



LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE DEVIL
IN
CAP AND GOWN

An examination of an article, published in the February issue
of *The Biblical World*, by Lucius Hopkins Miller,
Professor* of Biblical Instruction,
Princeton University

*In the Official Register of Princeton University—"Assistant Professor."

By
FORD C. OTTMAN

10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a dozen

ARNO C. GAEBELEIN, Publisher
456 Fourth Avenue, New York City

Copyright, ARNO C. GAEBELEIN, 1914

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF THE MEN AND WOMEN
WHOSE LARGE-HEARTED LIBERALITY FOUNDED PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY ON THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Presented by,

James G. Foster

Room G-2518

421 Barry St., Victoria B.C.

P.T.S. 1916-1917.

A CATALOGUE of Books on
Biblical Exposition by
various writers, including Dr.
Ottman, will be mailed free on
application to the Publisher.

The Devil in Cap and Gown.

The Devil, squirming and wriggling in “cap and gown,” has been permitted and allowed, by some inconceivable miscalculation—or inscrutable lack of vigilance—on the part of those in authority to undulate himself into the chair of “Biblical Instruction” in one of our great universities. In that officially protected position, assuming a human form, and controlling—so, at least, it would seem—a personality that is perhaps unconscious of his dominance, he is, either with or without the knowledge and consent of the Regents, deliberately palming himself off as a religious instructor of youth. Though cleverly clad in scholastic garb, he is without ability to conceal his identity, which is fully disclosed by a nasty and offensive trail that he has recently made.

The Devil, in every age, under all circumstances, in whatsoever cloak and domino, is the Devil always, with no sign, no stamp, not even a streak of originality. During the six thousand years of his sleepless activity he has been pounding on the same old bell, and the tedious and tiresome recurrence of the one monotonous tintinnabulation is irritating *usque ad nauseam*. Pest-laden himself with distrust of God, he has in all ages infected

whomsoever he could with the virulent disorder of that soul-destroying disease. In the garden of Eden, it was—"Yea, hath God said?"; in the wilderness of Judea, it was—"If thou be the Son of God"; *though so had God pronounced!* Ever questioning God, forever the same; and now, in the university class-room, he is exhaling his noxious vapor, and polluting the atmosphere with his deadly miasma of doubt.

The human tube through which the gas is blown enables us easily to discriminate the "Assistant" from the Devil. By a singular combination of the mental faculties of both—this Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—the "critical test" is applied to the Gospels and to the life of Christ, and there are "achieved results which are sure and extensive enough to satisfy fair-minded men."

Without further reflection on the title or the livery of this duplex personality, we shall accept the label that clepes the one, and shall now address ourselves exclusively to the nuncupative "Professor of Biblical Instruction."

He is no tyro, this Professor, no abecedarian, no tutor of propaedeutics: no, indeed, he is a full-fledged "Assistant Professor"; a past-master of Induction and Inference. From the steaming brain-pan of his stewing wits there has been poured out recently a malodorous broth that is now on exhibit in the galipot of the critical ecclesiologist.

The stirring of that unsavory rheum is neither alluring nor appetizing, but somebody ought to do it in order to find out whether or not there is "death in the pot."

It is presumed, to begin with, that an injection of this succulent serum will cause the scales to fall from our eyes, and, with a new-found vision, we shall be able to behold—

The Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism

Nunc est bibendum.

"For the intelligent layman the problems raised by biblical criticism become most acute when they concern the Gospels and the life of Christ."

The "intelligent layman" will no more question the "acuteness" of his "problems," if he swallows, without regurgitation, the dose prepared by the "biblical critic" whose cerebral effusion is now under observation. Immediately after deglutition he will have to face the "problem" of—

The Early Influences Under Which Jesus Lived

"In the light of modern criticism"—the fulvid flame that leaps from the pit—"what is reasonably certain regarding the general course of Jesus' life?"

Reasonably certain! That is the question. By all means let the gas be turned on that we may see the "acuteness" of this "problem"!

"The historian does not ask, 'How *might* Jesus have been born?' nor, 'How *must* He have been born?' but simply—'Under what circumstances *was* he born?' "

Mirabile dictu!

