

THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

Armistice Day

Some Reflections

Palestine Today

Through Travelers' Eyes

Carlyle and Calvinism

A Critical Estimate

Yucatan Temples

Mexican Ruins

Karl Barth's Theology

Some Revisions

Urim and Thummim

What Were They?

Cremation Discussion

Letters

Reviews

Verse

Club Reports

The CALVIN FORUM

PUBLISHED BY THE CALVIN FORUM BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

PROF. LOUIS BERKHOF, B.D.; PROF. CLARENCE BOUMA, A.M., Th.D.; PROF. ALBERT E. BROENE, A.B.; PROF. JOHANNES BROENE, A.M.; PROF. HARRY G. DEKKER, M.S.; LAMBERT J. FLOKSTRA, A.M.; PROF. PETER HOEKSTRA, Ph.D.; PROF. WILLIAM HARRY JELLEMA, Ph.D.; PROF. DIEDRICH H. KROMMINGA, A.B., Th.B.; PROF. H. HENRY MEETER, Th.D.; EDWIN Y. MONSMA, Ph.D.; PROF. JAMES NIEUWDORP, B.S.; WILLIAM T. RADIUS, A.M.; PROF. ALBERTUS ROOKS, A.M.; PROF. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, Ph.D.; PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, A.B., B.D.; PROF. RALPH STOB, Ph.D.; PROF. SEYMOUR SWETS, A.M.; JOHANNA TIMMER, A.M.; PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL, A.M.; PROF. J. G. VANDEN BOSCH, A.M.; PROF. JOHN P. VAN HAITSMAN, Ph.D.; PROF. HENRY VAN ZYL, Ph.D.; PROF. SAMUEL VOLBEDA, Th.D.; HARRY J. WASSINK, A.B., B.S.; PROF. MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN, B.D., Ph.D.

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

DR. CLARENCE BOUMA (Managing Editor), DR. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL, and PROF. J. G. VANDEN BOSCH.

CONTENTS—Vol. IV, No. 4, NOVEMBER, 1938

EDITORIALS

Armistice Day, 1938.....	75
Is This Neutrality?.....	76
Natural Science and Scripture Truth.....	77
Dr. Craig Carries On.....	77

ARTICLES

Palestine Today. By Lee S. Huizenga, M.D., F. R. G. S.....	78
Was Carlyle a Calvinist? By Effa Zwier, M.A.....	81
Temple Worship in Yucatan, Mexico. By Morris Steggerda, Ph.D.....	84
The Theology of Karl Barth: Revision. By Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th.B.....	85
The Urim and the Thummim. By Marinus Cook.....	89
Cremation and the Resurrection Body: A Discussion.....	91

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A Letter from India.....	92
A Letter from Holland.....	93
"I Am the Voice".....	93

BOOKS REVIEWED

Humor at Britain's Expense.....	94
The Life Hereafter.....	94
On Tabernacle and Temple.....	95

DISCUSSION CLUBS

Calvinistic Discussion Club.....	95
Nature and Scripture Study Club.....	95

VERSE

Peaceful Interlude	83
Thanksgiving	83

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly. Subscription Price: Two Dollars per year. Address all editorials as well as business correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Franklin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Entered as second-class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The CALVIN FORUM

VOLUME IV

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., NOVEMBER, 1938

NUMBER 4

ARMISTICE DAY, 1938

AN EDITORIAL

ONCE more we celebrate Armistice Day on November 11. It is just twenty years since that first Armistice Day, when the allied nations rejoiced over victory and peace. But if our celebrations of this day have for many years been made in a spirit of rejoicing, the present international scene is well calculated to fill our hearts with gloom. It is characteristic of this year's celebration that we will not so much look back upon the peace which ended the first world war, as look forward with apprehension toward a possible second world conflagration.

It must be confessed that there is enough in the present international situation to justify such apprehension.

When some months ago ex-President Hoover returned from his trip to Europe he summed up his view of the European situation by saying that he had found Marxism a dying faith and Fascism a raging fury. Mr. Hoover may prove to be mistaken about Marxism, but few will deny that he was right in his characterization of Fascism. The entire international picture is dominated by the aggressive and defiant attitude of the fascist nations.

Germany, Italy, and Japan are breathing defiance at the rest of the world. It was said that the World War was fought to make the world safe for democracy, but whatever truth or fiction there may have been in that statement for the period 1914-1918, it is beyond dispute that democracy is not only on the defensive today, but may soon have to fight for its very life.

Turn where you will in the world today, everywhere the fascist nations are on the aggressive and the democratic nations on the defensive. Japan is crushing the most populous republic on the face of the globe and is threatening the position and prestige of the Western democracies in the Far East. And in Europe Hitler and Mussolini apparently dominate the scene.

We can hardly comprehend the crushing blow which the European democracies have received from the so-called peace of Munich. Possibly at this close range we should call Munich one big question mark. But this question mark may soon turn out to be one terrible exclamation point. Let those who will, look

upon Chamberlain's flight to Berchtesgaden and Godesberg as a magnificent stroke of diplomacy and a wonderful act of self-denial in the face of a threatening war in Europe. Let those who will, hail him with jubilation as the preserver of the peace of the world. Let those who feel so inclined, send up prayers of gratitude to God for what this man has accomplished. We confess we cannot see him in that light. To us Munich seems like one big blunder on the part of England. We thank God for the continuation of peace in Europe until now, but we cannot persuade ourselves to send up a prayer of gratitude over the conference of Munich.

* * *

What makes the international situation so ominous is this backing down of the great democracies before the insolent attitude of the fascist nations.

Surely Germany is entitled to a place of honor and respect among the nations of the world. No student of history will care to deny that the peace treaty of Versailles constituted a grave injustice to the Central Powers. That France and England are in a sense reaping what they sowed in 1919 is clear. Not that is cause for alarm. Neither is it the dismemberment of that ethnological patch quilt known since 1919 as the republic of Czechoslovakia that need fill us with dismay. Let those who will, be under German rule.

The menace of the present situation is the fury of Fascism. The nations are lining up in two camps. Two philosophies of government are pitted against one another. What is happening in the world today has never happened before. We have had a great diversity of forms of government in the past and some of these have clashed with others. But today we witness the spectacle of two conflicting ideologies, two forms of government that cannot mix any more than water and fire, and these struggling for world hegemony.

In this situation the sympathies of every Christian American will of necessity be on the side of the democracies. We do not believe that God has ordained any special form of government as the only one pleasing in His sight. We do not believe that there is only one legitimate form of government

possible under the principles of Christian ethics. But we are deeply convinced that in the present struggle between democracy and the autocracy of Fascism all the finer hopes of a Christian civilization are wrapped up with the cause represented by the historically Christian democracies.

To the extent to which Fascism has its way in the world, to that extent freedom will be shackled. A world in which Fascism is in control is a world of the suppression and oppression of minorities; a world in which secret police and concentration camps silence the expression of honest opinion and judgment; a world in which the will of one man is substituted for the free exercise of the will of the majority.

* * *

That, as we see it, is at stake in the international situation today. Munich has proved to be a magnificent boost for the prestige of the loudest dictator in the world. And it has meant a crushing blow to the influence, respect, and prestige of Great Britain. There is an unmistakable connection between the peace of Munich and the loss of prestige which Great Britain is suffering in recent weeks in Europe, in the Near East, and the Far East as well. The whole world has been witness of the flight of the prime minister of the world's greatest empire to Berchtesgaden and Godesberg, and the world has not been slow to interpret those flights as meaning that now the strongest power in Europe no longer lives in the British Isles but in Berlin and the Bavarian Forest.

Great Britain may soon have to fight for its life. And she can be struck at many vulnerable points. Even if she should feel secure and safe in Western Europe, the future of Great Britain and its position in the world depends just as much upon Gibraltar, the Mediterranean, the Near East, and the Far East. If Germany succeeds in its plot to stir up the two hundred million Moslems against Great Britain, who knows what will happen in the Near East? If Japan should crush China and before long be master of the Pacific, at least on its Asiatic side, what will happen to Great Britain and its influence in the Far East?

And what will happen to our own country if the great fascist powers, in an unholy alliance with Islam, should control the strategic centers on the world's map? We have flattered ourselves with the thought of our comparative safety because of our natural geographical isolation. But how isolated is our isolation? Are not the South American republics the happy hunting grounds for the German propagandists? Is what has recently taken place in Mexico very reassuring on this score? Have we reason to believe that a world which treats written treaties as scraps of paper will be much concerned about that great understanding between the nations of our Western hemisphere which has never been committed to writing: the Monroe Doctrine?

* * *

And what are the prospects for Christianity and the Church in a fascist world?

Ask that question of Martin Niemöller pining away in the concentration camp of Sachsenhausen. Ask that question of the score of ministers who have been robbed of the privilege to leave their homes or to preach the gospel in Germany, the land of Martin Luther. Ask that question of Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna, one of the few Roman Catholic prelates to welcome the Nazis to Austrian soil, now suffering from the fury of the bigoted sons of Herr Hitler. Ask it of the missionaries who under Italian and Japanese rule have been denied the right to carry on their endeavors of bringing Christ into the lives of natives. Ask it of those who in Korea as well as Japan have been compelled to close their missions and mission schools because they refused to worship at the Shinto shrines and to pay divine homage to the head of the Japanese nation.

* * *

On this Armistice Day, 1938, we thank God for the liberties which we as a nation still enjoy, both civil and religious.

We humbly confess that we are unworthy of these blessings that make for a happy life in family, church, and nation.

And we earnestly pray for the advancement of the gospel of Jesus Christ both at home and abroad, and for the continuation of the influence of those powers to which liberty and democracy in the nation and the spread of the gospel of Jesus Christ in the missionary enterprise owe a lasting debt of gratitude.

C. B.

Is This Neutrality?

CHINA is bleeding from many wounds. The merciless heel of the cruel oppressor is crushing life—and more than life—out of its population. The butchery of men, the assault upon honor and decency, the utterly heartless aerial attacks upon a helpless civilian population, are going on apace at the hands of those who have not one excuse for being on Chinese soil. What the outcome of this war—even to this day never declared!—will be, only God knows. There is much at stake in this struggle, also as far as we in America are concerned. We who are both Christians and Americans cannot be indifferent to the trend of things as they are developing in the Far East. Both from an international and from a missionary point of view the outcome of the unequal struggle of China's four hundred millions with the Nipponese battalions is fraught with serious possibilities. But we are neutral! It is well. We have no duty to pull the chestnuts of other nations out of the fire. Surely it cannot be considered our duty as a nation to take up cudgels for every nation that is unwarrantably attacked by an enemy nation. But *are* we neutral? That is the question. Are we not fighting in the Chinese-Japanese war today? And on whose side are we fighting? Some months ago Harry Dijkstra, one of

our CALVIN FORUM correspondents in China, complained that America contributed a million for the Red Cross in China and alongside of that furnished Japan the scrap iron which it needs to murder and torture the nation whose wounds we would heal. In a recent issue of *The Living Church* an American missionary located at hard-pressed Hankow described the cruel raid that lay a large part of his compound and chapel low, and then he adds: "I should like to point out the fact that these pieces of shrapnel were probably made of good American iron, and should like to ask once more if something cannot be done in our country [i.e., America] to arouse public opinion against supplying Japan with all sorts of war materials, thus aiding and abetting her in this cruel war." We are not neutral, though we have an ingenious argument ready for anyone who accuses us of lack of neutrality. But the bald facts testify against us. We are fighting in China on the side of Japan. We are furnishing the scrap iron indispensable to Japan to carry forward its nefarious business on Chinese soil. Warfare in these days is not restricted to military operations. It is often fought on the economic front before it can be fought on the military front. On that economic front America stands on the side of Japan. The blood of China is also on our hands. How long will this continue?

C. B.

Natural Science and Scripture Truth

IF the Reformed Faith is to be a living force in modern thought and life we must not only defend it over against the attacks of its enemies, but it will also be supremely necessary to do constructive work for its further development. Such constructive work must be both of a practical, organizational, and of a scholarly nature. The Reformed Faith has always placed great emphasis upon education, scholarship, a world and life view. Already in the days of the Reformation it repudiated the aversion to scholarship which marked the Anabaptists of that day. By its emphasis upon a sound theology and a university training for its ministers—who at that time constituted the educated leadership of the nation—Calvinism in the days of the Reformation and thereafter in Switzerland, France, Holland, England, and Scotland established and strengthened the bonds between a genuine scholarship and whole-souled devotion to the Reformed Faith. Then came the days of the decline of the Faith before the onslaughts of Rationalism, Deism, and Pantheism. With the revival of the Reformed Faith in Holland under the masterful leadership of Abraham Kuyper in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the alliance between a high type of scholarship and Calvinistic thinking was re-asserted and re-established. Kuyper

founded the Free University. It is quite clear that one of the strongest weapons for the defense of the Reformed Faith in America should be found in our educational institutions. That is where the defection always begins, and that is where the defection began some decades ago. The Presbyterian Churches have lost their heritage in their educational institutions before they lost it in their pulpits and general assemblies. All this means that the Reformed Faith must be re-established and vindicated in scholarly fashion. This requires hard work. Philosophy and Science must be related to the genius and the fundamental implications of the Reformed Faith. The Reformed Faith because of its comprehensiveness and intellectual as well as spiritual vitality is capable of this. But it requires intensive scholarly effort to accomplish this. We must become in earnest about relating whatever new knowledge is brought to light in our day in the various fields of scholarship to the central principle of Calvinism. Not only do we need a well-informed press in these days of the revival of Reformed truth, but we also need study groups that are ready to cope with the problem of this integration of new knowledge with the Reformed Faith. The fields in which this is an urgent matter are such as Theology, Philosophy, and Natural Science. The recent organization of clubs for the study of fundamental philosophical and theological issues from the point of view of the assumptions of the Reformed Faith is a hopeful sign. We are happy to be able to point at this time to the organization of a small group of scholars whose objective is the study of the integration of Scripture truth and the results of the study of natural science. The first report of their doings appears on another page of this issue under the heading, Nature and Scripture Study Club. May the organization of such clubs as these be the beginning, however small, of a movement in the American scholarly world that shall carry forward the task of integrating and synthesizing all modern knowledge that is truly knowledge with the basic truths of Calvinism.

