



the **CALVIN** **Orum**

World Calvinism
Amsterdam 1949

Black and White
The Race Problem

Johann Wolfgang Goethe
His Bicentenary

Hearts Aflame
Commencement Challenge

That Acquisitive Urge
A Critique

Letters

Reviews

Verse

VOL. XV, NO. 3

**TWO DOLLARS
A YEAR**

OCTOBER, 1949

THE CALVIN FORUM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

<i>Editor-in-Chief</i>	CLARENCE BOUMA
<i>Associate Editors</i>	WILLIAM T. RADIUS HENRY J. RYSKAMP HENRY SCHULTZE GEORGE STOB
<i>Book Editor</i>	HENRY ZYLSTRA

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

ARTHUR ALLEN	<i>Australia</i>
HARRY R. BOER	<i>Nigeria</i>
ARNOLD BRINK	<i>Calvin College and Seminary</i>
HENRY BRUINOOGHE	<i>China</i>
CALVIN CHAO	<i>Shanghai</i>
J. CHR. COETZEE	<i>South Africa</i>
SAMUEL G. CRAIG	<i>Presb. Church, U.S.A.</i>
PAUL DE KOEKKOEK	<i>Edmonton, Canada</i>
F. W. DEN DULK	<i>Ethiopia</i>
MARK FAKKEMA	<i>Nat. Assn. Chr. Schools</i>
A. G. FOENANDER	<i>Ceylon</i>
BURTON L. GODDARD	<i>Boston</i>
EDWARD HEEREMA	<i>Orthodox Presb. Church</i>
JACOB T. HOOGSTRA	<i>Ecumenical Calvinism</i>
FRED S. LEAHY	<i>North Ireland</i>
TAKESHI MATSUO	<i>Japan</i>
J. GRAHAM MILLER	<i>New Hebrides</i>
PIETER PRINS	<i>Netherlands</i>
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH	<i>South India</i>
W. STANFORD REID	<i>Montreal, Canada</i>
WM. C. ROBINSON	<i>Presb. Church in the U. S.</i>
JENO SEBESTYEN	<i>Budapest, Hungary</i>
WILLIAM A. SWETS	<i>Ref. Church in America</i>
JOHN VAN BRUGGEN	<i>Nat. Union Chr. Schools</i>
LEONARD VERDUIN	<i>Ann Arbor, Michigan</i>
CHARLES VINCZE	<i>Hungarian Reformed</i>
JOHN W. WEVERS	<i>Princeton</i>

Address all editorial correspondence to Dr. Clarence Bouma, Editor THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan. Address all subscription and circulation correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan.

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly, except from June to September, when it appears bi-monthly. Subscription price: Two Dollars per year.

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

Published by the Calvin Forum Board of Publication

VOLUME XV, NO. 3

OCTOBER, 1949

Contents

Editorial

Reformed Ecumenical Synod: Amsterdam 1949	35
---	----

Articles

South Africa's Race Problem	Ralph J. Danhof 38
Johann Wolfgang Goethe: 1749-1949	Clarence K. Pott 41
Hearts Aflame	Anthony A. Hoekema 45
Christianity and the Acquisitive Urge in Man	Leonard Verduin 48

From Our Correspondents

Michigan Calvinistic Philosophy Club	51
Glimpses from India	51
Calvin's Institutes in Spanish	52
From Princeton Seminary	53

Book Reviews

Tennyson: Man and Poet	54
Theology and Philosophy	55
Calvin on the Synoptics	55
Calvin on John	56

Verse

Bright Hours	50
--------------------	----

Reformed Ecumenical Synod: Amsterdam, 1949

An Editorial

THE Reformed Ecumenical Synod of Amsterdam goes down into history not only as one of the most unique assemblies of churches that has ever met, but also as probably the most significant and the most hopeful gathering ever held for the consolidation of the forces of the Reformed Faith, for the promotion of the Calvinistic testimony throughout the world, and for the clarification and deepening of the Reformed consciousness among Presbyterian and Reformed groups of the modern day.

Of course, when this claim is made for the Amsterdam Synod it should not be divorced from its predecessor nor from its hoped-for successors. The Grand Rapids Synod of 1946 was the first step on the road of an organized Reformed ecumenicity, but it was avowedly only preparatory in character and consisted of only the three bodies that had up to that time shown some interest in such a movement. In coming synods the representation and the achievements will hopefully be much larger, as the movement continues to build on the foundations laid. The present Synod, however, has the distinction of being to date the most impressive such assembly held in Reformed Christendom.

One could spend many words and fill many pages expressing his regrets that large bodies in name Reformed and Presbyterian were not represented at this Synod. But in the face of the great apostasy of the modern day, and in the full realization that historic names have in many cases lost all meaning in modern Christendom, we who by the grace of God are lovers of the Reformed Faith in its biblical and confessional purity can only rejoice that so large and representative an assembly of Calvinists could meet, have fellowship, and transact business together at Amsterdam.

How large and representative was this Amsterdam Synod? Its members came from four different continents. If the desire of the brethren in Australia to be present could have been realized, the world's five continents would have been represented at Amsterdam. Nationally and racially speaking there were representatives of the following 15 groups: the Scottish, the English, the Welsh, the Irish, the Dutch, the Belgians, the French, the Germans, the Danish, the Hungarians, the Javanese, the Chinese-Javanese, the Sumbanese, the South

Africans, and the Americans. The white, the black, and the yellow race shook hands together and were one in Christ at this assembly. Though in some cases the groups represented were small, and even very small, in other cases men were speaking for hundreds of thousands, and in a few cases even for a million or more.

* * *
* *

To me the most remarkable thing about this assembly was the fact of its existence. Here in this body consisting of twenty-five officially delegated voting members, twenty-two unofficial delegates or observers, and eleven professorial advisory members, one saw in action the first truly representative deliberative world assembly of Reformed Churches coping with the problems of our day on a genuinely Reformed confessional and doctrinal basis.

This demonstrated that the Reformed Faith is a world movement and that the Calvinistic Churches who are in earnest about their creed are a living force in the world today. It was almost pathetic at times to hear expressions of surprise from some of the delegates and guest-members to the effect that they were not aware of the existence of all these groups of Calvinists here represented. Many of us discovered one another at Amsterdam. Many also expressed gratification over the fact that they had learned of one another through the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM. It was most heartening to learn that in the midst of the great apostasy of our day there are many throughout the world who still love the truth of the fathers, the Gospel according to the interpretation of a genuine Calvinism.

When Paul met the brethren from Rome who came to meet him as far as The Market of Appius and The Three Taverns, we read that "he thanked God and took courage." Again and again as we met, clasped hands, prayed, and sang in the fellowship of the Faith at Amsterdam, we "thanked God and took courage." In this connection mention may well be made of a scene during the sessions of this Synod. The scene was a most unusual one. In fact, strictly speaking it was not a session of Synod. But in another sense it was to me the most beautiful session of all those held. It was held not in the

Waalkerk at Amsterdam, but on the quaint old Island of Marken. Let me share it with you.

Imagine the Synod, augmented by some hosts and hostesses of the delegates, taking a bus tour through the province of North Holland on the Saturday of the first week. Imagine the entire company taking a small steamer from Volendam to the Island of Marken. There is nothing unusual, you say, about strangers paying a visit to Marken. That happens every day in the tourist season. But this was different. Upon arrival at the pier the entire synodical company was greeted by the elders of "de Gereformeerde Kerk" of Marken dressed in their Sunday best, their quaint wide breeches—but the finest for the occasion. The Synod was divided into four groups each under the guidance of a "Gereformeerde ouderling" to see some of the interesting things that everybody comes to see on the Island. And then the whole company was reunited in the little building of "de Gereformeerde Kerk." Here the ladies in their long tresses and colorful garb served the entire Synod tea and cake. Here, right in the auditorium where worship is held on the Lord's Day, tables were spread for the refreshment of the Ecumenical Synod. The elders sat with the officers of Synod in the enclosure in front of the pulpit. The organist was present this Saturday afternoon to play the finest sacred music. President Aalders spoke a word and the entire company (barring the friends who knew no Holland and who listened in reverence) joined in singing that great psalm: "Geloofd zij God met diepst ontzag!"

To me that was the greatest session of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod of Amsterdam. I am sorry for the members who missed it. To me it made no difference that no roll call was held and no minutes were read. I could do without the debates for a while without losing the sense of Reformed ecumenical reality. The Marken elder who in wonderment bordering on reverence asked one of us sitting next to him to be told from which country and church each one of those delegates had come, had caught the marvel of this Synod. As the names of the various parts of the globe from which these brethren had come to a Reformed Ecumenical Synod (and had also come to the little "Gereformeerde Kerk" on the Island of Marken) were enumerated to him in a whisper he sat in amazement. I know what he did. He "thanked God and took courage." There was a glow upon the faces of these elders in their wide Sunday-go-to-church breeches that Saturday afternoon that was the glow of joy and gratitude to Almighty God that they were one of a great company of people speaking many languages and scattered throughout many countries but loving the same Gospel, the same Lord, the same Reformed Faith. Here among the common Psalm-singing people of Marken, the finest representatives of the "Gereformeerde kleine luyden," who

have always been the backbone of any Calvinistic Church, the Reformed Ecumenical Synod was truly at home. We were loath to part.

* * *
* *

Perhaps you wish to know about the deliberations and the decisions of this most unusual ecclesiastical body.

Of course, it is impossible to discuss these in this editorial. Nor is that my purpose. You will see more about these things in future issues of *THE CALVIN FORUM*. Perhaps the real significance of this Synod did not lie in these decisions so much as in the fact that it has met and has opened up a new prospect for the future of Reformed ecumenicity.

It was impressive to note the unity of aim of all participating in this Synod. Also this sets it off from other ecumenical assemblies and even from world gatherings that sometimes bear the Reformed and Presbyterian label. It was refreshing at this assembly to be able to assume one basis and to see men live by that assumption in their discussions and decisions. Many world assemblies and ecumenical movements boast of fellowship and common prayer. But the sad fact is that in such cases even common worship is often impossible and—what is worse—that matters of creed must be suppressed or compromised.

Amsterdam 1949—as also Grand Rapids 1946—was a *Reformed Ecumenical Synod*. Every member solemnly declared his wholehearted assent to the great verities as contained in the Word of God and as formulated in the classic Reformed creeds. Throughout the discussions there was that silent assumption of a common basis that marked all sessions of Synod. There was diversity, great diversity. But there was the unity of the Spirit. And that "Spirit" was not a dumb, purely emotional, blankly mystical "Spirit." It was the Spirit of the Word, the Spirit that has led the Church in all the truth.

This was the one bond that held the Synod of Amsterdam together, that gave it a deeper and lasting unity. It was also the bond that existed before we had ever gathered for the opening session. It is the bond that guarantees a future for the Reformed Ecumenical movement. The language of the Reformed Faith is a universal language that knows no barrier of English or Dutch, of Malayan or Welsh, of Hungarian or French, of Afrikaans or Sumbanese. Even though it may at times be necessary for some of the members of a Reformed Ecumenical Synod to use head phones and benefit from translations, in the deeper sense we understand one another, whether our names be Moedak or Berkouwer, Langenohl or Dijk, Pouw I Gan or Van Baalen, Kas-molo or McKenzie, Grier or Oemboe Kapita, Marcel or Stonehouse, Varga or Tan Ik Hay.

This bond of unity rooted in a common confession also held us together in all of our discussions. Let no one think that there was no diversity of opinion and conviction at Amsterdam. There were lengthy debates. Distinct differences became apparent. Many rounds of discussion were held. Reports were repeatedly referred back to the committees that had conceived them and brought them forth. How could it be otherwise when intelligent, self-respecting men, lovers of the truth,—not to speak of Dutch, Friesian, Scotch, Afrikaans, and other characteristics—get together to think, deliberate, and decide together on the great implications and objectives of our Faith? But the beauty of all these discussions was their brotherly and understanding spirit on the one hand, and the solid ground of the Reformed Faith as our common basis of operation on the other. Also on this score the Amsterdam Synod augurs well for the future.

* * *
* *

As for the matters that have come up for discussion and decision at this Synod, the most important was undoubtedly that of the proper relation and attitude of Reformed Churches toward the Ecumenical Movement embodied in the World Council and in such organized movements as the N.A.E. and the I.C.C.C.

It must also be said that this discussion was the most revealing of all that took place. This matter had been placed on the docket by both the Dutch Gereformeerde Kerken and by the South African Gereformeerde Kerk. To understand the picture it must be explained that the Dutch Churches, which have met in General Synod since adjournment of the Ecumenical Synod, had this matter as an important issue of their 1949 agenda and were eager for the light which the Ecumenical Synod might shed on this problem. It soon became apparent that the crucial issue as it lies in the Dutch and also in the Indonesian mind differs entirely from that which such American groups as the Christian Reformed Church and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church conceived it to be.

