

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XIV

November, 1943

No. 11

CONTENTS

	Page
The Reunion of Christendom. Th. Engelder	745
Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)	777
Outlines on the Old Standard Gospel Lessons	784
Miscellanea	787
Theological Observer	795
Book Review	810

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 18, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



Theological Observer

American Lutheranism and Its Relations to World Protestantism.

In the *Lutheran Outlook* for July Rev. H. C. Caspersen, editor of *Folkebladet*, representative of the Lutheran Free Church, publishes an article having the heading "American Lutheranism and World Council of Churches," which deserves careful study. The author first attempts to view American Lutheranism as a whole. As he looks at it in a detached way, he finds it quite complex, having many different shades and varieties of subdivisions. He says, "One [branch] may emphasize piety and 'purity of life,' another confessionalism and 'purity of doctrine.' One lays stress on the 'church and the ministry' or a somewhat high-church order, another on the local congregation or the universal priesthood of believers, favoring a low-church view. Again, there may be differing views regarding the nature of Scripture, its origin, its inspiration, whether verbal and plenary (practically identical concepts) or historical and progressive, and so on, almost *ad infinitum*." A number of other divergencies are listed. Editor Caspersen is right: these differences exist. He is wrong in not censuring those who reject the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures or who are not concerned about "purity of doctrine" as well as "purity of life." If we are no longer interested in the Scripturalness of our teachings or the inviolable majesty of the "It is written," the days of Lutheranism are numbered.

Editor Caspersen holds that there is enough doctrinal unity among the Lutherans of America to have fellowship with one another. Yes, if the name Lutheran is enough to form the basis of fellowship or a merely formal endorsement of the Augsburg Confession suffices for union, his position is well taken. But wherever Lutherans find the genius of their Church in simple, unwavering loyalty to everything the Word of God teaches, especially the Gospel of the atonement, his appraisal will be unsatisfactory. Our writer objects to the procedure in which "comparative trifles" are made "mountain-high barriers." But he must not forget that no Christian can afford to take departure from any part of the divine Word lightly, even if it pertains to what appears a trifle; and while no one should treat a brother who errs in weakness without destroying the foundation as if he were a heretic, the authority of the Word must be safeguarded.

To the surprise of the reader, Editor Caspersen holds it to be a historical fact that "Lutheranism has never regarded itself as *one Church*." Accordingly he finds it "not remarkable that there is not a Lutheran Church in America. The situation conforms with the *sui generis* of Lutheranism itself. For Lutheranism is not a Church; it is a movement." That strikes one as very strange. Luther, of course, did not intend to found a new Church; he wished to reform, to purify. But did not his followers feel that they belonged together, that they formed one Church? The lack of outward organization and the liberty with which in the various countries Lutherans ordered their affairs, some having bishops, others not, some cultivating a highly developed, rich

liturgy, others preferring a simple mode of worship, has apparently led Editor Caspersen to the view that there never existed a Lutheran Church.

When thinking of the World Council of Churches, Editor Caspersen holds that the various bodies of Lutherans here in America may well join it. His description of the attitude they take at present must here be inserted. "It is very encouraging to know that the United Lutheran Church and the Augustana Synod already have taken the first steps of collaboration. They have by representation at council meetings manifested their sympathy with the new movement. The American Lutheran Conference, as such, has not yet dealt with the question. It is not possible to predict what stand it would take at this time. Likely the American Lutheran Church would hesitate, a majority of the Norwegian Lutheran Church could be expected to look with sympathy in the direction of the World Council, but a strong minority would almost certainly oppose. The smaller bodies, the Lutheran Free Church and the United Danish Lutheran Church, would be sympathetic toward the world federation. The Missouri Synod (the Synodical Conference) would not join or consider joining."

Much like E. Stanley Jones, the editor of *Folkebladet* wants each church body that joins the World Council to retain its own peculiar doctrines and polity. "What is needed is not regimentation, but co-operation." To combat Romanism successfully, Protestantism, he holds, has to form and present a united front. He concludes with the assertion that the spirit of American Lutheranism is opposed both to regimentation and to isolationism.

Apparently the World Council of Churches with its mingling of Liberals and Conservatives, of Modernists and Fundamentalists, of people who unhesitatingly and audaciously tread under foot what we Lutherans hold sacred and others who are more moderate, holds no terrors for this theologian. Nor does he recognize its unscripturalness. Our only remark at this time is that if there is to be a procession of Lutherans headed toward the World Council of Churches, we, of course, if our warnings are not heeded, cannot prevent it, but we pray God that He may let Editor Caspersen's declaration concerning our particular stand remain true and keep us from joining in the rush. A.

