

man is called to observe the law of CHRIST in his vocation. Are men blinded by the pessimism of business depression? Preach, "The LORD reigneth, let the earth rejoice." Is man inhuman to man? Preach, "The LORD reigneth; let the people tremble, for the LORD our GOD is holy." GOD is King of every life and of all of life.

Professor T. F. CARL MULLER also recognizes the outward call of the Reformed Theology; but he is sure that "the outstanding interest (in the Reformed Faith) is centered in religion, not in morality; on the Beyond, not on the here; on GOD Himself, not on the world first, with GOD as a subsidiary help to our per-

sonal and social existence in it." (*The Reformed Theology as a Guardian of the Pure Gospel*, January 1931 *Evangelical Quarterly*.)

In centering on the God-concept the Reformed Faith is just upholding Bible Christianity. GOD is the theme of the Bible. Bible preaching is preaching GOD. The Scriptures "Principally teach what man is to believe concerning GOD." Would GOD that the pulpit were following the Book! GOD declines to be made secondary to man. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The first and the greatest commandment is: "Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all . . ." The first

article in the creed is: "I believe in GOD the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." This primary word in early Christian preaching was also the question to be first raised and to be nobly answered by that great line of Christian thinkers stretching from JUSTIN MARTYR to AUGUSTINE of Hippo. Concerning this significant fact perhaps mother Britain has a word for America. An Oxford manifesto affirms "that the doctrine of GOD is the primary doctrine, and the Church was right to lay stress upon it." (Introduction to *Oxford Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*.)

(Concluded in our next issue)

Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

V. THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST

"I marvel that you are so quickly turning from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, unto a different gospel, which is not another—only, there are some who are disturbing you and are wishing to subvert the gospel of Christ." (Gal. 1:6, 7, in a literal translation.)

Another Gospel Which Is Not Another

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we pointed out the strange absence, in the Epistle to the GALATIANS, of the usual thanksgiving for the Christian state of the readers. There was nothing to be thankful for in the news which PAUL had received from the Galatian churches, and PAUL had not the slightest intention of expressing a thankfulness which was not justified by the facts.

The news which had come from the churches was bad and only bad, and the Apostle plunges at once into his treatment of it. "I marvel," he says, "that ye are so quickly turning away, from Him who called you in the grace of CHRIST, to another gospel, which is not another—only, there are certain men who are troubling you and are wishing to subvert the gospel of CHRIST."

The Person whom PAUL means when he speaks of Him from whom the GALATIANS are turning away is of course GOD the FATHER. GOD had called them by that

majestic call at the beginning of their Christian life which had been made possible only by the gracious gift which CHRIST had made for them on the cross; yet now they are turning away from such a call and despising such grace. No wonder that the Apostle marvels at a perversity so great!

The thing to which they are turning away so quickly is designated as "another gospel, which is not another." But in the Greek two different words are used here for "another." The word which is used in the former place is *heteros*; the word which is used in the latter place is *allos*. The former word, *heteros*, often, though not always, has in it the notion of difference in kind between one thing and another. Thus it is said in the Gospel according to LUKE, in connection with the transfiguration, that "the fashion of His countenance became other." Here the word *heteros* is used for "other," and the plain implication is that the fashion of His countenance was *different* from what it had been before.

The other word, *allos*, on the other hand, designates merely numerical distinctness of one thing from another. If I give a man an apple, and he asks me whether I have "another," the word that he will naturally use is not *heteros* but *allos*.

In view of this distinction, the scoff-

ing observation that "orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is the other man's doxy," is seen to illustrate rather clearly the principle that a little learning is a dangerous thing. As a matter of fact, *orthos* means "straight" and "orthodoxy" means "straight doxy;" whereas *heterodoxy* means a doxy that is *different* from straight doxy—in other words, it means "crooked doxy!"

We trust that the readers will pardon this slight digression and will now return with us to the matter in hand. PAUL says that the GALATIANS are turning unto a different gospel, but that that different gospel is not really a second gospel to be put alongside of the gospel already preached, as though it could be a companion with it in a series. "No," says PAUL, "it is not really a gospel at all; there is only one gospel, and that is the gospel already preached to you. This other teaching, though it purports to be a gospel, is not really a gospel at all. It is not really another gospel, but only a perversion of the one true gospel."

Christ's Gospel Or the Gospel About Christ?

The one true gospel is "the gospel of CHRIST." What does PAUL mean when he designates it so? In what sense is it to be called a gospel "of CHRIST?"