The leadership in the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland is not at all agreed that a Reformed Church should not join the World Council of Churches. This is still an issue among them, and on this issue their leaders have in many cases taken sides. Those who plead for joining the World Council, though not at all in the majority, include prominent men. Especially those close to the mission churches are champions of this position. In fact, one of the groups of native Reformed Church-

es on Java is today a member of the World Council. I do not here enter into the explanation of this fact, but a fact it is. It need hardly be said that alongside of this issue, the question as to the relative merits of the N.A.E. and the I.C.C.C. faded into insignificance, at least for the time being.

One is somewhat at a loss how to explain this favorable attitude on the part of some of the Dutch leaders of the Reformed Churches to joining the World Council. The present writer, as well as others from America, gave expression to surprise and disappointment on this score. We of America, who have gone through the experience of dealing with the Federal Council of Churches, and know how little the pious declarations of such organized groups of liberals mean, have long ago made up our mind on this issue. To speak in a familiar Dutch phrase, we thought we had passed that station. As a matter of fact, the debate in the Amsterdam Synod gave some of us the opportunity to fight a battle which we thought the Dutch would have fought through long ago. We are convinced the discussion has been most fruitful. It was most illuminating that this strong opposition to the World Council came from American Churches. We are convinced that the real value of the debate on this issue at Amsterdam does not lie half as much in the decision finally reached (though that is important) as in the effect which this debate apparently has had upon many members and advisory members of the Synod. All this, we trust, history will prove.

Meanwhile the Ecumenical Synod has decided to make a thorough study of this entire matter, including the N.A.E. and the I.C.C.C. In all probability the General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands will at its current sessions (which at the present writing have not yet ended) decide in similar vein. If so, it would appear that we have entered upon a period of study of this entire ecumenical issue. The Christian Reformed Church will be doing this with the problem of its own membership in the N.A.E. in mind. The Dutch Churches (and indirectly all churches associated in the Reformed Ecumenical Synod) will do the same with the issue of the World Council uppermost. This very divergence of point of view and attack clearly demonstrates the value and need of Reformed Churches to meet at stated times in Ecumenical Synod. It is for problems like these that joint consultation is highly desirable.

These and other matters bearing upon Reformed Ecumenicity will engage our attention in the days that lie ahead.

C. B.

South Africa's Race Problem

Ralph J. Danhof

Minister Neland Avenue Chr. Ref. Church
Grand Rapids, Michigan

IN OUR own nation we have been wrestling for a few decades to find a solution to our race problem, especially as it exists in most of our southern states. I readily admit and agree with the CALVIN FORUM correspondent, Professor J. Chr. Coetzee, educator at the University College of Potchefstroom, that our race problem is not as complicated as that in the Union of South Africa. I do not agree with my good friend when he claims that Americans are unable to understand the race problem in South Africa. Our inability as Americans to understand their race problem does not necessarily follow from the fact that the whites in South Africa are outnumbered by the black and colored races by as much as 4 to 1. It is true that white supremacy is not hanging in the balance in our nation, and the fear of the white man because of a negro domination has not reached the proportions it has assumed in the Union of South Africa. The number of blacks or whites in the final analysis has very little to do with a proposed solution of the problem. The domination of white or black may merely complicate the problem, but should in no way hinder the application of a solution to the problem if the principle to be applied is a sound one.

Our Own American Race Problem

We Americans and the white race in South Africa have a common problem. I state it with a feeling of sadness that there are still millions of people in our nation, many of them men of color, who still do not know the meaning of true freedom and are still deprived of the rights which a democratic state should offer to them. There are millions of negroes in our nation whose daily rounds and destinies are in the hands of powerful minority groups, who suppress politically, exploit economically, and abuse socially a group of people simply because of the differences in color of skin. We must readily admit that in our own nation deplorable conditions still obtain as the result of the unsolved racial problem. It is also for that reason that we take keen interest and a sympathetic attitude to the proposed solution offered to a similar problem as it exists in the Christian nation, the Union of South Africa. If the principle offered for the solution of a race problem is sound, it should be workable in every part of the world, especially so when it is claimed that the proposed solution is based on the teachings of Scrip-

ture. The principles of Scripture are applicable in every part of the world. When such a claim is made we are very eager to approach the proposed solution to South Africa's race problem with an open and a sympathetic mind. We are assured that if the solution offered will work in South Africa it will also work in the United States, and in every other part of the world.

From our own observations we must admit that the color bar is much in evidence both in our southland and in South Africa. Our own American southland today comprises approximately one-third of our total land area, and nearly one-half of the land area is a potentially rich part of our nation, but actually is very poor. During a national crisis the President of our nation had to point to the South's great economic lag. Politically the South is equally a tragic picture. A section with a quarter of the nation's population has for all practical purposes only one political party, and that political party in power has apparently only one aspiration and that is "to keep the Negro in his place." The political mind of the South is accompanied by an explicit fascism with regard to the Negro. Edward Byron Reuter, writing in *The American Race Problem*, leaves no doubt as to the influence of the race problem on southern life. He states, "The present arrangements (of race relations) are demonstrably uneconomic and morally stultifying; they retard the cultural advancement of the southern regions of the country, hence of the nation, and they make personally tolerable conditions of life impossible for large numbers of persons. They are an endless source of political corruption and governmental inefficiency; they perpetuate the educational backwardness both of the Negroes and the whites. In nearly every case, they operate to prevent the satisfaction of the real needs of the community life. Every consideration of economic, political, social, moral, and educational welfare calls for radical changes in the race relations." (p. 86.) These facts are fully corroborated by the two volumes published by Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma*, and by the well documented book of Drake and Cayton, *Black Metropolis*, and the recently revised published book, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, by J. Dollard. These recent publications, and many more books could be cited, clearly indicate and fully describe the inequalities which the Negroes of the southland of the United States must endure.

It is not surprising that in recent years no less than two million blacks have moved north to escape the abuses heaped upon them by the whites of the south. In the south the Negroes are treated as wards; by many in religion as an object of charity; by industry as a tool. Many Negroes are still eating the crumbs of democracy. The campaign statement of a prominent politician during the 1945 appeal for votes in the south said, "The present and future welfare of the South demands that the white race remain the dominant race I feel very strongly that certain social and socialistic activities sponsored by the New Deal and more particularly by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt are intolerable, detrimental, and an insult to the people of the great South." (*Afro-American*, June 28, 1945, p. 24.) The South still retains its segregation in cities, street cars, railroad stations, etc.

The Situation in South Africa

Travelling through various parts of the Union of South Africa I witnessed conditions which reminded me of our own southland. I saw the native locations and compounds which reminded me of the impoverished and caste condition in our own South. With the discovery of gold and diamonds thousands of natives have been recruited for the mines out of their original kraal surroundings, and work in the mines under a contract ranging from 9 to 18 months, under supervision of the Government Native Affairs Department. During the period of their employment they live in compounds where they are controlled to prevent thefts of gold and diamonds, but are otherwise fairly well housed and provided for. They are in most cases separated from their wives and children. The large cities have drawn the natives and seriously complicated the race problem. In various parts of the Union the male native must possess a pass, and his movements are carefully guarded. The whites in city, village, and country employ natives. Whether educated or uneducated, the black man lives separated from the whites. His life is one of segregation, and the economic standard is considerably lower.

Today the white man in South Africa is afraid of the Kaffir as he was in the eighteenth century. But today for a different reason. Then he feared the Kaffir because he was fierce and bold. Today because he is clinging and insidious: a drug, a growing temptation, a Hyde to his Jekyll. The white man has lured the black man from his kraal to work in the mines. He sees the black man imitating the white man, trying desperately to do what the white man does. The white man in South Africa has awakened the natives, and the black man is in the shadow of the white man, carrying his chattels. The black man has risen up and become a burden to the white man. The white race is questioning

now whether he would not, on the whole, be better off without his black servants. Moreover, the white man also is aware that the black man no longer keeps a decent distance as he formerly did. The question today is how can a white labor system be now made to supplant a black labor system? If the white man had not urged the native to come and work for him, would the seed of advance never have been sown in the native? The native himself is becoming race-conscious, and the white race is fearful of its own future in South Africa in view of the development and cultural advancement of the black race. The white race is fearful for its own self-preservation because it is in a great minority.

The present government in power in the Union of South Africa has made headlines in all parts of the world. The proposed program of action to solve the race problem has not received favorable comment outside of the Union. The Africa Committee of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, comprised of 43 major Protestant denominations, has openly criticized the policies advocated by the government headed by Dr. D. F. Malan, and declared that such racial policies constitute a violation of the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant of the United Nations. The resolution adopted states that the measures of the government were aimed to eliminate all non-European representation in Parliament, including the practice of white representation in behalf of white non-Europeans. The measures, so it is averred, would disfranchise all non-white citizens, and extend strict segregation even into spheres where it does not already exist. Whether the United Nations will heed this special appeal to curb the proposed racial policies of the present Nationalist government remains to be seen. The comment on the new racial policies in the May 4 issue of *The Christian Century*, under the title, "Eyes on South Africa" was also unfavorable. The writer stated, "All the Christian Churches in South Africa except the Dutch Reformed have protested against *Apartheid*." One Ring (we call it Classis or Presbytery) of the Dutch Reformed Church adopted the resolution that there is no Scriptural basis for the policy of Apartness, and requested the government to refrain from applying compulsory *Apartheid* laws. *Foreign Affairs*, October issue, 1948 p. 143, stated that the Dr. Malan victory was not a victory for or against Liberalism, but a decision between racial tolerance and good-will on the one hand (Smuts Party) and a reactionary policy on the other (Dr. Malan's Party). The writer claims that the victory of Malan was born out of a deep distrust of the United Party color policies. During the campaign in which Smuts was defeated the two outstanding opponents Malan and Havenga coined for themselves a common slogan, "*Apartheid*," yet the exact contents of their term was not defined

with any measure of exactitude. Foreign comments on the proposed racial policies of the Dr. Malan party have been unfavorable.

The Stand of the South African (Dutch) Church

Striking is the fact that the largest Reformed Church in South Africa, the *Gefedereerde Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk*, is in full agreement with a racial policy of "Apartheid." This denomination numbers nearly a million members and is found in every part of the Union. The policy of Apartness has been defined in two recent books, *Voogdyskap en Apartheid* by Professor Dr. G. Cronjé, and *Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid*, written jointly by Dr. Cronjé, Dr. Wm. Nicol, and Prof. E. P. Groenewald. All three authors are outstanding leaders in the largest Reformed denomination. The second chapter of the last mentioned book was prepared by Professor Groenewald, and he states that in the preparation of the principles of *Apartheid* and *Voogdyskap* (Apartness and Trusteeship or Guardianship) he freely made use of a document of "Die Raad van die Kerke" adopted in 1947, which he himself had largely prepared for his denomination at that time. For the benefit of readers unacquainted with the ecclesiastical constituency of the largest Reformed Church in the Union, it must be stated that "Die Raad van die Kerke" is an advisory body in which the four Synods of the denomination are represented, and the four Synods comprise a white membership which is slightly less than one-half of the complete white population in South Africa. The position of this large denomination is expressed in these words "... dat die Kerk teen enige gelykstelling tussen swart en wit gekant is en met oortuiging 'n sosiale differensiasie en geestes and kulturele segregasie—tot voordeel van beide seksies voorstaan. Voorts verklaar die Kerk: Die naturel (native) en Kleurling (colored or mulatto race) moet gehelp word om tot selfrespekterende Christenvolke te ontwikkel sover moontlik apart van die blanke." (*Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid*, pp. 40, 41.) The Church Volkskongress which met in 1947 in Johannesburg declared that racial apartness in every sphere of life must be carried out. The largest Reformed denomination in South Africa leaves no doubt as to its position on racial segregation and states in the *Laws and Regulations* for the government of the church, "Die Kerk laat geen gelykstelling tussen blankes en nie-blankes toe nie." (Article 9) Professor Groenewald also declares "... dat die beleid van apartheid en voogdyskap soos deur die Christelike Afrikaner voorgestaan ten opsigte van die nie-blankes, teruggevoer kan word tot die Woord van God." (*Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid*, p. 65.) From

the above citations it is self-evident that the Dr. Malan party has the support of his own church. Before we examine the Biblical arguments advanced for the racial policy of Guardianship and Apartness, let us briefly examine the nature of the race problem as it prevails in the Union of South Africa.

