

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XI

May, 1940

No. 5

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Reason or Revelation. Th. Engelder | 321 |
| The Prophets and Political and Social Problems. Th. Laetsch | 337 |
| Entwuerfe ueber die von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Epistelreihe | 351 |
| Miscellanea | 362 |
| Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches | 377 |
| Book Review. — Literatur | 392 |

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein weiden, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen wehren, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie*, Art. 24

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — 1 Cor. 14:8

Published for the

Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVES

Miscellanea

Our Arguments for Lutheran Parish-Schools

We have had our Lutheran parish-schools with us for a full century now, since it is a historical fact that the Saxon immigrants established schools for their children both in St. Louis and in Perry County immediately after their arrival in this country, in fact, before most of them had their own homes. In many congregations that were established with the ideals of Dr. Walther in mind, especially in his classic *Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staat unabhaengigen Ortsgemeinde*, the Christian school was erected next to the church-building, often even before the latter was planned, because it was considered self-evident that the children should receive an adequate training in the Christian doctrine and in Christian conduct.

Times and conditions have changed, especially in the last generation, and perhaps the members of our congregations have changed with them. In some sections of our Church the existence and maintenance of Lutheran parish-schools are still considered self-evident. Social and economic conditions have changed; standards of public schools have been raised; the German language, which, even four decades ago, was regarded as a prime reason for maintaining church-schools, has been largely superseded by English; the size of families has been reduced, and childless homes are increasing in number. These and other factors have definitely influenced attitudes, changed viewpoints, and — had a decidedly detrimental effect upon the parish-school system of our Church.

With this situation staring us in the face, we have been put on the defensive; for, instead of having parents and entire congregations requesting Christian schools, we have found both to have grown indifferent, in many cases even hostile, to regular, full-time schools under the auspices of the local congregation or of a group of congregations. Our stand in behalf of Lutheran parish-schools has been neutralized, if not vitiated, by pressure brought to bear, from without and within, urging that we must compete in every way, in curriculum and course of study, in buildings and equipment, in procedures and methods, with the State schools. The public schools, by the mere fact of their being State-supported, set the standards, and often State authorities made it a point to foist and force these standards on Lutheran parish-schools. In not a few States all schools, whether public or private, are directly or indirectly under the supervision of the State, either by open legislation or by regulations drawn up by the State Department of Education, sometimes under an arbitrary interpretation of some provision in the laws of the State. The veiled and often even the open challenge has been made that Lutheran parish-schools are un-American because they do not operate under the complete control of the State. These considerations frequently made a deep impression on people who were not properly imbued with Scriptural ideals in the education of their children. Many of them make invidious comparisons between the imposing struc-

tures of the State schools and the comparatively insignificant buildings in which many of the Lutheran schools are housed.

This negative attitude was further strengthened by arguments which frequently had a great show of validity. In a great many cases the cost of the parish-schools is the chief deterrent. All citizens, as a matter of course, pay taxes for the support of the State schools, and the proportion of these taxes, as they are intended for the schools, includes the major part of the sum paid over the counter at the county court-house or in the city hall. If Christian parish-schools are established and maintained, this means that much of an additional expenditure, an extra burden laid upon the shoulders of the tax-payer who is a Lutheran. If a congregation happens to be located in a part of a city where only the best of everything is found in the schools, its members will frequently demand buildings and equipment which will at least compare favorably with those of the State schools. When the cost of erecting and maintaining a Lutheran parish-school rises to fifty, hundred, and even a hundred and fifty and more dollars a child per year, the load cannot be assumed by the congregation. This argument is quite often supported by a complaint associated with that of inferior equipment, resulting in the inefficiency of parish-schools as compared with State schools. Since the course of study in the Lutheran schools quite frequently is not so elaborate and comprehensive as that of the State schools, especially as to certain externals, frills, and fancies which are sometimes fostered by the State schools, the charge is made, whether justly or unjustly, that the parish-schools do not accomplish as much as the schools which are acknowledged, by common consent, as the standard schools of a city or a community.

One of the supposedly weightiest arguments which was often used in favor of parish-schools was that taken from the pedagogical classics of Luther, especially his treatise *To the Mayors and Aldermen of All the Cities of Germany in Behalf of Christian Schools*, of 1524, as well as his earlier writing, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation with Regard to the Amelioration of the Christian Station*. The mistake in the argument was made in using the logic of Luther, which pertained to Christian state schools, to apply to Lutheran parish-schools. As we shall see, the points made by Luther can be utilized to this day, but not in the form in which the alleged proof was ordinarily offered. Luther was handicapped by the fact that he could not yet, as he complains, establish congregations independent of the state and was therefore compelled to have recourse to *Notbischoefe*, that is, the rulers of the various German principalities, who were the patrons of the schools. The reference to Luther as the great champion of Christian parish-schools was misleading, to say the least.

