

Digital Collections

What have Baptist colleges to do with fundamentalism and modernism?

Item Type	Text
Authors	Vann, Richard Tillman
Download date	2026-05-19 10:25:20
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/10392/7604

What Have Baptist Colleges to do With Fundamentalism and Modernism ?

(Address of Dr. R. T. Vann before the Southern Baptist Educational Conference, Memphis, Tenn., February 4, 1925. Published by the unanimous request of the Conference.)

When the two knights in the fable wrangled and fought over the color of a shield, they doubtless strove zealously for the truth as each saw it. Each saw part of the truth; neither saw it all, but strove as if he did. The combat, therefore, was the result of a combination of zeal and ignorance; an unhappy combination, at best, and generally dangerous. And in this particular instance, it may be noted that neither zeal nor ignorance repaired the damage of the fight, nor changed the colors of the shield. "Which things are an allegory."

It has come to pass in the last days that two armies of real, living knights have entered the field against one another. Boundless zeal they have, and also knowledge, but only in part. The combat has waxed hot, and our colleges have become the center of the battle ground. So that these institutions, which would fain have stood apart, have been forced to consider what should be their attitude towards the contestants and the issues involved, and I am asked to offer some suggestion for the settlement of that question.

AUTHOR'S NOTE.—A careful reading of this paper will show that the writer was not trying to present a scholarly discussion of issues, but only a popular appeal to the moderates of both sides in the pending controversy, in the hope of bringing about larger tolerance and a working harmony. He wrote as one who has accepted no theory of evolution, nor lined up with the extremists of either side; who holds firmly every fundamental doctrine of the evangelical faith, but is open to every new truth that may be discovered.

In considering the matter, it would seem desirable to get a clear understanding of the issues, and with that view, I wrote to a number of the principal disputants on either side for a definition of a typical Fundamentalist and a typical Modernist, respectively, and beg leave to submit their answers as fully as space permits.

For the Fundamentalists, since Dr. Frank M. Goodchild, of New York, seems to be the accredited speaker of the "Executive Committee of the General Committee of Fundamentalists of the Northern Baptist Conference," which apparently includes the leading adherents of that side, perhaps I could not do better than submit a brief of his statement, in a sort of catechism which he has prepared and published on Fundamentalism: Fundamentalists claim to hold the doctrines held and preached by Paul, and presumably interpreted in such deliverances as the New Hampshire and Philadelphia confessions. They insist on the supernatural element in creation, in the writing of the Scriptures, and in the birth, life, miracles and resurrection of Jesus. They believe in a vicarious atonement, in the regeneration of the soul through the agency of the Holy Spirit, in a real, final judgment of mankind, and in the everlasting existence of the soul after death, either in heaven or in perdition. Some of them also seem to insist on verbal inspiration and a pretty rigid literal interpretation of the Scriptures, especially in the first two chapters of Genesis. Nor do they rely much on the discoveries of modern science in their interpretation.

In interpreting the view of their opponents, they maintain that these deny all supernatural agencies, whether in creation or in the birth and works of Jesus, or in His resurrection, or in the giving of the Scriptures, or elsewhere. They hold that the basic principle of the typical Modernist *excludes* God both in creation and redemption, and in what is known as regeneration. While claiming to favor all social service themselves, they charge their opponents with substituting this for the regeneration of individual souls, as required by Jesus.

Moreover, they appear to feel that the root of all Modernism is the theory of evolution, which the Modernists are said to accept as the most effective weapon wherewith to destroy all belief in the supernatural.

With the above general statement, Drs. Sanford Brown and T. T. Martin, of the South, seem to agree, as does Dr. J. C. Masee, of Boston. And the latter adds, "The underlying philosophy of all Modernism is evolution; not simply as a modal theory of creation, but as a religious creed, involving an impersonal Creator and ultimately a non-moral universe." "Hence," he adds, "every real Modernist is an Evolutionist. We have found up here that our schools are the crux of the whole situation, and that preachers attending certain institutions are inoculated with the virus of Modernism, and will ultimately destroy the whole Baptist and Evangelistic fabric."

