

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XIV

July, 1943

No. 7

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| The Reunion of Christendom. Th. Engelder | 457 |
| Kiefl on Luther. Wm. Dallmann | 481 |
| Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference) | 488 |
| Theological Observer | 496 |
| Book Review | 521 |

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.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



ARCHIVES

Theological Observer

Candidates for Naval Chaplaincies.—The Navy's ambitious plan to procure chaplains by subsidizing, in college and seminary, young men who have been approved by their denomination provided that certain stipulations of the Navy as to courses of study are observed, is receiving a good deal of discussion in the religious press. The Western Section of the American Association of Theological Seminaries would like to see the plan modified in such a way that it will be the churches themselves who will do all the supervising, guiding, and subsidizing, in order to prevent State control of the religious and theological education of the future chaplains. The resolution adopted by the group mentioned when it was assembled at its biennial meeting May 5, 1943, reads thus: "In view of the urgent need of the churches for a continuing number of theological students to provide trained chaplains for the armed forces and adequate pastoral leadership for the civilian community, and also in view of the desirability of a clearly understood basis upon which such a dependable succession of candidates for this religious service may be assured, we earnestly request the Selective Service System to amend Occupational Bulletin No. 11 as issued March 1, 1943, so as to include the following provision: 'Any young man 18 years of age on filing his Selective Service Questionnaire, or at any time prior to induction, may request and receive favorable consideration for a II-A deferred classification as a pretheological student provided: (a) that he is properly credentialed by his church authorities as a candidate for the ministry; (b) that it is certified by a recognized college that he is accepted for admission and that within a period of 34 months, or 8 terms of 16 weeks each, after entrance, he will be able to complete a pre-theological course of study acceptable to the seminary which he plans to enter; and (c) that a recognized theological seminary certifies that he is unqualifiedly accepted for admission upon completion of this pre-professional work.'"

Dr. Albert W. Palmer of Chicago Theological Seminary in publishing the above resolution expresses the hope "that the churches will take appropriate action in support of the above resolution by making known to the Selective Service System their earnest approval of it." The *Christian Century* in a long editorial earnestly supports this resolution of the Western Section of the American Association of Theological Seminaries. It expresses the fear that the Navy's plan of subsidizing candidates for navy chaplaincies during their college and seminary career and exercising a certain amount of supervision is simply the proverbial "camel's nose." It feels that "the churches and seminaries have reason for profound disquiet over the prospect that the Navy—that is, the political State—is assuming responsibility and the initiative in the selection and education of at least a portion of the candidates for the Christian ministry. Its view is that what the Navy proposes is a definite departure from the established relation of Church and State. The restraint which holds its initial bad effects to a minimum

will tend to be thrown off as time goes on, and a further development of government interest in the seminaries and of constraint, if not control, over them will be hardly short of inevitable. The plan will produce an unwholesome psychological situation in the seminaries. Its effect upon the parish ministry of the churches will be invidious and harmful." What the *Christian Century* fears may come is: "Changes in the seminary's curriculum in line with the Navy's demands, or extension of 'military discipline' (which the plan now explicitly provides for) to include actual military training, the addition of experienced chaplains and/or other military officers to the faculty, and eventually the appropriation of a government subsidy direct to the seminary in compensation for the service which the tuition of the chaplaincy students (as of all students) does not cover. . . . The State will then be in a position to mold, if not to dictate, the education of the Christian ministry."

The warning cry here uttered "*Initiis obsta!*" is fully justified, we fear, and should be heeded by all lovers of religious liberty. A.

Federal Union.— Apparently the suggestion of E. Stanley Jones that Christian churches unite by forming a federation rather than through amalgamation is receiving a good deal of discussion. In the *Christian Century* of April 14, 1943, a Presbyterian, Dr. William Lindsay Young, president of Park College, Parkville, Mo., writes about this plan in favorable terms. Describing the plan of Dr. Jones, Dr. Young writes, "Federal union as he [Jones] proposes it is on the basis of expansion, not contraction. No Church is asked to lay aside any of its tested and approved values. Christendom would be poorer were it to lose the liturgical tradition of the Episcopal Church, the freedom and independence of the Congregational fellowship, the strong social passion and program of Methodism, or the evangelical emphasis which vibrates in the free heart of Presbyterianism. This proposal does not mean that the participants must reduce their convictions to the lowest common denominator. It means onward and upward, not backward and downward. . . . Another element of strength in this proposal is that its emphasis is in terms of function, not theology. It says in effect to one group, Come in with your Thirty-nine' Articles of faith, to another, Come in with your Westminster Confession of faith. These have values we must conserve. Come into this church fellowship with a view to increasing the effectiveness of all churches as they attempt to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. There are certain tasks we can do more effectively by working together than we can by working separately. Expanding those areas where we are already working together for the achievement of certain ends is essential before we can do much in another direction."

Dr. Young thinks that real union should not be striven for, for the first. "Fellowship is the way to understanding. If we can bear our burdens together and enter into each other's joys and sorrows, we will soon have the *esprit de corps* which is basic to ultimate reunion. There is nothing but tragedy before us if we try to weave together our ecclesiastical machinery and theological formulas without a prior spiritual oneness. Reunion is not the adjustment of an organization; it is the

growth of an organism. We may quickly and successfully rearrange the rods, wheels, and bolts of a machine and make it work. But to force artificially the growth of an organism can result in nothing but dull, stunted growth or death. We must never lose sight of the fact that we are dealing, not with machinery but with life."

Dr. Young looks at the whole question from the point of view of common sense, but not from that of the Scriptures. What would Paul say in this modern Babel of confusion and denial of precious, divinely given truths? What would Jesus have us do? These questions are not faced.

A.