To continue in this same strain of frankness, there were other flaws in the arguments which were frequently advanced. Thus the issue was often clouded by the assertion that it was contrary to Holy Scripture to call women teachers for elementary parish-schools, a contention which is not supported by the Bible, especially not by 1 Cor. 14:34 and 1 Tim. 2:12, since these passages speak of teaching publicly, "in the congregations," but not of teaching children of elementary school age. Here the

casual way in which the Lutheran Confessions and also Luther refer to the teaching of women has the background of usage in the times of the New Testament. We ought to be frank enough and honest enough to drop arguments which prove nothing and to discontinue the use of weapons which may prove to be boomerangs.

For we have sufficiently weighty arguments for the establishment of various agencies and institutions intended for the education and training of the young, specifically such as may be applied to Lutheran parish-schools. But we keep in mind that these arguments will have force only in the measure in which we acknowledge that the Bible does not command any particular agency or institution. We find there suggestions, rules, principles, but no precepts or ordinances specifying agencies or schools for the instruction of the young. Pedagogical maxims will be found by the score, and their value and weight in our argumentation are very apparent. Likewise the Lord lays down aims and objectives for us to keep in mind, and He directs the attention of those who have children in charge to these demands. Yet He does not say: These aims may be attained only by this or that specific agency. The *manner* in which those who are in charge of children will carry out His will is not prescribed but left to the freedom of parents and others whose motivation in life is the love of Christ.

One fact stands out clearly from the outset, namely, that the Lord holds parents responsible for the rearing of their children in the fear of God. That this was true in the Old Testament appears not only from the implications of the Fourth Commandment and from passages like Deut. 6:6, 7, but also from the manner in which parents were held responsible for the actions of their children and realized this obligation. The examples of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, of David, of Eli, and others present the situation both from the positive and from the negative angle. And the same responsibility rests upon parents according to the New Testament, as Eph. 6:4; 1 Thess. 2:11; Heb. 12:7; Luke 2:48-52, and many other passages show. In this connection Luther's exposition of the Fourth Commandment in his Large Catechism may well be consulted, especially the last paragraphs, where he summarizes some of his arguments and finally concludes: "Let every one know, therefore, that it is his duty, on peril of losing the divine favor, to bring up his children above all things in the fear and knowledge of God and, if they are talented, have them learn and study something that they may be employed for whatever need there is." (*Conc. Trigl.*, 629 f.) This responsibility which God has laid upon parents cannot be stressed too strongly and too frequently, especially in our days, when so many counter-currents tend to drive the vessel of this obligation from its course. This point is fundamental in our entire argument in behalf of adequate Christian indoctrination and training and should therefore run through all our efforts like a golden thread.

At this point some one might well interpose the argument: If God has laid the responsibility for the Christian rearing of the children upon the parents, why speak of agencies and institutions for religious education established by Christian congregations? This objection may sound plausible enough, at first blush, but we shall see that it does not possess

the cogency and validity which its proponents want it to carry. For there are some weighty considerations in favor of cooperation in matters of Christian education.

The first of these considerations is chiefly historical. For while the Lord, even in the Old Testament, as we have seen, placed the first and foremost responsibility for the rearing of children on the respective parents, He nevertheless addressed Himself to the entire congregation, to Israel as a nation, when He uttered the words recorded in Deut. 6:6, 7. Under theocratic conditions the congregation of the Lord and the state were identical, and the congregation, acting also as the state, was in charge of the rearing of the children and of their conduct in keeping with the Moral Law, the Ceremonial Law, and all other ordinances and precepts of the Lord. This fact explains the punishment of the Sabbath-breaker, Num. 15:32-36, and of the blasphemer, Lev. 24:10-14, but also the evident feeling of responsibility on the part of pious rulers to have the people taught in the Law of the Lord, as we learn from 2 Chron. 17:7-9 and 30:1 ff. God wanted the entire nation, as the people of His choice, to feel the responsibility for all its members, both in the matter of learning the Law and of keeping its precepts and ordinances. We shall do well to remember this historical fact and apply its lessons to the extent in which they emphasize the fact of mutual responsibility.

In the New Testament there is no theocracy, and hence we have no ordinances and precepts of the Lord which place the responsibility for the upbringing of children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord directly on any congregation or on any agency established by a congregation. We have no word of the Lord commanding us to establish and maintain a parish-school or a Sunday-school or a summer-school, or an institute of whatever kind; nor has God prescribed a course of study in religion and religious training that includes so much memory work (Catechism, proof-texts, hymns, etc.). This He has left to the wisdom and the freedom of the Christians and of the Christian congregations.