But wait, Professor Duplex, out of the wealth of his erudition, is about to answer the historian's question.

"Our sources of information do not enable us to answer explicitly. It is not clear just when he was born, nor where, nor under what circumstances. It is certain that this significant event in the history of mankind occurred near the end of the reign of Herod the Great, somewhere in what we now call Palestine. If you should press me for my opinion regarding further details, I would say that he was probably the son of Joseph and Mary and that he was born in Nazareth of Galilee."

That is the distillation of no clodpoll! Our Professor is no tomnoddy. He is not Davus, but Oedipus: not a simple servant, but a solver of sphinx's puzzles. What a heaven-born genius he has for sifting the wheat from the chaff in the Gospel narratives! Only a crone or a doodle could fail to be satisfied with such "achieved results."

Jesus was "probably" the son of Joseph and

Mary, and "probably" He was born "in Nazareth of Galilee"! "Achieved results"! Angels and ministers of grace defend us! For surety we have undetermined "probability"—a chance, a likelihood, a presumption, a nothing. Thin air! It is most distressing; it is really perplexing; it is, in fact, an "acute problem."

"Concerning the days of his youth and young manhood, we have no clear information."

Seen through a mist, dim, nebulous, obscure. We clutch at the shadows as they fall and fade.

"His visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve (Luke 2 : 39-52) may not be historical, but it is certainly in keeping with any inferences that may fairly be drawn from his later development."

"May not be historical"! But that is of no consequence. Professor Inference knows the way. We are as dull as a beetle not to have discovered this for ourselves. The record "may not be historical," but the inference "drawn from his later development"—all knowledge of which is derived from the self-same record—is as sound and as sweet as a nut. So the lame dog is helped over the stile.

"Whatever else we may or may not believe regarding his conception of himself, we are constrained to hold that he considered his life and teaching the consummation of Old Testament prophecy, and that he builded consciously on the basis of truth the prophets had already laid down."

“Constrained to hold”! We were getting the impression that nothing could hold him. But “constrained to hold”—what? The “life and teaching”—no reference to death, resurrection, ascension—of Jesus to be “the consummation of Old Testament prophecy.” This is what Jesus considered in His conception of Himself! How does the Professor *know* that Jesus so considered His life and teaching? We may be slow of thought here, but when we have a sure thing we want to be sure that we have it.

“Regarding his early environment, we know that he had four brothers and at least two sisters, and it is probable”—this note of uncertainty is discouraging—“that he learned the trade of his father, who was a master-builder in Nazareth.”

“It is quite likely [fine!] that our mental picture, [fine again!] should include visits to Jerusalem and to the larger towns of Galilee, where Greco-Roman culture had considerable standing. The Jewish scribes undoubtedly [good!] influenced him positively as well as negatively [best yet!] for, while he rejected the rabbinical system absolutely, there were broad-minded exponents of rabbinism, like Rabbi Hillel, whose loftier teaching was not unlike that of Jesus himself.”

“It is only fair to assume that these hereditary and environmental forces imparted form as well as content to Jesus’ expanding thought, but they do not explain his exalted personality.”

Nor does the Professor explain that exalted personality. It is the profound enigma of the human Christ dis-crowned of deity. Knowing so little the Professor should tell us by what intellectual process he comes to the knowledge of what he does know. How does he *know* that Jesus "had four brothers and at least two sisters"? And how does he *not* know that Jesus was born in Bethlehem? Why is the record so authoritative in the one case, and so untrustworthy in the other? In what crucible does the Professor separate the dross from the gold? "Achieved results" are, in all conscience, to be desired, but we want something other and above an "Assistant Professor's" *ipse dixit*.

The Call to the Messianic Life

Here the Professor speaks *ex cathedra*. But before his pronouncement let us hear Matthew and John.

Matthew says: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

John says: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a wit-

ness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for He was before me. And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias."

The Professor says: "That John the Baptist preceded Jesus, baptized him, and in more essential ways prepared the way for him, is certain. That he sustained such a conscious relation to Jesus as the Gospels of Matthew and John record is improbable."