That question is closely connected with another question, the question what *we* mean today when we speak of the gospel of CHRIST. Upon this latter question there depends the whole vast question as to the truth or falsehood of the Christian religion.

The English phrase, "the gospel of CHRIST," with the corresponding phrase in Greek, may mean at least two things. In the first place it may mean "the gospel which CHRIST preached," and in the second place it may mean "the gospel which sets CHRIST forth," "the gospel about CHRIST." In the English language, each of these two uses of the word "of" is perfectly well established, and so is each of these two uses of the genitive case in Greek.

Thus when we speak in English of "the gospel of PAUL," we are using the word "of" plainly in the former of the two senses; we mean not at all a gospel about PAUL or a gospel which proclaims PAUL, but a gospel which PAUL proclaimed. On the other hand, when we speak, for example, of "the gospel of the cross," we are using the word "of" just as plainly in the latter sense; we mean not a gospel which the cross proclaims, but a gospel which proclaims the cross.

But how is it when we speak of "the gospel of CHRIST?" Do we mean "the gospel which CHRIST proclaimed" or "the gospel which proclaims CHRIST;" do we mean "CHRIST's gospel" or "the gospel about CHRIST?"

According to the Modernist tendency now so largely dominant in the Church, we mean, or at least ought to mean, the former and not the latter. We ought, it is said, to think of the gospel as being the gospel which CHRIST preached, not the gospel which sets CHRIST forth; a message of which CHRIST was the great exponent, not a doctrine of His person or of His work. We ought, in other words, it is said, to return from this gospel *about* CHRIST and have recourse to CHRIST's own gospel; we ought to abandon the theological subtleties of atonement, redemption and the like, and have recourse to the simple message that was proclaimed by JESUS of NAZARETH on the shores of the sea of Galilee nineteen hundred years ago.

That formulation of the great issue in the Church is by no means altogether new.

It has been known for a hundred years or so, if not even far longer than that. It raises rather clearly the very greatest of all questions, and it ought to be dealt with in the most careful possible way.

Ought we to yield to the demand of modern "Liberal" preachers that we should abandon the gospel about CHRIST and have recourse, in distinction from that, to the gospel which CHRIST preached?

Which Gospel Exalts Christ More?

Before we answer that question, we ought at any rate to clear up one strange misconception—the strange misconception, namely, that represents "CHRIST's gospel," in this modern sense, as bringing us nearer to CHRIST or as giving CHRIST a greater place in our lives than "the gospel about CHRIST" which is being abandoned. As a matter of fact, "CHRIST's gospel," so understood, puts CHRIST in a very small place in our lives and makes him very remote from us. If the gospel to which we hold is merely the gospel which CHRIST preached nineteen hundred years ago, then our relation to CHRIST is not different in kind from our relation to many other great teachers. We can speak in that sense of "a gospel of PAUL" or "a gospel of SPURGEON" or "a gospel of D. L. MOODY." But it would be blasphemous to hold to a gospel *about* PAUL or a gospel *about* SPURGEON or a gospel *about* D. L. MOODY. That would put mere human teachers in a position that belongs only to CHRIST. Others may proclaim a gospel, but CHRIST alone is the substance or content of the gospel.

How remote, too, CHRIST is made from us by this modern rejection of the gospel about CHRIST in the supposed interests of a gospel which CHRIST preached! It is amazing that men can be so blind as not to see that the blessed "doctrine" of the eighth chapter of Romans, far from putting a barrier between us and JESUS, really is the only thing that can unite us to JESUS. He died nineteen hundred years ago. How may we hold fellowship with him today? It is this much despised "theology" which alone can tell us how—this theology that sets forth the meaning of His death and the fact of His glorious resurrection.

The Gospel That Christ Preached

In holding to this gospel about CHRIST, are we rejecting the gospel which He

preached when He was on earth? Far from it. For the gospel which He preached was also a gospel about Him; He put His own person and work into the centre of the gospel that He proclaimed.

He could not, indeed, proclaim that gospel fully when he was on earth. He had come into this world to redeem men by His death and resurrection, and the recounting of that great event was to constitute the gospel by which He was to be presented as the Saviour of men. The meaning of the great event could not be set forth in all its fulness until the event had taken place. Much, therefore, was left to the teaching of the Holy Spirit through the Apostles. A gospel that neglects the Epistles of PAUL and holds only to the teaching of our LORD on earth is not really loyal to CHRIST; nay, it is profoundly disloyal to Him, and it impoverishes woefully and sinfully our knowledge of His teaching and His person and His work.