And yet the Lord has laid down some very important principles for the rearing of children, which concern not only the parents but the entire congregation as well. For one thing, it is evident that those who are baptized into the name of Christ, while essentially and primarily being made members of the body of Christ, of the *una sancta*, thereby are also added to the roster of members whose names are listed in the church-book. Evidence for this is found in Acts 2:41, where we read: "They that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." The same truth is apparent from Acts 10:48; 1 Cor. 1:13-16, and other passages. And that children were included in the membership of the corporate body of the congregations may be inferred from Acts 2:39; Col. 2:11, 12 and the other *loci* commonly adduced to prove the necessity of pedobaptism. And here it should be noted at once that membership in any organization implies a reciprocal relationship, cooperation, mutual responsibility. If a person, young or old, is a fellow-member with me in the body known as the local Christian congregation, then his qualifi-

cations for such membership and the exercise of his duties as member are matters of my concern.

This argument bears even greater weight when we consider that the Lord has clearly set forth the conditions and obligations of adult membership in the Christian congregation, especially with regard to the great privilege of partaking of the Holy Supper. A notable passage concerning the Lord's demands for adult membership is found in Heb. 5:12 to 6:2, where the holy writer specifically states that he expects Christians to go beyond the principles, the first steps in the knowledge of Scripture truths and doctrines, and to go on to perfection. A similar thought is presented by the Apostle Paul in his Letter to the Ephesians, where he urges his readers to "grow up into Him in all things which is the head, even Christ," 4:14, 15. Cp. also 1 Cor. 3. The Lord expects the members of a Christian congregation to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear," 1 Pet. 3:15, to be able to "try the spirits whether they are of God," 1 John 4:1, and "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," Jude 3.

To these general qualifications for adult membership we must add those which are specifically connected with the privilege of receiving the Lord's Supper, as given particularly in 1 Cor. 11:26-32. The conditions laid down in this passage by the apostle, "examine oneself," "eating and drinking unworthily," "not discerning the Lord's body," "judge ourselves," and others, indicate that those who are admitted to the Sacrament must be familiar with the doctrines of sin and grace, of the substitutionary atonement, the nature of faith, the requirements of true sanctification, the elements in the Lord's Supper, the Real Presence, and others. Without at least some measure of understanding of these Biblical truths one can hardly partake of the Lord's Table with any degree of profit or blessing to oneself. To this must be added the instruction and warning contained in 1 Cor. 10:16-21, namely, that of the fellowship of the believers with one another, as well as with Christ, by virtue of their being partakers of that one bread, and that of shunning the table of devils if one would experience the blessing of the Eucharist in one's life.

All these facts are so important because the New Testament clearly shows that the Lord addresses these instructions and warnings not merely to the individual in his personal relation to his Savior but also in his relationship to all the other members of the congregation who, with him, enjoy the privileges of the Sacrament. That Christians, within the organization of the Christian congregation, are responsible for the conduct of one another is shown throughout the New Testament. The Savior spoke about this responsibility during the latter part of His ministry, when He discussed the question of mutual watchfulness and of Christian discipline in the congregation, Matt. 18:15-18. The Apostle Paul brings it out in 1 Cor. 5:1, 2; 2 Cor. 2:5-7, and in many other passages, especially in his heart-searching plea in Gal. 6:1-5. But we note in particular that in 1 Cor. 11 he places the relation of a Christian to the Sacrament under the supervision of the Christian congregation; for he introduces the paragraph on the proper use of the Holy Supper

with the reference to his readers' being together "in the church," "in[to] one place," the situation being clearly that of a meeting of the congregation, probably for the preliminary meal of the *agape*, but certainly for the celebration of the Eucharist. We note especially the use of the plural pronoun in the entire narrative, as in verse 30. It cannot be denied that St. Paul holds the congregation responsible for those who are given the privilege of receiving the Lord's Supper in its midst.

On the strength of the points here presented we cannot but conclude: If a congregation is responsible for the doctrinal knowledge possessed by its members, for their conduct in agreement with the Word of God, and especially for the fitness of its members to be admitted to the Holy Communion, then it must also have the obligation to provide for the indoctrination of its members in a degree commensurate with the Lord's will. We keep in mind throughout this discussion, of course, that the first responsibility, also for the indoctrination of children, rests with the parents. If parents can prepare their children for adult membership in the congregation, so that an examination conducted by its delegated officers, if necessary in the presence of the entire congregation, will satisfy the members that the candidates for membership are qualified, there is nothing essentially wrong with the situation, but it is rather a cause for rejoicing. If parents are not in a position to prepare their children for adult membership, specifically for confirmation and admission to the Lord's Supper, then the law of Christian love places the obligation of providing the proper indoctrination on the congregation. And this duty, namely, that of preparing children and others for the privileges of partaking of the Eucharist, is not to be assumed by some society or organization consisting of the parents of the children concerned, but pertains to the entire congregation. For if the children were already received into the Christian congregation by Holy Baptism, they are members of the congregation, whose spiritual welfare is a vital concern of all; and if the candidates are adults without previous church connection, then the obligations laid upon the whole congregation as to fellowship with the membership in Christ make the congregation responsible for an adequate training of the candidates before they are admitted to the Lord's Supper.