C. B.

Dr. Craig Carries On

LAST spring an announcement from the editor of *Christianity Today* led many friends of the Reformed Faith to believe that this worthy periodical was gracefully bowing itself out of the company of religious journals. At that time it was announced that this magazine, which heretofore had been a monthly, would henceforth appear as a quarterly. Some of us may have thought that this was the beginning of the end. But the appearance in October of the first quarterly issue has happily put such fears to shame. Here are 52 pages of solid, worthwhile material for all who love the Reformed Faith. The two subjects that receive the lion's share of space and attention are the doings of the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in

the U. S. A., and the Princeton-Barthianism-Brunner issue. On the latter subject, which with the coming of Brunner as guest professor to Princeton this fall has become a live issue for the future of Reformed Theology in America, Dr. Craig, the editor, not only writes a strong editorial, but he also publishes reprints of what he calls "recent significant articles on Princeton." Of these no less than five are presented to the readers. The first is our editorial, "Princeton, Barthianism, and Brunner" (THE CALVIN FORUM, June, 1938). The second is President Mackay's enthusiastic defense of Brunner's coming to Princeton which originally appeared in *The Presbyterian Tribune*. Then follows Dr. Van Til's "Brunner Comes to Princeton," an article which appeared in *The Banner*, issue of August 4, 1938. Dr. Kuizenga's "sprightly contribution" to *The Presbyterian* under the title, "On Putting One's Harness Off" comes next, and the series is closed by Dr. David S. Clark's article in the same periodical under the title, "The New Word of God." It will interest our readers to take note of this sentence of Dr. Craig's anent Princeton Seminary: "In fact if persistent rumor is well-grounded, the majority of the Seminary faculty—at least if, as strictly speaking we should, we think of the faculty as consisting only of those who have been confirmed by the

General Assembly—are far from Barthian in their sympathies." Neither Dr. Homrighausen's (though he is still teaching at Princeton) nor Brunner's appointment have been confirmed by the General Assembly. We congratulate Dr. Craig on carrying forward the battle for the historic Reformed Faith in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The staff of *Christianity Today* has been augmented by the addition of such men as Dr. Oswald T. Allis, Loraine Boettner (author of *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*), and Joseph A. Schofield, Jr. Alongside of the testimony of the Presbyterian Church in America, Westminster Seminary, and *The Presbyterian Guardian*, there is room for a strong journal championing the cause of the maintenance and the progressive promulgation of the Reformed Faith in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. Who knows whether in God's providence the heroic stand of the group now cast out by the powers that be in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. may not serve to consolidate the forces still loyal to the faith of the fathers in the old communion, and thus prepare a great revival of the Reformed Faith in that body. This is what happened in the state church of Holland after the secession movement headed by Dr. Kuyper. History may repeat itself.

C. B.

PALESTINE TODAY*

Lee S. Huizenga, M.D., F.R.G.S.

Medical Missionary, Shanghai, China

IT IS said that when the Crusaders first entered the Holy City Jerusalem, they were disappointed and, just as Nehemiah many centuries before had wept when he saw the city in ruins, so these brave warriors wept. Anticipation had thrilled them more than the stark reality they met. The Heavenly Jerusalem of their forward look and the pious idealism of what Jerusalem and Palestine should be, clashed with what they actually found.

In a like manner the Holy Land may be disappointing to many a Christian visitor, who loves his Bible and to whom all that is linked up with his Lord's earthly life is dear. Some way or other we associate an idea of holiness with the land and places so closely bound up with the life of our Lord. We call Jerusalem the Holy City and Palestine the Holy Land. We link up some idea of sacredness with Calvary and Gethsemane, with the Via Dolorosa and the grave from which the Lord arose and the hundreds of places better known to us often in this far away land than most of the cities of our own country.

Traveling through Palestine one is apt to become bitterly disappointed unless he can dissociate from

the so-called holy places the unholiness that he beholds and to see in what may appear to him a barren, rocky, unproductive land instead of what he thought was beautiful and flowing with milk and honey.

True it is, the land has possibilities which the present population has not begun to tap. There is an advancement that amazes the traveler who visits Palestine. The filthy native hut of the city is being replaced by beautiful modern flats and homes, new cities are built upon the ruins of the old; modern means of communications takes place of the camel and donkey and modern social life has taken on an entirely different and improved aspect to the average westerner.

Beauty and Filth

Parts of Palestine are most beautiful especially in springtime, some of the great valleys have the promise of some day being covered with crops too big for their barns to store away. Irrigation projects can do wonders for large sections that are now barren. If the Lord should again bless this land with "early and latter rains," the rocky hills and forbidding mountains one now sees on every side, can be covered with forests or become the grazing fields for thousands of flocks of sheep.

* A reflection on the Holy Land written by Dr. Huizenga during his recent visit to Palestine and Egypt.

The climate is wonderful. The land is fertile. Thousands of acres of orange groves of vines and of various orchards now already give a pleasing welcome to the tourist and the fragrance of the orange blossoms fills the air. Yes, there is much that pleases, but as Bishop Heber sung of Ceylon's spicy isle, "only man is vile."

The native city people are dirty. In their homes built of huge stones or hidden in part in the numerous caves throughout the rocky country, the least of what we would consider comforts are lacking. The sun shines hot upon them, water for washing is scarce except in certain places, the mountains and the dens and caves of the earth are so numerous that the Lord's parable of the man who fell among thieves and lay wounded by the wayside comes to you with new meaning. Today such a thing happens repeatedly.

Stinking goats increase the filth of the Arab's abode and the dirty looking camel and his trapping add only to the shock one's probably too aesthetic tastes receive when he expects to go traveling in the Holy Land.

Out in open plains the untidy Beduan Arab's tent is nothing too inviting, hospitable as some travelers claim the hosts are.

The necessity of feet washing one quickly learns, if he tries to do much walking along the rocky and sandy paths. Round about Jerusalem stones of all sizes abound and each step means stones unless you keep to newly built highways where automobiles honk and turn in before you at some horseshoe curve.

The Holy Places

But these things are but as nothing compared to what one meets at the holy places themselves. All Christian pilgrims have the earnest ambition to tread the footsteps of the Man of Sorrows, but one must learn to lift up his idealism unhampered and unobscured above the debris of human tradition and superstition that throughout the ages has accumulated on these spots. Some of these old churches look like antique shops covered with dust and ravages of time, rather than sacred temple courts.

The city of Bethlehem for instance, so sweet to the memories of childhood, when we drank in the story of the birth of Christ at our mother's knee and where we so vividly saw in our mind

Away in the manger, no crib for its bed,
The little Lord Jesus lays down his sweet head.

Instead of all that which in our imagination seems so real, one sees over the place where the Lord Jesus is supposed to have been born a huge old stuffy church of great interest may be to antiquarian, historian, and archeologist, but of little interest to the believing heart. Here in this old church, in hearing distance of where once in Bethlehem's fields the world's most wonderful peace song was sent into the world by angel voices—there one now sees a

Moslem soldier with a gun to keep three groups of Christians, who all claim first right to this sacred place, from attacking each other in their quarrels and strifes.

In Jerusalem one sees nine contesting Christian groups constantly quarreling in the Church of the Sacred Dome, built over one of the supposed empty tombs from which the Lord arose. Were it not for the Moslem guards on duty there this would annually at Easter Day be a place of death rather than savoring of resurrection and life.

Outside of these places are always numbers of guides and other undesirables who still seek to make the temple courts a den of thieves and you an object of their ambitions.

Few places are left where one may still see the original trail upon which the feet of Him walked, concerning whom the Jews sang and the church of all ages after them: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Gethsemane's garden claims to have the tree under which the Man of Sorrows sweat red, but the tree is now in a modern flower garden and beside a Popish Church that would easily make one think the whole thing a fraud and here even an offering is expected for a look.

But why go on in this vein? If you can free your thinking from these externals then the Holy Land has rich experiences in store for the pious pilgrim. With your Bible open after a day's tour new light comes to you. "Even the stones shall speak."

The Dead Sea

"Jordan crossed"—that phrase brings peace to the mind of him who standing at the fords of the Jordan may fear death, for coming from a long and wearisome desert tour, the Jordan water, muddy as it is, after all looks refreshing and with little difficulty "Jordan is passed" to put you at once in the Holy Land and almost within sight of the Holy City. That is a thought for reflection at the evening of life.

The Dead Sea, only ten years ago absolutely forsaken with not even an Arab's tent, with no birds flying about it, with no fish within its water, is showing signs of life. For millenniums receiving the fresh water of the Jordan without having an outlet for giving, the Dead Sea is now loosing its twice-honored grip. A large industrial plant is now extracting thousands of tons of valuable chemicals from the Dead Sea waters, upon its surface small sea craft now are busy making a livelihood and the Dead Sea, up to the present thought of as a miser only receiving but dead to the world, is now found to contain such abundance of healing qualities, that if normal times return to Palestine, the Dead Sea will probably become one of the greatest spas in the world. Thirteen hundred feet below sea level, the oxygen content of the air above the sea is the highest in the world, the radioactivity of its waters and the chemical composition of this briny deep is far superior to any other known medicinal bathing place. One large roomy modern sanatorium is al-

ready constructed and patients are even now finding their health revived. The Dead Sea changed into Ponce de Leon's "fountain of youth"—who would have thought it! Yet the beginnings of such a health resort are already open to the public.

Whether Palestine will be able to support the constantly increasing population is a question. At present some still doubt, but with the retilling of the fields and areas of reforestation, the return of the former and latter rain may once more make it a "land flowing with milk and honey." When a few decades ago the British soldiers began to build the railroad from the Red Sea to Jerusalem, in the optimism they called it the "Milk and Honey Railway." When thousands of these railway builders lay buried in the desert sand, without seeing milk and honey, the remaining men called it the Desert Railway. Could the men who rest in the sand now arise to see that railway crossing thousands of acres of fertile land with waving fields of grain in the springtime and orchard upon orchard bearing fruit to feed the Near East, with sheep and cattle for milk and bees that sip the flower cups for their owners to produce honey, they might be ready after all to think that their first long and prophetic view was right and once more speak of the Milk and Honey Railroad.

The Modern Beside the Ancient

There may be much old architecture buried in the sands, there may be temples and cathedrals ready to fall, there are also new buildings going up that hardly find their equal anywhere else. The old basilica over the so-called Holy Grave, built by the Crusaders many hundreds of years ago, is in such a state of decay that huge steel girders had to be built to prop it up. The earthquakes of a few years ago did such a damage to the time-worn structure, that this year the governor of Palestine issued a proclamation in which worshipping on Easter Day in the old basilica of the Church of the Dome was done at the worshippers' own risk.

But beside these old buildings new and strong buildings arise stately in structure, quake-resisting in masonry. The Jewish University, some modern cathedrals, the Museum donated by Rockefeller and just opened to the public, one of the world's most wonderful and imposing Y. M. C. A. buildings, King David's Hotel, the Governor's Palace and too many more recent buildings to mention, offset in their extremely modern and durable appearance all the ruins of ancient times.

A modern train with Pullman sleepers and dining cars attached carry you now instead of the donkey, or the camel of only a few decades ago. An excellent air field near Lydda is the stopping place of one of the finest and longest airways in the world and cars of all makes and sizes gracefully roll along over the winding roads up and down through the former rough and unsafe mountain passes.

Oil Fields, Grain Fields, and Vines

The oil tapers of temples and homes alike are giving way to electricity, and the water for home consumption from stagnant pools of former days is now exchanged for modern city water plants in all cities of any size. The rich oil fields from Iraq are being piped through the Holy Land and a large refinery for oil is now being built at Haifa making all the products of the oil fields available at a moderate price almost at the door of Jewish colonists and Arabs alike. Though greatly outnumbered by the Arabs the Jews have showed themselves formidable rivals in the rebirth of the country and are consequently hated and persecuted, but the "more they were oppressed the more they multiplied," say the ancient scriptures.

Where in Bible days the Jews were possessors of the land by conquest, they now own the land by purchase. At good prices the best of the land is purchased by the incoming Jew from the native Arab and within an unbelievable short time such land is transformed into a productive grainfield or a most promising orchard of citrus and other fruit. The vine and the fig tree play an important part as of old and the grapes of Escol promise again to become the choice of the earth.

Not all Jews in Palestine belong to this thrifty class. The native Jew who for generations past has been the inhabitant of Palestine resembles in many ways his Arab co-habitant of the land, but he has the promise of slowly being absorbed by the new colonist from the west with ideals and ambitions unsurpassable in any land.

In Jesus' Day and in Ours

The Palestine of Jesus' day was a land much the same as Palestine today and that will help the Christian pilgrim of today to evaluate the land better. Do the troubles of Christian denominationalism in Palestine annoy him, he must remember that Jesus, too, constantly met disagreeing Jewish sects. Do the ever-present guides and money-changers irritate him, remember in Jesus' day they, too, did their business, even in the temple courts. Do awful sights of filth and disease make one feel uncomfortable in passing through the narrow and thickly crowded city streets, remember Jesus, too, was in the press; he, too, saw the leper "full of leprosy," the blind man begging, he spoke of Lasarus "full of sores."

In Jesus' day the Holy Land was filled with people that suffered and made others suffer, in Jesus' day men fell in the hands of robbers. In Jesus' day there were sinners. It was just for these he said, that he came. To think of these things may set us straight in our thinking.

Today the world breathes out in wholesale what Palestine in Jesus' day did on a small scale. And as necessary as Christ was for the world of his day so necessary is He for the world of today.

WAS CARLYLE A CALVINIST?

Effa Zwier, M. A.

Ann Arbor, Michigan

A FEW years ago an orthodox preacher happened to assert in the course of his sermon that the Scotch *literatus* Carlyle had given an enormous impetus to Calvinism throughout the nineteenth century. The purport of what follows is to challenge this statement.