Roman Catholic Totalitarianism.—It is refreshing to note how frankly and emphatically orthodox Calvinism at times even now witnesses against the oppression and tyranny of the Papacy, which today is not a whit more evangelical than it was at Luther's time. *The Calvin Forum* (April, 1943, p. 180) thus writes editorially: "Totalitarianism is not restricted to the political realm. It is likewise found in religious and ecclesiastical groups. The evil of totalitarianism is not [merely] that it considers itself a superior form of the social and political pattern, but that it would rob all other groups of the freedom to propagate their views and would force every citizen into their totalitarian strait jacket, even to the point of resorting to intimidation and persecution." After further elucidation the writer says in application of his point to Romanism: "In every prevaillingly Roman Catholic country Protestants are even now frequently subjected to Roman Catholic persecution—and that often of the most vicious kind. Religious and ecclesiastical totalitarianism is still the ideal of the Roman Church. In Protestant countries the Roman Church pleads for religious liberty. It knows that the only way for it to enjoy that liberty in a mixed or prevaillingly Protestant country is by recognizing liberty for all. The acid test of their belief in religious liberty can only be made in prevaillingly Roman Catholic countries, where Protestants are in the minority. And here the facts do not exactly stand on the side of those who claim that Roman Catholicism believes in religious freedom for all as well as does Protestantism. Let those testify who have lived in predominantly Romanist countries. The recent hue and cry against Protestant missions in such Roman Catholic countries as those of South America is an interesting illustration of the point under discussion. The Romanists want liberty for their Church to preach everywhere, but claim that if a country is prevaillingly Roman Catholic, Protestants should be debarred from carrying on their missionary activity within its borders. This is the practical application of the religious intolerance and the ecclesiastical totalitarianism of the Roman Church. Protestants will do well to keep their eyes open to this evil." The editorial, of course, offers nothing new to our readers. Nevertheless, it is worth noting what Reformed Protestants of our time have to say regarding the presumption and arrogance of Romanism; and it helps us to appreciate a little better the warning voice of our Confessions: *Papam esse ipsum verum Antichristum*. Rome somehow just does not give us Protestants any chance to modify, change, or eliminate that time-old teaching of the Smalcald Articles. J. T. M.

Missouri's Familiar Theory of the Scriptures.—In *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (April, 1943; p. 213 f.) Dr. Carl C. Rasmussen, professor of Systematic Theology, Gettysburg, reviews Dr. Engelder's *Reason or Revelation*. The review, on the whole, is favorable. Dr. Rasmussen finds much to praise in Dr. Engelder's book. The review also shows that Dr. Rasmussen has read the book carefully. He criticizes the title "Reason or Revelation" and suggests another, namely, "Reason or Scripture," because Dr. Engelder identifies Revelation with Scripture. He writes among other things: "The author takes the familiar position of the Missouri Synod, which not only assumes this identification, but insists upon its familiar theory of the Scriptures."—"Its tireless attack on 'rationalism' is specifically and most especially meant to include any who doubt this particular theory of Scripture."—"Among those who would join with the author in utter rejection of what he calls *rationalismus vulgaris* there are many who accept the Bible as the Word of God, but dissent from Missouri's interpretation of Bible verses cited by her authors . . . in proving it."—"In this connection it is to the point to take notice of Dr. Engelder's admission that (p. 18) 'we need our reason to *understand the meaning of the words used in Scripture.*'"—"That inescapable admission seems to open a wide door, a wider door for sincere differences than thinkers of his viewpoint are wont to recognize."—"It is faith in reason indeed so surely to believe that it can with such absolute completeness tell us 'what the words mean.'" This unavoidable role of reason, as the reviewer next suggests, may help to account for disagreements within the Synodical Conference as to so-called "non-fundamental points of doctrine." The reviewer, moreover, calls attention to the fact that Dr. Engelder's condemnation of rationalism involves not only European, but also American Lutheran teachers. What shall we say in reply? It is true that Dr. Engelder condemns not only the *rationalismus vulgaris*, but also that more subtle rationalism which rejects both the verbal inspiration of Scripture and the so-called proof-text approach to its understanding. The two are closely related, the latter following from the former; and both are based upon clear Scripture passages as Dr. Engelder clearly shows. Here therefore we should not speak of Missouri's "familiar theory," but we must acknowledge both verbal inspiration and the text-proof method as scriptural. In the next place, "disagreements within the Synodical Conference as to the so-called non-fundamental points of doctrine" in the writer's estimation do not form a serious problem at all. We trust that through debates which are carried on clarification will be accomplished.—But how about the reviewer's claim that Missouri identifies Revelation with Scripture? Missouri readily admits that God has revealed Himself as to His divine existence and will also do it in the future in nature, history, and the human heart. In other words, Missouri does not deny the *notitia Dei naturalis*. But this natural or general self-revelation of God does not embrace the Gospel. That is found only in Scripture and it is indeed the chief part of Scripture, the revealed Law being given only in the interest of the Gospel. God's self-revelation, as pertaining to man's salvation, is therefore identical with Scripture, as our Lutheran dogmaticians have always pointed out.—Lastly, let us bear in mind that the fact that we need our reason to

understand the meaning of the words used in Scripture does not open a wide door for sincere differences; for this use of reason is absolutely ancillary or instrumental. Reason in this case merely serves as the *instrumentum cognoscendi*. If it goes beyond this, we can no longer speak of a legitimate *usus rationis*, but must speak of its *abusus*. In that case reason actually sets itself up as a *iudex veritatis*, and it is no longer formal reason with which we deal, but reason in the sense of man's pretended knowledge of God and divine things. In other words, it is perverted man's conceited mind denying the divine truth given us for salvation in Holy Scripture. But of this God's Word commands us most earnestly to beware. Since the natural man does not perceive the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:14) and the carnal mind is enmity against God (Rom. 8:7), the Christian theologian must bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. 10:5). Knowing Dr. Rasmussen personally as a sincere Christian truth seeker, we are sure that he will through continued study recognize in Dr. Engelder's treatise not merely "Missouri's familiar theory of the Scriptures," but God's own precious truth clearly revealed in His Holy Book. J. T. M.

"What Has Happened to Missouri."—A reader of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY has requested an explanation of a point in Dr. O. H. Pankoke's article, *Toward Understanding and Good Will*, in the March number of *The Lutheran Outlook*, the new publication of the American Lutheran Conference. The point concerns the part entitled "*That Missouri Synod Is No More*," with which the article closes, especially the first paragraph. As we read the article carefully, it seemed to us that Dr. Pankoke honestly endeavored to interpret Missouri to other synods of Lutheran profession in our country. In this sincere effort we find the explanation both of his criticism and of his praise of Missouri, the latter culminating in the words: "The Missouri Synod in 1942 is a powerful, streamlined organization. It is closely knit and has a high morale. Its program is simple, interested only in the fundamentals of a vigorous Church, the training of ministers, the education of the young, home missions. It is in close touch with life. It has a more than ordinary zeal for souls." This commendation of Missouri, we hope, is as true as it is generous (perhaps too generous). But not quite so true is the author's comparison of the Missouri of 1908 with that of 1942. There is, of course, some truth also in this comparison. The Missouri of 1908 was far different in many respects from that of last year. But the picture as a whole is overdrawn. At least not all "white beards" were as domineering and exclusive as those described by Dr. Pankoke. The writer of this item, for example, did not encounter such unsympathetic "white beards" as are pictured in the article. He entered the service of the church in 1906, though he was graduated in 1907. Yet in the first pastoral conference which he attended as a student he opened his mouth to say what he thought. And though perhaps he did not speak wisely and well, he was given a hearing, and in some cases his suggestions even were followed. Later, though still under thirty, when he entered an exclusive pastoral conference in a Middle West metropolis, he again opened his mouth as he saw fit, and again he received a hearing, and not spiritual death, nor ostracism and exile. But with this