All these considerations were carefully observed in the early Church, as information of an unassailable type clearly shows. With regard to candidates from the ranks of the Jewish Church we must remember that they, as a rule, had a very comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and it was but necessary to furnish proof that the Messiah for whom they had been waiting had already appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The Christians in Jerusalem, for example, including the proselytes, or Hellenists, will come under this category. The same may be said concerning the Christians at Lydda, Saron, Joppa, Caesarea, Ptolemais, and Tyre. Even the centurion at Caesarea must be considered as belonging to this class; for he is described as being God-fearing with all his house, which means that he had an adequate acquaintance with the Scriptures of the Jews and had accepted the God of the Jews.

The situation is somewhat different as soon as we cross the boundary into semipagan and Gentile conditions. When the people of Samaria with one accord gave heed to the preaching of Philip, Acts 8:6, the apostles at Jerusalem sent Peter and John to visit these congregations. This measure certainly helped the Samaritan Christians in clinging steadfastly to the one true Gospel. A similar situation obtained at Antioch in Syria. When lay Christians from the South had founded the congregation at Antioch, so that a great number believed and turned unto the Lord, Acts 11:21, the congregation at Jerusalem sent down Barnabas to find out the true status of affairs. This was not a meddling with the internal business of the congregation but a precaution to establish and develop the existing unity of spirit. How seriously the Christians of Antioch took the matter of adequate indoctrination for adult membership is seen from the remark of Luke: "A whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much people," Acts 11:26. In the field of foreign missions proper the procedure was customarily even more careful. With the exception of the conversion of the jailer at Philippi, where the number of miraculous elements are so plentiful, we find that St. Paul always devoted himself to the instruction of the Gentiles with great zeal. When he was prevented from remaining in a city for more than a few weeks at a time, we usually find him making arrangements for the further instruction of those who had declared their belief in Jesus Christ. Thus Silas and Timothy remained in Macedonia when Paul went to Athens and later to Corinth, Acts 17:14. Paul himself taught in Corinth for more than a year and a half, and in addition Apollos later went from Ephesus to Corinth and further established the congregation in the truth of the Word, Acts 18:27; 1 Cor. 3:4-6. After the congregations in Galatia had been established during the first missionary journey of Paul, he visited them a second time for the purpose of confirming them. And again, on the third journey, he took time to pass through the upper coasts, that is, the interior tableland, of Asia Minor, where these congregations were situated, Acts 19:1. We also find that Paul made it a point to have the brethren everywhere more fully established in the doctrine which he had taught them. He sent Timothy to Corinth in order that the Corinthians might have the benefit of his teaching. Later he sent Titus to the same city, 2 Cor. 2:13; 7:6, 7, 14. He evidently took the indoctrination for adult membership very seriously, as is evident also from a pattern, form, or summary of doctrine which served as a basis of the instruction given: "Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you," Rom. 6:17. This outline for Christian teaching (τύπος) may have been very similar to "the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me," 2 Tim. 1:13, namely, a summary of the chief points of Christian doctrine. Beyond a doubt the Apostle Paul considered it his duty to provide for adequate instruction of candidates for membership in the Christian congregation, and he caused this method to be followed in the various congregations founded by him, placing the responsibility for such indoctrination and its attendant Christian discipline on the congregation, as the body in charge of the means of grace. Let us hasten to add that the custom

thus established by the great apostle was followed by Christian congregations for many centuries, as the history of religious education shows. (Cp. *The Religion of the Child*, pp. 89—103.)

But how does all this affect the situation in our Lutheran congregations today? What bearing, in particular, does it have on the topic of this paper?

The answer is, as may be gleaned from the discussion above, that the Lord expects every Christian congregation to uphold the standards of adult membership laid down in His Word, especially with reference to admission to the Eucharist. And again we say that God has not designated the agency or institution by and through which such instruction is to be given. He leaves this to Christian liberty, but in such a way that this liberty, guided by the law of love, will not degenerate into license and disorder. As the Apostle Paul puts it: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another," Gal. 5:13. And again: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient," 1 Cor. 6:12. Cp. chap. 10:23. And St. Peter writes: "As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God," 1 Pet. 2:16.