"He [John] inaugurated the rite of baptism

which, with him, differed from all previously known religious lustrations and furnished the basis for later Christian practice. Finally, he baptized Jesus himself."

"The nature of the baptismal accounts and the testimony of the later parts of the Synoptic Gospels warrant our holding that, at his baptism, Jesus had an unusual inner experience which determined his whole after-life."

"The previous development in Jesus' inner life would lead him to sympathize with John's movement and, with others, to join it through the rite of baptism. This notable event seems to have brought his developing experiences to a focus and to have given him divine assurance of the rightness and reality of his own relation to God and to man. It convinced him that in the propagation of his own life lay the hope of men, and naturally, being a Jew of his own time, he associated this experience and work with the messianic idea and began to think of himself, probably, as Messiah."

"Jesus did not relate these experiences till later in his life, and then only to his closest friends. The externalized features of the baptismal accounts in Matthew and in Luke, therefore, must be considered unhistorical."

"The parabolic accounts [of the temptation] given us by Matthew and Luke really revolve about the one thought of compromise."

“Back of the accounts lies no external struggle, nor yet a mere phantom of early interpretation. It was a real but inward event which Jesus probably related to his disciples at a later time in parabolic terms.”

The Professor seems hard put to it in his arduous endeavor to squeeze good juice out of what he considers a very bad lemon. “Improbable” and “unhistorical” are the “gold dust twins” that do the work for him when he wants to expunge from the record all undesirable evidence. Give us, by all means, an expurgated edition of the Gospels! Blow the mist away that we may see what there is to be seen! Then the “temptation” of Jesus will find its true perspective in “the parabolic accounts given us by Matthew and Luke.” What a refreshing *harlequinade*! There was “no external struggle”; nor was it “a mere phantom of early interpretation”—whatever that may mean: no, it was “a real but inward event which Jesus probably related to his disciples at a later time in parabolic terms.”

“Back of the accounts lies no external struggle”! You have only to keep your eye on the drop-scene, and let your imagination inform you about what is taking place behind the curtain. That is “modern criticism.” “A real but inward event”! “Externalized” in “parabolic terms” in order to bring it within the range of the disciples’ apprehension! Jesus—a master of harle-

quin in pantomimes; and the Gospel record—a lie!

The Chronology of the Ministry

“The scene and length of Jesus’ activity cannot be accurately determined. The unreliability of the Fourth Gospel and the meagerness of the Synoptics leave the matter in the twilight. Whether his ministry lasted one year or three, we cannot say.”

“Unreliability”—“meagerness”—“twilight”! Peering about among unnumbered “probabilities” we “see through a glass darkly” and are thus enabled to cross the *pons asinorum*. Arriving on the other side we are obliged to crawl on all fours in order to find anything worth while. If the Gospels are “unreliable” and “meager” in their statement of fact, they are equally “unreliable” and “meager” as a ground for “inference.” Assumption, conjecture, guesswork, postulation, speculation: these are the assets that enable the Professor to strike a balance and continue in business. With such resources intellectual solvency is a dead certainty. Figure of speech, flight of fancy, flowers of rhetoric, well-rounded periods, extravagant language, flourish and fustian, *ore rotundo!* all this, and more of like stuff, will enable the Professor to hold down his seat, when the sole sources of information are

found to be "unreliable," "unhistorical," and "meager."

The Early Preaching

"We are told that he began in Galilee to preach the 'gospel of the kingdom.' What that 'good news' was we shall not discuss here."

To "discuss" the "good news" would be irrelevant and immaterial. Moreover, in view of the "unreliability" of the Fourth Gospel and the "meagerness" of the Synoptics, who can really tell whether or not there is any "good news" to discuss? We regret that the light goes under a bushel when there is such sore need of an open and steady flame. But the Professor is sifting the evidence, he is making a critical and minute examination, he has undertaken a systematic search for the truth, he is resolving the Gospels into their original and constituent elements, he is making an exhaustive inquiry that embraces all sources; meanwhile, the good news may await later consideration. Aye, and sinners are dying, awaiting the result of that inquisition. While the Professor is ferreting out and feeling the pulse of the witnesses, somebody else ought to occupy his chair and draw his pay.