Finding no general statement issued by Modernists, I must submit some from individuals of that persuasion. Practically all of these express serious difficulty in trying to define the two types in question, because of the several shades and degrees covered by them. Shaler Matthews says, "A Modernist is one who is undertaking to adapt evangelistic religion to the needs of modern times by the use of modern scientific conceptions and methods. A Fundamentalist is an evangelist who is endeavoring to reaffirm the forms and beliefs of the past church life. In my opinion, so far as each is honestly sincere, they are at one in loyalty to Jesus Christ as the revelation of a saving God in human flesh. The chief difference lies in their interpretation of the Scriptures. The Modernist insists on what he regards as a proper historical evaluation of the scriptural material, based upon a critical study of the sources. The Fundamentalist is demanding that the Bible be taken at its face value, and regarding whatever belief or habit or thought there is contained in the Bible as having the presumption of literal accuracy."

Harry Emerson Fosdick says, "The distinctions between a Fundamentalist and a Modernist are real and

serious. A Fundamentalist is one who thinks Christianity is indissolubly associated with certain historical formulations of doctrines or in the creeds. A Modernist is one who thinks that Christianity primarily consists of a man's experience with himself, his fellows and his God, mediated through Christ. A Fundamentalist is one who thinks that the living waters never can be poured from the mental receptacles in which it was first put. A Modernist is one who thinks that the living water can be poured into modern receptacles without spilling a drop of it."

E. G. Conklin, Chair of Biology, Princeton, writes: "I have the impression that one of the most characteristic features of their [the Fundamentalists'] faith is that the Scriptures are literally and verbally inspired and that they are to be interpreted in the main literally and not symbolically.

"On the other hand, I understand a Modernist to be one who accepts the teachings of modern science and, at least to a certain extent, modern Biblical criticism, though the extent to which he would go in accepting either, or both, of these would vary greatly in different cases.

"Where the teachings of science come into conflict with the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, I assume that the Fundamentalist would reject science and follow the Scriptures, whereas, the Modernist would accept the teachings of science and interpret the Scriptures in some other than in a purely literal manner."

President Faunce, of Brown: "I would say that Fundamentalists and Modernists are the modern successors of the Old Testament Priests and Prophets. The Priest was the stickler for the letter of the law, the exact performance of ritual, the payment of tithes, the legalistic conception of religion. The Prophet, on the other hand, believed in the present revelation of the Spirit, dared to say the only essential commandment was 'Thou shalt love,' and in a later age dared to say: 'If you keep that ceremonial law, though given on Sinai, Christ shall profit you nothing.'

"No priest of Israel permanently affected the world, but Israel's Prophets are still among the moral leaders of humanity."

I have also thought it well to obtain definitions of these terms from some of our Southern Baptist educators, as men who, because of their positions, are vitally concerned in this discussion.

President McGlothlin writes: "I should say a Fundamentalist is a man who bases his religious convictions upon the Scriptures, while a Modernist is a man who is inclined to base his religious convictions upon a broader foundation, consisting of the Scriptures, science, philosophy, experience, etc. The former takes his interpretations of the Scriptures as final and authoritative in all religious matters. The latter reserves the right to depart from the Scriptures if, on thorough study of any question involved, he reaches conclusions different from scriptural teaching. Of course, there are all sorts and shades of differences on both sides of the question, but the above seems to me to be the fundamental difference, rather crudely expressed."

President Poteat says: "A 'Fundamentalist' is a new species; a 'fundamentalist' is an old species, from which the new is a recent sprout. To this old species we all belong. We insist upon essential, necessary truth. A Fundamentalist is one who insists on the dictation theory of Scriptures and its literal interpretation as belonging to the body of essential, necessary truth. As it is now used, the term [Modernism] is most flexible, stretching to embrace at one extreme the materialist and agnostic, and at the other to the man who accepts the inspiration of Scripture, the miraculous in religion and Divine agency in creation. . . . Rejection of the established findings of Biblical criticism, opposition to current science as regards the method of creation, and the modern Judaism of a mechanical, observational premillienism, are other items of the Fundamentalist doctrines."

President Weaver says: "The modern tendency both in science and philosophy lies in the direction of accepting a world view, in which the universe is under

the complete control of inexorable law. Materialistic evolution would eliminate entirely the supernatural. The Modernists are trying to impose the conclusions of science upon the present-day interpretation of Christian faith. The Fundamentalists are trying to defend Calvinistic conception of the Bible."

