that too idealistic for a group composed of fallible human beings, have you forgotten that not even Jesus the Christ could find any fault with two churches out of a group of seven?

More than a generation ago, a congregation in North Texas had some sort of vision. It wanted to do something. It heard of a young preacher in a little Tennessee, county-seat town who was doing things. The church and the preacher got together. So forty-three years ago this month, the preacher began a ministry at that place which lasted for twelve years. You think that to be a commonplace? Well in January, 1906, there was not another preacher in all the churches of Christ south of the Mason-Dixon line, who was devoting his entire time to the work of one church. In the north, there were two or three such. I speak of North and South because at that time, nowhere else counted much in churches of Christ.

In the far west, there was no George Pepperdine College. There was a little church on Sichel Street, one in Pasadena, another at Santa Ana, one at Riverside, and one or two others in all of Southern California.

In the East, there were two churches in New England, none at all in New York, a handful of small churches in western Pennsylvania. What strength there was, lay in congregations, few of them

numerically strong, located mostly in Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, Alabama, Kentucky and a few Midwestern states.

About all of the preaching that most Christians heard, was done in the annual protracted meeting or by the occasional preacher who “dropped in.” The preacher who had a regular appointment on Sunday was a postman, or a farmer, or even a doctor, who was glad to receive five or ten dollars- or nothing. The missionaries on the foreign field could literally be counted upon the fingers of your *two* hands. Probably not a church in the brotherhood had a budget of \$300.00 a month. In fact, not a single church had a budget. That would have been digressive.

In 1906, the churches were defensive and dispirited. They had come out on the losing end of a fifty year battle over innovations. The innovators carried off most of the spoils of war. They had most of the church houses, most of the wealth, most of the intellect, in many states, all or most of the congregations, and what is more important—most of the initiative. It was a common saying in those days that if you were in a town strange to you, and wanted to find a Church of Christ, drive around the outskirts of the town on the poorer streets, until you found the meanest-looking building that might serve as a church. That would be it. The saying was not much of an exaggeration.

But, thank God, we had the Bible and a plea which was true to its spirit, and there were some men who had faith and vision. To-day there are states where you can drive on a federal highway for hundreds of miles and see at the entrance of practically every town, a sign advertising a church of Christ. To one, who through the eyes of a small boy, saw the other side of the picture, it is supremely thrilling to see the work that is being done in Japan, in Germany, in the Philippines; to know something about great churches (as Christ would count greatness) in Memphis, in Lubbock, in Dallas, in Nashville or countless other places; to meet godly men by the hundreds, who are spending their lives preaching the gospel in places large and small; to watch my brethren grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord.

Forty years ago our problem was largely negative—inertia,

lack of faith, lack of zeal. So long as the church is composed of human beings, this will still be our problem. No matter what we try to do, or how we try to do it, somebody will label it “unscriptural.” But I am not greatly concerned about these human anachronisms. The brethren want to do something, and these deft tossers of monkey wrenches will soon find themselves talking to an audience of one.

At this moment in history, the danger is that forward-looking, alert, intelligent, able brethren will become so disgusted with obstructionism and picayunish criticism, that those who can be so useful in the Lord’s Vineyard will, unintentionally lead into a new digression. Never in my life have I come to any decision on the basis of what Alexander Campbell or David Lipscomb thought about the question, but I believe that there is a crying need on this generation of preachers to study the issues and developments of the Restoration Movement in the nineteenth Century.

A year or so ago, a young preacher who was in one of my classes here, in referring to controversies between us and the Christian Church, told me that he thought that we argued about a lot of questions that were unimportant. Well, if I could have taken him to my childhood where I heard my father preach in a tobacco barn, or to a tent meeting held in sight of a beautiful building paid for largely by those in the tent, he might have seen some little importance that he had overlooked.