"Besides preaching, Jesus certainly performed acts of healing, chiefly on those who thought themselves possessed by demons."

It is fortunate for the Professor that the demoniacs of Gadara are dead. They never would have stood for that statement. They were not really possessed with demons; they only *thought* they were! Some sort of psychological excitement! Shades of night! What a cruel imposition to have been thimble-rigged like that! What would they not have done to this Gamaliel of the Jersey sand, had he gone to them with a tale like that! They "thought themselves possessed"! "Achieved results"! Subject the life of Jesus to the "critical test" and follow the road of the "historical method" to a "trained and informed commonsense." Draw the curtain. It is enough.

Early Difficulties

"These difficulties soon came, for Jesus' plain speaking quickly aroused the opposition of the rabbis and brought about the great conflict which culminated at the cross."

"Thoughts like that of Mark x : 45 must have been in his mind increasingly: 'For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.' How far Jesus went toward a solution of this dark problem we do not know and he leaves us free to form our own theories of it."

What dark problem? His giving His life a

ransom for many? And of this are we free to form our own theory? What conjecture, in the exercise of his freedom, does the Professor hazard? Listen!

“The Gospels support the conclusion to which our natural inferences would lead. He at least submitted to his fate, believing it to be the will of God and believing, also, that his death would, in some way, advance the interests of the kingdom.”

Into such a shadowy void the Professor’s “natural inferences” lead him. But on this subject he has more to say:

“For a time he kept all these thoughts to himself. The disciples were not prepared to understand or to endure them. Weeks of close intercourse, however, in these days of comparative retirement, must have enlightened their minds and strengthened their wills. At any rate, at the end of his sojourn in the northern districts, Jesus seems to have broken to them his dire forebodings. In Mark, these teachings do not appear until the time of Peter’s confession, and the psychological situation makes this view of the matter so fitting that we may conclude that any contrary representation found in the other gospels is due to unhistorical transposition or to later reflection.”

Chaos is come again! The Gospels are a “fortuitous concourse of atoms” and the scattered

members that cannot be articulated with "natural inferences" must be thrown to the scrap-heap. "Later reflection" is responsible for the vexatious material that has been brought in to augment and garnish the original record. A knot worthy to be unloosed! This Professor, who knows so many things that are *not* so, and so few things that *are* so, ought to be given time and opportunity to look for another job. In his pursuit of "natural inferences" he has gone too far afield ever to get back again in time for further usefulness in the chair of "Biblical Instruction."

The Change at Caesarea Philippi

"Peter's confession came as a result of the close association with Jesus during the days of retirement in the north, and it was evidently of great significance both to Jesus and to his disciples."

Another "inference"! Peter's confession, according to the record, was the effect of a direct revelation from God,—“And Jesus answered and said unto Him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.” This saying of Jesus, being counter to the Assistant Professor's assumption, may have found its way into the Gospel narrative through "later reflection." Bah!

Jesus' Expectation of Death and Resurrection

"Immediately after Peter's confession Jesus began to emphasize the suffering and death to come."

In proof thereof, Mark viii : 31-37; Mark ix : 9-10; Mark ix : 31-32; Mark x : 33-34; and Mark x : 45, are cited.

"We must bear in mind," continues the Professor, "in using these passages, the probability of their reflecting in part the views of a later time when the death and resurrection of Jesus had acquired paramount importance and a more definite significance."

"Similarly, with regard to the specific sayings referring to his resurrection, it may be that these verses merely record what, in the light of their experiences, later disciples thought he must have said."

"We may not know just what he thought or said. Probably we do not know."

Unexplored ground! Unknown quantities! Virgin soil! "We may not know"! "Probably we do not know"! Why drop the bucket into an empty well! What's the use! We might as well beat water with a stick or bay at the moon. This sowing the sand, speaking to the winds, striving after impossibilities, are all as useless and vain as whistling jigs to a milestone. We might as well be employed in sweeping the moon-beams from the campus.

Commenting on John xiv : 16-20 the Professor says:

“These words cannot be taken as coming from Jesus himself, for they are thoroughly characteristic of the phraseology and point of view of the author of the Fourth Gospel.”