Why Disunion?—Writing in the *Lutheran Outlook* on factors that hinder Lutheran unity, Professor John C. Mattes of Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, enumerates four foes as perhaps responsible, listed long ago by Roger Bacon, as leading to human errors: Undue regard for authority, habit, prejudice, false conceit of knowledge. Potent factors they may get to be, everyone has to admit. The paragraph on the curse of habit we here reprint. "Then there is the curse of habit. It would seem as though there are groups that, like the proverbial elephant, can never forget, with the result that the shibboleths of a past generation are repeated over and over again, even when they have completely lost their original significance. What began as a defense of great principles degenerates into mere logomachies, because pet phrases have become sacrosanct, and any new definition, even if it be a better one, is regarded as a sort of sacrilege. If it were not for a fear of confusing the issue,

we might easily compile a dictionary of such archaic slogans. We will only mention one, because it is such a stumbling block at the present time. It is the monotonously repeated designation 'verbal inspiration.' It has become a misnomer and a false shibboleth. Not that we disagree for one moment with the intention of those who use it or dissent to the slightest degree from what they are trying to say. Our complaint is that they do not say what they mean and that the average individual is bound to mistake their meaning. No matter what protestations are made to the contrary, the natural inference is that it is a statement of the wretched, non-Scriptural dictation-theory of the 7th [17th] century. We believe fully in the plenary inspiration of Scripture and its religious inerrancy, but that does not mean that we must regard the writers of Scripture as mechanical stenographers, or even accept the sacrilegious idea that the Holy Ghost, by accommodating Himself to the style of the writers, had to learn diverse Hebrew and Greek idioms from various human beings. Yet this is actually what the term naturally suggests. Why, then, insist on misleading definitions when most persons are sure to misunderstand them?"

The author's experience with the term "verbal inspiration" may have been worse than ours has been. Giving it an unscriptural content must, of course, be avoided. Usually, if our observation is correct, when the term is attacked, the critics are opposed to the plenary inspiration and the inerrancy of the Bible. We are surprised that Dr. Mattes speaks of the "religious" inerrancy of the holy writings. Does he mean to limit inerrancy to the "religious" elements in the Bible? Considering how many lances he shattered for sound Lutheranism when he was still a member of the U. L. C. A. and the general tenor of the words quoted above, we are loath to impute such a view to him.

At the conclusion of his article the professor strongly insists that acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions should be considered a sufficient guaranty of orthodoxy and that endorsement of other creedal statements should not be required. He believes we need no further confessional declarations. That sounds good. But where various interpretations of the Confessions arise or parts of the Confessions are rejected, discussion has to take place, and the drawing up of a joint document becomes inevitable.

A.

Verbal Inspiration Witnessed by Confessional Calvinists. Recently there were published the addresses and agenda of the Second American Calvinistic Conference, held at Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich., June 3—5, 1943. The book (to be had at Baker's Book Store, Grand Rapids, Mich., price, \$1.00) bears the title *The Word of God and the Reformed Faith*. It is divided into two parts, the first containing the seven addresses delivered at the Conference and the second, the banquet speeches and conference memoranda. Of the two parts, the first is the more important. The addresses, both scholarly and popular, are all worth studying, because they give the reader a clear insight into present-day orthodox Calvinistic thought. But what is more, the addresses are centered in the "Word of God," a most timely subject, since Barthianism and other erring trends of today have so badly misinter-