angle of the picture we are not now concerned. Dr. Pankoke's article represents the present movement in Missouri for church union as the result of a separation of the educative (St. Louis Seminary) and the administrative departments of our Church. Also this picture is not true. The changes that have occurred in recent years were not the result of a great pitched battle in which the independent forces won a victory over the organization. True, when the question arose whether Synod as such should conduct Valparaiso University, the majority dissented, and rightly so, since a Lutheran university was not a part of the regular program of the Church, as also the Lutheran high schools and academies were not a part of the church's official program. Such movements thrive best as private enterprises, though they should have the Church's sanction and support. But—and this is essential—the present union movement has not grown out of a clash between the organization and independent forces. When in 1920 the writer became a member of the teaching staff at Concordia Seminary, the "organization" (to use Dr. Pankoke's expression) already had taken steps towards establishing a Lutheran church union on the basis of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. Controversialists of long standing retired from the effort so as not to impede it. Others (such as Dr. Pieper), who continued to controversialize, became exceedingly moderate in their statements, showing a keen desire for church union of the right sort. (Cf. Dr. Pieper's *Zur Einigung*, and other writings.) In the meanwhile Dr. G. Mezger, who had never in his career scalped an Ohioan or an Iowan, was given the go-sign for doctrinal discussion, and go he did. The result was that the Word of God, attested in an irenical, winning way, bore rich fruit. Of course, problems remained (as they remain today), problems having their origin in different viewpoints of Lutheran loyalty. As Dr. Pankoke rightly suggests, in Missouri indoctrination and doctrinal emphases always came first, while in other Lutheran churches such doctrinal emphases were little known. This explains perhaps the "intense feeling" between Missouri and some Lutheran groups of which Dr. Pankoke speaks. But the gradual *rapprochement* between Missouri and other Lutheran synods in basic doctrinal viewpoints, which today is far greater than any intense feeling, should not be overlooked by anyone who studies the progress made in church union. If (to use Dr. Pankoke's words) "bitter public polemics . . . with the exception noted, has not characterized the life of our Church in the last decades," it is because we in the last decades have really gotten somewhere, and we are getting somewhere right along under God, as long as we give His Word a chance to accomplish what it would accomplish, namely, the unification of hearts "in the same mind and in the same judgment." Missouri today (as an organization) is eager to have church union, but it is just as eager to have that unity in doctrine and practice which makes for strength and solidarity and Christian brotherhood and true, effective co-operation among the Lutheran church bodies of our country. It desires a spiritual union, not merely an outward union; unity in doctrine and practice, not merely a church organization. And Missouri, we believe, has gone very far to find the right approach to such a Lutheran church union.

J. T. M.

The Question of Christian Youth Training.—*The Presbyterian Guardian*, in a recent number (April 10, 1943), has devoted several articles to the cause of Christian youth training. *The Presbyterian Guardian* represents the orthodox (Machen) group of Presbyterians, whose theological seminary (Westminster) is located in Philadelphia. Substantially the articles on Christian education say what also other orthodox groups of Christians have said on this point. One of the articles, however, properly stresses the intimate connection between the home and the school, a point which, alas, is frequently forgotten by many in our circles who regard the Christian day school merely as the business of the Church. We do not deny that the local congregation has an obligation over against the children in its midst. The Christian day school must always be a *parish* school in the full sense of the term. The Church *as such* must be interested in Christian education because of Christ's command to feed His lambs. This is a vital part of the public ministry. But the Christian day school also represents the Christian home. It exists because God has commanded Christian parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Christian day school thus has a dual motivation and origin. It is connected both with the home *and* the church. The former connection is emphasized in the article "Our Covenant Children," by Rev. L. A. Dunn, in which we read: "We hold the family altar to be essential in every home. It must have a wider revival if our Church is to be what it ought to be. . . . At the very least, every parent should use the *Shorter Catechism*, which can be purchased for a few cents. For the very young children an excellent and simplified *Catechism for Young Children* is available. There should also be in each home a copy of the excellent *Child's Story Bible* by Catherine Vos. . . . The sessions of our churches should not rest until there is a family altar in every home." To this group of Christians, then, the "family altar" means more than merely having the children recite a few prayers each day; it means systematic instruction in the Catechism and Bible History by the parents. The Christian day school thereupon follows as an "extension of the home." We read: "The school would be under the supervision of Christian parents. . . . The classes would no doubt start with prayer, and there probably would be classes in Bible instruction. But there would be more. What is desired is not simply a Christian veneer to secular education, but a thoroughgoing Christian education. Every subject in the curriculum would be taught from the Christian point of view, and all subjects would be related to God. . . . The formation of Christian school societies is encouraged in each locality to deal with the problems as they arise." The Presbyterians of this group so altogether regard the Christian day school as the business of Christian parents that they do not appeal to the local congregations to establish Christian day schools, but only to "Christian school societies." We believe that in doing this they overlook the duty which local churches owe to the children in their midst. Nevertheless, so much is true in their approach to the Christian day school problem that if parents neglect the family altar and refuse to assist in the Christian training of their children, the parish

school is powerless to effect what it should effect. There is some complaint today against the parish school as it exists in our midst. The charge is preferred against it that it does not engender true loyalty to the Church, and that in consequence of this large numbers of young people after confirmation become churchless or join other churches. It may be that the very accreditation of our schools imposes upon our teachers a burden which makes it impossible for them to give the Christian education of the children proper attention. Our schools may thus be led to give only a "Christian veneer to secular education." But we will not be quick in condemning our overworked, underpaid, and usually much criticized parish school teacher. He may be faulty in some cases, but we believe that in the majority of instances the lack of loyalty in our graduates from the Christian day school is owing to the lack of just such a family altar as the orthodox Presbyterians champion, an altar which includes not only prayer, but also systematic instruction in the Catechism and Bible History. Such family altars we had years ago, perhaps not in all, but at least in very many congregations. Unless our parents are themselves willing to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, our schools will be unable to accomplish what they are asked to accomplish. J. T. M.

The National Association of Evangelicals for United Action.—On the launching of this new organization the Chicago correspondent of the *Christian Century*, Dr. Charles Leslie Venable (U. L. C. A.) presents an extended report which we herewith reprint.