All institutions, agencies, and forms of Christian instruction are ours, but it is a matter of Christian wisdom to choose and maintain those which serve best in given situations, whether these be the Sunday-school or the Saturday-school or the summer- or vacation Bible-school or week-day religious instruction or training classes or confirmation classes or a full parish-school. But the listing or enumerating of the institutions and agencies in this order does not imply that they are of equal value for that indoctrination which is manifestly required according to the passages referred to above. It may not be altogether a matter of simple arithmetic, since other factors are also involved, but this line of argument carries much weight.

The Sunday-school, for example, can under the most favorable conditions yield only about fifty hours of instruction a year, about half of which is in the field of indoctrination. Even if the heroic experiment now being carried out under the supervision of a synodical committee, namely, to mold the Sunday-school teachers of our Church along certain lines, should prove much more successful, including the obvious regimentation attending the project, we cannot get away from the fact that the optimum expectation of clock hours in eight years cannot exceed approximately four hundred, not including confirmation instruction. Let us suppose that the Saturday-school is able to devote a total of eighty hours a year to actual indoctrination and that the summer-school will add another 45 to 60 hours, our total would still not rise above 170 clock hours of instruction in religion. Let us suppose that, under the most favorable conditions, with another 70 hours gained by week-day religious instruction, we might reach a total of 240 hours for a year of instruction, this would still hardly be equivalent to the work done in any other subject in the course of study of the elementary school. And the saddest part of it all consists in this, that the clock hours alone

cannot give us a true picture of the probable result. Even the most careful coordination and integration of the work done in the aggregate in these schools and classes, disjointed and sporadic as they are bound to appear in the minds of the pupils, will not give us a unit of indoctrination such as is required by a sound Christian pedagogy. It would take a pastor or teacher with almost superhuman ability to work out a plan which would cover, in a progressive way, all the Bible-history work and Catechism instruction which would be conducive to a gradual but definite growth in the knowledge pertaining to salvation. If there is truly no other recourse, a pastor or a congregation may have to make the most of such a situation and try to erect a structure of Christian education and training which will at least approximate the requirements of adult membership. Experience seems to have shown that it is seldom possible for agencies which are so disjointed to integrate the Scriptural facts taught with life, even if a preconfirmation training class precedes the regular confirmation class.

We are practically compelled, therefore, to consider the case of the Lutheran parish-school in accordance with the claims of the generations which preceded us. Without including the vexing question of the German language as one of the reasons for establishing these schools during the first seventy-five years of our existence in America, we may safely say, at least for those pastors who had the proper conception of the Biblical requirements, that they wanted to give instruction in Bible History in the Catechism, and in Christian hymns by means of a parish-school because all the arguments connected with Christian indoctrination favor this agency. A Lutheran parish-school, established and conducted according to recognized principles of a Christian pedagogy and religious philosophy, may count on a total of 300 to 400 hours of instruction a year in Bible History, the Catechism, memory work, and hymns (including singing instruction). This does not include the fact that all the work of a Lutheran parish-school will be permeated and impregnated with the spirit of true religion, whereby practically every subject will be presented throughout from the viewpoint of Christianity.

However, it is not merely the positive instruction in the truths of the Bible that we have in mind when we declare the Lutheran parish-school, with its graded and spiral system and program, to be the ideal agency for Christian indoctrination but also its prophylactic function. While it is true that many teachers in the State schools do not make it a point to attack the Christian religion, the spirit of a mere moral training of the young as well as that of unionism are bound to cause trouble in most instances. This is true, in a large measure, even in the high-school years, after the children attending these schools have already been confirmed. How much greater is the danger before the children have ever been given a solid foundation of Christian truth, and in particular when the text-books used in the State schools are permeated with evolutionism and other anti-Scriptural material. A single seed of unbelief placed into the impressionable mind of a child may grow up into a tree of skepticism which will make the growth of the seed of the Word practically impossible.

How shall we arrange our arguments in favor of the Christian parish-school? Let us suggest the following order:

1. While it is indeed true that the Lord has charged first of all the parents with the bringing up of their children in the nurture of the Lord, the points which Luther mentions with regard to Christian State schools may be transferred *in toto* to the Lutheran parish-school, namely: "In the first place, there are some so lacking in piety and uprightness that they would not do it if they could. . . . In the second place, the great majority of parents are unqualified for it. . . . In the third place, even if parents were qualified and willing to do it themselves, yet on account of other employments and household duties they have no time for it." (Painter, *Luther on Education*, 179 f.)

2. Since, in the majority of cases, membership in the Christian congregation is involved (the children having been admitted by Holy Baptism), the congregation as such is charged with the responsibility of preparing these young members for adult membership in the church. In the case of children who are not yet baptized the Great Commission and the law of love lays the duty of caring for their instruction in the Word of God upon the entire membership of the Christian congregation.