So goes on the process of reduction to nothing. Erase, expunge, exterminate, nip, nullify, mow down, abridge, depreciate, destroy. The star of inspiration is on the wane! But listen to this!

“If the transfiguration story is not entirely a myth, back of the evident legendary embellishments there may lie a real experience of an exalted nature—an experience which Jesus shared with his closest friends, growing out of the kind of conversation that was now uppermost with them.”

How much longer shall executive authority license and allow such a Decoy-duck to lure our boys into the muculent ooze of a free-thinking, Bible-dishonoring, Anti-Christian rationalism?

“If the transfiguration story is not entirely a myth”! If not—then “back of the evident legendary embellishments”! Look at the cold type! Did you send your boy to college with the understanding that he was to be inoculated with such virus? Were chairs of Biblical Instruction endowed with Christian money to support such perversion? Is there to be found for these boys no escape from such spiritual

assassination? So long as a tolerant clergy are content to seal up their eyes and sleep like a dormouse, regardless, indifferent, and unconcerned, there will be forthcoming no remedial decrees to silence and suppress such pernicious and detestable teaching. It passes the subtlest power of the imagination to understand how it happens that a man that has lost his faith in the Bible is ordinarily the man that is chosen as best qualified to fill the chair of Biblical Instruction. Let the Tartufes that, with gum shoes and dark lanterns, have crept into our institutions of learning, there to be vested in cap and gown to make culls and gulls of our boys, be stripped of their masks and shipped to limbo where they belong. Is there no vitriolic vocabulary caustic enough to make the satire sufficiently pungent? No voice to awaken the conscience and arouse a Christian sentiment that shall express itself in peremptory challenge of such teaching? So long as there is no positive and emphatic protest these "learned" sappers and miners will continue their underground work of wrecking the faith. The "Assistant Professor," under the spell of his exhilarating hallucination, seems to believe that he possesses a mental dynamite that will blow out the foundations.

The Last Journey to Jerusalem

“Mark assigns to this period a considerable amount of undoubtedly genuine teaching.”

This is a concession hardly to be expected,—but the gold is soon dimmed!

“Out of the many events and voluminous teaching of these last days many of our most precious gospels traditions have come. To be sure, accretions have crept into the teaching and incidents have been added without warrant.”

No sooner does one fog lift than another one descends. But we totter on after our guide.

“A simple parting-meal has been started on its course of transformation into a miraculous mystery, and in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is represented discoursing in the terms of Alexandrian philosophy. In general, however, the tradition is sound and we get a more detailed picture of Jesus here than at any other point in his life.”

“A simple parting-meal,” transforming “into a miraculous mystery”; Jesus “represented” as “discoursing in terms of Alexandrian philosophy”; and “the tradition” bringing this to us—“sound”!

From what a blinding illusion we have been delivered! The Lord's Supper, reverentially observed throughout the years, is stripped of its real significance and is become but the vague and uncertain memorial of a “parting-meal.” The

solemn valedictory, recorded in the Gospel of John, was never uttered by Jesus; He is only "represented" as so speaking; the words themselves are but the expression of the musing of some mystic in the Alexandrian school of philosophy. The flickering "light of modern criticism" is leading us further and further into the gloom of the cave of despair.

"There is no reason to doubt the story of the 'anointing at Bethany,' nor the main fact of the 'triumphal entry.' After his Galilean and Perean triumphs, he would naturally be the center of attention at the great feast and would arouse enthusiasm among the many representatives from these provinces. The latter story had doubtless been embellished, however, to make it fit into Old Testament prophecy. Similarly, the story of the 'cursing of the fig tree' is probably an example of the development of a parable into a miracle."

The record of the triumphal entry—"embellished"! "To make it fit into the Old Testament prophecy"! And worse still, if it is possible, parables develop into miracles and parade in borrowed plumes. Thus again the Gospel narrative is branded as a fiction or a forgery; it is, in the estimation of this critic, but a taradiddle, garnished by him with a Judas kiss. Is there no rebuke for this wearying suggestion of falsehood: no way to rusticate this rashling that

has openly dared to cast this infamous slur upon God's Word? In the desperate competition for distinction among the critics let this one advance to the front. "None but himself could be his parallel."