In order to lend clarity and significance to certain important ideas and statements of Carlyle's in a few of his major works, such as *Sartor Resartus* (1833-'34) and *Past and Present* (1843), I shall use as a contrasting foil the truly historical John Knox, and also some definite criteria of Calvinism as embodied by the late Dr. B. B. Warfield in his brief but scholarly pamphlet, *Calvin as a Theologian and Calvinism Today* (1909).

Criteria of Calvinism

These criteria as formulated by the distinguished American Calvinistic theologian are as follows:

(1) "... The doctrine of predestination is not the formative principle of Calvinism; it is its logical implication

(2) "Calvinism withdraws the eye from the human soul and its destiny and fixes it on God and his glory

(3) "... The five points of Calvinism are the sovereignty of the election of God, the substitutive definiteness of the atonement of Christ, the inability of the sinful will to do good, the creative energy of the saving grace of the Holy Spirit, the safety of the redeemed soul in the keeping of its Redeemer

(4) "Clearly at the root of the stock which bears these branches must lie a most profound sense of God, and an equally profound sense of the relation in which the creature stands to God, whether conceived merely as creature or more specifically as sinful creature. It is the vision of God in his majesty which lies at the foundation of Calvinistic thinking.

(5) "He who believes in God without reserve, and is determined that God shall be God to him, in all his thinking, feeling, willing—in the entire compass of his life activities, intellectual, moral, spiritual—throughout all his individual, social and religious relations, is, by the force of that strictest of all logic which presides over the outworking of principles into thought and life, by the very necessity of the case, a Calvinist.

(6) "In Calvinism, objectively speaking, theism comes to its rights; subjectively speaking, the religious relation attains its purity; soteriologically speaking, evangelical religion finds at length its full expression and its secure stability."

Carlyle, the Student, Faces other Isms

When Carlyle, the eager, inquisitive student from a Calvinistic home, came under the influence of

Scotch university chairs, he was facing much the same dilemma as some of our graduates when they become exposed to the influence of American university professors, as, for instance, the late Dr. R. M. Wenley at the University of Michigan, and others. Just as several of them get their own ism entangled and sometimes lost in so-called more broad-minded isms, so Carlyle got his own ism entangled and lost in other isms.

Moreover, although he was a genius in embryo, he was not able to cope with university men far ahead of him in years, in experience, and in learning. He became mystified, baffled, confused, perturbed, doubting, unhappy—and the natural upshot of it all was that he converted himself in the main from Calvinism. The new ism now followed by Carlyle, expressed in *Sartor Resartus*, his first important work, and to a greater or less degree in all his subsequent writings, is an amalgamation of Goethe-ism, Kantism, Fichtism (which in its emphasis upon the will rather than upon pure thought has much in common with Puritanism), Hegelism, Schlegelism, Schillerism, Puritanism, Calvinism, et cetera.

Whether he himself ever truly understood his own metamorphosis and new attitude of mind and heart, I much doubt. In *Sartor Resartus*, at any rate, his words do not always measure up to his new creed. Such a statement as "Is not God's Universe a symbol of the Godlike?" is queerly incompatible with, "If Nature is one, and a living indivisible whole, much more is Mankind, the image that reflects and creates Nature, without which Nature were not."

A vivid, fierce picture of the revolution which had taken place within the young man Carlyle we find in *Sartor Resartus*. His conversion from Calvinism evidently gave him a strong inspiration to produce this masterpiece, by which the world of letters is unquestionably enriched. But as far as he himself was concerned, he became dyspeptic, unhappy, irritable, and remained so to the end of his days. Thus, in spite of all his heroic literary efforts to gain the whole world, he lost his own soul. At any rate, he no doubt induced very many of his readers and admirers during the nineteenth century to accept his enlarged, pragmatic views of life and religion.

Carlyle, Knox, Goethe

This is Carlyle's reply to Emerson who had derogatively criticized a particular statement in the apologue of the Three Reverences in *Meister* (Emerson being, in true American fashion, somewhat more of a middle-of-the-road man in religious verities than Carlyle): "Believe me, it is impossible you can be more Puritan than I; nay, I often feel as if I were

far too much so, but John Knox himself, could he have seen the peaceable impregnable fidelity of that man's Goethe's mind, and how to him Duty was infinite—Knox would have passed on wondering, not reproaching."

Anyone acquainted with the historical John Knox and his writings would be inclined to challenge Carlyle as to this remark about Knox's "passing on wondering, not reproaching" the philosophy of Goethe. If Knox's span of life had approximately overlapped with that of Goethe, and the Scotch theologian would have paused long enough to catch the drift of the philosophy of Goethe, he evidently would have condemned Goethe in his emphasis upon the "infinite nature of Duty." In fact, Knox might have uttered an anathema against the upshot of the philosophy of Goethe not only, but also that of Carlyle.

The great German *literatus*-philosopher, reinforced by Kant, Schlegel, Hegel, Fichte, became the first and only love of Carlyle. His Scotch-Covenanter eyes were mesmerized by Goethe. His zeal for Calvinism died out. As Walker remarks in his standard literary history of the nineteenth century, Carlyle became a Calvinist without Christianity. Transcendentalism, which has some certain strains in common with the philosophic side of Calvinism, *i.e.* in providing a spiritual basis for the visible objective, became a pet idea of Carlyle's to the end of his days. Unlike Coleridge and Wordsworth, who in their late days renounced some of the philosophic ideals of their younger days, Carlyle had forever turned from Christian theism (Calvinism) to non-Christian theism (Transcendentalism).

Carlyle's General Theological Skin

The color of Carlyle's general theological skin is made up of diverse components, but as far as I now have been able to discover, Carlyle is inclined to be Puritanic in respect to the content of his writings, and Calvinistic in respect to their expression. Together with Puritans, he tends to put emphasis on life at the expense of doctrine, on will at the expense of intellect, on good works at the expense of atonement for sin. Just as in this country the pragmatism of John Dewey thrives in a Methodistic hotbed, so the idealism of the German transcendentalists easily found a fruitful soil in these fundamental ideas of English Puritanism. Duty became infinite to Carlyle, work became his gospel—Know what you can do, and do it. The conservative pragmatism of Goethe inflated Carlyle almost to a bursting point.

It must, on the other hand, be maintained that Carlyle never was entirely successful in shedding his Calvinistic skin. He had been born in it—in an atmosphere which had been diffused with the presence and teachings of John Knox, and which had enfolded him more tenaciously than the clothes enfolding mankind in *Sartor Resartus*. In *Miscellanies* VI, Carlyle thus expresses himself: "Thought, conscience, the sense that man is denizen of a Uni-

verse, creature of an Eternity, has penetrated to the remotest cottage, to the simplest heart. Beautiful and awful, the feeling of a Heavenly Behest, of Duty god-commanded, overcanopies all life. There is an inspiration in such a people; one may say in a more special sense, 'the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.' Honour to all the brave and true; everlasting honour to brave old Knox, one of the truest of the true!"

Some of us may incline to the opinion that inasmuch as Carlyle is a *literatus*, his works cannot be appropriately tested on the touchstone of criteria selected from theologians like Knox and Warfield. Something can be said in favor of this view, yet it is more true that, in almost any prose or poetic genius, theological and philosophical implications are inescapable. Theologians simply cannot be put into their own compartments by themselves and kept there, nor can philosophers be kept in their own compartments, nor can historians, nor can scientists, nor can men of letters. The theology that enters the soul in some form or other is inextricably interwoven with the philosophy that enters it, the history, the science, and the art. Many may deny this, but it remains true that, the soul being a unity and man innately religious, theology and philosophy, at any rate, involve themselves in almost any particular intellectual or cultural field. For example, Matthew Arnold, in line with the new scientific thought which strongly affected *literati* around the 1850's, had sworn off all old-time theology—and thereupon promptly wrote one work after another (*e.g.*, *St. Paul and Protestantism*) all in his own theological vein! Carlyle, too, cannot be looked upon merely as a poetic-prose genius. He must be called a philosopher-religionist as well, and must be viewed in the entire compass of his intellectual and cultural activities.

Calvinistic and Non-Calvinistic Elements

A few examples among many go to show that if Carlyle did lose the essence of Calvinism, he did not lose its phraseology. *Sartor Resartus*: "... Let us offer sweet incense to the Devil, and live at ease on the fat things he has provided for his elect." *Past and Present*: "... He who discovers no God whatsoever, how shall he discover heroes, the visible Temples of God?" (Cf. Warfield, Pt. 4).

The element of religious reverence that abounds in Carlyle, he perhaps imbibed to a greater degree from the Scotch Covenanters than from Goethe. The glory of God, the sovereignty of his election, the vision of his majesty, form strong pillars in the religion of the Calvinist (Warfield, Pts. 2, 3, 4). These inspire him with awe and reverence. All his thoughts and acts are to be pleasing in the sight of a just, righteous, and sovereign God. *Coram Deo* is his watchword. Although Carlyle was undoubtedly attaching a non-Calvinistic meaning to the term God, he had not lost the milieu into which this watchword was set. *Sartor Resartus*: "... Only in

reverently bowing down before the Higher does he feel himself exalted Know that there is in man a quite indestructible Reverence for whatsoever holds of Heaven" *Past and Present*: "In silence, in the External Temple, let him worship . . . he has a religion The External Nature of Justice looks about us everywhere."

What does Carlyle mean by God? His God is no longer the God of the Calvinist, but to him He has, as a rule, become equivalent to Nature, Destiny, Justice, Goodness, Duty, the Universe, etc. In other words, like the German transcendentalists, he confounded the God as spoken of by Dr. Warfield, with the attributes of that God. To Carlyle, God is the Sphinx. *Past and Present*: "The Sphinx is Nature, Universe, Destiny, Existence, howsoever we name this grand unnameable Fact in which we live and struggle, [and] is as a heavenly bride and conquest to the wise and brave, to them who can discern her behests and do them; a destroying fiend to them who cannot." I presume that Nichols is correct in saying that Carlyle retained the Metaphysics of Calvinism, but not the Facts of Revelation.

In his Gospel of Work, Carlyle drove some of the tenets of Puritanism to such an extreme that he became an apostate to it and also to Calvinism. The main tenor of his doctrine is not Augustinian, but Pelagian. Carlyle stands on the opposite side of the five criteria quoted from Dr. Warfield (Pt. 3), for he believed that one can be saved for eternity by one's work which is holy. *Past and Present*: "True work is worship The wages of every noble work do yet lie in heaven." *Sartor Resartus*: "For the God-given Mandate, Work done in Well-doing, lies mysteriously written in Promethean Prophetic Characters, in our hearts; and leaves us no rest, night and day, till it be deciphered and obeyed; till it burn forth, in our conduct, a visible, acted Gospel of Freedom." The Socratic "Know thyself," from which the Calvinist may derive the phrase "inability of the sinful will to do good" (Warfield, Pt. 3), Carlyle altered to "Know what thou canst work at . . . the latest Gospel in this world is, Know thy work and do it." Carlyle put the Holy and High God of the Calvinist (Warfield, Pt. 4) in the background, and Man in the foreground. Whether this be "Goethe-ic" or Pelagian, Carlyle made WORK identical to something divine. The Calvinist, on the other hand, keeps the Creator of Work (namely, his infinite and personal God) distinct from the Work itself, which Dr. Warfield terms "the compass of man's activities, intellectual, moral, spiritual" (Pt. 5).

Carlyle Against the Glorious Essence of Calvinism

Who can, after all, dissect the mind of a genius? Especially that of a peculiar poetic-prose genius like Carlyle? His language is often beautiful but vague, and it is evidently supposed to be so. Perhaps some "broad-minded" Calvinists can read a goodly portion of Calvinism and religious good in Carlyle, but

unadulterated Calvinism is scantily represented in him. In the main drift of his reasonings, it must be granted that he was opposed to the glorious essence of Calvinism. Although he gave a strong impetus to the moral, social, and political good of the nineteenth century, he negated Christianity as much as Matthew Arnold and other modern thinkers. Carlyle retained the "religious relation, but not the religion" (Warfield, Pt. 6).

Still, over and against it all, Carlyle was a powerful soul, who made his exalted spiritual morality felt throughout the nineteenth century. Moreover, Carlyle would not have been Carlyle, if he had not been born a Scotch Covenanter—if he had not been reared in a Calvinistic home, amid Calvinistic people. The undeniably fine literature to which he gave birth would not have been "the thought of a thinking soul" (his own definition for literature in *Past and Present*), had it not rested initially on the foundation stone of Calvinism.

PEACEFUL INTERLUDE

There is a stillness in the autumn wood
A peace never disturbed by bird or leaf
That shifts and rustles and then flutters where
It makes a carpet or a color sheaf.

Little aware that they are stored for food
As they plump softly to their tawny bed,
Acorns accent the primal interlude
For shortly must their sleep to snow be wed.

This peace is like a pause unhindering,
A hold to contemplate the season's good,
A rest to penetrate exhausted hearts,
A balm of healing for whatever mood.

This is the time to take the time to be
Close to your Father in a trust serene;
Clasped by His Spirit to the Infinite
You here may contemplate the things unseen.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

THANKSGIVING

I thank Thee for a manger bed
Transformed into divine abode;
I thank Thee for a garment's hem
From which a healing virtue flowed.
I thank Thee for a blood-stained cross
Where reconciliation came;
I thank Thee for an empty tomb,
The crowning triumph of Thy Name!

—VERNA SMITH TEEUWISSEN.

TEMPLES OF WORSHIP IN YUCATAN, MEXICO

Morris Steggerda, Ph. D.

Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, New York

IN March of 1931, the author and his wife returned from their first trip to Yucatan, Mexico, the land of the Maya Indians. On the return, we stopped for a visit with a brother in a large southern city. While there, this brother, proud to be a member of a large, newly built Presbyterian church, took us on a tour through the beautiful edifice. This structure had been marvelously and expensively built; it had a reading room, a game room, a kitchen, and the large auditorium was beautifully decorated. The ceiling decorations and carved figures were pointed out and the cost of each was told by the guide who accompanied us. The stained glass windows were explained in detail, the organ was exhibited, and we were told the pay of the choir members. His story interested us very little, for we had just returned from a land of ruined churches and this newly built church grieved us. It was just too much; too gaudy, too elaborate, too grand. In our minds we pictured 300, 500, or 1000 years hence when this building with its glorious decorations too might be in ruins, with trees growing from its very walls. Since that first return, I have visited Yucatan on seven similar expeditions, and each time as I have viewed the ancient temple I have been reminded of the new church in this large southern city.

* * *

I said that Yucatan was a land of ruined churches. What did I mean? At the time that Christ was teaching in Palestine, the Maya Indians in the southern part of the Yucatan Peninsula were building temples in which to worship their various gods. About 500 years later this civilization migrated slowly into northern Yucatan, and as they moved north they built stone temples along their route. Their stone temples are now completely abandoned but stand in ruins everywhere in the Yucatan peninsula. The religion, however, is not dead; it still lives in the hearts of the Indians, changed somewhat, to be sure, by the ideas of newcomers, but their temples of worship are no longer used.

In the sixteenth century, the Spaniards conquered the country and brought with them Christianity in the form of Catholicism, and a new zeal for building churches began. In every town and village at least one Catholic cathedral or church was built—not small churches, but huge structures with stone walls, many of which were six feet thick, and from thirty to forty feet high. The length of many of the churches was as much as 200 to 250 feet, with a width of 75 to 100 feet. An arched dome was built over the top, and the interiors of these churches were beautifully decorated. In these church com-

pounds there were rooms and chambers for a whole group of priests and monks and religious teachers. Today more than half of these churches are in ruins; tree trunks grow from the walls, roofs are fallen in, and the bones of the monks and church fathers are everywhere in evidence. Now bats and lizards use the corridors of the ruined churches, and in many of them the cattle and pigs gather to shelter themselves from the blazing tropical sun. The bells which once called hundreds to worship now hang silent and desolate in the belfries. Inside of many of these large, ruined churches one finds a small, thatched roof structure, which occupies perhaps a tenth or twentieth of the floor space. In these thatched structures, Mestizo women gather on special occasions to count their beads, and recite their prayers.

Much of this damage to the church buildings was done in a revolution approximately 100 years ago. When the Indians, revolting against the dominance of the Spanish rulers, plundered the towns and burned them, it was the churches, in the centers of the towns, which were the chief objects of destruction.

* * *

The author's work was carried on in and near a small town called Piste. In 1875, a traveler passing through Piste, described its church as follows:

"The church alone, sad and melancholy, without doors, its sanctuaries silent, its floor paved with the burial slabs of the victims, surrounded by parapets, yet stands in the midst of the ruined abodes of those who used to gather under its roof; it is today converted into a fortress. The few soldiers of the post are the only human beings that inhabit these deserts for many leagues around; its old walls, its belfry, widowed of its bells, are all that indicate to the traveler that Piste once was there."

These areas in Central Yucatan were abandoned during this revolution, but soon most of them were reoccupied. Only a few of the churches were reconditioned, and Piste's church was one of these, for in 1910 the ruined church was torn down and a smaller one was built in its place. However, another revolution occurred in 1918, and the church again suffered loss, but this time chiefly because of lack of further interest. From 1931 to 1938, the author visited this town every year. The ceiling of the church had fallen in years before, but it never has been repaired, the altar decorations have been removed several times to thatched houses, and then again returned to the church. Occasionally a few Indian women worship in the chapel, but because there are so few priests in Yucatan these interior

towns are very seldom or never visited by them. This more or less lengthy description of the church of this small Indian town is given because it is typical of many, and perhaps most of the Yucatan towns.

Religion today in Yucatan is not ardently followed, but it is not entirely dead. The Indians worship God through a combination of their pagan religion and Catholic symbolism, and most of this is carried on in their homes or in their fields. In most homes, whether Indian, Mestizo, or Spanish, there is a shrine with an image or picture of some saint set on a table at one end of the room. In recent years these images are being replaced by the opened Bible in those homes which have turned Evangelico (Protestant). The candles and saints of the Catholics are removed, but the cloth decorations and the setting remain the same. These Evangelicos in the Indian villages are taught by Mexican Protestant missionaries who come occasionally. Often, however, there is bitter friction caused by misunderstanding between their converts and those of the Catholics. This is indeed lamentable. In the larger population centers, the Mestizos (half Indian and half Spanish), and Spanish classes still use parts of the large colonial cathedrals, but this worship is carried on chiefly by the women. Children and men rarely attend the church.

* * *

In 1937, in a small town a few miles from Piste, a new Presbyterian church was being built by Indian labor, encouraged chiefly by one Mexican

Presbyterian missionary. One behind the other the Indians trekked, with heavy stones on their backs, just as their fathers did for the Spanish missionaries, and their older ancestors did for the ancient Maya Priests. For generations these Indians have carried stones to build the type of church suggested by the missionaries. But it seems safe to say that the Presbyterians or any other religious organization should profit by the history of this land of ruined churches, and not put their hope on large and costly edifices. The large church buildings were not only expensive to build, but their upkeep was also tremendous. Undoubtedly the ancient Maya experienced this in pre-Colombian times, as they kept up the Maya temples, and the Indians in colonial times, likewise experienced it when they were under the dominance of the Catholic Friars.

It is perhaps a natural tendency for a minister and a church body to think first of its building. Undoubtedly it has an important place, but I think of the effective little churches, conducted in Indian homes by the Reverend John Kempers of Chiapas, Mexico. For weeks at a time, this pioneer Protestant missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church, travels by horse through the jungle, conducting services in 50 or 100 little settlements, and nearly always in the homes of his devoted followers. Each one of these little groups is a Christian church. It is not necessary to remind the readers of this article that it is the invisible church which is all-important, and not the cost of the edifice in which worship is held. For these invisible churches there need be no costly financial upkeep.

THE THEOLOGY OF KARL BARTH

REVISION FOR CONSISTENCY'S SAKE

Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th. B.

Professor of Church History, Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids

THE original edition and version of Karl Barth's *Lehre vom Wort Gottes* came from the press eleven years ago. At that time his plan was to write a complete work on dogmatics, and the doctrine of the Word of God was developed by way of introduction. Five years later he found it necessary to postpone the publication of the rest of his *Dogmatics* in order to issue a revision of his *Prolegomena*. The revision became above all else an expansion. Already the volume which appeared in 1932 was notably larger than the original edition, but it covered only the first half of the field. It promised a companion volume of approximately the same size, but early in the present year this volume came out twice as large. Moreover, economy was practiced by means of the use of two sizes of type, and the two volumes together bring on their fifteen hundred pages easily

four times the amount of material found in the original edition.

Nature of the Revision

The revision was not prompted by a change of standpoint on the part of the author but, as he declared in the foreword in 1932, by a realization of the need of saying the same things in a different fashion. The second volume of the revised edition now gives a long passage from Luther in lieu of a foreword, and therefore the declaration given in 1932 must be assumed to hold also for this volume. The general effect of the remarkable expansion of the discussion is mainly in the direction of a clarification of the author's position. Since the appearance of the first volume this identity of standpoint with that of the original was of course no secret. The interval of six years which separates the second

volume of the revision from the first has brought no notable change in Barth's position. The two volumes are in full accord.

However, the revision brings a number of alterations that go deeper than mere matters of precision of formulation, fulness of presentation, and profusion of illustration. This also came to light as early as 1932. Barth has eliminated or refused to incorporate incongruous material and has in certain details actually changed his views. Frequently he calls special attention to such alterations. In general they are in the direction of greater consistency. They serve therefore in an emphatic sense for the clarification of his fundamental position. Before reviewing the main instances of such alterations it will be well to summarize the position of Barth in a brief statement that will be valid for both editions of his *Lehre vom Wort Gottes*.

There is no knowledge of God apart from His revelation in Jesus Christ. In that revelation God manifests Himself as the Triune, Who is Lord before and amidst man's contradiction and in its removal: the Father-Creator, the Son-Reconciler, the Holy Spirit-Redeemer. This absolute lordship of God excludes the possibility that His revelation should ever become an object which man can handle, over which man can exercise power. Therefore in the Incarnation the deity of Christ is not directly manifest but hidden in the servant-form, so that apart from the grace of the Holy Spirit man can not find the Son of God in Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore also the grace which the Holy Spirit is and gives is never some new quality or property that inheres in man, but even in his recognition of the revelation man's behavior remains weak and queer and strange. And once again for the same reason the Scriptures, through whose testimony the revelation of Jesus' earthly ministry becomes contemporaneous with us, bring the infallible Word of God in the form of fallible human words, so that without the Spirit the former can never be detected in the latter. In other words, the difficulties and obstacles and offenses which the indirectness of the revelation carries with it as it is given in Christ Jesus, and again as it is recorded in the Bible, and once more as it is received through the Holy Spirit, are necessary. They are the unavoidable concomitants of the fact that here God speaks in person and is subject of His revelation as its source, in the act, and even in the hearing of it. All attempts to get away from this persistent subjectivity of God must inevitably result in the total failure to discover the revelation of Him Who in this subjectivity manifests and maintains His inalienable lordship.

Some Formal Rectifications

We turn now to Barth's revision of his *Lehre vom Wort Gottes*, and, unless otherwise indicated, all the references will from now on be to either the first or the second of its two volumes. In the preface, vol. 1, p. VIII, he informs his readers, that in this new

edition he has drawn the lines more sharply. The direction in which he has drawn them more sharply he has indicated in the change made in the title of the work, which now is no longer designated as a *Christian Dogmatics* but as an *Ecclesiastical Dogmatics*. The motive for this change is not merely a desire to avoid a frivolous use of the word, Christian, but mainly a wish to emphasize the fact that dogmatics is no "free" science, but is confined to the realm of the Church and is possible and meaningful only there. This consideration has led to the elimination, as far as possible, of everything which in the first edition seemed like an "existential-philosophical" grounding or justification of theology. Such a grounding or justification would be a continuation of the line of theological thought that runs from Schleiermacher over Ritschl to Herrmann which, as a third position next to a really independent Protestant theology on the one hand and to the Roman Catholic trifling with the *analogia entis* and with a pretended natural knowledge of God on the other, is an impossibility.

In the original edition Barth began his discussion of the Incarnation with a paragraph on the objective possibility of the revelation, in the development of which he treated successively of the necessity, the meaning, and the reality of the incarnation. So also he began his discussion of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit with a paragraph on the subjective possibility of the revelation, in which he treated first of the possibility and reality of grace, then of the conditions of the possibility of grace, and finally of baptism as the cognitive ground of grace. The corresponding sections of the revision show a marked rearrangement. The discussion of the incarnation begins with a paragraph on God's freedom for man, the first subtopic of which is Jesus Christ as the objective reality of the revelation and the second, Jesus Christ as the objective possibility of the revelation. And the discussion of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit now begins with a paragraph on the freedom of man for God, which has for its first subtopic the Holy Spirit as the subjective reality of the revelation and for the second the Holy Spirit as the subjective possibility of the revelation.

In each case the discussion of the reality of the revelation is thus made to precede the discussion of its possibility. By this means the reorganization of the material brings out more clearly, that the revelation does not adapt itself to antecedent and extraneous conditions which are imposed on it and must be met if the revelation is to be objectively and subjectively realized. The inquiry into the possibility of the revelation is thus marked as an inquiry merely into the problem raised by its reality, the formulation of an answer not to a question which we had previously but which the reality of the revelation raises in our minds (vol. 2, p. 29). The original edition meant exactly the same thing, but was immediately misunderstood. Karl Heim, for instance, misunderstood Karl Barth's original representation

as a raising of the question of man in his self-despair as to how he may reach the assurance of faith (vol. 2, p. 225). Therefore this rearrangement became imperative (vol. 2, p. 11). Both objectively and subjectively the revelation is its own possibility. Objectively, God is free for man in Christ and, subjectively, man is free for God in the Holy Spirit.

Subjects Related to Natural Theology

These formal changes are indicative of the degree in which Barth's polemics against natural theology pervades his revision of his *Lehre vom Wort Gottes*. In its first volume there are certain topics around which this opposition to natural theology crystallizes. They are, his repudiation of existential thinking, his refusal to base the understanding of the Word of God on some kind of anthropology, his rejection of Emil Brunner's conception of an *Anknuepfungspunkt* for grace in natural man, and his condemnation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the analogy of being.

On pages 128-136 of this volume Barth gives a lengthy account of his repudiation of a grounding or strengthening of the doctrine of God's Word by understanding it as a thesis of existential thinking. He doubts whether in the original edition he has correctly indicated and distinguished between the concepts of phenomenological and existential thinking. He is not sure that existential thinking is more than a particular form of phenomenological thinking and that the two are not somehow identical (p. 128). And he has since entertained the mightier objection, that these concepts can not indicate decisive incisions for dogmatical thought, no matter how the philosophers may decide as to the content and relationship of these two concepts (p. 129). He cancels the fifth and the sixth paragraph of the first edition which dealt with man as the preacher and the hearer of the Word of God. For the Word of God would have to be predicate of man, at least of the man who receives it, if an analysis of the concrete situation of the man who speaks and hears in the Church were to yield determinations of the Word of God. But the Word of God is not a predicate of man (p. 130). Therefore those paragraphs of the first edition must be canceled (p. 135).

On the same pages he also gives a lengthy account of his refusal to introduce some kind of anthropology as a basis for the understanding of the Word of God, an innovation to which Fr. Gogarten had invited him. Such an anthropology would not differ from the old natural theology with its presupposition that God's being revealed in our being created, that man's creation which is also revelation of God, is somehow open to our direct insight, perhaps as confirmed by the Gospel. But this direct insight in man's creation and therewith in the original connection of God with man has, at least according to the reformatory presuppositions as to the extent of sin and its

effects, been lost through man's fall. It is restored to us only in the Gospel, in the special revelation (p. 134). To start from man in order to understand God can only mean to start from the man of the lost state of integrity and therefore of the present state of corruption. To understand God from man either indicates a process that is impossible in itself or one that can be described in the form of Christology and not in the form of anthropology (p. 135).