Desiring an expression from the Theological Seminaries, I wrote Presidents Evans and Mullins. The former calls attention to the old controversy between Pope Pius X and certain scholarly priests in the Catholic Church, like Sabattier and Loisy, of France, and Tyrrell, of England, who "castigated the Catholic Church for its failure to meet the intellectual and moral needs of our times." They insisted that they were true Catholics and wished "to return to the teachings of Jesus and the New Testament." President Evans thinks that in this instance, the Pope was a fair representative of the Fundamentalists, and the protesting priests represented the Modernists. It may be recalled, in fact, that in his famous Encyclical, the Pope called the protesting priests "Modernists."

President Mullins thinks the two classes are too varied in shades, grades, and degrees to lend themselves easily to definition. But adds: "In general, I would say, the Modernist is a man who is devoted to the modern point of view, to the exclusion of an authoritative Scripture, and Divine, supernatural revelation, while a Fundamentalist believes in these things."

In the above statements, there seems to be a pretty general agreement on these points: Fundamentalism represents in general, belief in the supernatural, in verbal inspiration, and literal interpretation, and in rejection of the assumed discoveries of science which seem to conflict with the Scriptures thus interpreted. Modernism, on the other hand, represents belief in a personal God, in the inspiration and supreme authority of the Scriptures rationally interpreted, in Jesus as the Son of God in a peculiar sense, and in the saving efficacy of His atonement. This generalization is not supposed to include the extremist on either side.

Now, with these two schools of thought before them, each clamoring for recognition and endorsement, what are the colleges to do? Both parties belong to our denomination, as do the college, and both, therefore, have somewhat to do with the colleges.

The question presented raises another: "What is the paramount object of a Christian College? What purpose inspired its creation? To fit young men and women for successful careers? Perhaps, in a measure; but the State is doing this admirably. To develop the highest type of men and women? The State is also doing this, to the limit of its functions. To promote the interests of the denomination founding it? Undoubtedly, in part. But let us all here admit and remember that even this is not the supreme purpose of a Christian College. Nor is its own advancement the chief end of any Christian denomination. Both the college and its fostering denomination have for their highest aim the promotion of the Kingdom of God on earth. No lower motive would give either a right to exist. The colleges, indeed, are agents of the denomination for the promotion of this high aim, and, as such, should seek the best means for realizing it. But in the nature of the case, a college must lead as well as serve. It sustains to its denomination somewhat the double relation of a pastor to his church. Servants though both are, they cannot serve their best without leading.

As such leaders, with two warring elements seeking to bring the denomination each to its own point of view, and that denomination looking to them for guidance, the situation is embarrassing for them. For, as President Weaver suggests, "the fighting between the Fundamentalist and the Modernist ceases as soon as either the one or the other discovers the presence of the educator, and each turns savagely on him. Whereas, if he were let alone, he would continue to emphasize the truths of the Christian faith and the incontrovertible facts of science." But, since the educators are not let alone, what position shall they take? Far be it from an humble soldier in the ranks to discuss strategy in the presence of

Hannibal. I only venture a few suggestions, which, although addressed to the college men, are really meant largely for the masses of our people whom they lead, in the hope that they may be persuaded to back their colleges in whatever policy these may adopt. The leaders may listen in, if they wish, while I talk to the people.

To begin with, as between the camps of the Fundamentalists and the Modernists, I think the colleges should enter neither, nor wear the uniform nor march under the banner of either. For it is well understood that each of the two holds some views that most of our people cherish, and all the truth held by either we are anxious to maintain; but by entering the ranks of either, one would incur the suspicion of the other in any position he might take or any deliverance he might make. Moreover, in all their policies, our colleges must have some regard for the great mass of the people, and should stay as close to those people as possible. And beyond question, so far, the mass of Southern Baptists are not lined up with either faction. Instead, they are generally indifferent to the whole discussion. Whether they *should* be, we need not answer here. But the patent fact is they are not; and as far as they can do so, without compromising principles, the colleges should stay with them, and seek to abate, rather than excite either panic or passion for which there seems to be no occasion.