preted that term. The speakers have treated such subjects as: "The Glory of the Word of God" (Ockenga); "What Is the Word of God" (Berkhof); "Present-Day Interpretations of the Word of God" (Allis); "The Word of God and Philosophy" (Stob), etc. While in our estimation the concept of Inspiration is not sufficiently clarified and also perhaps not adequately presented, nevertheless, the Bible in unmistakable terms is asserted to be the inspired Word of God. Some of the statements may interest the reader. We read: "It [Scripture] was written by men who were inspired, and the writings themselves were God-inbreathed" (p. 38).—"Calvin thought the writers as notaries who set down in authentic registers for public report what was dictated to them. He did not necessarily believe that the mode of reception was dictation, but that the result was as if these words were dictated" (p. 37).—"This is not the advocating of a mechanical theory of dictation, in which men were mere automatons, but it is the belief that God embodied Himself in these men by filling them with the Spirit so that they in perfect freedom, being preserved from error, expressed themselves in giving His message with all the differences of their background, knowledge, vocabulary, and mental processes" (p. 39).—"This inspiration, of course, is different from revelation. The revelation of God is one thing, but inspiration is another" (p. 39).—"We do not say that the Bible *contains* God's Word, but that *it is God's Word*" (italics ours, p. 39).—"It is the faith of Christians that the Scriptures are infallible, and this infallibility is due to the fact that they are the Word of God. On this we have the testimony of Jesus" (p. 40).—"Inspiration thus may be held [rather: should be held] to extend to the very words chosen by the authors" (p. 43).—"Here we have the reason why there is no other book which is the peer of the Bible, why in all our reading we should place the Bible first. It is God's Word" (p. 43). In the second address: "What IS the Word of God." Dr. Louis Berkhof (Calvin Seminary) argues against Vergilius Ferm's recent contention that "only those parts of the Bible are the Word of God which preach or urge Christ" (p. 61). Also this address (as also the others) deserves study, for in it, among other things, Dr. Berkhof defends plenary inspiration in a very lucid and forceful manner. One quotation from this scholarly address may interest our readers especially. He writes: "Pieper in his *Christliche Dogmatik* strongly defends the view that according to Luther the whole Bible is the Word of God and shows that the other view [partial inspiration] rests on the misinterpretation of a couple of passages in Luther's *Werke*. Cf. I, p. 334 ff."—Dr. Oswald T. Allis, in his masterly address "Present Day Interpretation," confutes "The Higher Criticism" and "Modern Dispensationalism."—But we must break off. There is so much that is not only good, but even necessary in these timely, Word-centered addresses that one almost envies these orthodox groups of Calvinists on account of their deep interest in theology and their confessional (though not fanatic) stand against the rationalism of our day. When will the day come that Lutheranism in our country will return from the periphery of secondary problems to the study of "first things"—sacred theology? Must Fundamentalist Calvinism show us the way back? J. T. M.

What Hindereth? The *Australian Lutheran* (Sept. 21, 1943) reports an incident which shows that the spirit of unionism is strongly at work also in Australia. The comments of the editor on the affair are worthy also of our notice and support. We read: "It was described as a step toward Christian union when recently a number of different denominations in a suburb of Melbourne decided that they would drop their usual Sunday evening service and have a united service in the town hall. The united service was arranged by ten different congregations of Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational, and Salvation Army persuasion. It was attended by 1,350 people, among whom were the mayor and the councillors. Since the attendance is said to have been gratifying, it would seem that the services of these churches would not have averaged 135 people in attendance. The aim of the united service was to hasten the day when the various denominations will simply keep silence as to the differences of their teachings and will organize themselves into one big church. Many think that the procedure adopted on this occasion is the only way to achieve that object. Now, of course, if it does not matter what a Christian believes and what a church teaches, no fault could be found with such a united service. But is that a principle established for the Church of the New Testament that there shall be no doctrinal discipline? Luther refused to enter into church fellowship with Zwingli for doctrinal reasons, and for doctrinal reasons we Lutherans still refuse the hand of fellowship to those who will not let the Word of God alone decide all matters of doctrine for them. Jesus says, 'Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven.' To fellowship with those who brush the Word of Jesus aside is not confessing Him. But if men believe that it is enough to believe that there is a God and that Jesus Christ was a great teacher of men, then division among them is foolish and sinful, and their divisions should cease." We must not be surprised if sooner or later all churches of a Reformed background unite into one large church set-up, more or less organically joined together. Calvinism has always favored church union on the principle: to agree to disagree. That was Zwingli's principle at Marburg, and in that, we believe, Luther recognized the different spirit of Zwinglianism. When Modernism tainted the churches of Calvinistic background, there was all the less reason to remain apart. After all, the principle of Unitarianism governed them all. Today there is a tendency of cleavage along the lines of Modernism and Fundamentalism, but Fundamentalism, within its definite scope, is no less unionistic than is Modernism. The only thing we Lutherans must do—and liberal Lutherans are not likely to follow in this—is to show our people just why we dare not unionize with errorists or heretics. This is nicely and briefly done in the editorial in *The Australian Lutheran*, and we are convinced that such instruction will not be in vain. By the way, a unionistic church has always been a weak church, lacking in dynamic, while a confessional church is strong both *ad intra* and *ad extra*. Nothing is gained by mere numbers.