Some Facts to Remember

The race problem of South Africa can only be understood in the light of the many races and peoples dwelling within the present borders of the Union. The principal division is between the whites (usually referred to as Europeans) and the non-Europeans of various classes and colors. The white population is mainly descended from the early Dutch and English settlers. Those of Dutch origin represent more than half of the total whites and speak Afrikaans preferably. English, however, is also understood by most Dutch Afrikaners, and is the dominant language in the larger cities. Apart from those of pure English and Dutch origin, there are also many foreign groups, including Germans, French, Portuguese, Greeks, Lithuanians, and Americans. The non-Europeans are mainly Bantus from various tribes who in bygone centuries migrated to Southern Africa from the region of the Equator and beyond, and travelling southward came to clash with the migrating whites travelling northward from the Cape Province. The Bantu tribes speak different languages, many of which, however, have a fundamental resemblance. The most important tribes include the Zulu, Basuto, Bechuana, Xosa, Pondo, Tembu, and Fingo. There are also many sub-divisions. The original inhabitants of South Africa, the Bushmen and Hottentots, are almost extinct in their pure form. In addition the race problem is complicated by a hybrid people, known as the Cape Coloured, who conform more or less to European custom in their habits and mode of living. The term "coloured" in South Africa has an entirely different connotation than in our nation, and this must be born in mind when you read a book on the race problem published in South Africa. The "Coloured race," the result of miscegenation, is a mulatto, a half-caste race. The coloured man is the fruit of the vice, the folly, the thoughtlessness of the white man.

[This is the first instalment in a discussion of the South African race problem, a problem which is most urgent and is enjoying world interest and attention today. Dr. Danhof has recently returned from a visit to the Union and has especially had opportunity to listen to and assess the attitude of the Afrikaans-speaking people, whose views in the main are embodied in the policies of the present prime minister, Dr. D. F. Malan.—EDITOR.]

Johann Wolfgang Goethe: 1749-1949

Clarence K. Pott

Professor of German
University of Michigan

SEVENTEEN years ago the cultured world commemorated the hundredth anniversary of Goethe's death. On that occasion Albert Schweitzer concluded his "Gedenkrede" with the hope that when we should again be called upon to remember the most universal of German men we should find ourselves in happier condition, materially so far as the speaker's native Germany was concerned, but above all "that then the time may have dawned, in which the life of humanity flows along again in harmonious and naturally animated movement, like the music of Bach, whose magic affected Goethe so strongly because his spirit found itself echoed in that music" (*Goethe Gedenkrede*, 1933, p. 50). The year of a new commemoration has come and we are witnesses to Schweitzer's cruelly disappointed hope. Yet it is wise to turn for inspiration, for wisdom, and possibly for guidance to those who in their own day were acknowledged as pre-eminent among thinking men. And indeed this instinctive turning to Goethe is reflected in a mass of recent publications—books, essays, and critical estimates.

The attempt to appraise Goethe's significance is at once confronted with a serious paradox: no man has ever been so voluminously articulate as he—in poetry, novels, letters, and journals we become acquainted to almost the last detail with the content of Goethe's "Gedankenwelt." Yet, as Karl Jaspers, a modern philosopher-critic emphasizes, when we ask the question as to the essential total significance of Goethe or even his ultimate views on our eternal problems, we have in the last analysis only "ein tiefes Schweigen" (*Unsere Zukunft und Goethe*, 1947, p. 12ff.). The dogmatist ought to beware; the incommensurable is present in Goethe to a degree even greater than we expect. Goethe hides himself, often intentionally, more often instinctively. He contradicts himself, and his attitude toward matters of the vastest importance is not clear. How, for example, in the face of his frequent, ambiguously expressed distaste for cardinal Christian doctrines, shall we understand the comment, made in old age to an intimate friend, that he considered himself "almost the only real Christian remaining—Christian in the way Jesus desired us to be." No elucidation of this astonishing and provocative remark is offered. Yet this

ambiguity, this silence while baffling, is so integral a part of Goethe that the conditions in his life and personality which necessitated it must be investigated.

The Perfect Unity of All Things

Central in Goethe's mature thought was the idea, or rather, the intuition of the perfect unity of all things. God, man, and nature are one and, what is much more, they are not dis severable. Analytical investigation, be the object in physical nature or in the spiritual realm, is a violation of the organic unity and for that reason not able to give us insight into the essential nature of the object. So strongly did Goethe hold to this view that he applied it most personally to his own life. He "felt" himself so completely merged and identified with nature and God that he refused to recognize the validity or value of analytical thought *as such*: subject-object forms of thinking he rejected although practically he was aware, of course, that all thinking presupposes a thinking subject and a thought object, the point being that Goethe did not feel that Truth could be arrived at *in this way only* or even material progress be made toward it *in this way*. As a result he rejects formal philosophy in a cavalier manner: "Ich habe nie über das Denken gedacht."

It was this intuitional feature of Goethe's apprehension of Truth, this immediate awareness of essence that so astonished his great friend, Schiller, who was a thinker *par excellence* and an extraordinarily reflective poet. And Goethe in turn was almost naively astonished that Schiller to whom he could not and did not deny poetic genius, was able always to reduce the most subtle of poetic and emotional problems to conceptual terms.

Goethe was many things during his long life; he was also a scientist and he was that as seriously, as purposefully, as he was poet. Having placed such great strictures upon the "scientific method," how then does Goethe as scientist differ from the modern analytical scientist—how did Goethe proceed to ascertain Truth in nature?

Given the basic belief that the universe was in truth a *universe*, Goethe approached nature intuitively,

tively, imaginatively, and humbly. It could perhaps be said, at the risk of oversimplification, that Goethe's own analytical study of nature was merely and entirely for the purpose of verifying his intuited idea of essence. That is to say that Goethe proceeded as a poet here also: the deductiveness of genius rather than the dispassionate stumbling inductiveness of the pedestrian scientist. And so Goethe's own investigation of nature became a pilgrimage of wonder, an attempt to think nature's, or better, God's thought after Him. This search implied not a crude and cruel dismemberment but a loving acceptance, almost passive, of natural phenomena: there is a strongly religious element in this scientific approach. As evidence of the fruitfulness of this approach, for Goethe, we can point to such Goethean "discoveries" (perhaps it would be better to say "verifications") in nature as the concept of the "Urphänomen," "Polarität," and many more.

Knowledge thus derived begins then with an immediate "given" idea and it comes by way of inspiration. True to his fundamental thought, Goethe did not distinguish qualitatively between such inspirational insights and those which found expression in his immortal poetry. To be sure Goethe was speaking reverently of his high calling as poet in his "Zueignung" where he characterizes the gift and significance of poetry as

Aus Morgenduft gewebt und Sonnenklarheit,
Der Dichtung Schleier aus der Hand der Wahrheit,

but he would have had no objection to applying the lofty sentiment to his scientific mode.

Goethe's Imaginative Pantheism

Nevertheless a practical question must be faced: granted the validity of all this for a favored genius, to what extent can an ordinary mortal adopt the Goethean method? To this Goethe's own answer would be that for the individual who is at all sensitive to and appreciative of these unconventional premises (he is addressing no others) the task is not so hopeless as it seems. Once Goethe's point of departure is accepted as a beginning—an acceptance which much of modernity will regard as foolishness and anathema—it becomes then a question of lovingly accepting and submerging oneself in nature's ways and this will be followed by a constantly increasing acuteness of insight, *i.e.*, there is progress within the individual's understanding of nature. Above all, man must and does become aware of himself as part of the universe but, and here Goethe recognizes both human limits and human dignity, he does not lose himself in it. Rather he is content now, because he can and should do no other, to focus attention upon himself. For this microcosm of self reveals to him all the essentials of the macrocosm, something, incidentally, which

Faust did not learn until almost the end of his days. When the individual becomes aware of himself as a part of the whole, and more, as a part in which the whole is contained in essence, he will perceive his own immortal significance. From then on the study, the improvement, the responsibility of this self will become the chief task in life. Therefore in all his works Goethe is concerned with the cultivation of this noble and nobler self, most completely no doubt in *Iphigenie* and *Wilhelm Meister*, most tragically in *Faust*.

The force, the divine force, without which this "Universum-Idee" is not possible—which joins God, man and nature indissolubly together—is Love. Without it there cannot be, in the Goethean sense, any knowledge possible and life can have no significance. On the purely human level and within his own concrete personal experience Goethe met this reflection of universal love in several individuals who influenced him deeply at various times in his life: in the pietist friend of his mother Susanna von Klettenberg, the "schöne Seele" of the *Lehrjahre*; in Charlotte von Stein, the guiding star of his first Weimar decade, to whom Goethe paid his greatest tribute by remarking in wonder that "she saw everything through the eyes of love"; in the complete unselfishness of the character of Spinoza as revealed in the latter's writings. Whatever Goethe has to say to us even today will be lost to us if we ignore the core significance of love as a life principle, if we fail to appreciate the weight which he placed on all-conquering goodness—tools indispensable in the never ceasing "Bildungsprozess" of self.

If we have followed Goethe affirmatively and are willing to hold several important questions in abeyance for the moment, we shall at once perceive and lay hold on a nobler conception of selfhood—a selfhood free from the inhibiting bonds of our immediate nature and hence free to recover ourselves in a spiritually based naturalness. This is what Schweitzer meant by the "harmonious and naturally animated movement of our life." We shall prize the sacred individuality of others; we shall recognize the eternal significance of the present moment and not lose ourselves in illusion, in "Schwärmerei." Having thus become receptive for Man and Things we shall conceive a great love for all Being. This is the heart of Goethe's imaginative pantheism.

Frustration and Pessimism

But more, and this too is Goethe, we shall learn that we cannot, because of our absolute limitations, go the whole way. There is for Goethe finally an abyss, and beyond it—darkness. Goethe's time of life, filled with unheard of achievement which validates the seriousness of his striving, was fraught

also with suffering. In one of his sadder moments, in old age, he tells us that he had not in his long life experienced four weeks of true happiness. Let us have done therefore with the superficial notion that Goethe was a constitutional optimist. Positively, and Goethe is by nature and by will positive, he learned to accept less than finality. He discovered the necessity of resignation, "Entsagung." This theme recurs often, especially in the declining years, most poignantly in the "Marienbader Elegie" of 1823. Goethe himself knew better than to speak of complete victory of self.

Having with Goethe recognized a final incompleteness in the harmonious order, we may speak with the late professor Robert Mark Wenley of a pessimistic element in Goethe (*Aspects of Pessimism*, 1894, p. 128 ff.). This strain goes deeper than its partial reflection in the "Kulturpessimismus" of Goethe's old age.

In somewhat more philosophical terms, Goethe, it may be said, was intuitively aware that he was tied to and into a teleology but he was at the same time unable to define the relationship clearly and happily for himself. He encounters obstacles which nature and self place between man and completeness—obstacles which thwart the operation of the love principle. Goethe felt the power of this enemy so tragically that he must necessarily act and take a position with reference to it. Characteristically he rid himself of the oppressive burden by "writing it away." In this light we must view *Werther* where the problem of the self cast into an uncomprehending universe is portrayed on an entirely personal level—and *Werther* succumbs to life and destroys himself. In *Faust* the conflict is universal; he comes to a compromise solution but it is not a victory. Whatever may be said about the small end of *Faust* psychologically and artistically, the character Faust has not really discovered "was die Welt im Innersten zusammenhält." Here too, i.e. in the final conclusion, there is a large ingredient of the Goethean resignation, certainly not to be looked upon as a success for Faust nor for man's enterprise.

More than a psychological unburdening by way of artistic creation was necessary if Goethe was not to end as had *Werther*. He learns to avoid, to resign, to flee from the insoluble and the unconquerable—to be silent. This is the mystery, "das tiefe Schweigen" of which Professor Jaspers speaks. In so doing Goethe acted upon an instinct of self-preservation whose presence he felt so vividly and so comfortingly that it assumes a personal entity—he speaks of his "Daimon"—the essence of his personal destiny, revealing itself to him not, as Wenley observed, "like that of Socrates, an inner voice peculiar to himself, but an experience, subtle maybe and incommensurable, of unity with a mystic force 'above all earthly control'" (*loc. cit.*) Much is to be ascribed to Goethe's reliance upon his

"Daimon." Its warnings account for Goethe's otherwise incomprehensible flights from personal situations: from Friederike Brion, from Lili Schönmann, from Charlotte von Stein, from Weimar to Italy, from poetry to science, from the French revolution which he despised and feared to the ancient orient of the *Westöstlicher Divan*. The sincerity of Goethe's trust in his "Daimon" is not to be doubted. Many times Goethe felt his life and self to be at stake and we ought to judge his behavior in this light. But here too there is a dark side. So strongly did Goethe abhor and flee from experiences which seemed to him to threaten the harmony of his existence that he could come to the truly awful admission that he could more readily tolerate "Ungerechtigkeit" than "Unordnung."

The Problem of Evil

It is plain that Goethe was struggling with the problem of Evil. Much has been said and written for and against Goethe's "pagan affirmation of life." It has been said that Goethe, as if by an act of will, refused to recognize evil. This is only partially so. It is wrong to say, as some modern critics seem to imply, that Goethe in facing what we call evil deserted the field and sought safety in avoidance of the crucial problems it poses. For Goethe did create the character of Mephistopheles, the emissary of the Evil One. But, and this is of equal importance, even here Goethe found a sort of positive value in evil when he has Mephistopheles define himself as

Ein Teil von jener Kraft,
Die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft.