Moreover, while avoiding alliance with either, and respecting the convictions of both parties, may not the colleges inspire in each more respect and tolerance for the other, and thus bring them gradually into a working harmony, in spite of divergence of views? As Shaler Matthews says, "There is a great deal of unworthy denunciation and belligerency in the air. I cannot understand why Christians should not discuss questions of formula in the spirit of Christ. If each party would try to work together to understand the other, and then agree to work together for the cause of Jesus Christ, most of the difficulty would disappear; as in the case of the differences between Paul and Peter, when the church at Jerusalem, having

seen that the faith of God was working with both, watched them give each other the hand of fellowship and divide the great field of the world between them." Let the colleges emphasize the fact that fundamentalism and modernism are not necessarily exclusive of one another and should not be made so by unreasoning extremists. If one might venture to say so, we have two notable examples of a union of the two in the same person. One of these was Saul of Tarsus and the other was Jesus of Nazareth. For it is clear that both of these held firmly to the old faith delivered to them, and equally clear that both gave modern interpretations to that ancient faith, and both suffered the penalty thereof. Southern Baptists would not willingly make common cause with their persecutors. Let the colleges urge the right and the duty of emphasizing the fundamentals of Scripture, illuminated by the researches of science. There may be differences without discord. Of the nearly four million Southern Baptists today, there are nearly four million varieties. And yet, certain vital principles hold them together.

The best means for promoting this most desirable end must be found by careful study of the issues and patient, brotherly counsel. Meanwhile, perhaps a few suggestions may be permissible.

Much of the existing trouble has arisen from mere terminology, indiscriminate generalization, and lack of definitions. The word "Rationalist," for example, has acquired a capital initial and an odious implication. Undoubtedly, some Biblical expositors have exalted reason unduly, and this evil has driven some reverent souls almost to discard reason in interpreting Scripture. But, as a matter of fact, are we not all rationalists to a degree? Are we not bound to bring to the study of the Bible the best common sense that we can command? If not, then, in filling a chair of Biblical Hermeneutics, there would be little choice between John A. Broadus and a Holy Roller.

In unjust generalizations, both parties are guilty, as appears from some of the statements quoted above. A Modernist will tell us what a Fundamentalist is in terms that really apply only to the radicals of that

persuasion, ignoring the fact that in such a definition he has misrepresented many moderates of that class. And so of the Fundamentalist in referring to the Modernist. By such methods, each partisan inflames the prejudice of just-minded men in his own party against good men of the other side, who, if all the facts were known, do not differ widely from them.

Or take the term "Evolution." You have frequently heard it employed in both public and private speech; but have you ever heard it defined? It would be interesting and surprising to know what meaning the word carries to the average hearer. In a series of meetings running through eight weeks, held not long since in my home town, the minister in charge made "Evolution" the burden of his messages; so much so, that a college student who heard three of his sermons said he had heard more about that subject in those three sermons than he had heard during his whole three years of college life. And yet, it transpired that two of the man's hearers thought that he was denouncing *adultery*. And during the session of a Baptist Association held last fall, one church sent up a resolution protesting against "that damnable doctrine of 'revolution' that is destroying the peace of our churches."

In most public discussions on this subject, the impression is left that any man holding any view of anything called "evolution" necessarily excludes God from the universe, denies the miraculous, of course, and is unfit for membership in a Baptist Church. A rare gift is the power of definition, even where you have a right to expect it. Years ago, I had occasion to look into a standard unabridged dictionary for a distinction in the meanings of "violin" and "fiddle," and read: "Violin—a stringed instrument of music. See fiddle. "Fiddle—a stringed instrument of music. See violin." I saw both, and then I saw a piano, which is also a stringed instrument of music—when it is not an instrument of torture.

Another source of trouble is the failure to make distinctions between *illustration* and *evidence*, for example, and between *analogy* or *speculation* and *demon-*

stration. One of our most honored and brilliant editors in the South recently published a book showing some striking analogies between certain natural phenomena and certain Scriptural doctrines; but he called them "demonstrations." I ventured to suggest that in his next edition he employ the term "analogy" wherever the word "demonstration" occurs. In the pending controversy, men do not seem to be so much troubled about the truth or falsity of certain theories as they do over their speculations as to the probable results of admitting those theories to be true. Mistaking their speculation for logical conclusions, they refuse to admit the theories. It would seem that common experience would teach the folly of such reasoning. Given a black cow, for instance, one would conclude *a priori* that all her products would be black; whereas, she actually eats green grass, and then gives white milk with yellow butter.