3. Although economic conditions and the pressure of State supervision of elementary instruction may appear to be real obstacles in the way of Lutheran parish-schools, earnest and prayerful efforts on the part of pastors and congregations will, in most instances, be able to overcome such difficulties and to establish Lutheran parish-schools which, *caeteris paribus* and even with a measure of supervision on the part of the State, will take their place by the side of State-supported schools. Success, in most cases, depends upon a real appreciation of the Scriptural requirements for adult membership and upon the trust in the Lord's omnipotent assistance.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Relation Between the Kingdom of God and the Church

In the winter 1940 issue of *Christendom* an article by Dr. E. H. Wahlstrom has the title "The Kingdom of God and the Church." By special permission of the publishers (The World Conference on Faith and Order and the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City) we reprint the last section of this article, having the subtitle "The Kingdom and the Church." Dr. Wahlstrom, we ought to add, is professor of New Testament language and literature in Augustana Theological Seminary. What he discusses in this section is somewhat of a moot exegetical question, on which our readers will be glad to hear what a distinguished New Testament scholar has to say.

"The Kingdom and the Church. From our preceding study it is evident that the Kingdom and the Church are very closely related concepts, indeed parallel or synonymous. Almost all that we have said about the Kingdom can be said about the Church, and *vice versa*. The Kingdom and the Church are both the result of God's saving activity. They have been and are established by His redeeming grace. It is clear, too, that the constituency of the Kingdom and of the Church is the same. The citizens of the Kingdom and the members of the

Church are those who have been redeemed, forgiven, and have received the Holy Spirit. They have 'tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the age to come.' They are the ones in regard to whom God's will to save has been carried out and who now live in fellowship with God.

"Both the Kingdom and the Church are universal concepts; both include all in the past and in the future whom God has called into the fellowship with Himself. Christ is the Head of both the Kingdom and the Church. Both the Kingdom and the Church are free gifts of God; both are open to receive all who are in need. In regard to the future we speak of the Kingdom of God in glory and of the Church Triumphant in heaven. And finally, the one who establishes the Kingdom and the Church is not man, not even the 'new man,' but God, who calls and redeems through His Word of grace.

"On the basis of this study it seems rather reasonable to identify the two concepts, the Kingdom and the Church. The one who first made this identification was Augustine; but the Church which he spoke of was the external, ecclesiastical organization. Luther, on the other hand, made the same identification; but the Church to him was the sphere in which the redeeming grace of God operates. It may be pointed out as significant in this connection that Paul treats practically of the whole of Christian teaching without making the concept of the Kingdom central. In the same way the Lutheran dogmaticians, ancient and modern, present the whole range of Christian doctrine, using almost exclusively the concept of the Church Militant and Triumphant. It may be that something is lost by this neglect of the concept of the Kingdom, but we are pointing out here merely that the Kingdom and the Church are so closely related and parallel that the one may take the place of the other.

"The chief difference between the Kingdom and the Church lies in the fact that the Church must be seen from two aspects. The Church is both the object of God's saving grace and the witness in the world to this grace of God. In so far as we think of the Church as the object of God's grace, it is identical with the Kingdom, and whatever is said about the one may be said about the other. From that point of view both the Kingdom and the Church are the sphere in which God's will to save and to redeem is realized. The establishment of the Church is in this aspect identical with the establishment of the Kingdom. But the Church is also a witness to this grace of God. The Church has been entrusted with the 'Word of Reconciliation,' and it is charged with the duty to 'preach the Gospel to every creature.' From this point of view the Church is not identical with the Kingdom but is the agency through which God establishes His Kingdom. We would not speak of the Kingdom as an instrument but as an end in itself. The Church, however, is both. It is an end in itself in as far as it is the redeemed people of God; it is an instrument in as far as it is true to its mission to proclaim the Word.

"In order to carry out its mission, the Church has developed a complicated system of institutions and rites as convenient ways of doing the work which has been entrusted to it. It is because these external

forms are not essential to the Church that the Church cannot from this point of view be identified with the Kingdom. The Church is God's agency of salvation; but when men are saved by His grace, they enter both the Church and the Kingdom.

"It would seem from this study that the confusion about the relation between the Kingdom and the Church arises principally at two points. In the first place, it is forgotten that the Kingdom is the Kingdom of Grace, and instead it is restricted to the 'new man's' making the 'doing of His will the supreme aim.' (Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 28.) In the second place, we have failed to keep clearly in mind the two aspects of the Church. It might be closer to the truth to say that we have failed to see the Church clearly as the redeemed people of God. We have identified the Church with some external, ecclesiastical organization, interested in the general uplift of society and having a more or less political character. Then we have found it impossible to think of this Church as the Kingdom. A renewed study of the nature of both the Kingdom and the Church should enable us to see more clearly both the similarity and the difference between these two concepts."