This is as far as Goethe could go in accounting for evil. He rejected Kant's teaching of "das radikale Böse," i.e. objective, absolute evil, feeling that with it Kant had "besmirched his philosophy" and, incidentally, seriously undermined Goethe's own "Weltanschauung." Modern man, however, has had this evil most cruelly brought to his attention again in recent times. Against it Goethe had no defense except his mysterious self-seclusion and silence. But its presence and Goethe's possibly unwilling awareness of it accounts in large measure for the tragic and even pessimistic strain in Goethe's thinking.

Stated religiously, Goethe was unable to account for sin although he was naturally thoroughly acquainted with the teachings of the Christian church in this regard. This avoidance or "Flucht" is to be closely associated with Goethe's instinct for self-preservation. He was as he himself put it "a conciliatory nature"; he stated at one time that he felt unable to compose a genuine tragedy, sensing that to do so would destroy him. Professor Wenley refers to this as his "constitutional inability to face pain"—an inability certainly in harmony with his entire nature and finding a parallel perhaps, though on an entirely different level, in the often decried

"moral cowardice" of an Erasmus. Whatever be one's personal attitude toward this aspect of Goethe's nature we are free to agree with Professor Wenley when he says: "the lack of this complete experience (i.e. the conviction of personal sin and its attendant misery) may have dwarfed his character as a man,—it enhanced, or perhaps we had better say, did nothing to detract from his achievement as a poet" (*loc. cit.*).

Goethe's Message to Modern Man

What now has Goethe to say to modern man—what of Goethe can we appropriate and to what extent? Professor Jaspers, who is perhaps too deeply affected by the awful darkness now resting upon Germany, is convinced that the world in which Goethe lived and in which his "Weltanschauung" could have meaning is finished. Goethe, he tells us, cannot furnish us with a way of life. The day of Goethe-deification is past. Modern man, Professor Jaspers continues, must do what Goethe allegedly would not do: look into the abyss and discover the depth of his misery. But this is overstating a legitimate case against Goethe. And Professor Jaspers himself indicates a permanent value in Goethe when he reminds us that Goethe can have significance only for individuals since the individual and his "Selbstbildung" runs as a *leitmotif* through all his works. We understand Goethe's hatred and fear of mass movements since they violate the sacred personality of the individual. And this attitude is of enormous significance in the midst of our contemporary passion for the collectivization of human minds and spirits.

Already during Goethe's own day and afterward, individual thinkers diagnosed the decay eating into the intellectual and moral foundations of western culture, among them the Danish thinker, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche, the latter of course in a completely different direction. Their appeal in the name of the dignity and responsibility of the individual went unheeded. It is obvious also that the content and direction of Goethe's thinking was at complete odds with the tide rising already during his own lifetime. More than that, the far-seeing poet was conscious of it and feared an impending disaster. In addition to direct statements to friends he has left us unmistakable evidence of these feelings and fears and that in his most universal work, *Faust*.

In the last act of *Faust*, part two, the crisis threatening the individual is presented in economic terms. Faust is coming to the end of his days and of his unholy association with Mephistopheles. He has come finally to find a measure of satisfaction, by no means complete, in a prosaic, practical occupation

—the reclamation of land from the sea. In this, it is to be noted, he is assisted by Mephistopheles, meaning that a curse rests upon the project from the beginning. The presence of the old, god-fearing couple, Philemon and Baucis, thwarts the realization of Faust's dream of empire, thus producing in Faust the characteristic discontent which always results in a despicable assignment for Mephistopheles. This is the setting.

Upon this scene now comes a character whom Goethe calls "der Wanderer"; his is not an organically necessary role in the drama and his arrival on the scene is puzzling until it is recalled that "der Wanderer" is a poetic invention with whom Goethe more than once identified himself in his lyric poetry. It is plain then that this is Goethe himself, now come as an objective witness and judge of the final act of the tragedy.

The two old people tell of Faust's spectacular achievements. They speak half in approval of this material progress yet they have misgivings:

Denn es ging das ganze Wesen
Nicht mit rechten Dingen zu.

They are anxious about the brutal exploitation of individuals which were the means of Faust-Mephistopheles. The "Wanderer-Goethe" is likewise unable to comprehend fully this new manifestation of an energy alien to his thinking and experience—he becomes silent and silently follows his old friends into their chapel: "Lasst uns beten." It is reported that later when the forces of evil in the shape of Mephistopheles and his "drei gewaltige Gesellen" murder the old couple and destroy their hut, the "Wanderer" chooses to perish with the old rather than adapt himself to the new. There is no doubt as to Goethe's attitude toward this criminal business: he has Mephistopheles say "ad Spectatores":

Auch hier geschieht was längst geschah,
Denn Naboths Weinberg war schon da,

showing that at least the cynical devil, Mephistopheles, has no illusions about the true state of affairs.

This is only one of the forms in which Goethe saw the impending disaster. His attitude is unmistakable though he could only warn. It is true, therefore, as has been insisted, that Goethe is completely out of harmony with modernity but he is so for the right reason. He warns us against an abyss, against "Irrwege," and counsels us to turn our back, as he did, on modern idols. For in the last analysis Goethe protested against "die moderne Entgottung der Welt" and a corresponding disregard of both the sacredness of individual man and his high personal responsibility. In this sense of warning Goethe has a message of dead earnestness for us today.

Hearts Aflame

Anthony A. Hoekema
Minister, Twelfth St. Chr. Ref. Church
Grand Rapids, Michigan

[This is a revised reprint of the Calvin Commencement address of this year. Owing to a regrettable error caused by the interchange of two pages of the manuscript, the text of the address as found in the previous issue was confused. In justice to the author and the subject we herewith reprint the address in proper form. The editor, who was in Europe when the previous issue went to press, offers his apologies to author and readers alike.]

IN HIS dialogue entitled *Phaedrus*, Plato propounds a most interesting parable about the human soul. The soul is there compared to a chariot driven by a charioteer and pulled by two winged horses. The charioteer is the reason; he guides and directs the chariot. The horses are of two diverse kinds: one is noble, whereas the other is ignoble. The good horse, comparable in a general way to what we today call the will, is white in color, and has dark eyes; he loves honor, temperance, and modesty; he needs no whip, but is guided by a simple word of command. The bad horse, however, is heavy and clumsy; he is dark in color, his eyes being grey and bloodshot. Instead of loving honor, he loves insolence and pride. Being deaf, moreover, this bad horse, which stands for the appetites or the passions, is extremely hard to control. The black horse is continually trying to pull the soul down into evil. The only way the charioteer can keep the chariot on the right track is to pull back violently on the reins, until the black horse's tongue and jaws are covered with blood, and the animal has been forced back on the road. After the bad horse has gone through this experience a number of times, however, and has learned his lesson, he is humbled, and follows from then on the wisdom of the charioteer.

The Greek Conception

This myth represents the typically Greek view of human nature. For the Greeks, the intellect was a somehow separable entity in the human soul which rules man's life, which is higher in rank and importance than any of the other functions of the soul, and which is morally unimpaired. Plato divided the soul into a rational part and an irrational part, stating that it belongs to the rational part to rule, and to the irrational part to be subject to the rule of the reason. Aristotle distinguished three types of souls: the appetitive, the vegetative, and the rational soul—the last of which is, in his estimation, the highest type of soul, the ultimate Form of the body. Of all the powers of man, reasoning is for Aristotle the highest power; it, more than anything else, is the best thing in man. Distinguishing between the

active and the passive reason, Aristotle taught that the active reason was an independent substance coming into the soul from the outside. It alone is immortal, surviving after the body has passed away in death. As a matter of fact, Aristotle even goes so far as to call the active reason divine. It therefore goes without saying that virtue, for Aristotle, is something primarily rational; it consists of choosing the proper mean between excess and defect, but it is the reason which must determine what that proper mean is.

All of this adds up to a very intellectualistic view of life. For the Greeks, the chief goal of education was the training of the *intellect*. In Plato's *Republic*, you may recall, the study of philosophy is the apex and the goal of the entire educational process. As far as the rule of the state is concerned, it is the philosophers—those whose intellects have been most thoroughly trained in the art of dialectic—who are to be kings. In the Greek view of man, therefore, the intellect dominates all the way down the line. Reasoning, thinking, and its end-product, knowledge, are considered the all-important achievements of man.

Not only this, but the intellect, in the Greek view, is thought to be morally unimpaired. Virtue, for both Plato and Aristotle, consists of following one's reason. Vice, however, is defined as following the passions or appetites instead of the reason. As is evident from the myth of the charioteer, reason is considered perfectly capable of leading man aright; if you therefore follow your reason, you cannot go astray.

The Scriptural View

Now let us go on, and ask ourselves whether the Bible supports the particular view of human nature I have been describing. To begin with the very last point, does the Bible teach that the intellect of man is morally unimpaired? Not in the least. Notice just a few passages. In Rom. 8:7 we read that "the mind of the flesh is enmity against God." Rom. 1:28 informs us, concerning those who refused to have God in their knowledge, that "God gave them up unto a reprobate mind." We are told, in Eph. 1:17, that the Gentiles walk "in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding." With regard to those that are unbelieving, Titus 1:15 informs us that "both their mind and their conscience are defiled." The consistent teaching of Scripture is that the mind or intellect of man

is not morally unimpaired, and that it cannot be relied upon as a safe moral guide, but that man's intellect, as well as the rest of him, is by nature thoroughly depraved, and in need of renewal. To return to Plato's figure of the chariot, Scripture would not agree that evil is found only in one of the two horses which pull the chariot; it would contend that the principle of evil is found within the charioteer himself.

But let us go a step farther. Are the Greeks correct when they claim that it is the intellect which rules man, and which is, therefore, the ultimate center of his existence? Does the Bible support this view? I do not believe that it does. In the Scriptures, as I shall briefly show, it is not the *intellect* but the *heart* which is considered the ruling center of man. And when I say heart, I do not, of course, mean the physiological heart. Nor do I mean what popular terminology often identifies almost exclusively with the heart: the feelings and emotions. No; the heart, as the term is used in Scripture, stands for the unitary center of thinking, feeling, and willing; of sinning and believing; of loving and hating—in other words, for the inmost center of the whole man.

There are many passages of Scripture in which the heart is spoken of as the seat of feeling—you will recall such phrases as “gladness of heart,” “sorrow of heart,” “heaviness of heart,” “rejoicing in heart,” and so on. The heart is also frequently represented in Scripture as the seat of willing: “Daniel purposed in his heart”; “there were great resolves of heart”; “settle it therefore in your hearts.” Rather unusual, and distinctly characteristic of the Bible, are those passages which present the heart as the center of thinking. Note such expressions as these: “the thoughts of his heart,” “a wise and understanding heart,” “why reason ye these things in your hearts?” Scripture, on this score, would agree with modern psychology, which does not split up the soul into so many more or less independent “faculties,” but which maintains the unity of the mind. So in Scripture all these various functions are recognized as proceeding from the same unitary center: the heart.

Furthermore, the heart is in Scripture frequently designated as the seat of sin, the center and source of man's depravity. But spiritual renewal is also said to take place in the heart. Regeneration is designated as the giving of a new heart. Faith is ascribed to the heart—“For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness” (Rom. 10:10). Various Christian virtues, such as love, forgiveness, purity, lowliness, and peace, are linked up with the heart in Scripture.

Summing it all up, the heart is considered in Scripture to be the unitary center of man, from which proceeds all that a man thinks, says, and does. As Jesus said, “The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is

good; and the evil man out of the evil [“treasure of his heart,” understood] bringeth forth that which is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh” (Lu. 6:45). According to this passage, what ultimately determines the moral calibre of man's activities would seem to be, not the intellect, but the heart. All depends, ultimately, on the moral and spiritual disposition of the heart. It is the heart that predetermines the moral quality of the intellect, and not vice versa. Hence the well-known injunction of Solomon in Prov. 4:23, “Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.”

Two Divergent Conceptions

So then we have before us now two divergent conceptions of human nature: The Greek conception, in which the intellect is considered central and dominant in man; and the Biblical view, which assigns such centrality and dominance to the heart. For the Greeks, education, even including religious education, would be a matter largely of training the intellect, imparting knowledge, deepening the understanding; but for the Bible religious education would have to be more than the training of the intellect, and would have to be concerned primarily with the development of the whole man, specifically with the creation of new attitudes of heart.

Certainly we who believe the Bible to be the inspired and infallible word of God should have no doubts as to which of these two divergent conceptions of human nature we would choose. I would have you note, further, that those who have helped to shape our Reformed tradition have taken their stand on this score with the Bible rather than with the Greeks. Notice, for instance, what Calvin says, in the third Book of the *Institutes*, chapter 6:

For it [the knowledge of Christ] is a doctrine not of the tongue, but of the life; and is not apprehended merely with the understanding and memory, like other sciences, but is then only received when it possesses the whole soul, and finds a seat and residence in the inmost affection of the heart.