Still another trouble in the way of argument comes from first selecting one's conclusion, and then finding his premises to match. This, you will note, accounts for many of the doctrines of various denominations. Nobody more than a Christian leader needs to recognize an argument and a just conclusion. Hence, Dr. Weston used to advise his students at Crozer to read "Greenleaf on Evidence" that they might know when a thing was proved.

Some years ago a friend told me that when he was a boy he decided to test the hoary theory about the nine lives of a cat. So he killed a cat and watched the carcass day by day until the flesh had been devoured by vultures, then buried the bones, and rejoiced in his conclusive demonstration. And it never occurred to him until years afterwards that he had really proved nothing, since the cat might have died eight times before.

These evils are ingrained in some instances, and, of course, can never be wholly corrected. I suppose the best the colleges can do is to point them out and emphasize them in endless iteration.

But the core of the controversy, as I see it, is the right conception of the Bible and the proper theory of

its interpretation. Out of the differences on these two points have grown most of the existing trouble. While we can never hope for uniform agreement about them, may it not be practicable to bring the moderate elements of both parties to common ground upon certain fundamental principles?

One is that the Bible is God's inspired revelation to men, and is our sufficient and authoritative guide in faith and practice, once its meaning has been established.

Second, that systems of theology are not Divine revelations, but only men's interpretation of such revelation; so that we cannot condemn offhand one whose theology differs from ours. It may be possible in such cases for either to be right or both to be wrong. Nor are theology and religion, or Christianity, identical. My theology may possibly be overcome by further investigation or by new discoveries, without affecting my religion in the least.

Third, our present English Bible cannot be verbally inspired, whatever may have been true of the original Scriptures as first given to the Sacred Writers. Our people should be informed that our English Bible was not given to us directly from God, but through some comparatively modern scholars; and no Fundamentalist, though of the straightest sect, would contend that those translators were inspired. Otherwise, he would be guilty of the same offense that he charges against the Modernist in holding that Shakespeare was equally inspired with the Sacred Writers. The people ought to know, also, that even our present Greek and Hebrew texts, which formed the basis of our English Bible, were made up of some two thousand manuscripts, more or less incomplete, and no two exactly alike. And then, they should know that the English translation itself is faulty and sometimes misleading. So that, when one says he believes every word in the English Bible exactly as it is, he ought to be made to understand that he is talking loosely, if not foolishly.

Fourth, that much of the Bible cannot be taken literally, and was never meant to be so taken. This is so well understood as a principle of interpretation

that no normal reader thinks of disputing it, except under the exigency of controversy.

Fifth, that in interpreting the Bible, regard must be had to the fact that the revelation from God was first given thousands of years ago, to an immature race, differing widely from us in respect to time, race, intelligence, habits and language. And God, of course, had to adapt his revelation to their conditions and conceptions, just as we talk baby talk to our children. A revelation to them, then, embodying the terms and conceptions of modern life, would have been useless, if not harmful. Even within the short life of our English Bible, numerous terms have had to be changed, to prevent misunderstanding.

And finally, that in some sense, God's revelation was, and is, progressive. It requires only a cursory reading to note the different conceptions of God in the language used concerning Him in the earlier books of the Bible and in the Prophets; and still more, in the New Testament. We are all conscious of the growth in our own conception of God since the days of our childhood. He can mean to us no more than we can conceive Him to be; so that we all practically make our own God. It is significant that the Bible nowhere undertakes to define God, though men have done so. "The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." But He has not defined Him.

As of Himself, so of His truth. "I have many other things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Mark the advance in the revelation given by Paul over that of Jesus; and also the advance of Paul himself from Thessalonians to Ephesians and Romans. The trouble lay not in the teachers, but in the scholars.

And His revelations in nature have been in keeping with those in His word. In both, he has advanced only as men have been able to follow him.

These statements seem to me to be so nearly self-evident it would seem that reasonable men of both factions might be brought to a common understanding about them, however they might differ in expressing

themselves. And if the principles enunciated are correct, then certainly we must allow some liberty of interpretation. There is danger of abuse, to be sure, in applying the principles; but we must try to correct and restrain the abuse, and not deny the principle. Old truths have not changed any more than God has; but in accordance with all analogy and all experience, *our conception* of that truth must necessarily change. So when we sing about the "Old Time Religion," let us do it heartily; but remember that this does not necessarily mean old-time theology.