A.

An Attempt to Stem the Tide of Religious Illiteracy

Writing in *America* (Roman Catholic weekly) on the topic of religious illiteracy in the public schools, Paul L. Blakely presents figures that are startling, and he at the same time discusses the plan introduced in various sections of the country to have public-school pupils dismissed at certain hours during the week in order to make it possible for the churches to give these boys and girls religious instruction. We reprint the article *in toto*.

"Some weeks ago the Kentucky House of Representatives considered a bill to permit the local boards of education to provide 'moral instruction' in the public schools. By a vote of 34 to 33, the House rejected the bill on the ground that it would 'endanger religious freedom.'

"This bill, it would appear, was permissive in character, not mandatory. The boards would be authorized to institute courses for the benefit of pupils whose parents wished them to have some training in morals, but [the bill] compelled no pupil to take this instruction. It is hard to see in this permission any encroachment upon religious freedom. No State, of course, can oblige any child to receive instruction in religion or morals. But there is no prohibition, either in the Federal Constitution or in the Constitutions of the several States, which forbids the public-school authorities so to arrange their schedules that the children may receive such instruction in religion as their parents may desire.

"This has actually been done in some States. Under this arrangement one or two periods are set aside weekly during which the children, on written request of their parents, attend classes in religion conducted by teachers who have been approved by the respective religious authorities—Jewish, Catholic and Protestant—and by the school board. On its face the action by the Kentucky House would debar this plan. In one sense it actually limits religious freedom, since it obliges parents

who are not able to send their children to religious schools to entrust them to publicly supported institutions in which 'moral instruction' is forbidden.

"To Christian parents and educators this deliberate exclusion of religion from the public schools is daily becoming more intolerable. In this unhappy exclusion, which has been the rule for a century and more, is found the reason for the statement that we are rapidly becoming a nation of religious illiterates.

"Precisely how many boys and girls are growing up in utter ignorance of religion no one can say. Obviously, the children in Catholic primary and secondary schools and in a few non-Catholic private schools must be excepted; but these, compared with the total number of children of school age, are hardly one in six. Dr. H. G. Ross, secretary of the International Council of Religious Education, thinks that at present from fifteen to twenty million children under seventeen years of age 'are without religious instruction.'

"Dr. Ross's estimate will not seem excessive when we consult the school and population statistics. In 1930 there were 36,164,601 persons in the United States over five and under twenty years of age. The number has grown somewhat in the last decade, but allowing for this increase and also for the fact that the age limit fixed by Dr. Ross does not correspond exactly with that of the Bureau of the Census, it is clear that the number of young religious illiterates — approximately from forty to sixty per cent. of the whole group — is appalling. Personally I am inclined to take Dr. Ross's figures as an underestimate.

"According to figures for 1936, 26,307,098 pupils were enrolled in the public elementary schools, and about 6,700,00 in the public high schools. How many of these boys and girls are receiving any instruction in religion outside the school which can be termed adequate is a question that cannot be answered definitely. No census covers this field, and we are obliged to rely upon reports. That of approximately 36,000,000 young people, from fifteen to twenty millions are 'without religious instruction' seems to me to be well within the bounds of fact. In some parts of the country, this horrifying proportion of illiterates may well be higher.

"If the welfare of this country is conditioned, as Washington believed, upon the preservation of religion and of morality by our people, the future does not present a pleasing prospect. As Dr. Luther Weigle, of Yale, has well said: 'When the public school ignores religion, it conveys to our children the suggestion that religion is without truth or value. It becomes, quite unintentionally I grant, a fosterer of atheism and irreligion. The present system reflects the conviction of no one except such free-thinkers as have been fetched up on atheism. . . . The ignoring of religion by the public schools of America endangers the perpetuity of those moral and religious institutions which are most characteristic of American life. It imperils the future of religion among us and, with religion, the future of the nation itself.' (*New York Times*, May 16, 1926.)

"The fear that by giving children in the public schools an escape from religious and moral illiteracy we in some way 'endanger religious freedom' or subject the State to the Church is quite without foundation.

We do not ask the State to teach religion, for that is not its function. All we ask is that children in the public schools be given an opportunity to learn something about almighty God and His Law.

"A short time ago a non-Catholic physician said to me: 'I know my children ought to have some religion, but how can their mother or I teach them? We don't know enough to teach it. The Sunday-school can't help me. It's not open on rainy Sundays; it's closed all summer; and it has no trained teachers.'