Notice, too, the following passage from Herman Bavinck's *Biblical Psychology*:

Although religious instruction must include intellectual instruction, it embraces more and aims at a higher goal. It . . . must strive to fashion the youth religiously in such a way that they shall love and serve God with all their mind, inclinations, and will. Knowing God, without loving and serving Him from the heart, is unfruitful, dead orthodoxy, not even worthy of the name of knowing . . . ¹

It is also extremely significant to note that a contemporary movement in Reformed thought, headed by Professors Vollenhoven and Dooyeweerd of the Free University of Amsterdam, is applying this same Scriptural emphasis on the centrality of the heart to the building up of a distinctively Calvinis-

¹ Herman Bavinck, *Bijbelsche en Religieuze Psychologie* (Kampen: Kok 1920), p. 214 [translation mine].

tic philosophy. These men repudiate the Greek stress on human reason as the ultimate starting-point of philosophy, and posit instead the heart as the source of all our thinking, calling it the religious root of man's entire existence.

Challenge to Calvin Graduates

What has all this to do, now, with our purpose here this evening? I think we may make a number of practical observations. To begin with, many of you graduating this evening plan, the Lord willing, to go into some phase of teaching. To you prospective teachers I would say, on the basis of the conception of human nature to which we, as Christians, are committed: Remember that you will not be teaching intellects, but persons. Your goal as Christian teachers will not be merely to fill your pupils' minds with information (though that is highly important), but to mold their lives for God's service. The bending of the will and the education of the emotions are very legitimate phases of your task as teachers. Hence, too, the importance of a worshipful atmosphere in your classroom, of character-training, of prayer, of setting before your pupils at all times the inspiration of a godly example.

Many of you graduating this evening plan to enter the ministry: an unusually large number of college graduates and all of you graduating from the seminary. Once again I would say, this time to you prospective ministers: Your purpose by and by must be, not merely to indoctrinate, not merely to fill people's minds with sound information about the Bible (though that is extremely important), but to mould the whole man for God. Preaching which is nothing more than the *mere* impartation of religious information is not full-orbed Biblical preaching, no matter how sound it may be. True, Spirit-inspired preaching should stir the soul, move the feelings, and bend the will. And the same holds true for catechism teaching, pastoral calling, youth work, and all the other aspects of a minister's work. As indicated in Paul's pastoral letter to Timothy, the minister's purpose may be nothing less than this: "That the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (II Tim. 3:17).

As you can readily surmise, it is not my purpose this evening to disparage indoctrination, or intellectual training—not in the least—but to help you see it in a wider perspective, as only one aspect of the development of the whole man. As modern psychology teaches us, the intellect is, after all, only one aspect of a functioning whole. It is the whole we are after; not just the part. We must be neither onesidedly intellectual, onesidedly voluntaristic, nor onesidedly emotional, but must strive to do full justice to all the varied aspects of man's totality.

All of you who are graduating tonight have now

finished a course of training at Calvin. What has been the result of that training? Merely the acquisition of certain intellectual skills? I hope not. Of this I am certain: that is not the primary goal for which this institution was founded. That primary goal is beautifully symbolized by the Calvin seal, which some of you will find engraved on your diplomas by and by. That seal, as you know, depicts a flaming heart in an outstretched hand—and under the figure these words, "My heart I offer thee, O Lord, promptly and sincerely." Is it not remarkable that the great John Calvin, intellectual giant though he was, found in that proffered heart his great life purpose? And is it not remarkable also that the institution from which you graduate tonight, standing as it does for Calvinistic instruction and indoctrination of the most rigorous sort, has nevertheless adopted as its own this motto, "My heart I offer thee, O Lord, promptly and sincerely"?

Hearts Aflame for God!

I hope and pray that each of you graduates will have made the words of that motto your own. I hope and pray that your stay at Calvin has meant more than merely the Christian training of your intellect, but that it has meant, above all, the consecration of your whole self to God's service. I hope and pray, and your parents and professors pray with me, that you may leave Calvin's halls tonight to enter a hostile, paganized, godless world, armed not just with the right answers, but with hearts aflame for God!

For nothing matters more supremely. There is nothing this sin-cursed world needs more today than men and women who are willing to lay their all on the altar of God's service. There is nothing the church needs more today than members whose godliness is more than empty formality or hollow respectability—members whose hearts are filled with an unquenchable passion to spend and be spent for their Lord. There is nothing your *Alma Mater* would rather hear than for each of you to be able to say, from the depths of your blood-bought heart, "To me to live is Christ." There is nothing that our blessed Savior looks for more eagerly, more earnestly, more longingly, in your heart and mine, than just the flaming heart in the outstretched hand.

In the year 1719 a young man by the name of Otto Zinzendorf visited an art-gallery at Düsseldorf, Germany. One picture in that gallery made a profound impression upon his soul. The painting depicted the dying Christ hanging on the cross, with cruel nails driven through His hands and feet, and with a shameful crown of thorns upon His head. Under that painting was an inscription, the words of which Count Zinzendorf was never afterwards able to banish from his memory:

"This have I done for thee;

What hast thou done for me?"

Christianity and the Acquisitive Urge in Man

Leonard Verduin

Pastor Evangelical Chapel
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

[This is the second and concluding instalment on this subject, the first having appeared in the previous issue. We apologize for the crude proof reading error in last month's issue where "acquisitive urge" became "inquisitive urge" in the title of the article.—EDITOR.]

WE were also to listen to some of Christianity's spokesmen anent the matter in hand, free and untrammelled gratification of the acquisitive urge.

We need not spend a great deal of time on voices from the Middle Ages. Medieval life was not geared to acquisition in any way comparable to life in our times. Christendom throughout these centuries remained rather close to the Scriptures in these matters. As long as borrowing implied distress on the part of the solicitant, Christian moralists frowned on usury. Shylock's aside may be considered typical:

"How like a fawning publican he looks!
I hate him for he is a Christian:
But more for that in low simplicity
He lends out money gratis, and brings down
The rate of usance here in Venice."

Even at that King Pippin is said to have heard when he asked the learned Alcuin what it was of which he never had enough: "Of gain."

Our interest begins with the Age of Reformation: not because Christian testimony underwent any great change at that time but because at the beginning of the century Max Weber with his *Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* and Richard Henry Tawney with his *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* started the myth that Protestantism, especially Calvinism, had given an unqualified go sign to the acquisitive urge. As a result what Aldous Huxley fabricates has become the stock in trade of every classroom: "The Reformers read their Old Testament, and trying to imitate the Jews, became those detestable Puritans to whom we owe not only Grundyism and Podsnappery, but also (as Weber and Tawney have shown) all that was and still is vilest, cruellest, most anti-human in the modern capitalist system." A French writer, J. A. Goris, interprets similarly "*Le Calvinisme, en elargissant la doctrine scolastique de l'interet, justifiait implicitement toutes les speculations financieres.*" We can best say to this that if one wants to speak of opening the floodgates to speculation the Weber-Tawney school surpasses all.

What was the attitude of the first generation of Reformers? Did they think in terms of "free enterprise with its emphasis on the right of the individual to do what he pleases with his property"? No man can consult the sources and say yes.

As to the position of the Anabaptist leaders we need not say a great deal—since they are not saddled with any such onus as is laid on the rest of Protestants, especially Calvinists. They did ponder the matter however. I have in my house just now a photostatic copy of a letter sent by Zylis and Lemke to Menno Simons about the last decade of the first half of the 16th Century. It reports the outcome of the Strassburg Convention, to which Anabaptist leaders from every land had come. The first item taken up in said letter reads: "Ten eersten van den handwerck ende koopmanschap, salmen alsoo handelen naa dat in den landen gelegen is, ende feijtig acht hebben op Godtes woort in der heijlige schriftte, wat dat lijden ende draagen mag." This is surely miles removed from free play for the urge to acquire. And anyone who has read Menno's scorching assaults upon "begeerichheit" and the resulting "pracht ende praal" will have seen enough.

The exact date of Hendrik Van Bommel's *Summa der Godliker Schrifturen*, the first book to go on the Index in the Low Countries, is not known. It was certainly prior to 1520. A few paragraphs of translation will satisfy us that Biblical views anent property, the acquiring and the holding thereof, were still part and parcel of the protesting faith. "The rich who live of their income must realize first of all that they may not use their possessions as they please. God has not given it you to spend it in dissipation, pretentious building or dress . . . for it belongs to the poor as much as to you . . . The rich man in the parable went to hell for misusing what was his own." Van Bommel says that it were better to use one's surplus to help a young woman so that she can be married and so avoid the all too common violation of her honor, or to help a young man so that he can be apprenticed out to learn a trade, etc. It is significant that he thinks of this not as enlarged alms but as the poor man's right and to such an extent that theft occurs when it is withheld. Unnecessary luxury is also theft

says he. Many a paragraph would serve excellently as an introduction to the resolution that says that "free enterprise with its emphasis on the complete right of the individual to do what he will with his property is basically antichristian."

Perhaps you are impatient to hear from specifically Calvinist pioneers. We shall come to them, but gradually. Here is the thought of Martin Bucer, the Swiss theologian who did so much for the Reformation in England: "They who conspire wickedly that none shall sell better cheap (more cheaply, L. V.) than other" and speculators "who buy up corn, meat, and wine to amass money at the cost of others" (common as the sunlight in our society, clever too) "are no better than common criminals . . . Neither the Church of Christ, nor a Christian commonwealth ought to tolerate such as prefer private gain to public weal."

Richard Baxter said: "The public welfare or the good of the many is to be valued above our own. Regard the public good above your own commodity. It is not lawful to take or to keep up oppressing monopoly or trade which tendeth to enrich you by the loss of the many." And "if that which you have to sell be extraordinarily desirable or worth more to an other man than you, you must not take too great advantage of his inconvenience or desire." These men were still too much swayed by the patent intent of Scripture to think of considering "free enterprise with its emphasis upon the right of the individual to do as he will with his possessions" anything but anti-christian. Again, notice that in all this short weights and similar shady practices are not in review.

Musculus said "the divines shall reform usurie when physicians have cured the gout: the sinne and the disease are both incurable." Notice that it is implied that "the divines" did assail the practices covered by the term "usurie"—but without success. Notice too that the practices referred to are roundly denominated "sinne." And notice finally, that once more no reference is made to false weights, misrepresentation, etc.—the one and only area that needs watching, in the mind of men who do not think that "free enterprise with its emphasis on the right of the individual to do what he pleases with his possessions is basically anti-christian."

That the ministers did actually thunder against these practices is testified to by an unknown contemporary who says "The preachers they crie out continually against all usurers with open mouth and in all their sermons: and yet what avails it? Nothing at all."

And in the face of all this men keep on saying "Calvinism was a form of Christianity which gave its sanction to the free enterprise of a commercial spirit and to the capitalist organization of so-

ciety." (Cunningham: *Christianity and Economic Science*, p. 67f.)

* * *
* *

Coming to Geneva itself, the Geneva of Calvin's day, we see it assail mercilessly a tailor who charged an excessive price, a butcher who sold meat above a fixed schedule, a dealer who charged three-pence a quart too much when selling to a needy person, a surgeon who took 50 crowns for removing a wen from a man's forehead, capitalizing on the man's (no doubt warranted) alarm at its change in size.

We have a final passage from Calvin himself. The man is accounting for the rise of pockets of communistic rebels everywhere in Europe: every word is heavy with pertinence to the present scene. Speaking of the attack by these revolutionaries upon the institution of private property he says: "It is true that at first glance they make a pretty good case of it when they score the avarice of those who call themselves Christians since one sees every man so engrossed in acquiring that the majority resemble swirling whirlpools and famished beasts. No doubt the Lord permits this and, as it were, loosens Satan's leash so as to incite these turbulent spirits who try to declare open season on men's possessions, so that He may punish the ungratitude of those who abuse these possessions, and that means just about everybody. One sees how great and small in these days burn like a furnace with a mad desire to amass and acquire. One sees by what means they try to enrich themselves. One sees how they who are well-fixed cram it all down their own throats or keep their hearts closed to pity for their poorer brethren so as to assist in their need by giving what is under their hand. We refuse to listen to divine admonition: there is therefore good reason why the devil should incite these firebrands of hell so as to increase the disorder which we ourselves fail to correct as God has commanded."

It will not be necessary to point out that Calvin certainly did not give the go sign to untrammelled gratification of the urge to acquire. He tells us "ever to keep in mind the comparison which St. Paul makes between earthly possessions and manna (2 Cor. 8:15) namely that he who has much shall take no more than he needs for his sustenance and that he who has but little may never lack . . . Seeing that we do not do this let us recognize that it is a just vengeance of God that these enraged ones come up thus to turn things upside down."