J. T. M.

Secret Societies and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.—At the Ninth Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church a special committee submitted a lengthy and detailed report on secret societies, which was filed away in the minutes of the assembly. In the book review section of this periodical the report will be more fully discussed, but here we wish to state what the *Calvin Forum* (August-September, 1943) has to say on the report. We read: "This clear-cut and forthright analysis of the subject takes up the religion for which Masonry stands, its doctrine of God, its attitude toward the Word of God, its ethics, its conception of salvation, its conception of brotherhood, and its universalism. After showing that the universalism of Christianity differs radically from the universalism of Masonry, the report continues with these fine, pertinent contrasts: 'Christianity claims to have the only true book, the Bible—Masonry places this book on a par with the sacred books of other religions. Christianity lays claim to the only true God, the God of the Bible, and denounces all other Gods as idols—Masonry recognizes the Gods of all religions. Christianity describes God as the Father of Jesus Christ and of those who through faith in Him have received the right to be called the sons of God—The God of Masonry is the universal father of all mankind. Christianity holds that only the worship of the God who has revealed Himself in Holy Scripture is true worship—Masonry honors as true worship the worship of numerous other deities. Christianity recognizes but one Savior, Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and man—Masonry recognizes many saviors. Christianity recognizes but one way of salvation, that of grace through faith—Masonry rejects this way and substitutes for it salvation by works and character. Christianity teaches the brotherhood of those who believe in Christ, the communion of saints, the church universal, the one body of Christ—Masonry teaches the brotherhood of Masons and the universal brotherhood of man. Christianity glories in being the only truly universal religion—Masonry would rob Christianity of this glory and appropriate it to itself. Christianity maintains that it is the only true religion—Masonry denies this claim and boasts of being Religion itself.'—This is clear thinking and straight shooting on an important issue before the Christian Church. The report concludes that 'Masonry is a religious institution and as such is definitely anti-Christian.' On membership of church members in these secret societies it finally states its position as follows: 'Far be it from the committee to assert that there are no Christians among the members of the Masonic fraternity. Just as a great many who trust for eternal life solely in the merits of Christ continue as members of churches that have denied the faith, so undoubtedly many sincere Christians, uninformed, or even misinformed, concerning the true character of Freemasonry, hold membership in it without compunction of conscience. But that in no way alters the fact that membership in the Masonic fraternity is inconsistent with Christianity.' This report was submitted to the 1942 General Assembly, and the committee was charged to send it to the ministers and sessions for their study. The 1943 Assembly has taken no further action. Just where the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as such hence stands on this issue

and what its attitude will be toward possible lodge members in the church is still undecided. It is reasonable to expect that some action will be taken before long. Meanwhile the splendid report of the Committee deserves careful and prayerful study." Personally we hope that this splendid report will be published in tract form so that it may be made accessible to such of our pastors and churches as desire to study it as a non-Lutheran witness against Freemasonry. J. T. M.

Why Not Teach This Year? — A reader of *The Christian Century* (Sept. 22, 1943) suggests that in view of the teacher shortage ministers be called upon to teach in our public schools. The writer evidently is somewhat acquainted both with ministers and schools, and some of his comments are most interesting. He says, among other things: "A recent report from Scotland stated that many ministers were filling vacancies in schools. Of course, Scottish ministers are all educated, and the relationship of Church and State is not as meticulously unrealistic as here. But why cannot American ministers do the same? There is a serious shortage of teachers. The minister is the most available man in most communities. Most educated people are employed in war jobs paying better salaries. The minister who is distressed at not doing any special war work can do it by teaching. And there will be no danger of profiteering from it. In rural areas the need is greatest. Ministers from near-by towns can serve these schools. The minister is well prepared to teach history or English in high schools. Some can teach science and mathematics. Many can teach in elementary schools. This is a good way of learning humility, which is not exactly the outstanding mark of the clergy. To work with little children and be free from the flattery of obsequious adult parishioners may be deflating to some pompous parsons, but it might be salutary as well. Teaching is an antidote for laziness, a malady which attacks many ministers. In small churches the minister frequently has nothing to do during the week and becomes a community errand boy or downtown loafer to keep from boredom. It is hard to convince the average man that the minister works, and there is much to justify the suspicion. Teaching will cut down on visiting time. But there certainly is more hope in spending the day with growing and impressionable youth than with old ladies of both sexes fortified in their prejudices and recalcitrancy. Teaching still leaves the minister time for visiting the sick and for preparing his sermons. For a generation the conscience of the Church has been uneasy over its loss of influence on youth. *Parochial schools, an obvious answer*, do not seem probable in the American scene [*italics ours*]. The minister in the school helps solve the problem. He can take Christianity into the schools — not in a belligerent or sectarian manner, but by teaching in the spirit of Jesus. It is not a secret that most of our textbooks in history, psychology, economics, and science are anti-religious. The minister can teach these subjects fairly and let students know that Christianity in America did not end with the *Mayflower*. And the quiet, devout, honest spirit of a minister working daily in the classroom will give students an impression that Christianity can be intellectually respectable and contemporaneously alive. The teacher has children five days one hour a week.