Between Barth and Brunner a difference has arisen as to the existence or nonexistence of an *Anknuepfungspunkt*, that is, a point of contact in natural man for grace and the revelation. On this question Barth expresses himself on pp. 250-257 of vol. 1. Among man's innate and acquired capacities there is no capacity for God. The possibility of faith is given man in the reality of faith which God loans him exclusively for use. This capacity for perceiving the Word of God, not man's own but loaned, not for contemplation but for use in faith, may be designated as a conformity to God, man's being fitted to God's Word. This is the *Anknuepfungspunkt*. It is what theological anthropology calls the image of God, following Gen. 1:27. But it is not, as Brunner would have it, the humanity and personality left over to sinful man from his creation. In the sense of a capacity for God which man has as a creature, the image of God has not merely been destroyed with the exception of a few remnants but has been annihilated without any remnant. The image of God which must be considered here and which forms the real *Anknuepfungspunkt* for God's Word, is the rectitude which Christ has resurrected to life and thus has restored, is a new creation.

This conformity to God is very close to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Analogy of Being, and yet it is a very different doctrine. There is indeed an analogy, a similitude or conformity between God and man. But this analogy is not to be conceived of as an analogy of *being*, that is, as an analogy which can be surveyed and fathomed, which can from the standpoint of a spectator be understood in a synthesis as an analogy. "Not a being, which in all dissimilarity the creature is supposed to share with the Creator, but the doing, for all mere theory unapproachable, the human decision is in faith in all dissimilarity analogous to the decision of God's grace" (p. 252). The analogy is not an analogy of being, but it is the analogy of faith according to Rom. 12:6. "If we understand man's conformity in faith to God and the *Anknuepfungspunkt* posited therein for the Word of God not as an innate or acquired attribute of man but as the work of the actual grace of God alone, then the last word which remains for us to say here is: God is in His Word acting on man. Because man's work in faith is that on which God's work is being performed, therefore man can recognize the Word of God. He knows as being known of God" (p. 257).

The Virgin Birth

In his original edition of the *Lehre vom Wort Gottes* Barth treated of the Virgin Birth of our Savior on pp. 275-281. The manner in which he did so carried rather pronounced reminiscences of the traditional Reformed conception. In His Person, Christ is pre-existent and this pre-existence of His Person must be borne in mind in an attempt to understand and interpret the significance of the Virgin Birth. The objective position of the human individual in history is determined by his father not his mother, and this general fact also has its significance for the interpretation of Christ's birth from the virgin Mary. The presentation was deficient in its failure to connect the Virgin Birth with a man's legal status, particularly as regulated in the Mosaic Law, and with the fact that imputation of guilt is always of necessity a personal matter. In the new edition these reminiscences of the traditional Reformed view are transferred from the text in large print to the notes in small print (vol. 2, p. 211).

In explanation of this change Barth says, speaking of the question why in Christ's incarnation the function of a human father is excluded: "But I would have the attempt of its solution viewed merely as a 'parergon' in distinction from the first edition of this book, where it was altogether too dominant in the field of vision." According to the new text, the Virgin Birth is the *sign* of the mystery which must happen to human nature to make it capable for union with the divine Word (p. 206). He stresses the merely signficatory value of the virgin birth: "It is well, at this place to be reminded once again of the fact, that by all means the virgin birth must be understood as an indication of this breaking through and new beginning, but not as its condition. It meant an obscuration of the pertinent questions and answers, that I failed to make this distinction in the first form of this book on page 276. If there is a necessary connection between this sign and this matter, the connection is nevertheless not casual" (p. 207).

This merely signficatory value of the virgin birth extends even to the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit. Barth claims, that the positive formula of the Apostles' Creed, conceived by the Holy Spirit, says, that "the conception of Jesus Christ that preceded His birth of the virgin Mary was the work of the Holy Spirit. For that reason and in so far it was a miraculous birth and as such the true sign of the incarnation of the eternal Son of God. The formula, conceived by the Holy Spirit, fills therefore so to speak the vacuum indicated by the formula, born of the virgin Mary. It names the ground and content, while the other names the form and shape of the miracle and sign" (p. 215).

Thus the Virgin Birth appears in the new edition as in its value more effectively reduced to that of a mere sign of the mystery of the incarnation. It was not necessary for the elimination of original sin, just

as little as in Mk. 2:1-12 the healing of the palsied man was necessary for the forgiveness of his sins (p. 207). "Noetically (for us, whom this sign has been given, who are to recognize it in and by this sign) the fact that Jesus Christ is the incarnate Son of God stands and falls indeed with the truth of the conception by the Holy Spirit. But one could not say that the mystery of Christmas stands and falls with this dogma ontically, in itself" (p. 221).

The Outpouring of the Holy Spirit

One distinctive feature of the revision of Barth's *Lehre vom Wort Gottes* which calls for distinct mention is the measure of expansion which the third section of chapter two has undergone. In the original edition the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was treated in a scant fifty pages, while in the new edition this section has been expanded to 280 pages. This is more than the average amount of expansion. It no doubt indicates a realization on the part of Barth, that here lies a problem of peculiar difficulty for his fundamental position. The fact that this section, as far as I am aware, does not bring any notices of incisive divergence from the original edition indicates that its main thrust has not changed.

Barth is interested, of course, in maintaining the discontinuity of the revelation with man also in the experience of the Christian. He gets the revelation, to be sure, but he finds himself either in the period prior to or subsequent to the occurrence of the revelation. He is always either looking forward or backward to its incidence; he is always living in the remembrance or the expectation of the revelation. Perhaps we ought to say, he is always looking in both directions and living in both states, but the revelation, even in the Spirit's bringing it home to us, eludes our experience. "In this before and after God wants to be praised and loved" (vol. 2, p. 255). Perhaps it were better to speak of indirectness instead of speaking of discontinuity.

His problem lies fully as much in the field of Christian activity as in that of Christian experience. Expounding the second of the two commandments of Mark 12:29-31, he takes his start for the definition of the concept of our neighbor in the story of the Good Samaritan, Luke 10:25-37. In the fact that Jesus elicits the reply from the scribe, that for the man that fell among the robbers the man who showed him mercy was his neighbor, he sees a general principle to the effect that our neighbor is always a person who has shown us mercy. And, since our deepest need is spiritual and the most needed service is being pointed to Christ, Barth concludes that my neighbor is an event rather than an individual. My neighbor is any man, within or without the Church, who may happen to become for me a sign and representative of Christ (pp. 460-474).

Our Christian activity consists in the praise of God, that is, in our bearing testimony to God in the midst of our fellows. He maintains the indirectness

of the revelation in this activity of the believer in the main in two ways. We may not obscure the testimony of God's grace by approaching our neighbor in any sense with a claim, a demand, a command. This would be legalism (p. 486). And we can naturally not bring it about, that our neighbor also really perceives the testimony of God's grace which we bring (p. 494). The form of this testimony has three elements: our word, our deed, and our attitude (p. 488f). The deed must be that of helping, relieving, gladdening him, and the like. Much significance in this setup organized Christian activity can not very well have, it would seem.

In a discussion of the problem of doctrinal differences which ought not to have schismatic significance Barth refers to his attitude to the Neocalvinists of the Netherlands as an illustration (p. 931). He characterizes the relation obtaining between him and them as one of thorough mutual antipathy which, he says, is no secret. It is also no secret, that the antipathy to Barth on the part of the Reformed leaders in the Netherlands is vitally connected with the interest which the followers and successors of Abraham Kuyper sustain in organized Christian activity, Christian education, Christian politics, and the like.

THE URIM AND THE THUMMIM

Marinus Cook

Minister Reformed Church, Hynes, California

THE words Urim and Thummim occur altogether seven times in the Old Testament; they are always used together, except twice; they appear in the same order: Urim and Thummim, except once.

These seven passages give us all the information we have on the meaning of these words and the use of the objects they indicate. There is a large volume of literature on the Urim and the Thummim mostly written by Rabbis, but it rests on tradition and not on Scripture.

Any one at all familiar with the Hebrew language recognizes the two words Urim and Thummim as plurals, and as such they are always used in the Old Testament, together or separately. But, although the form is plural, this does not necessarily denote plurality. There are several words in Hebrew with a plural form and a singular meaning, like the words for God, face, etc.

The Scripture Material

As to the character of the Urim and the Thummim we read in Ex. 28:30 that they were part of the priestly paraphernalia: "And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim, and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before Jehovah: and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before Jehovah continually." From these words it appears that the Urim and the Thummim were not something new, no description of them is given, no directions how to make them, or where to obtain them, no explanation of their meaning and use. They are treated as something already known or existing; the Israelites were familiar with them, and so our text speaks of *the* Urim and *the* Thummim. Nor do we find any description or statement as to their origin elsewhere.

They are also mentioned in Lev. 8:8: "And he placed the breastplate upon him: and in the breast-

plate he put the Urim and the Thummim." From this it is clear that the Urim and the Thummim were not irremovably attached to the breastplate, but could be put in (or on) later. The Hebrew text reads literally: "And he put upon him the breastplate, and he gave to the breastplate the Urim and the Thummim." We must, therefore, conceive of the Urim and the Thummim as objects that could be put in, or on, and taken off the breastplate. Perhaps the breastplate had a pocket or pouch for them.

In regard to the meaning and the use of the Urim and Thummim we have a few passages. In the passage, already quoted, (Ex. 28:30) it is commanded that the High Priest was to have the Urim and the Thummim always with him, when officiating in the tabernacle, so that they could be used at the instant they were needed.

In Numbers 27:21 more is said about their use. (In this passage only the word Urim is used). "And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before Jehovah: at his word they shall go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation." The Urim, then, was used in discerning the Mishpat (judgment) of the Lord; that is as an oracle. This is also clear from 1 Sam. 28, where the vain attempts of Saul in trying to ascertain the will of God are described, and how God did not answer him, "neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." (v. 6).

The same use of the Urim and the Thummim is indicated in Ezra 2:63 (in Neh. 7:65 we find the parallel passage). Here some people claimed descent from priestly families, but had no papers to prove it. Nobody was able to decide definitely whether they had a right to the priesthood. So it was decided to declare them "polluted" i.e. not fit for the

priestly function, "they should not eat of the most holy things" until God Himself should give His decision, "until there stood up a priest with Urim and with Thummim."

There is every reason to assume that the Urim and Thummim also were used as oracle in the instances mentioned in Judg. 1:1; 20:18; 1 Sam. 14:3, 8; 1 Sam. 23:2, 12; 30:7, 8; 2 Sam. 21:1.

Derivation of the Words

With this scant information it is no wonder that there consists much speculation about the origin, meaning and use of the Urim and the Thummim.

The word Urim is usually taken as the plural of *Or*, light, but the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, does not translate the word thus, but as *delosis*, in the singular and the plural. *Delosis* comes from a Greek verb meaning to make manifest, to make known by relating, to declare, to signify, which is simply another way of saying that the Urim served as an oracle. The Septuagint, however, uses in the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah another word, meaning to give light, or to be bright.

Luther gives "light" as the translation of Urim.

Thummim is generally believed to be the plural of *Tom*, perfection, completeness. The Septuagint gives "truth" in all passages, but one (Ezra 2:63, where "perfection" is used). Luther had in his first translation "completeness" (*Voelligkeit*), later "justice" (*Recht*).

Besides the nearly universally accepted rendering: light and perfection, or lights and perfections (see footnote in the Revised Version) there is another rendering, deriving Urim, and Thummim from *Teom*, which would give Thummim the meaning of "a twin." This, then, would indicate that the Thummim consisted of two objects of like shape and size, something like dice. In fact some expositors claim that the Urim and Thummim were nothing but two pairs of dice.

Most likely the Urim and the Thummim were different objects, and not one object with two names or a double name, for the article before the noun is nearly always repeated, and where the article is lacking, as in Ezra-Nehemiah the sign of the accusative is repeated before each word.

Just What Were They?

What were they? The Israelites in the wilderness needed no description or explanation, neither was there any command given for their manufacture. They were there, and they simply were taken from the place they were and dedicated, set aside, for the service of Jehovah in the tabernacle. This has led some to think that the Urim and the Thummim were brought by the Israelites from Egypt, and perhaps were part of the treasures that were given them by the Egyptians at the time they left Egypt.

As to their character and use we may well say at the outset that nobody definitely knows what they

looked like and how they were used. But the theories and speculations are legion.

Some hold that the Urim and the Thummim were of supernatural origin. Nowhere does God command the Israelites to make or fashion them, as was done in the case of other objects connected with the tabernacle service. But it may well be objected that, if they were of supernatural origin, why was there not made any mention of their being given to Israel, and how it is possible that they are mentioned in such an almost casual way in Ex. 28?

Some identify them with the twelve stones on the breastplate of the High Priest. In this case, since each stone bears the initial letter of a tribe, the oracle of God was given by the illumination of these letters, and these letters together would constitute the divine answer. But there were only twelve stones, with twelve letters of which three were identical (John, Issachar, Joseph) leaving ten letters while the Hebrew alphabet is composed of twenty-two letters.

Josephus identifies the Urim and the Thummim with the gems on the shoulderstraps of the Ephod, and says that illumination of them indicated acceptance of the sacrifice before the battle and consequently victory, while darkness indicated defeat. He limits the use of the Urim and the Thummim to matters of war, but according to Ezra 2:63 and the parallel passage in Nehemiah the Urim and the Thummim seemed also to have been used in indicating God's choice as to persons.

Many Theories—No Certainty

There are still others who do not identify the Urim and the Thummim with jewels on the breastplate, but regard them as separate objects. This is in harmony with Lev. 8:8, where the breastplate is put on first and the Urim and the Thummim placed in it later.