We may bring this thing altogether up to date with a reference to a paragraph in one of A. C. Van Raalte's letters written from America. Van Raalte says that the wrath of God is about to descend upon Holland and therefore he urges his friends to depart from the doomed place while there is yet time. And the sin that was calling down such visita-

tion from heaven? Sabbath desecration? Immorality? No, Van Raalte speaks of the policy to let hungry builders bid against each other until men are forced to a figure that cannot provide a living for the worker. A society that by such practices allows the rich to become ever richer and the poor poorer cannot hope to escape the wrath of God. That too is miles removed from untrammelled gratification of the acquisitive urge!

* * *
* *

Perhaps a word is now in order as to how this paper comes to be read in the present series, that of the Church's peace testimony. We feel that these checks upon the acquisitive urge within individuals in a given national unit are just as applicable to the relation of nation and nation. This is an area of moral sensitivity that needs to be stimulated. And it is the Church's business to stimulate it. This is a major portion of our peace testimony. Perhaps if the acquisitive urge of nations can be brought under the checks and restraints indicated above for the lives of individuals we will be able to avoid one of the most fruitful causes of war.

Something has been done in the past decade or two to sensitize our people as to the need of checks for the acquisitive urge in individuals: think of our income tax laws, inheritance laws, etc. But very few as yet feel that the same laws should operate on the international level. Yet if the Almighty does not grant to the individual unrestricted right to amass wealth, as we think to have shown, then

it is hardly to be expected that He will look nonchalantly upon a nation doing it. Nations too can go to hell for abusing what was their own, as did the rich man in the parable. There are certainly limits, in God's will for nations, as to how much of the world's supply of gold a nation may amass to bury it in a hill. There are limits to advantages which a well-placed nation may allow itself in such things as exchange rates, import duties, etc. Surely we cannot and may not feel complacent as we capitalize on another nation's need. Nations too, and our nation may well take the lead, must be ready to submit to self-imposed sharing of the world's wealth. Nations too must learn that "free enterprise with its emphasis on the complete right of the individual nation to do what it will with the means of production is basically anti-christian."

If we do not allow ourselves to learn these things from the Almighty we must not be surprised—and we recall Calvin's wise words—if turbulent spirits get radical. Communism is selling itself to the people in many places (think of China for example) pointing out that "free enterprise" is frequently just a name to assist in maintaining the status quo for nations that have come out on top in the acquisitive scramble. Free enterprise in the form of untrammelled gratification of the acquisitive urge of nations is basically anti-christian. We may manufacture American products at the devil cares how high a figure, knowing we have the buyer nations at our mercy: but in so doing we run a pretty despicable racket, one that cannot be made to stop reeking, spray it as we may with pious perfume.

Bright Hours

Now are the golden days. These windless hours
Are cupped with brightness, warm and still.
Here sounds but the flutter of painted moth
And the wing-whir of insects beyond the hill.

Soon comes the summer's aftermath—
The quick flung rain, the rusted flower.
Each emerald leaf will fray and fall
When dies this bright and shining hour.

MARIE J. POST

Grand Rapids, Michigan

From Our Correspondents

MICHIGAN CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY CLUB

THE club had a meeting on April 1, 1949, which was very well attended. About a hundred persons were present, and among them were many strangers and many students. No wonder, the speaker was Prof. Dr. C. Van Til of Westminster Seminary of Philadelphia, and his topic was Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin.

The speaker gave a broad historical review of the history of Greek and Mediaeval philosophy as far as Aquinas, to show that the classical theme of Matter and Form was not neutral, but pagan in its origin, and that the pagan connotation had crept into the philosophy of the Middle Ages till Aquinas tried to find a solution by teaching that philosophy was the whole work of reason, and that theology was the whole work of faith.

"The main question discussed was whether it is Aquinas or Calvin to whom we should look for leadership in our day. This way of putting the matter already indicates that, according to the speaker, there is a radical difference between the two.

The difference between them can best be noted, if we consider the problem of *analogy*.

Any philosophical position can best be known by the most basic distinction, or differentiation that it presupposes. A truly Christian position in philosophy as well as in theology, presupposes the Creator-creature distinction. Admittedly this distinction is nowhere to be found, but in Scripture. Only those who accept the Scriptures as authoritative really make the Creator-creature distinction basic to their thought construction. Thus the question of authority comes into the picture at once. There is no escaping this. No one really escapes it. Every thinker either presupposes the authority of the God of the Scriptures, or he presupposes his own ultimacy, and thereby virtually denies the authority of the God of the Scriptures.

Frankly presupposing the authority of Scripture, and, therefore, also frankly presupposing the self-contained ontological Trinity of which Scripture speaks, man's thinking as well as his acting must be taken as analogical to the thinking and acting of God. The truly Christian philosopher will, therefore, always think of God as the original, and of himself as the derivative reference point in all predication. Working on this he can be sure that his thought is truly in contact with reality. Even though he can admittedly know nothing exhaustively this does not mean that he can know nothing certainly. Here we have the true idea of analogy.

It is Calvin, more than any other man, who has taught us to think this way in the field of philosophy, and it is, therefore, Calvin that we need to follow in our day.

But what of Aquinas? Is his thought then so radically different from that of Calvin? Does he not make the Creator-creature distinction fundamental in his thought? The answer is that Thomas wants first to prove theism by an appeal to reason which assures itself as ultimate and only after that by an appeal to the authority of Scripture. Thomas, therefore, recognizes the legitimacy of a procedure which, when carried out consistently, leads to the very destruction of Christianity. Thomas does not make the Creator-creature distinction basic to his thought. He thinks in terms of *Being as Such*, and seeks afterward to introduce the distinction between Creator and creature. This is a false idea of analogy. It makes man the ultimate and God derivative. To admit the legitimacy of one question about *Being as Such* is to compromise the Christian position. For such an admission grants that the methodology

of the natural man is correct. And, if the methodology of the natural man is correct, then the conclusion of the natural man is also correct. Then it is only by means of an inconsistency that any one can come to the conclusion that Christian Theism is true.

Making a fundamental concession with respect to the autonomy of man which is the presupposition of the natural man's procedure—Thomas is not in a position to challenge the thought of the natural man at all. It is only a philosophy that is frankly and fully Christian at the outset that can challenge modern non-Christian methodology in all its forms. It is therefore Calvin, not Thomas, who meets the need of the hour."

The discussion was about the following topics:

1. The *analogia entis* of Aquinas.
2. The value of God's revelation to pagans.
3. The value of Plato's contributions.
4. The approach of Parmenides.
5. The moral integrity of the intellect of Aquinas and his acceptance of the four moral virtues of the Greeks.
6. Adam's knowledge of nature before the fall.
7. Dooyeweerd's conception of the law idea and of the idea of creation.

H. J. VAN ANDEL, Secretary.

GLIMPSES FROM INDIA

Telugu Village Mission,
Adoni, Bellary District,
South India,
July 30, 1949.

The Editor-in-Chief,
THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.

My Dear Dr. Bouma:

OF the many legacies which the recent global war left to the nations, perhaps the most interesting is a new gregariousness which was not apparent a decade ago, even among men and women of goodwill. This new spirit is evidenced by the extraordinary succession of political, economic, social, cultural, and religious conferences and conventions in and out of which people have been rushing for the past four years. Free India has had its full share of these gatherings, but I shall confine myself in this letter to commenting on two of them.

The Kotagiri Conference

The Nilgiris (a Sanscrit word meaning "Blue Mountains") are dotted with several resorts to which large numbers of missionaries and others migrate annually during the months of April and May when the fierce heat of our short South Indian summer makes existence on the great plains most uncomfortable for everybody, and, indeed, hazardous for foreigners. Staying six thousand feet up among the pines and blue gums of Kotagiri, your correspondent and his Holland-American wife were privileged to enjoy a great deal of Christian fellowship with many missionaries, indigenous and foreign, and to sit in on a couple of missionary conferences. At one of these gatherings, two particularly interesting papers were read on *Christian Initiation* by the Rev. Marcus Ward who came to India about 15 years ago under the Board of the English Wesleyan Methodist Mission. A graduate of Cambridge University, Rev. Ward served as a district missionary among the Kanarese speaking people of the Mysore State before being appointed to the staff of the Bangalore United Theological College.

Reminding us of the necessarily large proportion of adults and adolescents aged fifteen and over among the converts initiated into the Christian faith in all pioneer Missions, the speaker pointed out that these persons were invariably baptized on a confession of their faith. He stressed the need for close adherence to the injunction given by our Lord Himself which the Apostle John has recorded in Chapter three, verse five of his Gospel. In this "Believer's Baptism," he declared, Christian workers of all Protestant denominations stood on one common ground of doctrine and practice. Turning next to the initiation of infants and children, Mr. Ward said there was a sharp cleavage between Baptist and other adult baptism groups on the one hand, and the larger number of sects, on the other, which believed firmly (or less rigidly) in the need for all infants to be baptized by water as an "outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace" and a clearly implied covenant between God and His children. This latter form of baptism, the speaker added, obviously required 'ratification' by the child on its attainment to years of discretion, indicating also the imperative need for careful teaching by the Church and parents in order to render the Sacrament complete and effective. Space will not permit of a fuller report, but it will not surprise FORUM readers when I add that Mr. Ward's unequivocal presentation of this concept of baptism drew down on him during the ensuing discussions, a good deal of criticism from two main theological camps. After being taken to task for his championing the baptism of "Spiritually unknowing children" as against "Believing adults," he was next assailed by a group of Lutheran and Anglican ministers. These brethren were vehement in their adherence to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration—which, it was evident, the speaker did not believe in. But the papers and the discussion which followed were of more than passing interest to us in view of our efforts during the past 18 months to teach Reformed doctrine to our fellow-workers and our Christian students so that these and, in due course, the rank and file of Christians on the Mission field, may hold a thoroughly Calvinistic world and life view.

An All-Religions Convention

In sharp contrast to the Kotagiri conference was an All-Religions Convention which a correspondent reports from Bombay. Here, under the leadership of the genial, Oxford-trained Christian Governor of Bombay, Sir Maharaj Singh, a large number of influential and highly educated men gathered "to find a common ethical and philosophical basis for a friendly discussion on various theories of man's relationship to God." Delegates present represented the Hindu, Moslem, Buddhist, Jain, Parsee, and the Christian faiths.

The Bible, Koran, *Bhagvath Gita*, and many other religious books were dipped into and one gathers that there was unanimity regarding the concept of the "Universal Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." The learned gathering, we are told, decided that there was no fundamental difference in what the various scriptures teach and that a fraternizing of men of all religions was possible and desirable. I do not know just what contribution the two gentlemen representing Christianity made to the convention, but it may be safely assumed that they too were "in complete accord with the spirit of the gathering" and left, filled with a species of universalistic satisfaction. The general tone of this particular All-Religions Convention is oddly reminiscent of the reports one has read of somewhat similar get-togethers in Europe, Canada, and the United States. However, it may be that my "Calvinistic exclusiveness" renders me unfit to pass an opinion on gatherings of such ecumenical distinction!

The Impact of Communism

The rising tide of Communism which has been sweeping through Asia has not left India untouched. This Marxist menace to our national economy is not only from without: we also have it growing up weedlike in most of our industrialized sec-

tions. But, fortunately, the cult has made but little real progress in India where the two leading indigenous religions oppose its spread in a way in which Buddhism in China and South-East Asia has not been able to.

Hinduism with its deep-seated emphasis on the worship of God, however degraded the actual practice may have become, constitutes the strongest possible barrier against the atheism so closely associated with Communism. Also, the tremendously strong family and caste ties which bind Hindus together offer yet another powerful breakwater against which even the mightiest waves of Communism would only dissipate themselves. Similarly, the rugged individualism of the Moham-medan, coupled with his fanatical and often pathetically sincere resignation to the "Will of Allah," makes Islam in India another staunch bulwark against the inroads of Communism.

But what of the impact of Communism on the Indian Church? Here, too, the very nature and peculiar genius of the Christianity which nine generations of devoted British and American missionaries have helped to establish firmly in this country enables us to view the future with optimism. I feel that the position is ably crystallized by the Rev. Frederick Franklin, the American-born Religious Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in India, in a recent address given at Madras. I quote briefly from his speech. Emphasizing that there was radical difference in the very foundation, method and purpose of Communism and Christianity, the speaker said: "Communism is founded on hatred, but Christianity on love. The purpose of Communism is to take, while that of Christianity is to give. And while Communism teaches 'All thine is mine', Christianity teaches 'All mine is thine'." Mr. Franklin went on: "When sacrifice, love, and fellowship are the basic principles of Christianity, Communism is based on hatred, cruelty, and plunder." To this I would add my own belief that although the now largely free evangelical Church in India is still weak in government and finance, we are a renascent body standing on Biblical Principles which are essentially right, and can, therefore, face the new situation with courage and a good deal of confidence.