Or, not to be back that far, I would like to take him to a fine old town on the banks of the Cumberland River. In the summer of 1947, I drove away from my aunt’s home one evening. Just down the street a few doors was the home of Cordell Hull; a little farther was a little brick church house. With tears in her eyes, my aunt said to me: “Joe, its hard to go past the church where you have worshipped for forty years.” What happened? Well, a few months previously some sweet-spirited folk decided to fellowship—yes, just fellowship—a preacher who could worship with or without. Just before Christmas of 1948, the inevitable happened — the inevitable always happens—and an organ was brought in. Digression can take place in the twentieth century.

I do not greatly fear the immediate efforts of those who are greatly concerned about our lack of appreciation toward those who divided the church. I do fear the insidious after effects upon younger persons in future years. Last year, a young preacher showed me a mimeographed sheet concerning the instrumental music question. He said that some of the arguments were novel. If he had been a little better read, he would have known that they were the same outworn arguments used in the last century.

We have a new intellectualism in the church. Wisely directed, it can lead us into a period of the greatest growth and accomplishment that any of us has ever known. Misdirected, unaware of the lessons of history, it can plunge us into disaster. And when I speak of disaster, I have a great many more things in mind than instrumental music.

WHEN UNITY CEASES¹

J. HERMAN CAMPBELL

On the eve of Christ's death, he prayed that "all may be one," that the world might believe that God had sent Him. Christ's desire for unity was expressed by Paul some thirty years later to a church made up of both Jews and Gentiles: "Let us walk by the same rules." (Phil. 3:16). In A.D. 30 there were no denominations to be considered as barriers to the unity of the one body. However, the unity of the early church was disturbed in two ways: first, the spiritual and social tension between the Jews and Gentiles; second, carnality within the congregation. The first menace was an outgrowth of Judaizers who harassed the newly established church. The Galatian letter was written specifically to correct the errors being taught by Judaizers. The effect of this false teaching is noted in the influence it had upon Peter. (Gal. 2:11-14). The second force working against unity is well illustrated by noting a case in the Corinthian church. The immoral conduct of one member gave rise to Paul's pointed statement, "... have no company with fornicators... Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." (I Cor. 5:9, 13).

Of the two forces working against unity in the "one body," the departure in doctrine was considered of equal consequence in retarding the progress of the church as the evil, carnal practices of fornication and drunkenness. There is, however, a distinction to be made between these two agencies in method of attack on the unity of the church. A departure from sound doctrine comes from a teaching program that covers a period of time, while the carnal act that may divide God's people often makes a sudden appearance. Again, in a doctrinal departure the entire church is affected, while more often the carnal sin is localized and can be handled rapidly and successfully before it "leaveneth the whole lump."

¹ This address has been printed only in part because of the limitation of space

Paul's drastic method of procedure to be imposed upon the young man who had his father's wife indicates how the matter should be handled.

Turning our attention now to the problem of "doctrinal unity," which in our chief consideration in this study, we observe the following plan in the mind of God for the New Testament church. The church was founded upon "the apostles, prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone;" (Eph. 2:20) with its function to make known "the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. 3:10-11). To this end Christ "gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ; till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Eph. 4:11-13). This work was entrusted to three types of qualified teachers; those directed into all truth by the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Jno. 16:13); those endowed with spiritual gifts from the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts 8:17); and faithful men, who were able to teach others (II Tim. 2:2). Even under these divinely appointed instructors who were working to bring the members "unto the unity of the faith," one of these preachers, Paul, writing of his own time, said to the church at Thessalonica, "For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work." (II Thess. 1:7); then later to Titus, "For there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake... Reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men who turn away from the truth." (Titus 1:10, 13,14). Surely one would not be so careless in his reading as to overlook the duty of the elders in the local church to deal with departures from the faith which will cause division. The churches of Galatia that had permitted a perverted gospel to be preached were characterized by

Paul as “O foolish Galatians who did bewitch you,” (Gal. 3:1). To the church at Rome, Paul admonished: “... mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the DOCTRINE which ye learned: and turn away from them... by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent.” (Romans 16:17).