Nevertheless, our LORD did proclaim the gospel about Himself even when He was on earth. He did put His own person into His gospel.

That fact has often been denied in modern times. The denial of it lies at the root of the reconstruction called "the Liberal JESUS" in its typical forms. The real JESUS, according to that reconstruction, did not present a doctrine of His own person; neither did He have the slightest notion of a redeeming significance of His approaching death; but He proclaimed with wonderful simplicity the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and we are His true disciples when we cease disputing about His place in the scale of being and hearken to His simple message.

The Jesus of the Gospels

To reconstruct JESUS in this way, it is of course necessary to reject much that the Gospels contain. The gospel of JOHN has to be eliminated at the start, since throughout that Gospel JESUS is represented as making His own person and the nature of His redeeming work the express subject of His teaching. If the Gospel of JOHN is true, then JESUS most emphatically did put His own person into His gospel, and the "Liberal" reconstruction is wrong.

But even after the Fourth Gospel has

been eliminated, much still remains to be done. In the Synoptic Gospels also, JESUS is represented as putting His own person into His gospel; and hence by a mere appeal from JOHN to the Synoptic Gospels the simple teacher of the fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man is not yet found. He can be found, therefore, if at all, not by taking as they stand the utterances attributed to JESUS even in the Synoptic Gospels, but by regarding some of those utterances as authentic and by rejecting the rest.

The Jesus of the Supposed "Sources"

How can the choice be made? Conceivably it might be made by the discovery of earlier sources underlying our Synoptic Gospels. Possibly, it might be said, the unauthentic elements in the teaching attributed to JESUS have been introduced by the authors of our Gospels, whereas if we could only reconstruct the sources that they used we should find that JESUS was really such a one as we modern men desire.

As a matter of fact, however, this method of reconstruction has been found to fail. The two chief sources supposed, rightly or wrongly, to underlie our Gospels of MATTHEW and LUKE are (1) MARK and (2) a source commonly called Q, which is supposed to contain chiefly sayings, as distinguished from deeds, of JESUS. And in both of these supposed sources the undesired element appears in the teaching which JESUS is represented as carrying on; in both of these sources JESUS is represented as holding a lofty view of His own person. The well-known utterance of JESUS in Matt. 11:27, beginning, "All things have been delivered unto me of My Father," appears in practically the same form in Luke 10:22, and so must be thought to have stood in the supposed source, Q. Yet this utterance presents the same lofty view of our LORD's person as that which is presented in the Gospel according to JOHN.

Even more impressive than such individual utterances is the entire tenor of the two supposed sources. Neither MARK nor the supposed Q really presents a JESUS who was a mere preacher of the fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man; both of them present a JESUS who offered Himself not merely as teacher but as Saviour. As JAMES DENNEY (in a

book sadly mistaken and unduly concessive in some ways)¹ correctly insisted, JESUS is represented, even in the earliest sources which have been reconstructed, rightly or wrongly, by modern criticism, as offering Himself not merely as an example for faith but as the object of faith. He did, in other words, even according to the earliest sources or supposed sources, put His own person into His gospel; His gospel, even according to the earliest sources, was a gospel *about* Him.

Thus if we are to discover a gospel of JESUS which was not also a gospel *about* JESUS, we must certainly go back of the earliest written sources of information which, rightly or wrongly, have been discovered by modern criticism; we must suppose that, in a period of oral tradition prior to those earliest written sources, the information about JESUS became contaminated and thus the JESUS who really lived in Palestine, a pure and simple teacher of the fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man, came falsely to be presented as one who attributed to Himself superhuman functions as the Redeemer of mankind.

"The Liberal Jesus"

But how are we to separate what is true from what is false in an oral tradition now preserved for us only in written sources already vitiated by a false view of JESUS' person? Surely the process of separation must be very difficult. And when it has been completed, what sort of JESUS remains? Is the JESUS who remains even then exactly the sort of JESUS that the "Liberal" historians desire?

At one point even the Liberal historians (or most of them) admitted that He is not. Even their reconstructed JESUS, they had to admit, thought that He was the Messiah; and His Messianic consciousness introduced a totally discordant element into their picture of Him. Their simple preacher of the fatherhood of GOD did after all claim a stupendous dignity for Himself. What becomes then of their fundamental thesis? Even their reconstructed JESUS was not exactly the kind of person whom they desired to find.