"Proposing to set up a rival organization which will parallel the Federal Council of Churches in every one of its activities, the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action was organized here last week. Its leaders claim that there are '24,000,000 persons of evangelical persuasion without representation in federated or co-operative activity' and that 'the great majority of the 23,000,000 persons for whom the Federal Council has presumed to speak' are misrepresented in the policies of that body. (The last census reported a total of 36,000,000 Protestants.) The 500 men and women who came from various parts of the country to this meeting voted to raise \$150,000 to organize these millions into a national body under the presidency of Harold J. Ockenga, minister of the Park Street Congregational Church of Boston. They had spent \$24,000 in country-wide efforts stretching over the last year to convene this organized meeting.

"Prominent in the organization are members of such groups as the Free Methodists, Pilgrim Holiness, Christian Reformed, Swedish Covenant, Scandinavian Alliance Mission, Assemblies of God, Church of God, Christian and Missionary Alliance, Mennonite Brethren, and independent 'Bible churches.' It would appear that the Baptist groups are the first of the older established bodies likely to be blitized by the new agency. John W. Bradbury, editor of the *Watchman-Examiner*, was one of the convention speakers, and Carl F. H. Henry of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary was in charge of publicity. Baptist pastors and laymen from Altoona, Pa., Memphis, Tenn., Fort Collins, Colo., and Colburn, Ala., took prominent parts in the convention. The *Christian Standard*, anti-organization paper of the Disciples of Christ, was also represented.

"The association holds that through liberalism Protestant churches have diluted their faith and lost their evangelistic zeal. They seek to organize a body which will help them to recover both. The creedal statement adopted in the constitution of the National Association of Evangelicals proclaims that 'we believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible and authoritative word of God.' It declares for a Trinitarian view of God and stands for belief in 'the deity of Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His vicarious and atoning death, in His bodily resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and in His personal return to power and glory.' It holds that 'regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential' to salvation. This statement, the association claimed, is 'broad enough to include all groups which have remained faithful to the great Christian doctrines, but sufficiently narrow to exclude the liberals who reject the authority of the Scriptures.' Millennialism, although played down, was strongly represented in the meeting.

"This association also quarrels with the Federal Council on three practical points. It declares that ministers of its point of view are not allowed by the Federal Council to speak on national radio chains. Its president claims that he has been assured by officials of the chains that if the Evangelicals can get enough millions of Protestants into their association, they will be given comparable radio time. The Evangelicals also object to having the Federal Council represent them in the appointment of chaplains or in pronouncements on public questions. In these fields they expect to press their claims for a voice of their own. They said they expect to make an aggressive assault on 'liberalism' in schools and colleges and to strengthen denominational 'Bible schools' for the training of the ministry. They plan to use the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship and the League of Evangelical Students to hold conferences and develop leadership, it was said. A program of religious education from Sunday school to college level will be worked out when the association gets around to it. Work among service men and in war industrial communities was approved by the convention, which seemed to have no doubt it could get funds. A weekly paper is planned."

As might be guessed, the *Christian Century* does not favor the organization of a rival group to the Federal Council of Churches. In an editorial it strongly condemns the undertaking. It claims that the new body is not needed to uphold conservative views, because the very kind of conservatism represented in the new organization is found in the bodies which are members of the Federal Council. It ignores that leading spokesmen of the Federal Council of Churches, such as Dr. Fosdick, distinctly belong to the so-called liberals and wish to be classed as Modernists. As to the motives of the organizers the *Christian Century* says, "What the organizers of this new movement seek is therefore not representation within a united Protestantism, but control of one segment of a divided Protestantism. Their emphasis upon the opportunities which they anticipate will be open to them in radio, in the appointment of chaplains, and in representing millions of Protestants be-

fore the public in other capacities, gives them away. They have seized upon this moment when the co-operative agencies are in process of a larger integration to make a bid for power under the aegis of a revised sectarianism." This is not fair. The Protestants who have formed the new organization simply refuse to be represented by men who trample under foot the truths which they themselves hold sacred. They furthermore wish to have an opportunity of testifying as widely as is humanly possible to the truths which they love. Such an opportunity would not be given them if they were members of the Federal Council of Churches. A.

How Protestant Mission Work Began in China.—In the *Presbyterian* of April 29 an interesting article, having the title "The Blood of the Martyrs" and written by a Presbyterian missionary of China, the Rev. Archie R. Crouch, appeared relating amid what sacrifices and martyrdoms Presbyterians established and conducted their missions in China. The opening paragraphs are particularly interesting because they speak of Morrison's efforts to bring the Gospel to the Chinese. Morrison, it will be remembered, was the first Protestant to translate the Scriptures into the Chinese language. We quote these paragraphs:

"A Presbyterian elder was responsible for getting the first Protestant missionary to China. The elder was David Washington Olyphant, an American merchant who traded with the Orient. The missionary was Robert Morrison. He was a Scotch youth of twenty-five, appointed as a missionary to China by the London Missionary Society. The East-India Company had a monopoly on the shipping from Britain to the Orient and would not allow missionaries on its boats. It took the business sense and evangelistic zeal of an American Presbyterian elder to get the missionary to his destination. Young Morrison had come to America to find a way across. When Elder Olyphant heard that he was going to preach the Gospel to the Chinese, he gave him free passage. It is said that the merchant remarked to the missionary, 'And so, Mr. Morrison, do you really expect to make an impression on the idolatry of the great Chinese Empire?' 'No sir,' was the ringing reply, 'I expect God will.'

For two years Morrison had to live in secrecy in Macao and in Canton. The English merchants and sailors resented his presence. The Chinese themselves had laws against everything that Morrison did. He therefore spent most of his time in language study and in translation. It took him seven years of discouraging work to gain his first convert. In spite of personal hardships and enemy opposition he lived to put in twenty-nine years of service in China, but when he died, there were only seven baptized Protestant Christians in the whole Empire." A.