I would like to express my appreciation of the exemplary regularity in the arrival of my copy of the FORUM which seems to get better each year in the quality of its contents. May the Lord bless you and your colleagues as you proclaim and popularize the Calvinistic ideals for which the Christian Reformed Church stands!

Fraternally yours,

ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES IN SPANISH

Facultad Evangelica de Teologia,
Camacua 282,
Buenos Aires (6), Argentina.
August 6, 1949.

Mr. Clarence Bouma, Editor

THE CALVIN FORUM,
1301 Franklin Street, S.E.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Mr. Editor:

THANK you for your letter and for the copy of THE CALVIN FORUM which you so kindly forwarded to me. The Spanish edition of the Calvin's *Institutes* to which you refer was the first Spanish translation of the 1536 edition of Calvin's work, and was published here on the fourth centenary of its original publication. It was translated from the Latin by a converted Roman Catholic priest. The historical and critical introduction was written by myself (who am a Methodist minister); and we included the original presentation of the work to the Spanish-speaking public written by Cipriana de Valera. Valera, as you know, was one of the earliest translators of the Spanish Bible. He turned the 1559 edition of the *Institutes* into Spanish and published them in London in 1597. In his day Valera was known by the Roman Inquisition as "the

heretic;" and, of course, almost all his work had to be done beyond the reach of the Spanish authorities.

You will be interested to know that the 1936 edition of the *Institutes* is now out of print. It is our hope within a reasonable time to publish a critical edition of Valera's original version of the complete 1559 text. This represents, of course, a great undertaking in Latin America, but doubtless our Presbyterian friends and others who hold in high esteem the contribution of John Calvin to Protestant theological thought will support us in the undertaking. I shall appreciate your mentioning the project in *THE FORUM* and putting me in touch with interested people.

The Protestant Faith has made great advances in Latin America during the past quarter of a century, as was plainly evident in the recent Evangelical Latin American Conference which met in the Union Theological Seminary in Buenos Aires. There were delegates from fifteen Latin American countries and from some twenty different denominations, who came to see eye to eye on the main problems of our work, and who felt themselves closely united in the great evangelistic enterprise. It is estimated that there are perhaps three million Protestants in Latin America today and their numbers and influence are rapidly increasing.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

B. FOSTER STOCKWELL.

FROM PRINCETON SEMINARY

Princeton, New Jersey,
August 18, 1949.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

SUMMERTIME in Princeton is usually a period of quiet. As most of the readers of *THE CALVIN FORUM* may know Princeton is primarily an educational center. As such it is not only the home of Princeton University and the Theological Seminary, but is also the home of the Institute for Advanced Study as well as of the Westminster Choir College. As a result the summer vacation months find the town almost completely deserted, with most of the local shops running on short schedules, since the students have left on vacations, and most of the residents are living at the summer homes. The same thing holds true for the Seminary campus with the exception of about forty students enrolled in an intensive summer course in elementary Hebrew. This course has appeared remarkably successful thus far. Classes meet two hours daily with a two hour interval for study. This continues five days per week for ten weeks. In the ten week course the students attain quite a degree of proficiency in reading the language, since they are able to give it undivided attention. The term for the present summer is almost over, tomorrow (August 19) being reserved for a final course examination. Thereafter complete academic quiet will pervade the campus until the opening of the next academic school year on the 26th of September.

The comparative quiet of the summer period is, however, completely broken for two weeks in July when the school is host to the Summer Institute of Theology. As usual, the program enjoyed great popularity, over three hundred attending from almost every state in the union and representing a wide selection of denominational affiliations. Dr. James S. Stewart, professor of New College, Edinburgh, and well-known author of a book on Paul, *A Man in Christ*, led the Convocation Period

the first week, and Dr. John R. Gray of St. Stephen's Church in Glasgow, the second week. Probably the high-light of the Institute this summer turned out to be a highly-controversial series of three lectures on the problem of the relation between church and state, given on successive evenings during the first week. The first address was given by Professor Werner Richter of Muhlenberg College, who during the time of the Weimar Republic served as Under-Secretary in the German Ministry of Education. Most interest, however, centered in the last two lectures dealing with the problem as it came to expression in a discussion of the recent (March 8, 1948) Supreme Court decision on the *Vashti McCollum v. Board of Education of Champaign County* (Illinois) case. Charles Clayton Morrison, author and former editor of *The Christian Century*, whose anti-Catholic stand is well-known, gave the second lecture. The last one of the series was given by Professor E. S. Corwin, McCormick Professor Emeritus of Jurisprudence at Princeton University and one of the outstanding experts on U. S. Constitutional Law. Prof. Corwin holds a position almost directly opposed to that of Dr. Morrison with respect to that of the Supreme Court decision, which naturally created a great deal of heated discussion. To any one interested in reading Professor Corwin's speech, it may be of interest to know that it has been published in a special symposium on "Religion and the State" published as the Winter, 1949 issue of *Law and Contemporary Problems*. All in all, it can be said that the Summer Institute of Theology has had another successful season.

The register of members of the Faculty in the Seminary Catalogue for the year 1949-50 will embody a large number of changes. During the course of the Summer death has reduced the number of our professors emeriti by two. Its youngest member, the late Dr. John E. Kuizenga, died suddenly at his home in Holland, Michigan, in the early part of the summer. Dr. Kuizenga was formerly the Charles Hodge professor of Systematic Theology at the Seminary. Just last Saturday (August 13) our oldest living member, Dr. Geerhardus Vos, former professor of Biblical Theology, passed away in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in his 88th year. With their passing not only we of the Seminary, but the entire world of Reformed scholarship, mourn the demise of two of its ablest exponents.

After two years on our campus as Guest Professor of Theology, Dr. Bela Vasady is leaving us to assume a permanent position as professor of Theology at the recently created Fuller Seminary in Los Angeles, California. In his place Dr. George S. Hendry of Scotland has accepted an invitation to occupy the Charles Hodge Chair of Systematic Theology, left vacant by the retirement of the late Dr. Kuizenga two years ago. Dr. Hendry is a graduate of the Universities of Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and pursued graduate studies in the theological faculties at Tübingen and Berlin. Dr. Hendry is probably best known to us from his *Hastie Lectures* delivered at Glasgow in 1935 and published under the title *God the Creator* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1938). Two new chairs have been created in the same department by the Board of Trustees, the Stephen Colwell Chair of Applied Christianity and the Benjamin B. Warfield Chair of Theology. Occupants of these chairs will be Drs. Paul L. Lehman and Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., respectively, both formerly Associate Professors. It is obvious from these changes that the Seminary is growing and enlarging its scope of Christian service.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN WM. WEVERS.

Book Reviews

TENNYSON: MAN AND POET

ALFRED TENNYSON. By Charles Tennyson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 579 pages. \$7.50.

Lord Hallam Tennyson, the poet's son, who wrote the famous *Memoir* (1897) was excellently coached, and that has its advantages. He is a brave man who will tell his biographer, as Carlyle told Froude, to reveal all; and in Froude's day it was a perilous and daring act to do so. Tennyson had no such wish, and Hallam no such intention. Muckraking was some years away; in 1897 it would have been infamous to write on *My Grandfather, an Ass*. The official Victorian biography came out in two heavy volumes, both long and idolatrous. It was more often an unrecognized branch of hagiology than biography. Hallam Tennyson's biography, though not irritatingly idolatrous, smashes no icons. The steam of incense is always faintly present, and the faintest whiff of the family skeleton really disturbs no reader.

Charles Tennyson, the poet's grandson, living in a different age, untrammelled by Victorian reticences, having had access to hundreds of pertinent and previously inaccessible letters, felt free to violate Tennyson's "strongly expressed desire that his personality and private life should be studied only through his poems." He also felt that his grandfather's wish was morbid, and that he could in so doing make a real contribution to the understanding of the psychology of poetic genius. Not that the Tennysonian skeleton was particularly horrible. The chief suppression had been the alcoholism of Tennyson's father, a respected Anglican clergyman. Unfortunately, this alcoholism induced paroxysms of violence which imperilled the security of his family. When all the predisposing factors have been examined, however, one is more inclined to pity than blame. Most of the new facts are amplificatory, adding many interesting items to the known career.

The book is the painstaking product of years of intelligent research. Although there is neither footnoting nor bibliography (a fact the serious student of Tennyson regrets), there is overwhelming internal evidence of exhaustive study and definitive result. The reader gets to know both the complicated environment and the many-faceted personality it produced. The critical material in the book is unimpressive. The author, for example, treats *In Memoriam* in terms of genesis rather than idea; he nowhere seeks to complement Bradley's commentary. There are, of course, a multitude of illuminating comments upon the poetry, but they are concerned with psychology rather than critical evaluation; what we get is a portrait not a critique.

Let no one think that Tennyson's personality was prosaic or his life pedestrian. Tennyson was nothing if not arresting. He had a superb body, dominating any group with his ample six feet, mass of black hair, dark skin, and remarkable eyes. He always had a gypsy air, something of the tranced look of Maud's lover. A laborer watching him stride by said, "I wouldn't be as black as him for summat." But nature is puckish, and housed in that superb body an equally lusty hypochondria so that throughout his life Tennyson fretted over an organism that was to hold up with only minor derangements till he was ninety-two! He had a brilliant and inquiring mind, mastering not only the classical tradition (he read Latin fluently all his life), but modern literature as well. He studied Kant and Spinoza as well as natural science. He had a spectacular memory of which Charles Tennyson adduces amazing evidences. He was abnormally sensitive, wincing at stupid reviews. He supposedly was shy, but he would slouch about in

a great Spanish cloak and sombrero, and then hate to have people stare at him. He was naively egoistic, reading his verse to Fitzgerald with "not bad, eh Fritz," or reading *Maud* and stopping to say, "There's a wonderful touch." He had a weird social sense. At a party he asked Leigh Hunt in his booming voice where the beautiful Mrs. B. was. When Hunt discreetly whispered in reply, he said loudly, "Quit chirping like a little bird, and point her out." Although morbidly concerned with his health, he ran up hills in old age, drank a daily bottle of postprandial port, and smoked continually a particularly villainous tobacco. Although he suffered profoundly from the intellectual agony of his time, he arrived at a firm intuitive faith which enabled him once to say to a friend: "God is walking with us now, on this Down, as we two are walking together, just as truly as Christ was with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus."

The portrait which I have impressionistically sketched is the heart of the book and is built up with infinite, loving detail from letters, reminiscences and pertinent anecdotes. Equally fascinating are the fine portraits of Tennyson's colorful friends: the dazzling Hallam, crotchety Fitzgerald, sulphurous Carlyle, placid Jowett, booming Gladstone, Irving, Ellen Terry, Palgrave, and Queen Victoria, who regarded him as a sort of mentor. The social texture of Tennyson's life was amazing, how could he but sparkle in such a "jocund company"? Already in 1853, Tennyson bought Farringford, a mansion of fifteen rooms on the isle of Wight with an estate of two-hundred acres. Later he bought an estate in Blackdown Sussex. For years a constant stream of gifted visitors furnished a society of real distinction. Fortunately, Tennyson's poetry paid £10,000 in one year, so that he could maintain a splendid salon. That society dazzles the envious reader.

Tennyson's love for Emily Sellwood is illuminated, and its crucial importance in his life demonstrated. When the publication of *In Memoriam* removed the financial and religious prejudices of the Sellwoods, he and Emily were married, and, as he said, the peace of God entered his heart. Although she was long an invalid, she screened him from the crowd, handled most of his correspondence, and helped him with a sane and penetrating intelligence.

As I have said, the biography makes its real contribution not in literary criticism, but in literary history, furnishing illuminating data on the genesis of all the important poems. Tennyson's lifelong concern with the Arthurian legend is portrayed in detail; and, although his knights are Victorian gentlemen, that is not because he was unfamiliar with their hacking and hewing originals. He deliberately used the Arthurian framework for his own more or less allegorical ends. There is also much new and valuable material on the reception of the poems, ranging from the contemptuous attack of Croker to the overwhelming encomiums that greeted *In Memoriam* and "Crossing the Bar." Tennyson's somewhat infantile wincings under the critical lash are amusingly recounted. When he had published *Maud*, an anonymous cad wrote, "Sir, once I worshipped you—now I loathe you! So you've taken to imitate Longfellow, you B E A S T!" Such fly stings roused him to tantrums.

Some may object to the length of the work, but I regretted finishing it. Although Charles Tennyson has but little of his grandfather's literary gift, the book is absorbing; and it is that because of the author's real gift for appropriate selection and arrangement of revealing detail. The portrait is highly favorable, but then, even with his little vanities,

Tennyson was a good man. Happily, Charles Tennyson does not apply the naturalistic prejudices of our time to the reticences of a very typical Victorian. He has respect for a different moral persuasion. He has also a profound respect for Tennyson's agonizing search for God. Tennyson was an intuitionist and founded his faith in the testimony of his spirit and the trance. He believed the life of the spirit overwhelmingly important. So it is, and we can be thankful that in this, the definitive biography, that conviction is properly revered.