They did, indeed, try to minimize the importance of JESUS' claims; they represented the claim of Messiahship by

JESUS as a mere means to an end, a mere means that He adopted almost against His will. But such palliative treatment evidently did not go to the root of the matter. It remained true that the claim of Messiahship was totally out of character if JESUS was the kind of teacher that the Liberal historians represented Him as being. Yet that claim was rooted too deep in the sources for it to be removed save by a few extremists.

Thus it is not surprising to find in our day evidences that the whole imposing reconstruction of "the Liberal JESUS" is destined soon to fall to the ground. If JESUS was not the divine Redeemer whom the Gospels represent Him as being—and of course according to the current naturalism He could not have been that—then it is increasingly being admitted that we can never determine just exactly what He was.

Sixty or seventy years ago, when "the Liberal JESUS" was first constructed on the basis of the Gospel of MARK (or a supposed earlier form of MARK) and of the supposed source later called Q, there was vast enthusiasm. Scientific history, it was supposed, had had a beneficent result. At first, indeed, it was admitted, it had given many persons pain; it had removed from the pages of history many things about JESUS that the Church had held dear. But in removing things that were false or uncertain, it had, men were told, established with all the greater firmness the things that remained. For the first time, it was thought, "the life of CHRIST" was put upon a firm scientific basis; the assured results of modern criticism of the gospels could at last, it was supposed, be summed up, and on the basis of these assured results the real JESUS could be presented to the Church.

That real JESUS lacked, indeed, many things that had hitherto been found in the JESUS of Christian faith. Gone were His stupendous "metaphysical" attributes—His preëxistence, His omnipotence, His omniscience, His Trinitarian oneness with GOD. Gone were His miracles, His redeeming death, His resurrection from the tomb, His final judgment of the world. But to balance these losses, it was thought, how much had been gained! The true humanity of JESUS at last had been rediscovered. JESUS at last had been brought near to us: He was no longer a pale

¹ Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 1909.

metaphysical abstraction, but had become a living person of flesh and blood; He had become a true example and teacher and guide, a true leader into a larger and more glorious life. Let the Church forget its dry theology, it was urged; let it take JESUS as its leader and go forth to more glorious conquests than it had ever seen before!

Such, in essentials, was the program of the Liberal historians. That program had a great vogue in the modern Church. The reconstruction of the Liberal JESUS appeared in all essentials in H. J. HOLTZMANN's book on the Synoptic Gospels in 1863; it was repeated in many learned and many popular treatises; it was raised to the highest pitch of popular enthusiasm by HARNACK's *What Is Christianity?* in 1900.

The Fall of "The Liberal Jesus"

But today the vogue of "the Liberal JESUS" has entered upon a sad decline. Scholars who, like the older Liberal historians, reject the supernatural in the Gospels are no longer at all clear about the "assured results" of modern criticism on the positive side. All our sources of information, it is seen with increasing clearness, are imbued with a supernaturalistic view of JESUS' person; all of them represent him as offering Himself to men not as a mere prophet or teacher, but as a Saviour. How, then, can the historian ever hope to discover the real JESUS beneath these gaudy colors of the supernatural that have so hopelessly defaced His portrait? In the attempt to answer that question, modern scholars are falling more and more into despair. Gone is the almost lyrical enthusiasm with which HOLTZMANN in 1863 set forth the purely human JESUS whom he supposed to have been rediscovered by modern historical research. More and more the sobering conviction is gaining ground that the naturalistic criticism of the Gospels, rejecting the miracles, has been able only to destroy and not to build. It has shown, in the opinion of the naturalistic historians, that the JESUS of the Gospels was not the real JESUS—but what sort of person the real JESUS was—that question, it is increasingly admitted, must forever remain unanswered. We can show what sort of person the primitive Church held Him to be, but what sort of person He

really was—this remains hidden from our eyes.

The Real Jesus

Against such skepticism must be placed at least one solid fact. It is the stupendous picture of JESUS which the Gospels contain. That picture presents unmistakable marks of truth. It is totally un-

like all that we know of the fancies of the early Christian Church; it is irreducibly original; it is amazingly vivid and concrete.

Yet about one thing modern skepticism is unquestionably correct. The Gospel picture of JESUS is suffused with the supernatural throughout. It is not the

(Concluded on page 17)

Birth Control in the Light of the Bible

By the Rev. J. H. Gauss, D.D.