Copernicus and the Roman Catholic Church.—On May 24 it was four hundred years ago that Nikolaus Copernicus, whose views on the movement of the heavenly bodies (his epochal book had the title *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*) have been adopted by modern science, departed this life. He was born February 19, 1473, in Thorn, Poland. He pursued his studies in Cracow and Bologna. *America* (Roman Catholic) in a lengthy article about him gives him the titles: scientist, physician, economist, statesman, and soldier. When the question arose

whether his book in which he departed from the theories of Ptolemy as to the nature of our solar system should be printed, some bishops and cardinals urged him to publish his conclusions. At first he refused. *America* tells the story in this fashion, "To the persistence of his friends he yielded, only to publish an abstract of his theory, which brought him great renown in some quarters and condemned him in others. It was George Joachim Rheticus, who gave up his professorship of mathematics at Wittenberg to sit at the feet of the new master, who finally prevailed upon Copernicus to yield to the entreaties of Cardinal Schoenberg and other learned men. The astronomer, then 68 years of age, dedicated his book to Pope Paul III and surrendered his manuscript to the cardinal for publication. The printer engaged to publish the book was one Andreas Osiander, who, ironically enough, happened to be a Lutheran preacher with an interest in astronomy. Now, it so happened that the Lutherans had raised quite a cry in opposition to the Copernican theory. Consequently, Osiander, wishing to tone down the theory, inserted the word *hypothesis* in the title. He also substituted an anonymous preface, in which all the categorical statements of Copernicus were changed to mere hypotheses. It took about two years for printing and binding. The first copy was put into the author's hands on May 24, 1543, the very day he died. The dim eyes of the dying man did not perceive what Osiander had done."

We who are not astronomers think that Osiander, if he wished to publish the treatise of Copernicus at all, acted very wisely by stating in the preface that what was presented was a hypothesis, a theory, because it seems to us that even today with our immeasurably improved instruments of scientific research and investigation we cannot go any farther than to speak of theories on the constitution of the solar system and the universe, unless the Bible has some specific statements bearing on these matters.

It is interesting to read the account of *America* as to the position of the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the Copernican theory. It says, "The book appeared at a time when almost everyone believed that the sun moved around the earth. . . . Consequently, opposition was inevitable. The Catholic Church, through the Pope and cardinals, had sponsored the work; hence there was no opposition from that quarter at first. Those in the Church who might have been disaffected tolerated the theory, because—thanks to the forgery of Osiander—it was set forth merely as a hypothesis. But even as such it was attacked by the Lutherans, who claimed that it could not be reconciled with Scripture. The passage in dispute was Joshua 10:12, 13, where the Israelite leader called on the sun and moon to stand still, and they did. From this passage, argued the Lutherans, it is evident that the sun must move around the earth. Accordingly, they condemned the theory as heretical. About fifty years later, Johann Kepler, the German astronomer, came upon an annotated copy of *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*. To his great surprise he discovered that what Copernicus had written was held by him as *absolutely certain*, and not as mere hypothesis. It was not long before he became a staunch advocate of the sun-centered

system and published the truth about the Polish astronomer's work and belief. This intensified the antagonism on the part of the Protestants. It was a signal for some Catholic theologians, too, to voice their disfavor. . . . Two serious questions always arise when the story of the prohibition of Copernicus's book is recounted. The first is the vital query whether or not the Church belittles and opposes science and scientific progress. Indeed, had it not been for the urging of the cardinals and bishops, joined with the final proddings of Rheticus, we surely would not know of the sun-centered system today as Copernican. To understand the reason for the Church's opposition, it is necessary to recall the belief current in those days. Although the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic system had been questioned in the more recent years, yet Catholic philosophy and theology presupposed it. Astronomy in those days was looked on as a part of philosophy. The Bible had been interpreted in the light of that earth-centered system. It was a time-honored theory. But then, of a sudden, this sun-centered system was put forth to tempt men's minds; here was a theory which contradicted all their former beliefs, even the very testimony of their senses. The Church was not to adopt it at once without making an investigation." Having mentioned some of the difficulties which attached to the theory as proposed by Copernicus, *America* continues, "Is there any wonder, then, that Catholic philosophers were prone to take exception to such a proof? It must be remembered that the present-day knowledge and data of the heavens were not known when the Copernican theory was condemned. Time proved the doctrine of Copernicus to be correct, and Rome retracted by removing the book from the Index." (In a previous paragraph *America* had pointed out that in 1616 the Congregation of the Index had declared the Copernican system to be "erroneous and wholly at variance with the Holy Writ" and had put the book on the Index, that is, in the list of forbidden works.)

Does all this agree with the infallibility of the Pope? *America* writes, "The second charge brought against the Church is that in approving the decree of the Congregation of the Index, which passed sentence upon the Copernican system, the Pope had erred. A telling proof, indeed, they argue, against the infallibility of the Pope. It is true that Paul V approved the decision of the Congregation. But he did so only in so far as was necessary for the prohibition of the book to the indiscriminate reading of the faithful, on the grounds that it was imprudent reading under the circumstances of the times. But he was not speaking solemnly in his full capacity as teacher and pastor of the universal Church on a matter of Faith, as revealed by God, or on morals. The Copernican system was a purely scientific question. In such a case the Pope does not claim to be infallible. Consequently, in the light of subsequent discovery, we admit that he erred, but the instance had nothing to do with the doctrine of papal infallibility."

It will be observed that the writer in *America* distinguishes between hypothesis and theory. He faults Osiander for calling the views of Copernicus a hypothesis while he himself terms them a theory. We suppose that what the writer in *America* has in mind is the definition of hypothesis which the Standard Dictionary lists as one of the meanings

of the word, "Loosely, and generally, an unsupported or ill-supported theory; a supposition advanced with little to warrant it; a mere guess or conjecture." Since the statements of Osiander are not before us, we cannot say in which sense he desired to have the word hypothesis understood. We have quoted so extensively from the article of *America* chiefly because we desire to draw attention to the distinction made by Roman Catholic theologians between pronouncements made by the Pope in the field of faith and morals and pronouncements in the field of science. Pronouncements of the latter kind, so these theologians assert, are not necessarily infallible. Whether an infallibility which is subject to such limitations is of much value is another question. A.

Rome's Opportunity? — In the *Lutheran Companion* an article which appeared in *Our Sunday Visitor* (Roman Catholic) is reprinted. The Roman Catholic writer had chosen as his topic "Christian Unity Can Bring Peace." Let the reader see how the topic is elaborated.

"It took the world a long time to admit this. To reach this logical conclusion our notions about religion went through some queer changes. Take for example our ideas about faith and norms of morality. Going contrary to Scripture and the universal teaching of the Church, Luther and his followers taught that faith alone without good works was sufficient for salvation. The fallacy of such a doctrine soon became evident in what followed. Today most Protestants have gone to the other extreme in declaring that it doesn't matter much what you believe so long as you are 'sincere' and lead a good life. As if such a thing were possible! As if one can lead a good life without definite moral principles of acting.

"It took Hitler to show that 'sincerity' is not a norm of right and wrong, for who can doubt but that he is sincere? It took a Hitler to show that one religion is not as good as another, for if Nazism is as good as Christianity then why waste precious human lives to crush it?