And this suggests that we should be extremely careful about framing and insisting on cast-iron dogmas. Dogma, in a sense, is useful, to be sure, and perhaps necessary; but it is also dangerous. Wrongly employed, it amounts to an effort to confine living and expanding truth in an iron mould. When tempted to do this, it might be well to remember that the original meaning of the term dogma is, "what seems to be true." And, by the way, in the beginning "heresy" seems to have meant "one's power to decide for himself." So these two terms in their original significance go to the heart of things for Baptists. For, unless we mean to assume the function of a Pope, all we can ever say is, "What seems to be true." And the power to decide for one's self is only another expression of the soul's competency for God. Why should not all rational men of both sides who seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness come to a working understanding on these principles? And if they should, could not our colleges help to bring about this understanding?

And if we can reach an agreement here, it would seem that we might find a common ground for the teaching of science in our colleges. It is here that the battle is fiercest. "Here," says Dr. Masee, "is the crux of the whole matter," and Dr. Goodchild tells us that "the trouble lies in the professors." What, then, shall the Christian college do about teaching science? As an outsider, I would venture to advise, go on as before, in reverent search for all truth. One of a college's functions is to discover and impart truth. Like its Divine

Headmaster, "to this end was it born, and for this cause came into the world, that it might bear witness to the truth." It cannot merely *tolerate* truth. Heavens! Think of Jesus of Nazareth *tolerating* truth! Hearing Him proclaiming and defending it so bravely and seeing Him live it so superbly, we are not surprised later to hear Him say, "I *am* the truth." Nor do we wonder that His promised Spirit would lead us into all truth. The inspiring sweep of it! *All* truth; not only in His Book, but in all places of his spacious dominions. Since He came as the world's true light, I have wondered if all light is not heaven-sent and holy. It is said that when old and feeble Hayden was carried into a cathedral to hear rendered his own Oratorio of the Creation, and at the outbursts of that lofty strain, "Let There Be Light," he raised his withered hand toward heaven and cried, "It came from there." And I fancy that music is truth's own twin sister.

*"Hail, holy light, offspring of heaven, firstborn;
Or of the eternal, co-eternal beam!
Before the heavens, thou wast, and at the voice
Of God as with a mantle didst invest
The rising world of waters dark and deep,
Won from the void and formless infinite."*

So, instead of saying the *right*, should we not say the *obligation*, to study all lines of science in our colleges? A distinguished scientist wrote me some time ago, "I feel that I not only *may*, but *must* learn all that my Redeemer is trying to tell me, both in His Word and in His world."

Now, granting that we may and must teach science in our colleges, we must concede some other things.

First, this teaching must be done by scientists. Neither priest nor prophet, nor apostle, nor even our Lord Himself ever made the slightest contribution to our knowledge of natural science. For enlightenment on this subject, then, we must go, not to the cathedral, nor the Theological Seminary, but to the laboratory.

Second, the scientist must be allowed absolute free-

dom of research. Otherwise, we should virtually be saying to him, "Discover whatever you can, provided your discovery does not interfere with my convictions or my prejudices." Such a limitation would be unthinkable for a Baptist. All along, our boast has been that all we ask of any seeker after His will, in respect to church doctrines, for example, is that he study the Bible, not as a Methodist or an Episcopalian, or even as a Baptist, but with an absolutely open mind, just trying to learn the truth. We cannot favor such freedom of investigation in God's written Word and oppose it in His universe.

Third, we must concede, and we shall do well to remember, that in every conflict between scientists and religionists, the latter have been defeated. Andrew D. White, one of the founders and for many years president of Cornell, in his "History of the Warfare of Science with Theology," points out several such instances, which need not be mentioned here. And then he adds, "In all modern history, interference with science in the supposed interest of religion, no matter how conscientious, has resulted in the direst evils to both, and invariably; and, on the other hand, all untrammelled scientific investigations, no matter how dangerous to religion some of its stages may have seemed for the time, has invariably resulted in the highest good for both."