Paul sensed a falling away from the faith as early as A. D. 60, and he gave the following instructions to the elders at Ephesus: “...from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.” (Acts 20:30). And to Timothy a few years later: “But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats.” (I Tim. 4:1-3). “But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money, etc.... holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof; from these also turn away.” (II Tim. 3:1-5).

AT THE END OF THE FIRST CENTURY

By the time the Apostle John wrote his second epistle (we think about A. D. 85-90), some of the conditions had arrived in the New Testament church that were prophesied by Paul. The Gnostic teachers (called deceivers in II John 7) claimed to be advanced thinkers, and they were anxious to relegate Christ to the past. In their teaching they flatly denied the incarnation. The standard that John gives for the faithful to follow is found in verse 9: “Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son.” The action for the faithful when confronted with “the deceivers” is given in the following verse: “If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting; for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works.” It must be observed just here that the churches often met in private homes (Rom. 16:5; Col. 4:15), and if these traveling deceivers were al-

lowed to spread their doctrines in these homes and then sent on with an endorsement as Apollos was from Ephesus to Corinth (Acts 18:27), there was no way of escaping responsibility for the harm wrought by these anti-Christ. The statement in II John 10 is more than a mere study in hospitality to strangers. John's statement is a basic principle of procedure in dealing with those who pervert the gospel.

On the closing pages of the New Testament the church at Pergamum was being censured for "holding the teaching of Balaam" and the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes. (Rev. 2:14-15). The church at Thyatira was charged with being seduced by the woman Jezebel. (Rev. 2:20).

With the close of the New Testament, one observes that God's plan to preserve unity under the new covenant is predicated upon a strict adherence to the words of the apostles; and any deviation therefrom was sufficient cause for faithful brethren to withdraw from those who were corrupting the gospel. Where too great a departure had come, there was danger of the candlestick being removed from the church. Hear Paul on the matter as we close our study on unity in the early church period; "And if any man obeyeth not *our word* by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed." (II Thess. 3:14). Speaking to the Church at Ephesus, Christ commanded a return to its first love or he would remove the candlestick. (Rev. 2:5).

TODAY

And what of today, 1949? I am not posing as a prophet when I say unity is about to be sacrificed again, and the iniquity which will induce it is at this moment work. There is a wedge being driven unmistakably into the body of Christ.

THOSE ACCUSED OF BEING CONSERVATIVE ARE CHARGED WITH:

1. Teaching there is a definite plan whereby one becomes a Christian: and unless one conforms to the pattern, he is unsaved.
The Pattern Doctrine.

2. Teaching with strong emphasis that we are under the law of Christ as well as under his grace. *Pharisaical Legalism*.
3. Putting the “bee” on those who have departed from the faith so they will be ashamed and return to their “first love.”
4. Following Diotrephes: *Religious Dictators; Popery; Ecclesiastical Centered Preachers*.
5. Saying and preaching that there is no working basis with denominations.

Motto: “Come ye out from among them, and be ye separated, saith the Lord and touch no unclean thing.” (II Cor. 6:17). “Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up.” (Matt. 15:13).

(They believe it their duty and prerogative to help the Lord do the rooting up— and NOW).

6. Being ORTHODOX in procedure and word at any price. *Keepers of Orthodoxy*. a) Orthodoxy must come before developing Christian personality. b) One must be Orthodox before he is recognized as a missionary in foreign lands.