Dean, Brookes Bible Institute, St. Louis, Mo.

THE reports of a committee appointed by the Federation of Churches on Birth-Control have been made public.

Undoubtedly thousands of right-thinking people are sadly perplexed, and some justly indignant at the Majority report approving the use of "contraceptives" in marital relations; also undoubtedly other thousands will be encouraged to resort to the use of such means to indulge sexual lust without marriage, or, if married, without incurring the care of children.

The Majority report refers to the Church and the Bible as "silent upon the subject," and intimates that such silence gives consent, or at least does not forbid.

Its reference to the Bible is quite misleading, though doubtless unintentionally so. The Bible is not as silent as the report implies:

Read Gen. 1:26, "multiply," and again after the Flood, Gen. 9:1, "multiply;" I Chron. 4:27, JUDAH's superiority to SIMEON, SIMEON's tribal family did *not* "multiply;" Ps. 127:3-5, many children a matter for congratulation as an expression of God's favor; Prov. 31:28, the "virtuous woman's" "household" consists of "husband" and "children;" I Sam. 2:21, the birth of prayer-answered SAMUEL; is followed by "three sons and two daughters." Zach. 8:5 promises the streets of Jerusalem shall one day be full of boys and girls at play. I Tim. 3:4 sets forth the fitness of one for the office of bishop, as having "one wife" and being the father of "children;" I Tim. 5:10, states as a condition that an aged widow receive aid from the Church, that she has "brought up children," and verse 14, directs that "younger women marry, bear

children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to reproach;" I Cor. 7:14, declares God's special interest in a Christian's children; Eph. 6:4, commands fathers to bring them up for God, Mark 10:14, records the Savior of our race welcoming children to His blessing and a large place in the Kingdom of God.—Most truly did the heathen women say to the Christian missionary, "Yours is a God that cares for little children."

God instituted marriage—and that for birth of children—and that according to the physical laws He had created in man; true, not as a means for gratifying selfish passion resulting in births too frequent for health of mother or child; yet not avoiding such births by use of "contraceptives" to prevent them.

Birth-denial is not birth-control, but sinful, selfish refusal to fulfill God's purpose in marriage.

True Birth-control, or Abstinence is God-fearing, marital self-control, as we are taught in I Cor. 7:5.

Not a child, but "*children*" are necessary in God's ideal family on earth. Such ideal families are vital to our race, to every nation, to our nation, to the Church of JESUS CHRIST. Let us not live lower than beasts, but as men, being spirits, created in the "image" of God, with bodies made in the "likeness" of God.

"Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify GOD in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." I Cor. 6:20.

"Your whole spirit, and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it." I Thess. 5:23, 24.

ment and the Resurrection, that the General Assembly's declaration of 1923 did not state the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines, 'and that all who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship.' Where loose doctrine prevails, dangerous ethical teaching is sure to follow. . . . The prominence which some of our Ministers are giving to these ill-favored teachings, such as birth control, is an evidence of a fading interest in redemptive Christianity. . . ."

Notes on Biblical Exposition

(Concluded from page 9)

picture of a mere prophet and teacher simply overlaid with a few supernatural elements. Rather does the supernatural, both in the presentation of fact and in the presentation of JESUS' claims, enter into the very warp and woof. If the supernatural be rejected, then there is really nothing that certainly remains. No wonder that an increasing skepticism has taken the place of enthusiasm for "the Liberal JESUS!" Increasingly it has become evident that unless JESUS was essentially what He is represented in the Gospels as being, His true person and character can never be rediscovered by any historical research.

Such skepticism will always be condemned by a sound common sense. The picture of JESUS in the Gospels is too self-evidently true ever to be removed thus radically from the pages of history. If, then, we cannot reject the supernatural element and retain the rest, what remains for us to do? One thing and one thing only remains—that we should accept the whole, that we should accept the miracles and accept JESUS' stupendous claims.

When we take that step, everything in early Christian history falls into its proper place. The beginnings of the Christian Church, which before seemed to be a mass of contradictions, a jumble of kaleidoscopic changes, become the inevitable result of one stupendous fact; and the historian wonders at the blindness with which he formerly groped for the solution of a problem to which the key lay so ready to hand. There is really no other solution. A great building was

never founded upon a pin point. At the foundation of the Christian Church there stands the supernatural CHRIST.