"Hitler has taught us, too, the need of Christian Unity. To one who keeps abreast with present day religious trends one thing seems to stand out above all else. It is the desire for Church Unity. It is paradoxical that out of such world chaos and divisions among nations there should arise such a burning desire for unity. Church Unity is the question of the day. It is agitating the minds of sincere Christians of all denominations. Even the daily press and secular magazines give frequent mention to the issue. If Christian peoples all over the world were once again united in common bonds of faith and charity as they were before the 16th century, what a happy world this would be; what strength to fight the forces of paganism; how much bickering and jealousy between nations and rival Christian sects would be eliminated; what a guarantee for true and lasting peace!

"Never before since that eventful day when Catholic Unity was first destroyed by the Protestant revolt has the world had such a longing for that feeling of 'Oneness' which comes only from the acceptance and practice of a common creed. Never before have we realized so clearly the often forgotten fact that the cause of most disputes between nations has its deepest roots not in politics but in theology. Many are now convinced that if religion is so absolutely necessary for the preservation

of society, then not any religion will do, not any form of Christianity will do, but only that founded by Jesus Christ and which stands today as the only force capable of hurling back the onrushing forces of paganism. That force is the Catholic Church.

"In such a frame of mind many a soul is now casting longing glances in the direction of Rome. Today the eyes of many millions are turned hopefully towards Pius XII. The strategic position which our Holy Father enjoys in world affairs, standing out in a world darkened by hate as a lone beacon light of hope for future peace, has turned the thoughts of many to the possibility of all men being once more united in the true fold of Jesus Christ."

Whoever has read history will be slow to believe that putting the whole world under the scepter of the Pope will mean peace for the harassed nations of our earth. At once it will be recalled how through the machinations of the Papacy internecine war was fostered between the various states of the so-called Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. And the wars between Charles V. and Francis I. certainly were not caused by the Protestant Reformation, because both of these monarchs professed to be loyal sons of the Pope at Rome. The attitude of the Pope at the present time when he is sitting on the fence and desires to be on good terms with the Axis Powers and Spain, on the one hand, and the Allies on the other, certainly does not inspire confidence in his leadership to bring about world peace. If our prominent politicians kowtow to Rome, we are quite sure they do it not because they believe the claims of the Papacy to be well founded, but from political considerations. Those who are inclined to listen to the siren's voice coming from the Vatican had better read the Smalcald Articles.

A.

Officiating at Funerals.—In the Question Box of the *Lutheran Standard* for April 17 this question is submitted:

"Our Lutheran Church is often criticized by non-Lutherans and also by some Lutherans, for that matter, because many Lutheran pastors refuse to officiate at funerals of non-Lutherans. These critics maintain that it is the pastor's duty to officiate when asked to do so regardless of the person's past life or the circumstances surrounding his death. Refusal, they say, is to sit in judgment, which Jesus expressly forbids in Matthew 7:1-6. Kindly give us your opinion on this question."

The answer which the writer of the Question Box, Rev. Wm. N. Emch, gives should be pondered by our pastors.

"When the pastor of a congregation officiates at a funeral, he is not acting as an individual, but as the representative of his church. What he does, in a sense, his church is doing through him. Now the question is, 'Should the church feel in duty bound to give a Christian burial to one who does not even profess to be a Christian?'"

"Circumstances alter cases. Each case must be decided on its own merits, and, especially in the more difficult cases, the pastor alone should not do the deciding. The church certainly does not want to leave the impression that it is a matter of indifference whether one is a Christian or a non-Christian; it does not want to encourage unbelief; it does not want to give godless people and careless worldlings a false hope.

Therefore it certainly would be wrong to say that the church should give a Christian burial to any and everyone if asked to do so. Note that I am emphasizing the fact that the minister is the representative of the Christian Church.

"The church, however, is to embrace every opportunity to preach the Gospel. At the funeral of a non-Christian one might have a chance to reach people with the saving Gospel whom otherwise he would never have an opportunity to reach. It is not easy to officiate at such a funeral. With fear and trembling the minister should prepare for such a funeral. To refer to the departed one as an example of those who neglected the grace of God and is certainly lost would hardly be a tactful way to woo souls for Christ. But, on the other hand, one dare not leave the impression that there is any hope apart from man's only Savior. If a Christian minister consents to officiate at the burial of one who did not even profess to be a Christian, his whole aim certainly will be to glorify His Savior and to win souls for Him.

"When should a Christian pastor consent to conduct the funeral of a person who was not a member of his church? We shall have to leave this largely to the individual pastor together with his congregation. In such a case it is perhaps best to say little or nothing about the deceased one and simply preach a Gospel sermon that makes plain God's gracious plan of salvation.

"As to transgressing Christ's injunction: 'Judge not, that ye be not judged,' etc., these words must be interpreted in the light of their connection and other words of Scripture. If you just go one verse farther than the section indicated in your question, you find the injunction: 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine.' Who are here compared to dogs and swine? It is certainly those who have no more appreciation for sacred, holy things, than dogs and swine have for pearls. It must be, then, that the disciples of Jesus are in a sense to judge people by their conduct and deeds. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' What Jesus forbids is the self-righteous, hypocritical judging.'"

No one will deny that here we are dealing with a delicate as well as an important question. Let everyone who is confronted with an issue of this nature bear in mind that he must not deny the truth. At the same time let him not ignore the dictates of Christian love. That the views and feelings of fellow Christians must likewise be given consideration is self-evident.

A.

New Marriage Laws Enacted in the State of Missouri.—The daily press reports that Governor Forrest Donnell has given his approval to two important bills which have been passed by the State legislature in which new marriage regulations have been laid down. According to the one, all applicants for marriage licenses have to present a doctor's certificate issued within fifteen days to prove themselves free from communicable syphilis. The second law is intended to prevent hasty marriages. It requires that a three-day waiting period intervene between the issuance of the marriage license and the marriage itself. The enactment of these laws will be welcomed by all citizens who are interested in the well-being of the body politic.

A.

Union of Presbyterians Anticipated.—At an all-day meeting held recently in the Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, plans which may lead to a reunion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were discussed.

This meeting of the General Assembly's Department of Church Co-operation and Union heard a report of discussions held in February between representatives of the two churches at which a proposed constitution was drafted.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States is the Southern branch, the division between the two having taken place in 1861 over the slavery issue.—*Christian Beacon*.