Christianity has probably suffered more from its ill-informed defenders than from unfriendly scientists. And, if this is true, when her champions go forth to battle in the spirit of their Master, what shall we say when they march out, as they sometimes have done, with a strut and a swagger? Says a recent writer, who is no special friend of religion, "The scientific swashbuckler is not the product of ripe scholarship, but of immature scholarship." Could he have said less about the theological swashbuckler.

Fourth, in my humble opinion, we are not only wide of the mark when we assume that a majority of modern advanced scientists are trying to discredit the Bible, but we are in our own light in such an assumption. Why should we impeach a man's motives or his

piety simply because he feels bound to follow and proclaim certain convictions about a question of pure science—especially when that man's life is adorned with "the beauty of holiness"? Why should we not rather rejoice to have such a man who could stand in the front rank with his fellow-scientists and contend that their discoveries do not exclude God, but only enlarge Him? If I have read aright, the Book of Nature is only another volume of the Book of God, and consciously or unconsciously, every real teacher of science is a professor of theology. If the heavens declare His glory; if He holds the seas in the hollow of His hand; if by His strength the mountains stand, being girded with power; if the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, then whatever land the foot of the modern scientific explorer may touch, there he may set up his banner and claim it in the name of his Sovereign. And to me, it is pleasant to think that this is just what many such explorers are doing. It was said of Pasteur that he entered the far realms of science with a microscope in one hand and a crucifix in the other; and one can but recall here the prayer with which Kepler closes his "Harmony of the Worlds": "Lo, I have done the works of my life with that power of intellect which Thou hast given. I have recorded to men the glory of Thy works as far as my mind could comprehend their infinite majesty. . . . If I, a worm before Thine eye and born in the bonds of sin, have brought forth anything that is unworthy of Thy counsels, inspire me with Thy spirit, that I may correct it. If, by the wonderful beauty of Thy creation, I have been led into boldness; if I have sought my own honor among men as I advanced in the work which was destined to Thine honor, pardon me in kindness and charity, and by Thy grace grant that my teachings may be to Thy glory and the welfare of all men. Praise ye the Lord, ye heavenly harmonies, and ye that understand the new harmonies, praise the Lord. Praise God, oh my soul, as long as I live." It may be remembered that Kepler uttered this prayer when he had completed a mathematical demonstration of a scientific theory, for the enunciation of which

not long before Galileo was condemned to die as a heretic by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Shall we, then, set no limit to the investigation and teaching of modern science in our Christian colleges? Absolutely none, save one: that the teacher should seek for truth and not for fame or fortune; and that he seek as a scientist and not as a partisan theologian. With such a spirit, let him roam as far as he may, and he will still be in the King's country. Let him dig as deep as ever he will. But while he is digging he need not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street; nor need he dump his dirt in the front yard. Let him speak only when his pick has rung upon the bed-rock; and then, if he be a reverent seeker after truth, we may expect him to exclaim with rapturous surprise, "The Lord is in this place and I knew it not."

These suggestions are submitted with hesitancy; and not as a panacea, but only with the hope that as leaders and trainers of our youth and as guides in some sort to the thought of our denomination, our colleges may discover and mark the way to peace and progress. Meanwhile, let the rest of us support them heartily and follow on as best we may to learn His ways, that we may walk in His paths.

And let me say in closing that in these last years things and facts have meant much more to me than terms and theories. I am not saved by a theory, but by a tremendous fact. And out of all the pending controversy, I think I shall be content if the disputants will leave me a Creator that creates; an inspiration that inspires; a Redeemer that redeems, and a Saviour that saves.

Terms we must needs have, I know; and yet how inadequate they are! Even for our highest *human* moods we have nothing but silence. But when an infinite God speaks to an immortal soul, there is no speech nor language. It is deep calling unto deep, and we can only be still and know. In one of Richard Fuller's noblest sermons, delivered before the Civil War, he told about receiving an aged negro into his church. And when the old man was asked to relate

his experience of conversion, he answered, "Please 'scuse me, marster. It ain't given to a po' nigger lack me to talk about dem deep things of God."

Let us know our limitations and wait and watch; and watching, let us try to see Him, whenever and howsoever He may choose to reveal Himself. It may be that what looks like a morning mist is really the veil of the temple; and what seems a jack-o-lantern may be the morning star.

*"We know, oh Lord, so little what is best,
Wingless we move so lowly.
But in Thy calm all-knowledge let us rest,
Oh Holy! Holy! Holy!"*