THOSE ACCUSED OF BEING LIBERAL ARE CHARGED WITH:

1. Preaching the love of God to the neglect of other basic teachings.
2. Preaching and teaching with special emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount; Romans 12; and I Corinthians 13.
3. Being too free with the sectarians, such as: a) Speaking on their programs without making any distinction as to the true church and its teaching as opposed to denominationalism. b) Fellowshiping denominations to the degree that it takes a gospel magnifying glass to distinguish between the two. c) Taking sectarians into the local church membership on any type of baptism. d) Citing Luke 9:49-50 as evidence that there are Christians in all churches.
4. Either preaching pre-millennialism or tolerating and encouraging those who do believe and preach the false doctrine.
5. Over-emphasis on the Spirit of Christ and the “sweet spirit” to be developed in man.

6. Frequent use of the Platonic terms: e.g. the true; the good; the beautiful.
7. Excessive use of committees and interchurch organizations to get the work done that should be handled by and through the local congregational organization.
8. Advocating special programs, organizations, recreational ventures, etc. to have the youth of the church from modern society.

Of the two current thoughts, history reveals that liberalism in attitude toward the standard of II John 9 results in a departure from the faith with nothing substantial to sustain the Christian. While if there is a tendency toward undue conservatism, which I doubt is the case today, the foundation for Christian growth is always present to build upon, and there is little danger that Christ will remove the candlestick.

One test of our preaching today may be put on the basis of whether Peter, James, John, and Paul would recognize what is being taught, should they take a seat in the church building. I fear that they would leave many church services without understanding the message of the hour even though they had a knowledge of the English Bible; for we have many preachers in the body of Christ using philosophic and theological terms that would be like the language of Ashdod to the writers of the New Testament Brethren, this type of teaching and approach will never build up the body of Christ so that it may "attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God."

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: PREMILLENNIAL?

WADE RUBY

When Jesus ascended from the Mount of Olives, two men in white apparel stood by the wondering apostles and said unto them: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." Before his crucifixion Jesus had comforted his friends with the following famous and beautiful words: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

The emphasis which Jesus gave to his second coming developed among the disciples an alert consciousness of the greatness and the importance of that day. In Matthew 24 Jesus spoke the following words: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, the other left. Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." The emphasis of this passage is objectified in the parable of the ten virgins, which Jesus closed with the ad-

monition: "Watch, therefore, for ye know not the day nor the hour."

The second coming of Christ was a cardinal point of faith with the early Christians; and so it should be with us today. The second coming of Christ was a great hope in the Christian heart in the first century; and it should be so with us today. The Christian writers urged their brethren to anticipate joyfully the return of Christ. Peter wrote that men should look for and earnestly desire the coming of the day of the Lord; Paul admonished the Corinthians to wait for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ. And Paul wrote the following to the Philippians: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

The great event of the future for the Christian is the day of the coming of the Lord, indeed a great and notable day.

So first of all in this talk we face the truth of the second coming of our Lord, the fact and reality of that coming.

Now the most important thing for us is to adjust our lives to this truth, to this historical fact of future world history, and to the past historical facts and truths concerning Jesus Christ, upon which facts and truths our hope for a second coming is based. The most significant adjustment to be made in life, the only really important one, is the adjustment of mind and heart and life to the truths of God in Jesus Christ and concerning Jesus Christ, the truth of the gift of Christ by God, of his life without sin, of his death on our behalf, of the atonement and propitiation through his blood, of his second coming, of his judgment of the living and the dead. Yes, man is not socially or morally or cosmically well adjusted until his life is adjusted to these truths.

So when Jesus comes, the really important question is, Am I ready to meet him? Have I found access through obedient faith into the grace of God? Has my will been submissive to his will? Has my life been yielded fully unto him in Christ Jesus the Lord? This is the important question concerning the second coming of

Jesus Christ. When he comes will he find me ready, waiting for his revelation, looking for and earnestly desiring his appearing, and rejoicing that at last, in the fullness of God's purpose, he has come.

I repeat: These two things are important to me: First, the truth of Jesus' coming; and second, being ready to meet him when he does come. These are the most important things concerning the subject of which I speak.