The One True Gospel

If that be so, the whole distinction between the gospel of CHRIST and the gospel about CHRIST falls to the ground. The gospel of CHRIST, the gospel which He proclaimed, is seen also to be a gospel about Him. He came into this world to make that gospel possible by His redeeming death and glorious resurrection. While He was on earth He proclaimed that gospel afore, and He left the fuller presentation of it to the apostles whom he chose. But always He is both the author and the substance of His gospel; the gospel that He proclaimed was also the gospel in which He was proclaimed.

Hence it makes comparatively little difference whether in any particular case PAUL means by "the gospel of CHRIST" the gospel that CHRIST proclaimed or the gospel that proclaims Him. Usually when he speaks of the gospel he is thinking certainly of the latter rather than of the former; he is thinking of the gospel as that which sets forth CHRIST's redeeming work rather than as that which CHRIST proclaimed when He was on earth.

What does he mean in our verse in Gal. 1:7, when he speaks of the "gospel of CHRIST?" Does he mean the gospel which CHRIST proclaimed or the gospel which proclaims CHRIST? If he means the former, he is no doubt thinking not so much of CHRIST's proclamation of the gospel when He was on earth, as of His proclamation of it to him, PAUL, after He had risen from the dead, when He appeared to him on the road to Damascus.

Possibly he might mean that. More probably, perhaps, he might mean the gospel about CHRIST, the gospel which sets CHRIST forth.

But in this particular place we are inclined to think that he means neither. Rather is he designating the gospel here simply as the gospel that *belongs* to CHRIST. It is CHRIST's property; yet these Judaizers are seeking to lay violent hands upon it. They are seeking to deal as they will with what is not really theirs but CHRIST's.

Would GOD that every modern preacher might avoid the Judaizers' sin! The gospel is not ours to change as we will; in proclaiming it we are but stewards. GOD grant that we may be faithful stewards; GOD grant that we may truly proclaim the gospel which is not ours but the gospel of the LORD JESUS CHRIST!

Two Corrections

THROUGH an unfortunate oversight two mistakes appeared in the April issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The able article on "Church Union and Doctrinal Purity" was written, not by the Rev. Wm. Carter, D.D., but by the Rev. James Carter, D.D., Professor Emeritus at Lincoln University, Penna. The Rev. Wm. Carter, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., wrote disclaiming authorship of the article, saying, "I thank you for the compliment in ascribing the article" . . . and "the article is a very fine one, and I fully agree with the author . . ."

The meditation on "Noble Loneliness—Micaiah," by Pastor R. Saillens, was translated by the Rev. Paul Woolley, Th.M., from the French periodical *Le Chretien Evangelique*, and credit should have been given that distinguished journal.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY is sorry for these unintentional mistakes and expresses its sincere regret to the parties concerned.

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church U. S. A.

Calls

James G. Robinson, Ph.D., Oilphant, Pa. to First Church, Lewisburg, Pa.;
L. S. Hall, to Littleton, Colo.

Calls Accepted

J. D. McGregor, Watertown, N. Y. to Cato and Meridian, N. Y.;
William T. McKinney, West Chester, O. to Main Street Church, Petersburg, Ind.;
R. H. Rolofson, Royal Oak, Mich. to First Church, Astabula, O.;
William J. G. Carruthers, Chestnut Level, Pa. to Faith Church, Baltimore, Md.;
Frank R. LeFever, Ashland, N. J. to Light Street Church, Baltimore, Md.;
Laurence R. Waddell, Assistant First Church, Baltimore, Md. to Chestnut Grove and Ashland Church, Baldwin, Md.;

James Steenson, to Winnebago, Minn.;
E. E. DeLong, Roxana, Ill. to Wood River, Ill.;
Jesse E. Agams, Ossian, Ind. to Litchfield, Ill.;
Samuel Harris to Burns, Ore.;
Rex. Stowers Clements, Associate Pastor Fifth Avenue Church, New York, N. Y.;
Francis M. Dowlin, Ocean City, Md. to East Whiteland Church, Frazer, Pa.;
W. M. Bigham, Sturgis, Ky. to Paris, Tenn.;
G. W. Jones, Savannah, Tenn. to Huntland, Tenn.;
H. J. Hasch to Danville, Ill.;
George E. Muran, Sandy Lake-Fairfield-New Leban, Pa. group to Knox Church, Detroit, Mich.;
Frank M. Weston, D.D. First Church, Geneva, N. Y. to become Executive Secretary of Rochester Presbytery;

Changed Addresses

Arthur T. Davies, 6851 Halliday Ave., Oakland, Cal.;