According to the Jewish Cabalists the Urim and the Thummim were placed in the middle of the ephod, and consisted of a stone or plate of gold on which was engraved the *Shem-hammephorash*, the ineffable Name, never pronounced and written JHVH, Jehovah. The High Priest, standing before the veil, would gaze at the Urim and the Thummim on his breast, speak the invocation, and would in answer hear either an inner voice, or an audible answer from the Shekinah over the mercy-seat.

A more modern explanation is that Urim, meaning light, bright refers to polished diamonds or other precious stones, and Thummim, meaning perfect has reference to natural, unpolish jewels in the rough. A handful of these were in the pocket of the breastplate (Lev. 8:8) and were used much like dice. Thrown on a table or the mercy-seat their position revealed the will of Jehovah.

Philo thought that the Urim and the Thummim were of Egyptian origin, in which he may have been right, but explains them as two images, representing

two virtues of powers, the one Truth, the other Justice. Modernistic interpreters, always glad to find resemblances of Biblical ideas in heathen religions, have pounced upon this theory of Philo and elaborated a system of semi-heathen religious customs, thoroughly mixed with other elements in the worship of Jehovah.

There are not enough places in the Old Testament

from which to deduce anything definite as to the character and uses of the Urim and the Thummim. All that can be said is that whatever they may have been, they were kept in the ephod of the High Priest, to be used in ascertaining the will of Jehovah. All we read in addition to this is mainly the result of Rabbinical speculation and to say the least, very fanciful.

CREMATION AND THE RESURRECTION BODY

A DISCUSSION

Dear Editor:

In the January, 1938, issue of THE CALVIN FORUM Dr. Gerrit H. Hospers offered some thoughts on the merits of cremation. He is in favor of cremation. That is his privilege; perhaps I would be too. But in defending it Dr. Hospers uses an argument that strikes me as being unsound and dangerous. I had expected plenty of protest against his argument. But thus far I have seen nothing in the English language that reflects on Dr. Hospers' stand. Hence I should like to present the following. If you think it worthy of your valuable space I should like to have you run it in a following issue of the FORUM.

Dr. Hospers argues that the body will not figure in the resurrection anyway, so why raise any argument about the method used in disposing of a corpse so long as the method is decent and honorable. Says he, "strictly taken, the literal truth is that no part of its constituents will be used in the resurrection body to come." The only continuity there will be, according to Dr. Hospers, between our present body and our resurrection body is *in the mind of God*. According to a certain "pattern" God has made our present frame; according to that same pattern He will construct a new body at the time of the resurrection. The physical does not carry over; not even a "germ" of the physical, as Dr. Kuyper held.

Now this strikes us as being a very unconventional argument. More than that, it strikes us as being definitely un-Reformed. For, our glorious resurrection is a part of the "restoration of all things"; it is part of the broad "palingenesia" which God is performing. And the resurrection of Christ, the regeneration of a human soul, our physical resurrection, and the cosmic regeneration, are all of them so many consignments of this "palingenesia." And it would seem that what is true of one of these consignments is true of all the others. Now in the case of the resurrection of Christ there was very certainly continuity between the body that hung upon the cross and the body that issued forth out of the sepulchre. And, let it be noted, that continuity was certainly physical. Christ's resurrection emptied the grave of its physical contents.

To go on, in the regeneration of a human soul we touch the "palingenesia" in a non-physical sphere, it is true, but there is most certainly continuity between the old and the new. And, be it noted, that continuity is not merely in the mind of God. It is also in the material, in this case the "spiritual material," of which the soul is built. Reformed theology has ever opposed the idea of "creatio de novo"; but it appears that Dr. Hospers is sponsoring the notion.

Further, in the end of time a new heaven and a new earth will appear upon the scene, through a final consignment of "palingenesia" activity of God. And there will be continuity between the old and the new. For the old will be renewed. And this continuity will not be merely in the mind of God; it will very surely be in the things themselves also. When the Bible speaks of the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven we are, according to traditional Reformed exegesis, to understand that this language does not imply "creatio de novo" but that this figure is used to show that the new regime does not come evolutionistically but as the result of a catastrophic stroke of the creative power of God.

Now, if the "palingenesia" program consistently uses *existing materials* all along the line, it would seem highly improbable that it should get along without the existing materials in the matter of the resurrection of the body. And this improbability weighs heavily against Dr. Hospers' theory, it seems.

It is true that the fact that the unjust will participate in the resurrection complicates the argument. They are not caught up in the "palingenesia"; yet they rise from the dead.

It seems that not the resurrection of the body as such, but the *glorious* resurrection of the body is part of the "palingenesia" program. But in either case *continuity in the objective* is required. When God objectified a divine thought (i. e., created the universe and its contents) He performed an act that is a solitary act in the life of God. It is not repeated. Christ miraculously increased the loaves when He fed a multitude; but He began with existing materials. Whatever happens in the universe happens *to it*, also the "palingenesia." The same creative power of God that was active in creation becomes active again in the "palingenesia"; but with this difference, that in the creation it did not use existing materials whereas in the "palingenesia" it did.

In fine, Reformed theology shuns the idea of "creatio de novo"; Dr. Hospers seems to have accepted it. Or can he perhaps make clear to us the difference between the creation of the world (in which the Divine Being objectified a divine thought) and the resurrection of the flesh (which consists, according to Dr. Hospers, of another objectification of a divine thought)? If he can distinguish between these two in a way compatible with the genius of Reformed theology, he will be rendering a very worthwhile service and perhaps win us for his view.

Yours sincerely,
LEONARD VERDUIN.

Corsica, S. Dakota.

DR. HOSPERS REPLIES

The able article by the Rev. L. Verduin raises a point or two which has an important bearing on the nature of the resurrection of the body. His article deserves careful attention.

At the bottom of the argument lies the important question whether God, since the Creation, continues at all to create, as we say, *de novo*. Brother Verduin holds that this creating ceased and that this is the Reformed belief. However, Dr. Kuyper in his *Dictaten Dogmatiek* says this: "We confess that God ceased to create after the sixth day; but we understand by this the creation of new kinds of creatures. For God still goes on to create the individuals in the existing species" (Locus De Homine, 66).

And here are a few facts which support *creatio de novo*:

1. From the beginning till the present time God has *created the souls* which from time to time He houses in their bodies. This is the Reformed idea and has significantly been called *Creationism*.

2. In two of our Lord's miracles *creatio de novo* is unmistakable.

(a) When the water was turned into wine. This wine was "good," as the ruler of the feast declared. Its being "good" wine meant that it was the genuine article. Only through a creative act could the additional material which made the water into genuine wine, be in evidence.

(b) In the feeding of the thousands the few loaves and fishes could have been multiplied only through a creative act or process. Bro. Verduin remarks that Jesus *began* with some material; but this does not help the difficulty about the way in which the *additional* bread and fishes came to be on hand.

If now creation occurred in *these* cases, it is also possible in other cases. So consider the cases of those bodies which were burned and the ashes strewed into the river, as were Wycliffe's; or those cases in which sharks devoured the bodies which were then assimilated into their own. To expect that the Almighty must gather the atoms of these in order to reconstruct and resurrect them is (we speak reverently) expecting too much of the Almighty. We believe that it is far more congruous with the dignity and the ways of God that He creates anew,

that He "gives again a body as He pleases," finally a perfect one.

To what extent and in what degree are our present bodies fit to be utilized for our resurrection bodies? We answer, They cannot be so used at all.

Ours is a body of sin. There is no soundness in it. Even when the soul was regenerated no good came into the substance of the body. Sanctification of the soul does not affect the texture of the body. Said Paul: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:16). Even the regenerate soul is not fit for heaven till in the article of death a supreme act of sanctification occurs. How much worse then is the situation of the body! It is fit for nothing except to be cast off. Absolutely a new creation is in order, and God will make it anew after the pattern He has designed for it. This is not the case with the regeneration of the soul. The soul being the very identity of the person, something inscrutable takes place in the substance of the soul when it is being regenerated. Hence there is continuity in the very substance of the soul under whatever circumstances, but not in the body. Since the body is only the envelope of the soul, the continuity of this envelope is of secondary importance. When God giveth a body in the resurrection, He furnishes a new envelope. Paul calls it in effect a *new suit of clothes*, "naked . . . clothed upon" (II Cor. 5:3, 4). This new "suit of clothes" will be after the original pattern. The sameness of the pattern will constitute continuity, not the goods.

It may be objected that the "change" which Scripture attributes to the body for its resurrection is a different matter than a *creatio de novo*. But what then about the bodies of those who died 5000 years ago? Those burned and eaten? Where is their dust? And the old body even being on hand, in whatever stage of decay, even the dead of but one day, what is the metamorphosis of those bodies but a stupendous miracle of Divine power equivalent to creation? And take the cases of those living at the time of the Second Advent: these undergo a "change"; in the "twinkling of an eye." Should one look at such a person at the moment of this "change," I do not think he would notice a falling off of the original body to make way for the new. How such a body disappears will be as little within the range of human observation as was the change

of water into wine at Cana, as little as the disciples could notice the manner in which somehow these few loaves and fishes were multiplied. These Divine procedures lie within the realm of mystery. This also applies to the body of our Savior which, while retaining the marks of the passion, became a glorious body. This metamorphosis, too, was a creative act. The manner of it would have escaped observation.

Bro. Verduin refers to the "restoration of all things" and the "palingenesia of the universe" in which physical material is concerned. Does *creatio de novo* occur in these when they undergo a change? For do not the materials of the present earth carry over into the new order of things? Yes, there will be a "new heaven [firmament] and a new earth." Through a *creatio de novo*? Strictly taken, perhaps there may be room for doubt here. Surely there will be great changes, and these through Divine power. We do not know whether chemistry, let it be in a new and higher form, will operate in the constitution of the new earth with its vegetation, etc.

The reader will pardon me if for the sake of completeness I add another difficulty which Bro. Verduin did not mention. I refer to the many passages which directly speak of bodies rising from their graves. Do these texts not contradict my contention that the buried bodies no longer will be taken into account for the new? Well, it is a matter of interpretation. I believe these texts must be interpreted *plastically*. Even Kuyper leans that way when he writes as follows about this same matter: "Something concerning which you must not just think about the particular location of the grave in which the body had been laid. . . . No; when mention is made of the grave or of the *pit*, then Scripture means thereby the *whole earth*, which is dust, whose power resides in this dust, which awaits you and takes you up into its bowels, in order to make you return to dust" (*E Voto*). All the circumstances compel us to interpret *plastically*, i. e., moulded on wellnigh universal appearances. The "earth," whether soil, or sea, or what not, is symbolized by the *grave*, and hence from every place and situation the dead are represented as escaping from the further domination of death through God giving them a body in the mysterious act of resurrection and according to the pattern which He had designed for it.

G. H. HOSPERS.

East Williamson, N. Y.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A Letter from India

Adoni, South India, September 1st, 1938.

The Editor, THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Sir:

It is hard to realize that three months have slipped away since I last sat at my typewriter to tap out a letter to you. Evidently the flight of time is not appreciably slower here in this allegedly slow-motion land than it is in your own bustling America.

We in India have our two-miles-an-hour ox carts but we also have air liners roaring across the sky—seven services of sea and land planes a week between here and Europe! Then, while our peasants continue to till the soil with similar implements to those in use two thousand years ago, they also foregather of an evening on the village square to listen to broadcast items from a government radio installed for propaganda purposes! But do we in India have a monopoly in anachronisms—inverted out here, if you like! Let me give you just one instance of a preconceived notion of mine that was shattered within a month of my landing on U. S. soil. I had been led to believe that your country was all speed and hustle and teeming cities. Imagine, then, my amazement at discovering many typical "Uncle Ezras" living amidst such peacefully silvan charms as that immortalized in the daily broadcast from "the friendly little five-watter" at Rosedale!

Among the many good things in your June number perhaps the best was your very illuminating editorial on the impact of the Barth-Brunner Theology on America and particularly on Princeton Seminary. My interest in your comments is more than academic as I had the privilege of meeting a number of alumni of that august seat of learning during my year's stay in the States. From impressions gleaned from conversations enjoyed with these friends and your own remarks I am not surprised at the controversy that has been raging around this latest trend at Princeton. Be that as it may, one feels instinctively that it will be many years before Calvin College and Seminary will depart from their solidly Calvinistic policy and lean towards the liberal orthodoxy or orthodox liberalism—

I offer my readers the choice of oxymorons!—"discovered" and worked out by Barth & Brunner. I wonder, in this connection, whether any of your many readers could recommend me a good work on this highly interesting, if controversial, "Crisis Theology."

South India has recently been entertaining and enjoying to the full two distinguished visitors from overseas. The first, Rev. C. F. Andrews from England, is no stranger to India. With many years to his credit as an active worker in one of the big British missions, Mr. Andrews has been for some years past a purely social reformer. He is one of the two best loved Europeans in India and a close friend of Mahatma Gandhi. Both in this land and abroad where Indians have settled, Rev. Andrews' championship of the rights and privileges of our people has earned him the well-deserved title of a true friend of India. Mr. Andrews has been very busy over a couple of books that he is writing on some of the latest phases in India's changing outlook.

The other, and perhaps even more popular visitor, is from the U. S. A. Famed as a traveller, author, lecturer, social reformer and missionary, Dr. Stanley Jones flashes up and down India like a brilliant comet leaving behind him a trail of popularity and enthusiasm—and perhaps some criticism too from reactionary British officialdom. India's intellectuals all over this country positively hang on Dr. Jones' words as he delivers his orations and it would be quite safe to say that no foreigner, European or otherwise, has anything like the following that Dr. Jones has built up among college students and the professional classes generally. I believe, despite all the criticism that has been hurled at this man in America and elsewhere, that his influence on Indian thought has been good and sound, and that the true value of the influence can be assessed properly only in the years to come when the "Young India" of today will shoulder the burden of leading and governing a free and self-respecting nation.