They have to go to school. And they are young enough to change their minds. Why don't you teach this year?" — Evidently the problem is not quite as simple as the writer would make it. We know from experience that the conscientious pastor of even a small congregation has quite enough to do if he really does the work which has been charged to him by his call — studying, preparing his sermons, teaching catechism classes, both young and adult, winning souls for Christ, and so forth. Let us not be hasty in condemning the average minister as an indolent person, though, as Dr. Walther has said, there is no other profession so likely to make a person lazy as the ministry. Then, too, there is the problem of teaching. As a rule, the minister is not trained for teaching, and he cannot meet the requirements demanded by the State boards of education. But after all is said, is there not something to consider in what Mr. C. G. Hamilton from Aberdeen, Miss., has to say? We are speaking, of course, from the viewpoint of the Christian day school, which Mr. Hamilton admits to be the "obvious answer" to the problem of the Church's loss of influence on youth. In large parish schools where the faculty is adequate to take care of the teaching, the minister may not so easily fit in with the teaching staff of the school. But in smaller schools, we believe, the pastor will do well to take over some of the branches as, for example, religion, history, geography, physiology, and others, in which his witness on behalf of the truth will be of great value. Teaching children is an "antidote for laziness." Teaching *does* enhance the pastor's influence on his church's youth. Teaching *does* make him wide awake to the problems confronting the young people of today. The writer for a number of years taught a parish school of eight grades, and the experience he gained from it has been most valuable. And today our Church is facing a real teacher shortage. Students of the second year at Concordia Seminary last June were asked to volunteer for temporary teaching work, though this may affect most seriously our vicar and candidate problem during the next years. So why not let the pastor prepare himself for teaching and keep young with the youth of his church? Many of our pastors are doing this and have done this for years, and their graduates are an honor to them. We, of course, do not favor Mr. Hamilton's suggestion that the minister take Christianity into the school . . . by teaching "in the spirit of Jesus." For one thing, such teaching does not belong into the public school, which may teach ethics, based on the natural law, but not religion. In general, we have much reason for giving thanks to God that in our country the relationship of Church and State is meticulously unrealistic. We write this, because, in the second place, if modernistic or fanatically adventistic ministers or even some other ministers for all that take Christianity into our public schools, the salvation of believing children might be endangered. The idea that ministers "in the spirit of Jesus" teach religion in our schools is one which is loaded with dynamite.

J. T. M.

Inflation in China. The information contained in an editorial in the *Christian Century* describing the economic stress in China must be heeded by Missouri Synod Lutherans as well as by other Christians whose representatives are working in that country. The editorial says in part,

"The rate of exchange (in West China) has remained fairly stable for a considerable time, but the level of prices has advanced and continues to advance beyond the point where a missionary's salary, converted into an impressive number of Chinese dollars, would even buy food for his family, not to mention other necessities of life. Suppose a couple gets \$125 a month. At the current rate that means about 2,500 Chinese dollars. Sounds like affluence, doesn't it? But consider prices: sugar, 26 Chinese dollars a pound; flour, 7; butter, 135 (when there is any); eggs, 2 dollars a piece; coal, 3,000 dollars a ton. Divide by 20 to translate into American dollars. These are quotations as of three months ago. Since then some items have changed little, while others have increased 30 to 50 per cent. A correspondent of the *Christian Century* currently reports that a new typewriter ribbon cost him 400 Chinese dollars. Twenty American dollars for a typewriter ribbon may bring the matter home to literate Americans even more than \$1.30 a pound for brown sugar. Canadian missionaries report, in the *United Church Observer*, that some of them are selling their clothes to buy food. Obviously that can't go on. The churches cannot doubt the value of the services that have been rendered by their representatives in China during these hard years and the importance of their future work. The testimony of the Chinese themselves would remove any doubts they might have. If they want this work to go on, they must make it possible for the missionaries to live." As far as our own information goes, the description given in the above is not exaggerated. Are we all awake to the difficulties with which our missionaries are struggling and as willing to support them as we should be? A.

Interest of Presbyterians in Foreign Missions. A commentator in the *Presbyterian* states that a year ago the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterians asked the Church to have 500 of its young people dedicate themselves to service in the field of Foreign Missions. The writer furthermore says that during the present year, 1943—1944, "forty new missionaries are to go out to the field, twenty more young people are to be put through a course of training, and one hundred more are sought as 'appointees in waiting.'" He says that of this last one hundred many have signed on the dotted line. As to the attitude of the Board of Foreign Missions he states, "The war, in its eyes, is not an obstacle, but a challenge: while some doors seem for the moment to be closed, others are opening wider than ever. Even Afghanistan is making ready to admit the missionary who has sat at its gate, in Persia and India, for so many years." In his view "large areas of China are ready and eager for the Gospel; the highlands of South America are white unto the harvest; Mexico offers an open door in provinces lately closed." His appeal is to the Church in general to give and to the youth of the Church to dedicate itself to the service abroad. The lesson to be drawn from all this by us Lutherans is so plain that it requires no elucidation. A.