The Last Week in Jerusalem

"According to the Gospel of John, Jesus began his work with the so-called 'cleansing of the temple,' and we therefore usually assume that there were two occasions on which Jesus performed this act. Undoubtedly the Synoptics are right in placing this striking event at the end of Jesus' life, and the author of John has transferred it to the beginning for some reason of his own and in disregard of the historical facts."

The Synoptics are right and John is wrong! None other than a second Daniel could so easily detect and so delicately adjust all difficulties. By all means, give us an expurgated edition of the Bible, with all "forgeries," "fabrications," "embellishments," and "reflections" eliminated, and we shall have left, perhaps, some jot or tittle that, through some delicately adjusted teinoscope, may, possibly, escape the vanishing point. The Professor, with his omniscient and all-comprehending view of divine revelation, should clear the gospel road of its rubbish, set up legible, explicit, intelligible signs, that those,

upon whose track are the avengers of blood, may make unhindered their flight to the City of Refuge, if, indeed, in "the light of modern criticism," a City of Refuge is any longer of necessity.

"How much of the reported discourses, about the coming of the kingdom (Matt. chap. xxiv; Mark, chap. xiii; Luke, chap. xxi), comes from Jesus, and how much from early Christian tradition, is impossible to say."

But, Professor, Why impossible to say? Your wonderful acumen, your fine and penetrating perception, your extraordinary faculty for original creation, your ready and accurate discernment and judgment, your intellectual acuteness, sagacity and insight, your intuitive appreciation of what is right, proper and fit, your remarkable fineness and rare delicacy of thought, your most adequate mental power to receive and to understand, your heaven-born genius, in short, your *nous*, should make it impossible for you to say, "It is impossible to say." Tell us frankly how to escape from the flexuous and sinuous path over which you have been leading us, and to the end of which we are limping along. Tell us about the death of Jesus. What was its significance?

"Jesus' death has been theologized out of all true perspective. The unalterable fact that it was the climax of his life of love and service has thereby been attested, but often in unmeaning, if not actually illogical and anti-ethical terms."

The answer is vague. It is, in fact, an evasion. The Professor further tells us:

“We do not have to be trained theologians to understand either the necessity of the cross or its main significance.”

True enough. But we should like to know just what, in the Professor's judgment, is its main significance? Is it merely the attestation of “His life of love and service?” This and nothing more? Or, did He die, that, by virtue of His precious blood, lost and guilty sinners might be redeemed to God? Inference, speculation, induction: these cannot determine values here. We must know, in the collapse and beggary of all other hope, if for sinners there has been accomplished redemption through the vicarious suffering and death of the Lamb of God. By His blood are we justified? Shall we be saved from wrath through Him? These questions, Professor, you leave unanswered. Your “critical theory” leads to “the beautiful Isle of Nowhere.”

The Resurrection

“We must now endeavor to present the probable facts underlying the resurrection stories, and estimate their significance. The signs and portents, the empty grave, the definite period of three days, the physical appearances, the forty-

day period and the ascension—all these may best be put one side.”

The field here is indeed swept bare that we may range at will in the dreamy realm of speculative imagination. There were no signs, no portents, no empty grave, no definite period of three days, no physical appearances, no forty-day period, no ascension. What, then, is there left to us? *Faute de mieux*—An alternative!

“We have to choose between an objectively real, but non-physical, manifestation of the spirit of Jesus, and some kind of vision theory.”

Beyond all dispute, and no mistake, we are here facing a distinctly disagreeable dilemma. “The manifestation of the spirit of Jesus, objectively real, but non-physical”—an apparition, a supposed visible spirit, a specter, a ghost!—or, “some kind of vision theory!” This offer of two theories, one of which may be chosen, is by no means alluring.

“The first”—so continues the Professor—“is easy to understand, granted the main fact, because it requires little psychological preparation on the part of the disciples. On the other hand, it is a bit harder to accept than the second because we make so much of the psychological in these days. However, through the activities of the Society of Psychical Research, we have latterly become much more accustomed to the thought of the possibility of this sort of event.