It is possible that the many strictures passed on men of Dr. Stanley Jones' calibre may be due to the lack of understanding between the Occident and the Orient. There are just a few Occidentals who do understand and appreciate the Oriental mentality and life-view—and Dr. Jones is one of them. And

in this connection I would like to mention a much appreciated gift of a book from a Grand Rapids publisher friend. "Toyohiko Kagawa, the Christian," by Rev. J. K. Van Baalen, is a volume that should be read by all who would like some insight into the Oriental mind. I know that I am once again on controversial ground but ask leave to say that much of the criticism one heard and read of in regard to the famous little Christian leader from Nippon might have been due to well meaning theorists in pulpits, on platforms and at writing tables failing to understand Dr. Kagawa's peculiarly Oriental mentality and outlook. After all, though the fundamentals of our common faith are few in number and the same the world over, the peoples of America, Japan & India, let us say, are widely different and our respective problems definitely dissimilar. I myself feel highly privileged to have had chances of meeting and talking with Christian men and women here in the Orient as well as in Europe and America. These varied contacts have very materially helped me to understand and appreciate fellow believers from other races and nations.

In these days of ever quickening communications, with the radio gaining in popularity with the middle classes, one is almost bewildered by the swiftly changing kaleidoscope of world politics. Now it is Germany preparing with almost indecent haste for the "next war" that some politicians seem to think inevitable. Next it is British efforts in Czechoslovakia to pour oil on troubled waters. Then, a quick turn of one's attention to the Far East in order to see whether Soviet Russia is about to enter the ring where Japan and China are locked in a sort of death grip. "It is all so foolish and childish," says the Voice of Modern India with a shrug. "These bellicose foreigners should take a leaf out of our book and resort to *Satyagraha*, or non-violence as enunciated and practised by Mahatma Gandhi!" Thus the more or less philosophical man-in-the-street who, however, breathes a private prayer that the various belligerents and would-be combatants may stay far away from India. As for the educated Indian, he rightly or wrongly believes that the ultimate balance of power on the globe depends on the attitude of the United States and its astute President. Careful note is taken of every important pronouncement made by your political leaders, of your naval, military and air building programs and of the industrial situation. I wonder whether the average man in your country realizes how important a key position the U. S. holds in today's world situation?

I had hoped to be able to touch on some of the modern religious and ethical cults in vogue in India, but space and time forbid the carrying out of any such intentions in this present letter. I shall, however, try to tell you something about Theosophy and one or two other developments of Hinduism in my next, D. V.

Let me, in conclusion, congratulate you on becoming president of the newly formed Mid-Western society for discussion on Calvinistic philosophy. We shall look forward to reading about these discussions in future numbers of the FORUM.

With fraternal greetings to yourself and my numerous readers,

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

A Letter from Holland

My dear American Friends:

Upon request of Professor Bouma I hope to write you a bi-monthly letter on conditions in the Netherlands. I have never had the privilege of seeing your country, but I have always been deeply interested in it. In consultation with your editor these letters will deal especially with religious and ecclesiastical matters in our country. I propose to cast my reflections in the form of letters because this was suggested by your editor and also because I prefer this myself. Letters are more informal and often fully as clear and direct in their presentation of the subjects for discussion. I find I can express myself with more ease and clarity in a letter than in a solid, formal article.

No doubt some of you would like to ask me: Just what are the conditions at present in the Reformed churches in the Netherlands? I might turn the question on you by asking: "Looking at us from your American distance, what do conditions in our churches look like to you?" I surmise you would reply, as many American friends have already done, by saying: "You people in Holland are creating quite a furor there. Judging by your church papers the impression we Americans get of you is that polemics and controversy usurp most of your time and that our Netherland friends take great delight in debating on church matters."

Now I can very well understand that you should have this impression about us. And from your distance it might seem that you are right. And yet this is not the case. You must remember that we have a rather large number of church leaders, both in professor's chairs and in the pulpit, but that

it is only a couple of these who engage in this lively controversial battle. Now I have no doubt that these brethren do so from a sense of duty, but I hasten to add that I am equally convinced that they are mistaken in this judgment. At any rate, I will have no part in it. As those who may have read my contributions to such religious weeklies as *Calvinistisch Weekblad* and *Credo* very well know, I prefer to write constructively, rather than polemically. To be sure, the battle for the truth of God should not for a moment be relaxed, but I believe that we must fight this battle upon another front.

As many of you undoubtedly know, the 1936 Synod, which met at Amsterdam, issued an urgent admonition to the churches that all onesidedness in preaching the truth of the covenant be avoided and that preaching should warn the sinner as well as edify the saint. For this synodical admonition there was indeed occasion. Now that two years have elapsed since this deliverance was made I believe we may say that in the main it has been taken to heart. One does not hear much complaint any more about one-sidedness in preaching. Besides this matter there were a number of other issues that had called forth a lively controversy in the church press. For the study of these issues the Synod at the time appointed a committee which is to report in 1939. Hence next year the report of this committee will be in the hands of the entire church and the matters at issue can then be thrashed out thoroughly before the proper bodies and the conclusions laid down in definite decisions. Many are of the opinion that this will be the means of greatly reducing, if not completely silencing, the noise of the present controversy. The position of many can be expressed as follows: Let us not waste our energies in internecine warfare, but let us jointly give battle to the great enemy, the enemy of unbelief, whose power is waxing ever greater also in our own country, as statistics of withdrawals from the Christian Church clearly prove. Let our American friends not forget that the large majority of the membership of our churches are eager for the return of the constructive mode of procedure and operation, even if the present discussions in the church press are rather lively at times.

In my next letter I propose to tell you a little about the work we as a church face in our attack upon unbelief. I shall be happy to receive questions and comments from those who may read these bi-monthly letters and assure such correspondents that I shall take notice of these and utilize them to the best of my ability.

With sincere fraternal greetings,

P. PRINS.

Deventer, Netherlands.

(Note of Editor: We are happy herewith to present to our readers the first letter from one of our ministerial correspondents in the Netherlands. Dr. Prins is pastor of a Reformed Church in Deventer and has recently taken his Doctor's degree at the Free University, writing an extensive thesis on the subject of Conscience. We hope to review this work in THE CALVIN FORUM before long. Dr. Prins is also known in Holland for the deep interest he has taken both by word and deed in the spiritual welfare of men in the Dutch navy. He is a regular contributor to such religious weeklies as *Calvinistisch Weekblad* and *Credo*. With such men as Dr. Leigh S. Hunt from England, Professor J. Chr. Coetzee from South Africa, and Dr. Prins from Holland serving as our regular correspondents—not to mention the others already quite familiar to our readers—we will undoubtedly be kept well-informed on current life and thought among Calvinists throughout the world.)

"I Am the Voice"

In the September issue of the FORUM appeared an article by the Rev. Bastian Kruithof, whose purpose it was to urge humility upon the ministry. Needless to say that every sincere ambassador of Christ will agree that that virtue necessary in all Christians, ought to shine forth especially in the minister.

However, as so often happens in this sinful world, I fear the picture was one-sided, and hence incomplete. The writer selected the words of John the Baptist "The Latchet of whose Shoes." But the same herald of Christ also said, "I am the voice crying in the wilderness." We find something of the same kind with the apostle Paul. At one time he says that he is the least of the apostles, not worthy to be called an apostle. But at another time he says, "I magnify [glorify: R. V.] my office," Rom. 11:13. And in our democratic age it seems rather imperative to glorify the office (not the person) of the sacred ministry. If indeed it is to remain a "sacred" ministry, and not be dragged down to the level of the secular.

Time was when he who held this office was very highly esteemed, if not for his person, then for his work's sake. Perhaps many went to the extreme of somewhat idolizing their minister. There seems very little danger of that, now that the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction. And rather than playing the part of the minister ("den dominee uithan-

gen") it now frequently happens that it is difficult to detect or discover the minister. And the net result is that there is rather lack of respect for the office which he occupies.

It is perhaps because the Rev. Kruithof has overlooked the dignity of the office that he arrives at some of his conclusions. For instance, he takes it ill of ministers to accept free services of a doctor. This is not at all a general practice. For this reason I inquired about this of our family doctor. He stated that according to the ethics of the medical profession, no charge was to be made for services rendered to those in the other professions.

As to the form of addressing a minister, the writer of the aforementioned article prefers to have him addressed by his

given name. As a matter of fact, however, such a custom does not prevail in the medical profession. Doctors will invariably address each other as "Doctor So and So." And a doctor's wife will speak of her husband to others as "Doctor," and not as "George" or "Will." Looking at the ministry merely as a profession (it is infinitely more) why should we cheapen our profession, when already it lacks the esteem which it deserves? Why not rather, with Paul, resolve to magnify and glorify our ministry? Perhaps this would also, although indirectly, result in a desire with more of our young men to enter the sacred ministry.

S. G. BRONDSEMA.

Muskegon Heights, Mich.

BOOK REVIEWS

HUMOR AT BRITAIN'S EXPENSE

WITH MALICE TOWARD SOME. By Margaret Halsey. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1938. \$2.00.

NOT all the credit for American humor goes to Mark Twain. Not all of it goes to men. Margaret Halsey is as fine and clever a humorist as any of them. The wife of a man who went to England on an exchange professorship, she accompanied her husband and studied almost everything that does not appear in books. People and places with all the trimmings interest her in London, Paris, Norway, and Sweden.

The title suggests her attitude. Nothing English is "sacred" to her. She applauds what she likes and aims brilliant sallies at traditions, customs, places, and even her husband who bears the marks of his class, and who must benefit from such a wife.

Entering a Cathedral she enjoys the "bumper crop of dead knights." She has not much use for English food, except beef, and speaking of English pie she says, "The English eat it, and when they stand up and walk away, they are hardly bent over at all." She speaks of the monuments and plaques in English churches, that make the traveler look around for price tags. A matron at a tourist place "has a mouth that ought to be left out in the woods to catch bears." Of some oil paintings in Norway she says that "the artists have been so carried away by their subject that the results look like colored diagrams of tonsillectomies." Perhaps a stab at surrealists.

In Paris she has "hot chocolate so rich and beautiful that I had to keep pushing the calories back into the cup with my spoon." At Chartres the concierge at the hotel "is a stout little man with snapping eyes and a moustache which makes him look like Birnam Wood on the way to Dunsinane."

English rooms are often chilly and damp. She feels the urge to ask one hostess "if she has trouble with stalactites." At the Bloomsbury hotel "the rooms are so cold that I sometimes wonder whether I ought not to plant a flag and claim them for the United States."

She has little use for the class system. In America a man is judged by how much money he has now. In England the past is strong. "Having had money is just as acceptable as having it." "But never having had money is unforgivable, and can only be properly atoned for by never trying to get any." A pretty shrewd observation with as much tragedy as comedy in it.

Henry, her husband, "has a sense of property like Silas Marner and Andrew Mellon combined." She cannot separate him from an ancient scarf his sister had made for him years before. Henry has two colds a year just before and after Christmas. "He (she) calls them Hänsel and Gretel."

As an undercurrent there runs through the book the deep appreciation of the old world. Margaret Halsey must confess that "the England I have seen is lovely to look upon beyond anything I had imagined before I came." The digs she takes at England are the proper payment of an old debt. For the English have looked at us long enough as Indian-dodging barbarians.

Margaret Halsey is a humorist of the first order. For she knows, among other things, that a large part of humor is controlled, yes, disciplined exaggeration.

BASTIAN KRUTHOF.

THE LIFE HEREAFTER

WAT LEERT HET OUDE TESTAMENT AANGAANDE HET LEVEN NA DIT LEVEN? By Dr. A. de Bondt. J. H. Kok, Kampen, The Netherlands. 228 pages; price unbound f 2.75.

THE treatise under consideration is another precious fruit of the work of the Free University of Amsterdam. It is a rather comprehensive thesis prepared by the author to meet the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology. It is quite evident that the two Old Testament men of the Free University, the Professors Van Gelderen and Aalders, profoundly influenced the author's Old Testament work. This does not mean that he has not investigated things for himself. Every page of the book gives evidence of the fact that he is thoroughly acquainted with Old Testament problems and has carefully studied the relevant literature and even examined it with meticulous care. We were glad to notice that he manifests considerable independence of spirit, and refuses to be controlled by the rationalistic and evolutionistic prepossessions of many Old Testament scholars. While taking account of the various conjectures and opinions offered in the course of time, he follows his own course. Every lover of the truth as it is revealed in the Word of God will welcome this study of Dr. De Bondt.

His book constitutes an important contribution to Old Testament literature, and especially to our knowledge of the Old Testament conception of the future life. In the first chapter he deals with the concepts of life and death in the Old Testament and rightly calls attention to the fact that both of these terms have a deep spiritual significance. In the deeper sense of the word life is communion with God, and death is separation from Him. In this connection he seeks to give an answer to some of the questions which recently disturbed the peace of the Church in the Netherlands to some extent.

What the author says in the following chapters about Sheol, the descent into Sheol, and the deliverance from Sheol, is of particular interest in view of the widespread theory that, according to the Old Testament, all the dead, both the pious and the wicked, descend into a common underworld without moral distinctions, where men live as shadows, without sharing in any of the interests of life. After a careful study of all the relevant passages he comes to the conclusion that there is no ground for the assertion that the Old Testament teaches the descent of all men into such an underworld. He finds that the idea of such a general abode of the spirits of the dead is reflected only in two or three figurative descriptions dealing with Gentiles. His general conclusion is that the word Sheol has various meanings, such as death, the grave, danger of death, power of death (this also in a spiritual sense), the place of the wicked dead, and the deepest place known to the Israelite.

Of equal importance, however, is the last part of the work, which deals with the problem of the resurrection in the Old Testament. One often meets with the assertion that the Old Testament does not teach the resurrection from the dead; or that this idea occurs only in a couple of late passages and was evidently borrowed from other nations. The author shows that both of these positions are untenable. Such passages as Hos. 6:2 and Ezek. 37:1-14 do not explicitly teach the doctrine of the resurrection, but do have some bearing on it. Other passages, however, clearly teach it, namely, Ps. 16:9-11; 17:15; 49:16; 73:24; Job. 19:25-27; Isa. 25:8; 26:14, 19; and Dan. 12:2.