Now in addition to these, it is also interesting to attempt to determine from the Scriptures just what will happen when Jesus comes. It is interesting, especially to minds with certain bents and tendencies, to attempt to chart an exact and orderly chronology of events—to say, "First, this will happen, then this, and then this." And especially is one intrigued to stress his own chronological table if he feels that most other persons have not come to the understanding to which he has achieved, and about which he feels certain. Personally, I have never been blest, or cursed, with that type of mind which feels a necessity to unravel all the secrets of the future. I have been somewhat of the mind to make the preparation necessary for the coming of the Lord, and then to leave everything with the Lord, certain that the chronology of events as he has purposed them and ordained them will be followed.

You have noted that the topic on which I was to speak is: THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: WILL IT BE PREMILLENNIAL? I accepted the assignment to speak only fifteen minutes on this subject with the provision that I should present what I consider the most vital truths concerning Christ's coming, and treat as best I could the question, Will the coming be pre-millennial? Obviously, I could not and shall not treat this subject adequately in the time allotted.

I shall attempt to answer the question concerning the pre-millennial coming of Christ by indicating from the Scriptures what I believe will happen when Christ does come. First of all, I point out that I was reared in what is called the post-millennial school of thinking. I went to Harding College in that school, and

despite the contentions of uninformed persons concerning J.N. Armstrong, I remained in the post-millennial school at his feet. From him I studied the Bible, both in Greek and English. From him I studied sermon preparation and delivery. And not once in the three years I studied with him did he teach me or his classes the pre-millennial theory concerning the coming of Christ. Furthermore, from the first sermons I preached, twenty-one years ago last fall, until my most recent sermons at the Southwest Church of Christ in Los Angeles concerning the establishment of the church, I have preached Daniel 2:44 as fulfilled in Acts 2, and have preached the kingdom predicted in the prophets as fulfilled in the work of Christ and the Apostles, and as existing from the Apostles until this day. I believe that when John preached "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," and that when Jesus sent out his disciples to preach that the kingdom of God had come nigh, that the kingdom was at hand, that it was nigh. I believe that this was the kingdom to which Jesus referred when he said, "There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." I do not believe the teaching of some, that Jesus had in mind the establishing of a kingdom, but that he deferred the establishment until the future. I believe that Jesus established the kingdom which had been announced by the prophets and by John and by himself. I have never had any different view, nor have I ever expressed any other view. But so much for that. Let us turn to some Scriptures which teach us concerning what will happen when Christ returns. First of all, we read Matthew 25:31-33: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left."

Our next Scripture is the very familiar passage in I Thessalonians 4:13-18. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and

rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." I have never been able to accept what appears to me a rather strained interpretation which states that the "then" of verse 17 covers a period of one thousand years.

One of the Scriptures among many like it often relied upon to support the actual national return of the Jews is given a different interpretation by James at Jerusalem in Acts 15. The prophecy is from Amos 9, and reads as follows: "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, after this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." It seems quite clear to me that James, speaking with the Spirit of God, established beyond doubt that Amos referred to the coming of the kingdom, the church, which Christ did establish, and to which the gentiles have had access, as Amos declared they should.

Thus I believe that the Scriptures teach that when Christ comes he will judge all men, that the destinies of men will be determined then, that after this general judgment we shall enter into the presence of God, to be with him eternally. I believe that the following words from the famous chapter, Revelation 20, refer to the same judgment as Matthew 25: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I

saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.”

I have been willing, and am willing today, to rest upon what I believe is the clear message of the Scriptures which I have quoted earlier, concerning what will happen when Christ returns. The Scriptures which I quoted earlier do not indicate to my mind that Christ will establish a kingdom when he returns. I believe that Christ, when he was here before, established the only kingdom which he will establish on this earth. I believe that when he returns he will judge all the nations, that after this judgment we shall all enter into an eternity with God, according to what we have done, whether we have done evil or whether we have done good; that Christ will deliver back to the Father the kingdom over which he now rules, and that we, with him, shall serve our heavenly Father together.

WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE?

GEORGE PEPPERDINE

My idea of a college is that it shall be a private institution giving students standardized work in the liberal arts in a Christian environment. It should meet the requirements of the academic accrediting agencies. I want it to be sound economically, sound in patriotism, and sound in religious teaching. I am especially concerned that it shall remain sound in its religious teaching.

Such a college is not a church or a seminary. It cannot be handled as a church. It is not under the control of the church, it is not an auxiliary of the church, or an extension of the church, but it is an extension of the work of the home. Such a school is a private academic, educational institution with a department where religious subjects are taught.

In any four-year standard accredited college, it must be assumed that the primary purpose is general education; religion is only one department in more than a dozen departments. If 100% of the trustees, faculty, and students were fully developed Christians, still the college would be only an academic institution.

Now the question:

It is possible for an educational institution such as I have described to be correctly called a "Christian College"? Many educational institutions do call themselves Christian colleges, but it is true only in a limited sense. Some of them are Christian in a greater degree than others.

The Bible does not authorize the establishment of any Christian institution other than the church and the home. All so-called Christian colleges are only academic educational institutions with some degree of Christian influence and characteristics.

Consider the example of a public school which is supported by county taxes; this school might have 100% Christian Board of Education, faculty, and students, but still it would be only an academic institution, because its business is to teach secular subjects. It could be called a Christian school only in a limited sense. If 50% of Board of Education, faculty, and students were Christian, it

would have the same right to be called a Christian school in a limited sense. It would be a Christian institution in the sense that its influence is Christian in a large degree.

Likewise the so-called Christian colleges are only academic institutions with Christian influence. Some of them have much greater Christian influence than others; still they are only academic institutions, because about 90% of the teaching is on subjects other than religion.

The term “Christian College” should be considered a relative term. The larger the percentage of genuinely Christian people concerned in its operation, the larger will be its Christian influence. I have heard of one college among our brethren which claims 100% of its trustees and faculty are members of the church and 80% to 90% of its students. That is wonderful, and its influence cannot help but be very good. But if 100% of its students were members of the church, as well as all the faculty, it would still be only an academic institution because 90% of its teaching is secular on subjects such as mathematics, history, sciences, languages, etc. It can be called a Christian college in a large degree, because it has a large degree of Christian influence. Who can say just what percentage is necessary in order for a college to be properly called a Christian College?

The George Pepperdine College trustees are 100% members of the church of Christ and likewise all the faculty in the religion department. Our faculty teaching academic subjects—the regular or permanent members of the faculty—are largely members of the church of Christ. Some of our extra or part-time teachers, who are used to fill in on academic subjects are not members of the church of Christ. However, great care is taken in the case of all teachers to see that they are free from any attitudes in teaching of any subjects that might be harmful to Christian faith.

It is, of course, desirable to have a big majority of the student body Christian young people. That matter is controlled largely by the geographical location of the college. The enrollment of some of our so-called Christian colleges could be 100% filled with young people from the families of churches of Christ in their states. Out

here in California we have a larger percentage of the young people from the families of churches of Christ in our college than those colleges do in other states, but that fills only one-fourth of the capacity of our college. (If this school were in China or Japan, probably no more than one or two per cent of the students would be members of the church.) Shall we close our doors to other students because they are not members of the church of Christ? There are many young people of other faiths and many with no religion clamoring to get in. The Bible does not say anything about how a college should be run. In the light of Biblical principles, human judgment must be used, and it is our judgment that we should screen out these young people carefully and take as many as we can handle of those of good character. We know we are rendering them a good service. All students are required to study Bible courses in New and Old Testament. During the school year a good number of young people obey the Gospel of Christ. We think that in view of our location, we are doing that which is wisest and best for the students and for the cause of Christ.