In fact, there is no insuperable difficulty in the way of the modern man who inclines to the acceptance of this first explanation. On the contrary, certain tendencies in modern psychology and philosophy pave the way to such a belief."

They "pave the way" to something warmer and more tangible than a mere "belief": like good intentions, they pave the way to hell. Nor do we have either relish or gusto for the *delicatessen* served up by the "Society" through whose "activities" this particular choice is made easy of apprehension. In "Psychical Research" the "modern man" is certainly a wonder. He professes power of communication with departed spirits, but the distillation of all the wisdom that he has thus far been able to extract from shades and phantoms would not produce enough moisture to wet the inside of an eviscerated shrimp.

We cannot see our way clear to choose this "objectively real, but non-physical, manifestation of the spirit of Jesus"; it is an unqualified renunciation and a definite denial of the Gospel record, and it is thereby convicted of error.

"The second theory would necessitate an explanation something like this: Jesus' impartation of spiritual life to his followers, especially to the receptive and impressionable Peter, was too great to be wiped out even by so paralyzing and unintelligible a calamity as his death. Certain words of Jesus, conveying hope at a time when all

seemed dark, would linger in the mind. It may also be that these words expressed a belief in a speedy return and establishment of the kingdom. After the first despair, due to Jesus' departure, the new life they possessed from him was brought to a focus by their return to Galilee, and possibly, also, by definite forecasts of their Master. It then produced in these men, of an age, race, and clime predisposing them to such things, and first of all in Peter, whose individual temperament was most favorable to such impressions, a series of 'visions.' These were inner, spiritual experiences, easily propagated from individual to individual, and from individuals to groups. Thus they spread, probably from Peter first, as the records all suggest, and in every case colored, most naturally, by the content of Jesus' personality by which their lives were dominated."

Little comment is here necessary. This self-styled sage never so fully manifests the folly of his wisdom as when he attempts by constructive thinking to bring together and put up a new temple of truth in the place of the glorious structure that he has so laboriously attempted to pull down.

We reject the second choice, as we did the first, and for the same reason; it is an unqualified renunciation and a definite denial of the Gospel record, and it is thereby convicted of error.

But our preoption is challenged. The Professor says:

“For the modern man, as it seems to me, the choice lies solely between these two views. In either case, the resurrection accounts prove the actual existence of a spiritual life and power which enabled men to brave danger and death in an unpopular cause, for an unpopular person; a spiritual life and power which, on sure historical grounds, we can connect with the life of Jesus of Nazareth; a spiritual life and power which, through these men, has come down through the centuries in ever-increasing fulness, purity, and beneficence. These facts must be interpreted in accordance with the thought-atmosphere of our age, but they must be interpreted, and no interpretation is true to fact which does not recognize the spiritual supremacy of Jesus of Nazareth in the life of the world.”

But we still decline to accept the Professor's alternative. We protest against his reassertion of the worn-out mythical theory, with its admixture of pyrrhonism and rationalism; and, over against his daring presumption, we place these words:

“Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have

testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.”

This is the resurrection of Christ in the light of ancient revelation: the other is the resurrection of Christ in the light of modern criticism. Between these two views lies the choice. Instead of the froth and the foam, the spray and the spume, the barm and the bubble that effervesce from the class-room of this Princeton Professor, we choose the living water that, clear as crystal, flows from the throne of God.

If it is a question between entity and non-entity, a being and a blank, a reality and a nullity, a subsistence and a non-subsistence, a fact and a fancy, a truth and a lie; we shall stake our all on the Word of God, and shall choose the truth, and shall repudiate the lie. To choose the other would bind us to the conclusion to which the Professor has come:

“Instead of a supposedly objective physical fact, supporting a structure full of mysterious dogmas, we get an objective, or at least equally real, spiritual fact—a mass of such facts, indeed—which goes to support the reality and supremacy

of the spiritual life of Jesus. Through him we may rise to belief in a God, of like-minded love and righteousness, whose hands direct the destinies of the whole universe of men and things."