We are grateful to the author for his thorough and painstaking study, and hope that it may have a clarifying influence in his own country, and may lead many others to a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the Old Testament teachings respecting the future life.

L. BERKHOF.

ON TABERNACLE AND TEMPLE

DE SCHADUW DER HEMELSCHER DINGEN. By Rev. W. H. Bouwman; with a foreword by Prof. Dr. J. Ridderbos of Kampen Seminary. Published by J. H. Kok of Kampen; 176 pages.

It is a real pleasure to introduce to the readers of the FORUM this attractive work that has recently been introduced to readers across the Atlantic by our friend, Prof. Dr. J. Ridderbos.

In twenty-four meditations, related to as many texts from Scripture, the author discourses in a very edifying and applicatory manner, concerning the ceremonially holy sanctuary, the holy servants, the holy service and the holy times that formed the shadow of the heavenly realities.

A great service of this book lies in the wide variety of texts that are placed above the meditations and that are taken not only from the Pentateuch and from the Letter to the Hebrews, but also from many Psalms, from Haggai, Matthew, and Acts.

There are various works on the Old Testament ceremonial institutions, but very few have achieved as attractive and as practical a presentation of the ritual as this edifying series of meditations.

The work does not burden the reader with technical studies of the Hebrew or Greek words that would need elucidation in a formal theological discussion of pattern, shadow, image, type and antitype.

Nor does it, in its history of the priesthood, take much cognizance of the varying relationships between priests and Levites, in different periods of Israel's sacred history, as sketched, for instance, in the article on "Priests and Levites," in the "International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia."

We do not share the author's view that the scapegoat was for Satan, but believe that the margin of the American Revised Version at Leviticus 16:8 has the correct idea that the scapegoat was for "removal,"—for dismissal to a remote region.

On the Old Testament connection between sacrifices and sins done with a high hand, presumptuous, intentional sins, the author might do well to compare such positions as those of Fairbairn and A. B. Davidson, for the death of the sinner was not the only solution for such sins, on the basis of Old Testament Theology, and this position is supported by Psalm 51:16-19 and by Micah 6.

Meanwhile, these strictures affect only brief portions of the book under review. The volume remains a very edifying and attractive presentation of the ceremonial ritual, in the light of an unusually large number of Scriptural selections taken from both the Old Testament and the New. The author has really enriched the literature concerning "De Schaduw der Hemelsche Dingen." Those of our esteemed readers that have acquired the ability of reading with ease more than one language find a serviceable treatment here of one of the less familiar portions of Scripture that has meanwhile a high practical value.

MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN.

DISCUSSION CLUBS

Calvinistic Discussion Club

THE group organized last year in Michigan for the purpose of studying present day problems from a distinctive and constructive Calvinistic point of view, met in fall session October 7, 1938. Our host was our fellow-member, Dr. L. Greenway, of Grand Haven.

The session was to be devoted to this question: Just what, among all the problems one meets in the realm of thought, is most fundamental? The executive committee, having been instructed to do so at the last meeting, had taken upon itself the task of working out a scheme of studies, in which the most basic problem would be unfolded. The committee worked jointly but presented the fruits of its labors individually.

The secretary, Dr. J. G. Van Dyke, introduced the subject, "The Ontological Subjects Should Be Treated First." This he had worked out under three heads. Ontology is first because it is logically so. "Being" is previous to all else. In the next place, it is theologically incumbent upon us to study Ontology first. Does not Dogmatics begin with God, who He is, his decrees, etc.? And is not Theology systematized knowledge of Theos, of God? In the third place, the Scriptures demand that the ontological problems should be investigated first. The writings of St. John are very plain in this matter. Especially illuminating is the third chapter of his Gospel. After this paper had been read, our president, Professor Dr. C. Bouma, presented and explained a plan for the study of Ontology upon Christian-Augustinian-Calvinistic assumptions. In this survey he brought to the fore 12 different aspects, both historical and systematic. The first deals with the Nature and Unity of Reality, the next five tackle the problem through outstanding historic types of philosophical and theological thought. The remaining six take up the basic phases of the Christian-Theistic view of Reality.

The scheme of studies was accepted and so we have for the year 1939 the following schedule: 1. "The Nature and Unity of Reality"—Professor C. Bouma; 2. "Christianity and Platonism"—Dr. J. G. Van Dyke; 3. "St. Augustine and Reformed Thought"—Dr. R. Stob; 4. "The 'Christian' Philosophy of the Middle Ages"—Rev. J. Weidenaar; 5. "Modern German Ideal-

ism and the Reformed Faith"—Dr. L. Greenway; 6. "Schleiermacher and the Beginnings of Theological Modernism"—Dr. L. De Moor.

We hope to arrive at a clear-cut conception of "Being." We are sure that the fight against all false theologies and philosophies must be waged in Ontology. Monism, no matter how construed—idealistically or materialistically—is the great enemy of Christianity. Grateful to our God we are, but our constant prayer is that He who is from everlasting to everlasting, may grant us the light of the Spirit. In Thy light we shall see light.

J. G. VAN DYKE, Secretary.

Nature and Scripture Study Club

THE Nature and Scripture Study Club of Grand Rapids was organized during the summer of 1936. It is composed of nineteen college graduates, both men and women, who accept the infallibility of the Bible and who have more than an ordinary interest in natural science. Its secretary is Mr. Harry Wassink, 1023 Calvin Ave., Grand Rapids, Michigan, to whom all correspondence should be addressed. The purpose of the club and its method of study are explained concretely in the following review and preview given by the undersigned at the opening meeting of the 1938-'39 season.

Fellow members and friends:

The program committee of our Nature and Scripture Study Club has enjoined upon the office of the presidency the duty that the chairman, at the first meeting of each year, shall present a review of the club's activities of the past year, and also a preview of its work for the coming year. Owing to our frail memories it is undoubtedly wise to bridge the gap of our long and busy vacations by some such means. Besides, it will probably be helpful and encouraging for our future efforts to look backward upon the path which God in His gracious providence has privileged us to pursue. However, it is manifestly impossible to give a complete summary of all of the club's activities of the entire year, but perhaps I can describe concisely what appear to me now to have been the most significant of the many intellectual events of each meeting.

Creation, Space, and Time

On the evening of September 23, 1937, the Reverend William Hendriksen introduced a discussion of the subject: "The Creation of Heaven and Earth in the Beginning." This introduction convinced us that the Bible clearly teaches that time is not merely a category of the human mind, but rather that it is a mode of existence of the whole creation. Time extends from the beginning of creation, even before man was. This Scriptural view of the objective reality of time agrees so well with the practical experience of the natural scientist that he will immediately assent to it, in spite of the sophistries of some philosophers on their subjective conception. To appreciate the value of the Scriptural interpretation of time for science, suppose that the opposite were true. Try to imagine the enthusiasm of a Christian natural scientist who was determining the acceleration of a falling body, if time were merely subjective! On such a supposition, since space is a correlative of time, our knowledge of nature could progress only like Mephiboseth who was lame in both feet, but the Biblical reality of time permits the free development of natural science.

At our meeting of November 4, your chairman read a paper written by Mr. D. J. Whitney, editor of the *Creationist*, on "Flood Geology." The belief that the deluge formed all the strata in the earth has been zealously propagated by Mr. George McCready Price and his disciples during the last twenty-five years. Although it is admitted that this is an ingenious theory, it is not yet at all clear that the Scriptural account of the deluge warrants us to explain all of the earth's strata in this way. Probably the best that can be said for this theory is that we do not now have a more satisfactory one. Incompatible with the theory is the explanation of some commentators of Scripture that the deluge was merely a local catastrophe. Our discussion of Mr. Whitney's paper indicated the club's need of a well-trained Christian geologist, since the relation between the geological layers and the Biblical history of the earth is an important problem for us. Even the theory of organic evolution now finds one of its main supports in an evolutionary interpretation of geology.

How Old is the Earth?

On the evening of December 2, 1937, the Reverend William Hendriksen displayed for us "The Light of Scripture on the Question: How Old is the Earth?" He pointed out that according to Biblical data a uniformitarian theory cannot apply to the time from the fall of Adam to Noah. Subsequently he made the intensely interesting suggestion that we should look for a solution of the problem of the geological layers not only among the immediate consequences of the fall of man and of the deluge, but also that we should consider the possibility that some of the earth's strata were formed during the intervening centuries. In this connection he focussed our attention upon the words of Jehovah spoken immediately after the flood: "I will not curse the ground any more for man's sake . . . While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease" (Genesis 8:21-22). In accordance with Mr. Hendriksen's suggestion, one of our members has been making a careful investigation of the condition of the earth during the time between the fall of man and the deluge. The club is eagerly awaiting the results of this study.

Radiation

On January 13, 1938, Mr. Harry Wassink introduced for us the subject, "Radiation," and he convinced everyone that, no matter from what angle we investigate the energy of the universe, we are always led to the conclusion that its availability is continuously diminishing. Even though photosynthesis causes the temporary storage of some energy at a higher plane, the sum total of energy in the universe is like water running down hill in that it is constantly sinking to a lower level. Mr. Wassink's introduction was really a physicist's exposition of Psalm 102:26 and Hebrews 1:11 where we read that the heavens and the earth "shall wax old as doth a garment." Thus it is noteworthy that the Bible was already teaching the essence of the second law of thermodynamics long before this law was definitely perceived by students of physics.

Of Dr. Edwin Monsma's introduction of February 17, 1938, on the "Effects of Radiation on Plants," it will be recalled that some kinds of plants are especially adapted to light periods of a particular duration and also that some plants are peculiarly sensitive to light of particular wave lengths. Although this paper did not prove that all mutations are due to disruptions caused by radiant energy of short wave lengths, the harmful effects of high frequency radiation upon plants, often followed by visible mutations, indicate that mutations may be nothing more than manifestations of hereditary injuries. Thus from Dr. Monsma's introduction we may conclude that the mutation theory of evolution is really in a precarious condition. Is it not also a very suggestive thought that a process of disintegration in the heavier chemical elements should produce high frequency radiation which in turn cause hereditary degeneration in organisms?

At our meeting on April 14, 1938, the Reverend William Hendriksen introduced the study of "The First Four Days of

Creation." He explained what Scripture does reveal and what it does not say about this subject. For example, he emphasized that before the creation of light or radiant energy, matter, according to Genesis 1:2, was not in a confused state of chaos, but in a condition described as "void and without form." It was a glimpse of new truth that this declaration of Scripture agrees with the conception of physics that in the absence of radiant energy matter would be in an amorphous state. The Christian natural scientist experiences an exultant thrill when he discovers such new relationships. Moreover, in this case the two witnesses, Nature and Scripture, combine their testimony to refute the reconstitution theory of creation which was mistakenly developed by the eminent Calvinistic natural philosopher, Charles Bonnet (1720-1793), and is still diligently proclaimed by many misguided fundamentalists today. Surely, in view of such paired testimony the words "void and without form" unequivocally contradict that fossils and mineral crystals already existed before the creation of light.

A Creed for Christian Naturalists

Since Mr. Dudley J. Whitney had sent us a copy of his creed, together with another creedal formulation by Mr. George McCready Price, with the urgent request that we should subscribe to one of them, or that we should modify them, our secretary was charged to send a copy of these creeds to each member for study. At our next meeting, however, the club decided to appoint a committee to formulate a proposed creed of our own. In the month of May an entire evening was devoted to a consideration of the articles of the committee's creed. It was encouraging to observe that we were so well agreed upon the fundamentals, even though there also appeared to be a difference of opinion about one article. Our discussion revealed that there are members in our club who know and understand what Drs. Kuyper, Bavinck, Geesink, Hepp, and other theological writers of the Netherlands have contributed toward basic principles for a Nature and Scripture Study Club. Altho one evening proved to be too short for the complete formulation of a creed to which all could subscribe, our discussion was very profitable. We learned to appreciate more fully the depth of our basic principles and their comprehensive significance. Finally we agreed to table the matter of a creed to a more opportune time when we shall have made further progress in our regular program of studies. At that time we hope to complete this work, for in our unanimity lies our strength.

Retrospect and Prospect

Having thus briefly and eclectically reviewed our studies of the past year, it will doubtless also be profitable to summarize our experiences in a few general conclusions. In the first place it may be concluded that as we wended our way homeward from each meeting, we realized not only that our gathering had been pleasant socially, but also that we had acquired greater knowledge of that truth which helps us to depict clearer lines in our Christian world and life view. Moreover, at several points we discovered new relations between our natural science and our knowledge of Scripture, while at the same time we improved and strengthened the foundation for our understanding of both general and special revelation. Thirdly, we have repeatedly found that a Scriptural interpretation of nature is more reasonable and agrees better with our experience than any interpretation based upon purely human philosophy. Finally, on numerous occasions we observed that our understanding of God's Word and our interpretation of His works harmonize exactly, while in all of our deliberations we have found no real conflict between them.

In view of these conclusions and in view of the fact that our club is the only known American society which definitely pursues the broad aspiration expressed in its name, we feel it to be our duty to continue our general program planned for several years to come. Our past progress, though small, places upon us the serious responsibility to prayerfully pursue the same method of study during the year 1938-39. Accordingly, our program committee has detailed for us the following series of topics for this year: (1) "The Biblical Views of the Antediluvian Period"; (2) "The Last Three Days of Creation"; (3) "The Origin of Man according to Evolutionary Science"; (4) "The Creation of Man in God's Image"; (5) "The Evolutionary Conception of the Development of the Human Mind"; (6) "Evolution in the Light of the Bible"; (7) "The History and Meaning of the Recapitulation Theory"; (8) "The Evolutionary Theory in the Light of Creation"; (9) "Discussion of Our Creed."

This program reveals that our committee has planned a series of interesting and important studies for the coming year. Our treatment of the proposed subjects will undoubtedly contrast clearly some of the most significant implications of the evolution theory with the Biblical description and interpretation of creation. May the prospect stimulate us all to do our best and may the Holy Spirit guide us in all of our deliberations that our club may continue to progress onward and upward toward the high ideal of a completely integrated world and life view.

J. P. VAN HAITSMAN.