It should always be kept in mind that a college is organized and operated under the laws of the State to do an educational job. Its primary purpose as an institution is to provide education. The Christian College strives to give that education in such a manner that young people who must have an education to compete in the modern world will not lose their faith while they are receiving their training. All ambitious young people of this day need education. If they receive this training under circumstances that destroy their faith, they are lost to the church.

Therefore, although we as individual Christians are doing all we can, personally and through our local congregations, to get people to obey the Gospel, our greatest service *as a College* is to provide excellent educational facilities in an environment that will strengthen and further develop Christian faith. In this way, the brightest young people among us from the families of the churches of Christ, can prepare themselves for service in business, the professions — wherever higher training is required—keeping and increasing their Christian convictions and purpose, and thus

become a great influence for good in their communities.

My observation has been that young men and women who received their higher education in such an environment are the leading workers in local congregations. This caused me to conclude that the greatest amount of good could be accomplished by providing such education for young people. I am deeply gratified as I see young people who have come through our college doing great work in preaching, in foreign mission work, in teaching, in public service, in business, and at the same time remaining loyal and active members of the church. I hope that many thousands of such young people will be sent out from our college through the years that lie ahead, and that they will accomplish great good in the generations to come.

There are many opinions as to how the college should be run. All of them are based upon the judgment of some person. May I ask just what factors shall determine the policy of a Christian College other than the sincere judgment of Christian people when the Bible does not cover the subject? We are using our best judgment in the management of this college and we think we are doing fairly well.

One man with whom I talked, who is an elder in the church, told me we should not call this institution a Christian college, and he gave as his main reason that we allow boys to smoke in their private rooms in the dormitories. Another man said it is a sin to allow the use of Coca Cola. Of course, these matters are only opinions or human judgment. I do not smoke, but occasionally I drink a Coca Cola, and one man has as good a right to his opinion as another, but that should not be a good reason for saying that if we differ on these things, we should not call the institution a Christian College.

In regard to smoking, many think it is better to allow a young man to smoke in his private room than to establish a rule which he will not obey or which will force him to go across the street every evening after so that he can smoke a little while. At least we keep the classrooms and campus free from smoking. I asked the elder referred to above what he did about the members of his

church who stand in front of the church building on Sunday morning and smoke before and after services. Of course, he does not do anything about it. We have some such members where I am an elder. Some members have not grown in grace as they should. Some are still babes in Christ. I think all congregations have some such members. Should we disfellowship them? I think this is a matter where mature human judgment must prevail. So it is not imperative for every member of the church to be 100% perfect in order for the church to be called Christian. If so, none that I know of would qualify. There are sure to be some members who are not entirely faithful; there are others who do not attend regularly; some do not contribute as they have been prospered; some are not perfect in morality and honesty.

It is not imperative that every citizen in a community or the nation be a Christian in order to call it a Christian community or a Christian nation. We speak of a Christian home or Christian family, when very often there are one or more children in the family old enough to obey the Gospel who have not done so.

Therefore the term Christian nation or Christian community or Christian family or Christian college can be used only in a relative or limited sense. That is the only way the term should be applied to a college, and our college is, in that sense, a Christian college.

I am gratified with the progress we are making in this College. I am gratified, but never satisfied. I want to go on and improve until it gets to a place much nearer perfection than at present.

In the Founder's Statement published at the time the College was started, I said that I believed the greatest contribution I can possibly make to the coming generation is to establish this College. I still believe the same thing. One of the Statements I made at that time is as follows:

"This institution, while placing special emphasis on Christian living and fundamental Christian faith, shall be a private enterprise, not connected with any church, and shall not solicit contributions from the churches."

My hope and prayer is that this institution shall go on during many generations toward the great objective of helping young

people to acquire “Adequate preparation for a life of usefulness in a competitive world;” and “A foundation of Christian character and faith which will survive the storms of life.”

My fondest ambition in this life is to provide the greatest possible help for young people in educational facilities and in spiritual guidance, thereby improving their lives here and hereafter and glorifying God to the fullest extent.