"I believe that many non-Catholics are anxious to give their children an education in religion but find themselves in the position of my friend. The Sunday-school is not the answer, nor, I admit, is the plan of dismissing the children twice a week for religious instruction a complete answer. The real answer is the system which does not divorce religion from education. But the religious-instruction plan will help many and will reduce the number of our religious illiterates." —

An important subject! That the ignorance in religious matters of the average boy and girl in America is simply abysmal a mere casual inquiry quickly reveals. We agree with the article in its advocacy of the Christian day-school as the ideal solution, and, in its indorsement of a dismissal of pupils from the public schools for an hour or two every week to receive religious instruction as a measure which, at any rate, is better than to have them receive no week-day religious training at all. At the same time we heartily approve of the action of the Kentucky House of Representatives when it rejected a plan permitting local boards of education to provide "moral instruction" in the public schools. The little information given seems to indicate that the danger scented by the legislators was real. A.

Sin and Grace Stirs Cornwall

The very teachings that are looked upon by many as an old story in our circles have a way of stirring people mightily in other parts of the world. Just five years ago a grocer's clerk in Michigan, Joseph Pedlar by name, set out as the first lay preacher and missionary of our Synodical Conference. He is a man of middle age, and he was confirmed as an adult by the Rev. Theodore Nickel, then at Bessemer, Michigan. Joseph Pedlar felt a desire to go to Cornwall, the land of his birth, as missionary. He studied Christian doctrine and other seminary subjects with his pastor, coming three nights a week, five hours each time. So diligently did he study, and so great was his interest, that he satisfied all concerned as to his fitness to preach.

Without salary or support and without ever having cost any of our boards a dollar, Joseph Pedlar went to Cornwall, where he has been preaching sin and grace for five years, with amazing success. He supports himself and his family by part-time work in a grocery.

"I have two services every Sunday, at 11 A. M. and 3 P. M.," writes Mr. Pedlar under date of January 10. "I also have an adult class. The interest is wonderful. The class was formed, and I was asked to take it because, they said, I was 'the greatest authority they knew on the Bible.' We have eighteen and are hoping to get more. The steward said

to me: 'All we have heard about has been assessments (church dues), but we have neglected the spiritual side entirely.' 'Your Lutheran Church,' he said, 'has the pure Gospel, but our Church is rotten.' This man has become a convert through Bible-study. I shall try and hold this class together and give them the full Lutheran teaching. If only I had more time, I could form other classes during the week, but I am busy all day Sunday. Men even beg me to come to their houses for discussions of Bible-truths. I've never seen such interest in the Scriptures. Dare we neglect these opportunities? We could have a class every night in the week at Perranwell, Goonhavern, Wheal Francis, Rose, Callestick, Silverwell, Crosscombe. They are all waiting for the Word."

In a long letter, in his modest way, Mr. Pedlar describes his missionary experiences in the various villages where he is preaching and the splendid reception everywhere. The people are overjoyed at hearing of sin and grace in this age of Modernism. They crowd the chapels, and Mr. Pedlar is booked up solidly with appointments six months in advance. He conducts simple Lutheran preaching services in borrowed chapels and rides from place to place on a bicycle, over wide, solitary moors, over break-neck hills, or else climbs along a teacherous footpath that skirts granite cliffs 400 feet or more high, with the stormy Atlantic at the foot of these perilous cliffs, drenching him with spray.

One of our American pastors, who has spent several months of each year lately working with Mr. Pedlar in Cornwall, said of this remarkable man:

"Each time that I have been over, I have returned to America astonished at the way in which God's Word is stirring Cornwall. People sixty miles away were discussing Joseph Pedlar. I have heard him preach several times. He preaches simply and naturally, without stooping to any of the tricks of oratory. He tells the plain story of sin and grace in an animated, gripping conversational tone. The people in the chapels, accustomed, as we in America also, to the "Big Five" of the liberal parson (politics, social gospel, industry, race relationships, and war), are stirred mightily. They sit with a most pathetic eagerness of face as Mr. Pedlar explains the truths of Law and Gospel. Mr. Pedlar has no delusions. He does not share the liberalistic view that prosperity, rather than sin, is at the root of all our evils. Neither does he believe for a moment that the Church should try to solve the problems of men and nations with the communistic social gospel. He preaches only sin and salvation."

"In Truro," this pastor says, "I met a very prominent official of the Duchy of Cornwall. In his hand he carried a copy of Dr. J. T. Mueller's *Christian Dogmatics*. He had read this book carefully several times, he told me. Through it he became a convert to the Lutheran movement and one of its most valued champions. The same book, by the way, has just recently opened the eyes of a very able man from London, who came to Cornwall a militant evolutionist. Mr. Pedlar gave him Dr. Mueller's book to read and explained matters to him in detail. This man has openly rejected evolution and all other isms. Mr. Pedlar prizes, next to the Bible, Dr. Mueller's *Dogmatics* and Dr. Walther's *Law and Gospel*."

F. R. WEBBER