So the curtain falls! Behind the screen the "Professor of Biblical Instruction" is perhaps creating another harlequin to present before the foot-lights. Has Princeton come to this? How are the mighty fallen!

Beyond all peradventure the Bible will survive the "critical test," but how long, by gift and by legacy, are Christian men and women to continue their support of Institutions that leave unexpurgated from their escutcheon the blot of such detestable and sweeping heresies?

What remedy is there for such bane? One way to shrink their sinews is to withhold and to withdraw all financial help, and by gift and legacy to strengthen the institutions that remain faithful to God's Word.

Let Balak, with his house full of silver and gold, support the Balaams that are willing and eager to respond to his call. Under such circumstance we may trust Jehovah to force from the lips of the unwilling prophet a blessing instead of a curse.

But when Princeton University or any other Educational Institution, founded on the principles of Christianity, tolerates without rebuke, and permits without protest the Word of God to be discredited, to be dishonored, and to be branded

with the bar sinister; then the glory of that Institution is departed; it has fully forfeited its claim upon the sympathy and upon the support of Christian men and women.

It has been an uncongenial task to pass under review the teaching of a particular Professor unknown to the writer except in the light that has been brought to a focus in *The Biblical World*; and, at the same time, seemingly to subject to criticism the Trustees of a great University, who are leaders in the scientific, scholastic, commercial and theological world. To direct criticism exclusively against them would be manifestly unfair; for we are painfully aware that the teaching under reprobation is not confined to any particular University, but is becoming alarmingly common and offensively loud-voiced in many of our Institutions of Learning.

To suffer in silence may leave undisturbed the palladium of peace, but peace must not be preserved at so great cost. It is indeed painful to reflect upon the dire consequences that must inevitably follow such misteaching, and we plead for a protest emphatic and authoritative enough to silence and suppress a propaganda that is leading our youth into the blinding mist and unspeakable sorrow of a lost faith.

NOTE.

Prior to the publication of this pamphlet there was sent to each of the thirty-one Trustees of Princeton University a note as follows :

MY DEAR SIR:

Enclosed please find an article from the February issue of *The Biblical World*. May I venture to ask if the views presented in this article have the endorsement of the Trustees of Princeton University?

An early reply would be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FORD C. OTTMAN.

From the responses received it is gratifying to be able to say that Mr. Miller's teaching is as obnoxious to many—possibly an overwhelming majority—of the Trustees, as it is to a great host of believers in the integrity and the authority of the Bible.

There remains, however, the pertinent question—How much longer are we to suffer in silence such intolerable misteaching in our Institutions of Learning?

WORKS ON THE BIBLE

BY A. C. GAEBELEIN

- The Annotated Bible.** Volume I, the Pentateuch. This work will be complete in 10 vols., covering the entire Bible..... \$1.50
- The Prophet Daniel.** Acknowledged throughout the English speaking world as one of the best expositions of Daniel..... 50c.
- The Prophet Joel.** One of the few satisfactory commentaries on this interesting Book..... 75c.
- Exposition of Matthew.** Two vols. in one. Over 600 pages. Sixth edition..... \$1.50
- The Acts of the Apostles.** This exposition has been welcomed by all leading Bible-teachers \$1.50
- The Lord of Glory.** Meditations on the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ. In artistic binding..... \$1.00
- The Masterpiece of God.** A strong yet simple exposition of the first three chapters of Ephesians..... 50c.
- The Work of Christ.** Past, present and future.. 50c.
- The Jewish Question.** All about the Future of the Jews. Highly endorsed and has been helpful to thousands..... 75c.
- Studies on Zechariah.** A good key to that Book 50c.
- The Harmony of the Prophetic Word.** This volume has been pronounced the best key to the entire Word of Prophecy as found in both Testaments. Fourth edition..... \$1.00

We pay postage to any part of the world. If you order these eleven volumes together we give you a reduction of 30%.

Have you "OUR HOPE"? Edited by A. C. Gaebelin. Send for a free sample. Address all orders to

PUBLICATION OFFICE "OUR HOPE"

456 Fourth Ave., New York City

From:

Victoria B.O.