The Outlook in China. An editorial in the *Watchman-Examiner* speaks of the friendly attitude of General Chiang Kai-shek toward the Christian Church and the opportunities in China for aggressive mission endeavors. The editor says:

"A great tribute has been paid by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to the Christian Church and its missionaries in China. In an address at the opening session of the first national Christian conference held since the outbreak of the war, the Chinese leader said: 'We still need them (the missionaries) and welcome Christians from other lands who serve the people of China with true sympathy and devotion. Do not feel that you are guests. You are comrades working with us to save our people and build a new nation. Christians from abroad and Christians in China are on the same footing and can work wholeheartedly together for the reconstruction of China. . . . Let the church identify itself more intimately with the life and needs of the people and cooperate fully with the government and social welfare agencies and build a heaven in society. When there is opportunity, the church should not hesitate to take a lead in social service.' The Generalissimo urged the church in China to proclaim more widely its teachings and to broaden the scope of its work, particularly in public health. [?] This is a far cry from the cold days of more than a century ago when Morrison went to China. It warms our hearts and gives us hope concerning the future, for with governmental approval of our foreign mission enterprise the churches of this country are faced with an opportunity unequalled in the history of the world. There are still several hundreds of millions in China who have never heard the name of Christ and who know nothing about the Gospel."

A.

Afrikaans and English in South Africa. A correspondent to the *Calvin Forum* (June-July, 1943), writing from Potchefstroom, South Africa, dwells on the problem caused by the fact that South Africa is governed by a bilingual and biracial nation, consisting of the Afrikaans-speaking descendants of the Dutch and the English. The correspondent, J. Christian Goetzee, has evidently given much attention to the problem, and some of the things he states are extremely interesting. He writes, among other things: "In this problem of biraciality there is at the present moment none more important and burning than that of bilingualism or unilingualism. Will this coming nation remain bilingual or will it become unilingual? At the present time both English and Afrikaans people accept the fact that there are two races and two separate languages. This is also borne out by our educational policy. For years now we have two or three types of schools, especially elementary and secondary, but also tertiary schools. There are particularly the single medium schools, that is to say, there exist side by side schools in which English and schools in which Afrikaans are the media of instruction. This type of school seems to most of us, educationalists as well as statesmen, to be the ideal type: instruction through the mother tongue is nationally and educationally the only sound principle. . . . There is but one language for the education of a child, and that is the language of its mother. The agitation in South Africa for the application of education through the mother tongue is only a part of our general struggle for Christian national education. Language is of fundamental importance for the intellectual and mental development of the child. It is the medium for intercourse not only between one human being and another,

but also between man and God. The language which a child acquires from the first, in its intercourse with human beings and with God, is the language of its mother: the mother tongue forms the basis for the whole education of the child, and without it a child cannot be properly educated. . . . A good Afrikaner will naturally organize his school along the lines of a sound Afrikaans spirit, and a good Englishman will do likewise. What, then, we ask, becomes of the other group in such a mixed school? Our experience of dual schools—with English and Afrikaans pupils—is that the children very seldom play together: the Afrikaans-speaking children group together, and so do the English-speaking; instead of helping along unity, we cause division! An Afrikaans child—and that applies equally well to an English child—is never more conscious of the fact that he or she is Afrikaans than when in the company of English children.” . . . This relatively short quotation from a rather lengthy article may give the reader some food for thought. On the one hand, it demonstrates the tactful colonial policy of the British in permitting the Afrikaner, from whom, of course, England took the hegemony in South Africa, to retain his Afrikaans language and culture. On the other hand, it shows what stupendous problems exist in a bilingual or multilingual nation, in which the various racial elements hold tenaciously to their linguistic and cultural inheritance. Such a situation must naturally produce clannishness, aloofness, misunderstanding, suspicion, strife, and other antisocial attitudes. We may therefore welcome the gradual Anglicization of our own various racial elements as a boon which is much to be appreciated, especially since this takes place not exclusive, but rather inclusive of the various cultural elements brought into our country by the different racial immigrants, our democracy serving as a huge melting pot in the best sense of the term. In a commonwealth like ours there is little room for untold varying language and cultural groups existing side by side and having heterogeneous ideals and aims. Mr. Goetzee writes: “Instead of helping along unity, we cause division.” And in this he is right. Different languages are division factors, barriers among races and nations, while unilingualism tends to unite men into harmonious social groups. We are, of course, interested in the problem solely from the religious point of view. There is no doubt that unilingualism makes the preaching of the Gospel much easier both within a church and without, for it removes the obstructions and tensions caused by bilingualism or multilingualism. But this is only one side of the question. The other side is that of the spread of the Gospel by means of many languages. As long as linguistically different elements exist in a nation and they cannot understand the language of the land well enough to be religiously edified in it (we must, of course, here distinguish real need and mere downright stubbornness), it becomes the duty of ministers to employ their language in the service of Christ, and students of theology must be willing to learn such languages “becoming unto the Jews as a Jew” and “to them that are without law as without law,” “that they might by all means save some” (1 Cor. 9:20-22). And at this point also there must not be too much haste and pressure to force elderly people to use a language they do not under-