The Moving Story of Missionary R. H. Hult.—It was due, so we are told in the *Lutheran Companion* of April 7, to the impassioned pleadings of Ralph H. Hult that the Augustana Synod in 1917 decided to begin mission work in the Soudan of Africa in order to help stem the tide of Moslem progress. In November, 1919, having been duly commissioned as a missionary, he left for this field. His wife followed him the next year. Two years later he was transferred to a Lutheran mission field in British East Africa, the German Leipzig missionaries who had worked there having been refused permission to return. In 1926 the Hults returned on furlough. He accepted a call into mission fields in the United States. In 1941 we find him again on his way to Africa traveling on the *Zamzam*. This ship was torpedoed, but all people on board escaped. By and by, after internment in France and Portugal, he again reached America. In 1942 this intrepid messenger of peace again left for Africa and in July of that year reached the Augustana Synod mission field in Tanganyika. Alas! he was not to labor there for any great length of time. He became afflicted with malaria, heart trouble resulted, and quite unexpectedly he died March 22 of this year. How inscrutable are the counsels of God! His wife and the children, who are still at home, live in Springfield, Mo. His family was not with him when he traveled on the *Zamzam* and when he made his last trip to Africa. The zeal which Missionary Hult displayed must bring a thrill to every Christian heart, accompanied by the prayer that there may be found many candidates of the holy ministry and ministers of the Gospel willing to sacrifice their all in order to bring Christ to heathen people.

We append an interesting paragraph from the *Lutheran Companion*, "During his stay in the Soudan region, Pastor Hult made a special study of each new language or important dialect with which he came into contact. The vocabulary contained a list of 105 common words, together with numerals up to 20 and the tens up to 100. He recorded a total of 70 of these languages and dialects from the lips of natives and afterwards added 15 more from other parts of the Soudan. Missionary Hult wrote regarding these, 'I had hoped that they might at least serve the purpose of suggesting possible groupings and relationships of the tribes and subtribes represented, and thus aid missionaries in locating the strategic centers from which they might best reach the many unevangelized tribes in that part of Central Africa.'"

A.

Religion at Harvard.—The Rev. Frederic B. Kellogg, chaplain at Harvard University and Radcliffe College, has conducted a poll in Dr. Gallup's style on the attitude of the students toward religion.

About 400 young people were asked to classify themselves as greatly interested, fairly interested, and so forth.

Twenty-six per cent of the women and 12 per cent of the men, reports the *Protestant Voice*, said they are very much interested in religion, worship regularly in their churches, and take active part in religious projects.

The fairly interested who go to church about once a month includes 39 per cent of the men and also of the women. A third group consists of those who admit the validity of some aspects of religion and attend church occasionally. This includes 18 per cent of the women students and 31 per cent of the men.

Seventeen per cent of the men and of the women also classed themselves as definitely not interested in religion at all. Four men and no women, of the 400 interrogated, classed themselves as antagonistic to religion and the Church.

Some of the students said their indifference to religion is due to laziness. Others said they are seeking some satisfying church connection but haven't found it. Some think religion is fine for other people, but not important for them. — *The Lutheran*.

Concerning Religious Education.—In the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) an editorial appeared with the title "Religious Education Endorsed by Indiana." On account of the information it contains we here reprint it.

"That the American people are becoming aroused to the need of religious education for the young is indicated by the fact that an increasing number of States are enacting legislation to permit school children to be released from public school for the purpose of religious instruction. The latest among these is Indiana, where a bill for this purpose has just been passed by the legislature and signed by the governor. Similar measures are now pending before the legislatures of Wisconsin, New Jersey, and California.

"Weekday church schools, in which attending pupils are released for one to three hours per week from public schools, are now in operation in more than 800 school systems in forty-one States. This is an estimated increase of 19 per cent over the number which were in operation in 1932.

"Three types of weekday school are now functioning in various localities: the community type, in which all faiths co-operate in general planning and in which Protestant groups unite in conducting one system of schools; the semicommunity type, in which all church bodies unite in the general planning, but in which each denomination carries on its own teaching program; the parish type, in which individual congregations conduct their own schools unrelated to other churches.

"Weekday religious schools are not intended to supplant Sunday schools, but rather to supplement them. In no instance have they been known to work injury to the regular teaching program of the Church.

Instead, they have often stimulated interest in Sunday school among unchurched children, and very frequently they have tended to raise the standard of instruction given in the regular parish schools. The week-day religious education movement is full of promise and should receive the wholehearted sympathy and support of all Christians. It is undoubtedly one of the most effective means by which the Church may help to combat paganism in America."

Thus far the *Lutheran Companion*. We must take this opportunity of reminding ourselves and others that, after all, the best means of educating children in the proper way is the Christian day school, in which the pupils are under the influence of the Word of God all the time they are in and at the school. In the degree in which our youth increasingly needs instruction outside the home, since homes are becoming secularized more and more, let us exert ourselves to maintain Christian day schools, this splendid heritage which we received from our fathers. A.

The Meaning of the Cross.—Writing on the topic "The Cross is Crucial," Dr. H. T. Kerr, professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, speaks of theories of the Atonement. We reprint his final paragraph, though it is somewhat lengthy, because it represents a point of view which one meets quite commonly these days.

"Finally, it may help us to understand the meaning of the Cross if we think of it as God's condemnation of sin and, at the same time, as God's supreme revelation of His saving love. To put it negatively again, we may not catch the significance of the Cross if we hide its plain message behind theories of atonement and reconciliation. It may be that theories are necessary and useful, but we must remember that the Cross is God's saving act and not a theory. Or to put it differently, we must realize that our faith in the Cross of Christ must be personal, or as the Barthians say, existential. Somebody else's faith will not help me, and somebody else's theory of how the Cross saves may or may not prove an adequate explanation for me. The Early Church thought of atonement as ransom paid to the Devil; the Middle Ages, following Anselm, thought of Christ's death as satisfaction for God's honor; Abelard and his modern imitators were chiefly concerned with Christ's selfless sacrifice; the Reformers and the Puritans, in a time of political upheaval, used the legal and governmental language of justice and substitution to express the way of reconciliation. These and other interpretations are all worthy of consideration since they all purpose to interpret the Cross. Yet they are not all of equal value, and no one can perfectly communicate what, we have said, is essentially ineffable and mysterious. It is not simply that theories are inadequate, but that we are saved not by assent to any particular theory of the Cross, but by the faith that 'Christ died for our sins.' This conviction, which is born of a sense of penitence (in so far as the Cross reveals man's sin for what it is) and thankful devotion (in so far as the Cross reveals God's forgiveness), must precede and condition any theory of how atonement is possible. Unless that personal conviction exists, theories are not only valueless, but definitely dangerous. For example, any theory of

atonement which suggests that God stands aloof from man and must be reconciled to man is not worthy of serious concern, for it is manifestly out of touch with the New Testament and with the Christian experience. The Christian believes that the Cross reconciles man to God, not God to man. If God had to be reconciled to man, atonement in any sense would appear to be impossible, and one wonders if such a conception of God is in any sense Christian. No, if we are to understand the message of the Cross, we must seek to interpret it as God's way of redeeming and reconciling sinful men to Himself. That God takes this initiative, that forgiveness and newness of life are offered, that Christians throughout the ages have testified to the saving power of the Cross—this is surely a Gospel to preach and a Gospel to hear again and again.