JOHN TIMMERMAN.

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

DE VRIJHEID DER EXEGESE. By K. J. Popma. *Goes, The Netherlands: Oosterbaan en Le Cointre N. V., 1944. 260 pages.* CALVINISTISCHE GESCHIEDENIS BESCHOUWING. By K. J. Popma. *Franeker, The Netherlands: T. Wever, 1945. 170 pages.* DE PLAATS DER THEOLOGIE. By K. J. Popma. *Franeker, The Netherlands: T. Wever, 1946. 76 pages.*

THESE three books reached the reviewer's desk long ago, though after the late war, but they have not lost any of their importance for the Netherlands, nor for the cause of Calvinism in general. In the meantime the author, a teacher of the classical languages in a Reformed gymnasium at Apeldoorn, and Secretary of the Association for Calvinistic Philosophy, was appointed to the University of Groningen, his alma mater, as a professor in Calvinistic philosophy. Dr. Popma is one of the most talented of the new movement, and deserves to be known among us not only as a keen and critical mind, but also as a writer who has made important contributions in a time of crisis for a Reformed theology and philosophy.

In the first book he comes to grips with the problem of the liberty of exegesis. Without denying the sphere-sovereignty of the institutional church, and of institutional and scientific theology, he makes plain that according to our Reformed principles as they are expressed in our creeds—especially the so-called Belgic confession—the reading, and therefore the explanation, of Scripture is the bounden duty and privilege of every believer. Neither the church nor the theologians open the Bible. The Bible is an open book, and within the limits and explanations of the Reformed creeds, every Calvinist should constantly study the Word of God, and discuss its contents with others, his family, his friends, and his fellow-believers. If he does not do that, but begins to lean on the judgment of ecclesiastical or scientific authorities, the church will lose not only its liberty, but also its foundation. Says the author:

We are called to liberty. That is an honor, and a bliss.

But it also means a violent struggle. The truth will make us free, also from the tyranny of the arrogance of science, and the no less gruesome tyranny of the offices of the church ("Kerkelijk Ambts-theïsme," p. 259).

In the second book the author opens fire on the liberalistic theory that religion is a factor in history which can be safely neglected because of the preponderant aspects of politics or economics, with education and art in the background; and he attacks the Anabaptistic and Thomistic theories which make the history of the church the only worthwhile part, and declare that culture in its higher as well as in its lower layers has no real significance for the church and for eternity. Dr. Popma believes that Christ is the Mediator of Redemption, and of Creation, and that He, therefore, has come not only to save the elect, but also to make possible a decent and rational, and even a Christian civilization which has significance for this life, and for all eternity. The history of the world is therefore first of all a history of the church, but then also of the other categories of life, in which on the whole the pagans and unbelievers take the lead. The two histories are organically connected because they are one in Christ.

In the structure of history we must distinguish between the creational and the lapsaric factors (from *lapsus*, or fall). In the development of history there must then be a twofold task for the believers, *i.e.*, the church as an institution and an

organism. It must fight the good fight of faith, and at the same time obey the common mandate to subdue the earth (Genesis 1:28) in a Biblical way. It must foster the study of history, for this study reveals the character of all spheres of activity and all institutions. It must learn to distinguish between reverence for historical traditions, and the necessity of constant reform in all spheres of life. It must also try to understand the fruit or value of history for eternity. History embraces all of our activities. The central one is religion; next in order are morality, justice, art, economics, social contact (the home, the school, the workshop), expression (especially language and literature), and the science investigating the relations and first principles of all spheres, *i.e.*, philosophy. History must study the past of all these aspects as well as consider their values for the kingdom of Christ. Thus history becomes the science next in importance to philosophy and theology.

Dr. Popma's third volume is a study of the place of theology among the sciences in the church and in everyday life. The main task of theology is the scientific study of the Book of books. This should be of great help to the church, as long as theology occupies its place with honor and dignity, guarding its own duties and privileges, and staying on the right track. If theology tries to dominate the church with its preferred theories on certain important issues, or if it leaves the Biblical basis and becomes either rationalistic, or irrationalistic, the church is in danger of losing its life and liberty. Theology must never forget that our confessions are based on the Scriptures to which we all must appeal, whether we are scholars or not, and that the creeds are not scientific documents, but compendiums of the main truths of the Bible, so that all scientific, theological, and philosophical problems are considered to be outside of the pale of the church's authority. Popma limits himself to a formal discussion and avoids all up-to-date problems, so as not to appear partial. He certainly touches on a live issue, and tries to show, proceeding from the principle of sphere-sovereignty as expressed in Articles 7 and 32 of the Belgic Confession, where the real cause of the crisis in the Reformed churches of the Netherlands is situated, and what Reformed churches everywhere should do to avoid such crisis. This book is indeed of great ecumenical value, theoretical as well as practical. There cannot be any true ecumenicity if the churches in their gatherings try to settle scientific, theological, and philosophical issues. All sciences are theories, and all theories are based on certain religions, which means for a Calvinist biblical, but pre-scientific or pre-theoretical truths called prejudgments. These basic biblical teachings the churches should hold to, and they should investigate any confessional problems connected with them. The churches should then urge all those who differ on certain theoretical questions to be tolerant in their discussions. This does not mean that any theory on an extra-confessional point should in the long run be tolerated, but that the way to solve scientific problems is not to appoint Synodical committees and to take Synodical decisions on such matters, but to have meetings of a scientific nature where all such matters are discussed in a friendly and brotherly fashion. For a renewed interest in theology and philosophy we need research and persuasion, and not force. This is Dr. Popma's message and we consider it very valuable.

H. J. VAN ANDEL.

CALVIN ON THE SYNOPTICS

COMMENTARY ON A HARMONY OF THE EVANGELISTS. By John Calvin. Translated from the original Latin; and collated with the author's French version, by the Rev. Wm. Pringle. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1949. Three volumes. \$10.50.

THERE are two main schools of thought with respect to the histories of Christ imbedded in the Four Gospels. The one detects irreconcilable differences and discrepancies in the four records and claims them to be cluttered with

contradictions. The other regards them as valid, authentic portraits sketched from four different angles or, as Calvin himself put it, "a chariot drawn by four horses." "Each one of the evangelists," says he, wrote "by the direction of Divine Providence . . . (and) followed the method which he reckoned best" (The Argument, p. xxxix, vol. I). The one designates it as a human and therefore fallible set of records, as a body of tradition with only a modicum of historical validity; the other regards it as divine and therefore infallible, not without its antinomies, it is true, but antinomies which indicate not inherent contradiction but rather the limitations of the finite mind.

John Calvin, an adherent of course of the first school of thought, saw fit to begin his series of N. T. commentaries by combining the first three gospels into a harmony, arranging the parallel passages and making comment upon them. He made no claim to originality in so doing but conceded that the pattern was set by his friend Bucer. His motive in so doing was to aid the ordinary lay Bible student who might be bewildered and perplexed by the similarities and differences that obtain in the Synoptics and in John's Gospel. Says he, "I thought that it might prove to be a seasonable and useful abridgement of their labor, if I were to arrange the three histories in one unbroken chain, or in a single picture, in which the reader may perceive at a glance the resemblance or diversity that exists." (The Argument, p. xl, vol. I.)

In keeping with all of Calvin's works of an interpretative and commentative character, this harmony is marked by studious application of the historico-grammatico principle of interpretation, with its close scrutiny of the original and the various shades of meaning and letting the light of the context and of contemporaneous history play upon it; by reference to classical writers, Demosthenes, Virgil *et al*, to buttress his exegesis; by a diction and style that tends to become laborious at times but which must be evaluated in the light of that age; by a strong practical and devotional interest expressed in this injunction, "In ordering our life . . . our first study ought to be to approve ourselves to God; and we know that what he chiefly requires is a sincere heart and a pure conscience" (Comment on Luke 1:6); by the constantly recurring theme of the sovereignty of God, which sovereignty he takes pains to insist is not arbitrariness "as if man were tossed or thrown up and down like balls by a tyrannical authority" but is consonant with human freedom; by a wholesome modesty which does not detract from the firmness of his own convictions (*cf. e.g.* Comment on the genealogies in Matthew and Luke); and by an apologetic thrust in which heretics, particularly the Papists, the Jews, and "that filthy dog Servetus" (p. 37) come in for especial treatment. With respect to the Roman Catholic celebration of the birthday of John the Baptist he says, "I pass over the disorderly scene of a procession accompanied by dancing and leaping, and licentiousness of every description, strangely enough employed in observing a day which they pretend to hold sacred, and even the amusements authorized on that day taken from magical arts and diabolical tricks, closely resembling the mysteries of the goddess Ceres" (Vol. I, p. 16). Throughout, Calvin is the logician and debater, who, on the premise of "Scripture alone," wields lusty blows for the truth of God. A case in point is his scathing attack upon the Roman Catholic doctrine of clerical celibacy and the exposure of its invalidity on the basis of Lev. 10:9. Men may question some of his conclusions, *e.g.* his claim of the right of magistrates to punish heretics, but no Bible scholar can ignore his trenchant, thorough treatment of the Word of God.

The three volumes of this harmony were dedicated to the Burgomaster and Council of the City of Frankfurt in tribute to their valiant defense and maintenance of the Protestant faith in Germany. The first volume is graced with a rare etching of Calvin by Pierre Woieiot, the celebrated 16th century artist. We are indebted to the Eerdmans Press for making these excellent works available and for presenting them in sturdily-bound, handy and attractive volumes. JOHN H. BRATT

CALVIN ON JOHN

CALVIN'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN. In two volumes, with an Introduction by Merrill C. Tenney, Dean of the Graduate School, Wheaton College. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. 457 and 346 pages. \$3.50 and \$3.00 respectively.

OVERS of the Scriptures cannot fail to appreciate the expository writings on the Sacred Books that come from the hand of one who regards them pre-eminently as the revelation of God in Christ. Such an expositor certainly was John Calvin, and this fact is nowhere more evident than in his work on John's Gospel. Throughout his reverent treatment of the fourth Gospel, Calvin is dominated by John's own self-expressed purpose in writing, namely, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

Calvin's faithfulness to the spirit and purpose of John's distinctive record of the earthly ministry of our Lord is evident already in his preliminary statement of the Argument of the Gospel, when, comparing this Gospel with the first three, he says (p. 22): "And as all of them had the same object in view, to point out Christ, the three former exhibit his body, if we may be permitted to use the expression, but John exhibits his soul. On this account, I am accustomed to say that this Gospel is a key to open the door for understanding the rest; for whosoever will understand the power of Christ, as it is here strikingly portrayed, will afterwards read with advantage what the others relate about the Redeemer who was manifested."

As the Gospel writer's purpose could not but involve him in a strong polemic against the prevalent forms of unbelief, so Calvin, though primarily concerned with a reverent illumination of the text, draws out the full polemic significance of John's record, and in a way that is surprisingly pertinent to our own age of unbelief. Illustrative of this timeliness of Calvin for the twentieth century is his comment on chapter 5:23, when he observes with his wonted pious insight (p. 202): "Whoever then desires to have his worship approved by the true God, let him not turn aside from Christ. Nor was it otherwise with the Fathers under the Law; for though they beheld Christ darkly under shadows, yet never did God reveal Himself out of Christ. But now, since Christ has been manifested in the flesh and appointed to be King over us, the whole world must bend the knee to Him, in order to obey God; for the Father having made Him sit at His right hand, he who forms a conception of God without Christ takes away the half of Him."

Two things may be said, in such a brief notice as this, of the practical usefulness of this work of Calvin. First, that notwithstanding all the water that has passed over the dam since Calvin's day, in the field of Biblical interpretation, Calvin still provides sound insight into the profundities of John's Gospel. As Dr. Tenney says in his introduction, "the essentials of the teaching in his Commentaries will probably never need to be changed." The second is that, though Calvin's work on John is scholarly, one need not be a scholar to read it and profit from it. It is written with an eye to the spiritual needs of the ordinary Christian.

With reference to both of these points, the characterization of the Commentary by the translator is still an accurate appraisal, and indicates the pre-eminent value of the work. Writing his Preface to the Translation in 1847, he said: "The present Work brings under review some of the most intricate questions in theology; and in handling them he is not more careful to learn all that has been revealed than to avoid unauthorized speculation. They who know the difficulty of the path will the more highly appreciate so skilful a guide, who advances with a firm step, points out the bypaths which have misled the unwary, conducts us to scenes which we had not previously explored, and aids us in listening to a Divine voice which says, *This is the way, walk ye in it.*"

Leota, Minnesota.

PETER VAN TUINEN.