stand, because the salvation of a single soul is unspeakably precious in God's sight and must be so in that of the pastor. At present one third of our seminary graduates must still do a good deal of preaching in German, while another third must do occasional preaching, and the last third will find much use for German in their pastoral ministry. And what goes for German, goes also for Norwegian, Slovak, and other tongues represented at our seminary. The Christian minister must be characterized by neither racial nor linguistic prejudices. But there remains also the question of general culture. Languages are the doors that open one's way to the cultures of the various peoples; and to have acquired a minimum of such culture means to have secured for oneself an indescribable pleasure and treasure. There is a linguistic narrowness which is helpful and a linguistic narrowness which is harmful; and the minister of Christ will place every opportunity and talent into the service of Him whose righteous cause he pleads, confessing with St. Paul: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (1 Cor. 9:22).

J. T. M.

Religious Education in Britain. The British government has issued a proposal regarding religious education in the schools. It provides that all primary and secondary schools shall begin each day with a "corporate" act of worship and that religious instruction shall be given all pupils except those whose parents object.

Religious instruction would be given in public schools according to plans approved by the churches and also in church schools measuring up to prescribed standards. Churches would be required to provide half the cost of improving their schools to bring them up to the standard.

Roman Catholic periodicals criticize the proposals, saying there would be difficulty in providing 50 per cent of the cost of necessary improvements required so the church might retain full control over teachers and courses of study.—*The Lutheran*.

Scientists and the Christian Faith. What is the present attitude of men of science toward Christianity and the Bible? Writing in the *Christian Century*, Dr. Hornell Hart, a liberal theologian and a member of the Society of Friends (Quaker), teaching at present in Duke University, has this to say on our question, "In 1933 Prof. James H. Leuba of Bryn Mawr College found that less than 13 per cent of the more distinguished sociologists and psychologists believed in God, while less than 10 per cent believed in a life beyond death. Among the more distinguished biologists and physicists from 12 to 20 per cent admit holding these beliefs. The less distinguished scientists were somewhat more inclined to believe than the more distinguished, but practically all groups had lower percentages of belief in 1933 than in 1914. The failure of organized religion to hold the loyalty of the intellectual leaders of today is indicated by the fact that whereas more than one half the adult population of the United States hold memberships in churches, only 25 per cent of the more distinguished American men of science admitted any church affiliation in 1930-'31. He states that constructive religious attitudes have been expressed by prominent men of science like Eddington, Millikan, Conklin, Jeans, and others, but according to his observa-

tion "increasing alienation has been evident between science and organized religion." Disturbing and saddening as this information is, it should not surprise a reader of the Scriptures. Paul stated when writing to the Corinthians that "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." This will remain true to the end of time. The Gospel will continue to be a stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. Here, too, the word of Jesus has its application: "Blessed is he that is not offended in Me." A.

The Auburn Affirmation. The *Christian Beacon* (Bible Presbyterian Church) of August 12, 1943, reprints the Auburn Affirmation. The document is too long to be reproduced here. Those interested should obtain a copy of the *Christian Beacon*, Camden, N. J. The issues involved are vital; it is wise to survey them at frequent intervals. In speaking of the doctrinal contents of the Affirmation the *Beacon* gives the following information:

The five points of doctrine contained in the deliverance of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., in 1923, and which the Auburn Affirmation *attacked* are as follows:

"1. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.

"2. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.

"3. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

"4. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and of our standards concerning our Lord Jesus Christ that on the third day He rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession.

"5. It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God as the supreme standard of our faith that our Lord Jesus showed His power and love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it."

The Auburn Affirmation declares that one can be a loyal Christian without accepting these five points.

Brief Items. Much publicity has been given to a statement by Brigadier General William R. Arnold, Chief of Chaplains of the Army, in which he declares that almost one thousand additional chaplains are needed at once. He added the information that since Pearl Harbor 33 chaplains have died in the service of the Army.

The *Gripsholm*, which brought back to America our missionaries in China that had been imprisoned by the Japanese, has been in the Orient again and is expected to return to the United States in December, having among its passengers 300 homecoming missionaries.

The *Watchman-Examiner* has published several articles by Dr. Pierce in which the struggle in Northern Baptist circles between Modernism

and Fundamentalism in its bearing on Foreign Mission efforts is spoken of. The writer strongly protests against the unbelief which in the form of Modernism has invaded Northern Baptist circles and naturally is transplanted to the mission fields.

The number of churches that have joined the World Council of Churches is now 82. The last additions have been the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Church of the East and the Assyrians (formerly the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of the East).

This summer the daily press reported the death of a prominent Lutheran theologian of America, Dr. J. L. Neve, professor emeritus of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio (U. L. C. A.). He was widely known as an author through his books in the fields of Church History and Symbolics.

The *Christian Century* informs its readers on a decision made by the Supreme Court of Kentucky. It is to the effect that church pledges do not constitute legal obligations. A Kentucky farmer, some time before his death, which occurred in 1937, had signed a pledge promising to give five thousand dollars to Transylvania University besides several other pledges of a similar nature. The lower courts held that these pledges had to be paid by the estate, but the Supreme Court ruled otherwise.

After six years of work the Hymn Book Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church has published a revision of the hymnal of this Church. There are 600 hymns in this book, 210 of them new ones, that is, hymns which were not in the collection when it was issued in 1916.

With 2,865,200 men and women in the Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, exclusive of the Navy nurses' corps, Rev. Capt. Robert D. Workman, Chief of Chaplains, said recently that the present corps of 1,500 naval chaplains must be greatly enlarged.—*Christian Century*.

Dr. Campbell Morgan, noted British preacher and author, for the last eleven years pastor of Westminster Chapel, London, now has resigned, old age making the active ministry too burdensome for him. His positive testimony for the old Gospel has been much appreciated in conservative circles.

The United States Department of Commerce through its subdivision, the Bureau of the Census (William Lane Austin, director), has issued a special pamphlet giving a part of the census of religious bodies for 1936. It is Bulletin No. 18 and deals with the Lutherans. What is offered is described as "Statistics," "Denominational History," "Doctrine," and "Organization." Separate statistics are given for each of the 22 Lutheran bodies. The publication was "prepared under the supervision of Dr. T. F. Murphy, chief statistician for religious studies. The pamphlet may be obtained from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., for 15 cents.

The Yonkers Baptist Church recently resigned from the Northern Baptist Convention and from local state bodies, charging that these organizations had forsaken "the recognized practices, polity, and faith of Baptist Churches of America." The reason given was the affiliation of the Northern Baptist Convention with the Federal Council, which

was accused of being pacifistic and totalitarian and of "forcing a radio monopoly on the Protestants of the nation."

Christian Century, Aug. 18, 1943

Writing in the *Presbyterian* on the Westminster Assembly (1643 to 1648), Dr. H. T. Kerr of Princeton Theological Seminary says, "The examination of ministers took up a great deal of the time of the Assembly, and the question as to the educational qualifications of the clergy was thoroughly examined. Here are some of the conclusions: 'A man must be able to read his Greek Testament.' 'All our learning lies in Latin books.' 'I am of the opinion that the pastor's office is to convince. He must be able not only to feed the flock, but to keep off the wolves.' 'The times are learned and demand a learned ministry.' 'We may think the place obscure, yet it may have knowing people therein.'" Not bad even in 1943!

When the Atlanta, Ga., Christian Council, representing the Protestant Churches of the city, recommended that the Bible should be taught in the public schools "as God's Word, without controversy or sectarian bias" and the Methodist Ministers' Conference had voted its approval, the Baptist pastors opposed the move, stating that they did not approve "of the teaching of religion in tax-supported institutions, declaring it would be a violation of the historic Baptist principle of separation of Church and State." They stated that Bible study should be carried on in the churches and the homes, and the family altar should not be neglected. — *Christian Century*.

News of church conditions in Germany has to be obtained from the neutral countries adjacent to it. The *Religious News Service* prints an item which was sent from Stockholm and according to which Germany will be suffering from a most severe shortage of pastors after the war, since so many of them have been killed on the war fronts. It is stated that on an average one German pastor dies on the war fronts every day. According to this source the exigencies of the situation may require the ordaining of laymen as pastors. Here are great opportunities for the Church of the old Gospel, and, at that, in the land of the fathers.

According to *Religious News Service* religious conditions in England are rather sad. 10 per cent of the people are really devoted to Christianity, 30 per cent assume a kindly attitude toward it, 50 per cent are entirely indifferent, and the remaining 10 per cent actually oppose it. This is the description given by Bishop Wilson of Chelmsford. "When the Son of man comes, will He find faith upon earth?"

On July 1 Pastor Martin Niemoeller began his seventh year in a concentration camp. He is at Dachau, which, recent reports indicate, has become something of a specialized camp for the detention of religious prisoners. His health is reported good. — *Christian Century*.

Since May, 1929, it has been illegal in U. S. S. R. (Russia) to print, publish, distribute, or circulate the Scriptures or any part of them. No modification of this law has taken place. No permission has been granted to anybody to distribute God's Word in Russia proper.

Watchman-Examiner