I know not how that Calvary's Cross
A world from sin could free;
I only know its matchless love
Has brought God's love to me."

It is too bad that people will talk about theories of the Atonement instead of simply accepting what the Scriptures say about the substitutionary atonement.

A.

A Presbyterian minister of Sao Paulo, Brazil, writing in the *Christian Century* under the heading "Brazil Welcomes Protestantism," describes conditions which confront Roman Catholicism in that country. Believing that the information he submits may be of interest to many of our readers, we reprint a few paragraphs of his article:

"But in the older cities, too, the Catholic Church is losing its hold. There Protestantism is not its only rival. The urban centers have shown themselves hospitable to non-Christian cults of a spiritualistic type. Definite information about all these cults is not available. However, it is known, for example, that the Esoteric Circle of Communion of Thought has more than 55,000 members in Sao Paulo and that there are related organizations in most of the large cities, with scattered members all over the country. In 1941, 20,000 people attended a single spiritualistic meeting in the Sao Paulo municipal stadium. Brazil has 7,000 (the figure is correct) legally incorporated spiritualistic societies which follow the teachings of Allan Kardek, and 15,000 non-incorporated societies with a total of 10,000,000 members. The Theosophists also are growing rapidly. Such a situation has serious implications for Protestantism as well as for Catholicism.

"But far more alarming, from the point of view of the Catholic Church, is the rise within it of a body of believers who openly and scornfully reject such dogmas as papal infallibility and transubstantiation, question the efficacy of the Mass, and express disapproval of many of the Church's ceremonies. These people, who are fundamentally religious, constitute excellent raw material for Protestantism. Indeed, in innumerable cases they are Protestants without being aware of it. When our message is presented to them, they accept it joyfully." A.

Brazil Welcomes Protestantism.—Under this heading, Mr. Miguel Rizzo, Jr., evidently a native of Brazil and well acquainted with existing conditions, emphasizes in *The Christian Century* (March 31, 1943) the

great need of his country for Protestant mission work. His article is a reply to the recent Roman Catholic protest against this work in all of South and Central America. As the subheads of his article (too long to be quoted in its entirety) show, the Catholic Church in Brazil is losing ground, spiritualistic sects are thriving, vocations for priesthood are shrinking, the Catholic Church is not a uniting factor, and while still in its infancy, evangelical (Protestant) work has had a phenomenal success. We quote a few paragraphs because of their interest and importance. Mr. Rizzo writes:

"In surroundings where it has never been able to count on a majority, the Roman Church takes on characteristics very different from those that mark it in our country. I have in mind its readiness to resort to violence and its tendency to persecute. When I was in the United States, representing the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, U. S. A., I told an audience that the Catholic Church had engineered the burning of Protestant houses of worship in Brazil. My hearers appeared skeptical. Fortunately I had just received a copy of an important Sao Paulo daily which reproduced a photograph of a Protestant church in flames and reported how the conflagration had started. Thus I was able to convince them in some measure of the violence of which Romanism is capable. It is an ugly story, which is daily receiving fresh documentation in almost every 'Catholic' country in South America."—"The waning of Catholic influence in Brazil is the outward sign of a social transformation which is profound and active and without precedent in our history. And that transformation is directly traceable to the work of American missionaries. Their first converts came from the poorer classes, who soon perceived the value of education and made every effort to send their children to the available schools. As a result the second generation of Protestants came to occupy important positions in all spheres of Brazilian life. Today many of our eminent teachers, lawyers, physicians, and engineers are Protestants. Moreover, many of the textbooks most widely used in Brazilian schools, are written by Protestant ministers. Protestants have made their mark especially in educational circles. Their growing pre-eminence in this field is the cause of deep concern on the part of Catholics."—"Paradoxically, Protestantism is exercising a beneficent influence on the Catholic Church itself. The latter has been forced to change its methods of propaganda and to abandon some of the more ridiculous. Its clergy, a large part of which was openly dissolute in premissionary days, has been thoroughly reformed, and today immorality is rare in its ranks. Again, the threat to its dominance has compelled the Catholic Church to give its people better spiritual care. A good friend of mine, who is a leading Catholic layman in his section of the country, told me that his city had profited greatly by the work of the evangelical. At my expression of surprise he explained playfully, 'When your folks opened work in my town, the bishop was obliged to send us the best priest in the whole district.'"—"That the Catholic Church in the United States should protest against the sending of missionaries to South America is to be expected. That certain misguided Protestants should join in its protest is, to say the least, deplorable. So far as Brazil is concerned, if all those who have

benefited by the work of the missionaries could speak, their voice would drown out utterly the clamor of the hierarchy. Let mission boards send us as many missionaries as possible. We shall receive them with open arms and thank God for their coming."

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America manifestly is not going to accede to the Roman Catholic demand that Protestant missionaries be withdrawn from the Central and South American countries. But the Federal Council itself on account of its liberal setup is not able to offer the Catholic Americas the pure Gospel which they need. There are already too many liberal Romanists in these lands; their number therefore should not be increased by liberalizing Protestants. What the Catholic Americas need, is exactly what the Catholic world needed when Luther four hundred years ago inaugurated the Reformation. The Lutheran Church has a duty toward the Catholic Americas which it must perform in ever increasing measure as soon as possible. The slogan "Bringing Christ to the Catholic Americas" must be translated into action with all possible speed. The program will require much planning, praying, giving, and judicious co-operation with helpful temporal and ecclesiastical authorities for effective work; but our Church is ready for all that. *Consules videant* that the tremendous opportunity may not be lost to us.

J. T. M.

British-Israelitism Discussed in Church Papers.—The *Calvin Forum* (April, 1943) offers the first of a series of articles on the vacuous British-Israelite theory which is being urged by its ardent, though visionary proponents both in the British Empire and in our country. The first article in the *Calvin Forum* is introductory and therefore does not offer any definite conclusions. But it says, perhaps by way of suggesting the conclusion of its investigation: "If these contentions prove to be true, we shall accept them with gratitude for the instruction received. If they prove false, we shall have to reject them, no matter how flattering the theory may be to our racial ego." The *Australasian Theological Review* (December 31, 1942) quotes in part an article on British-Israelitism (the name commonly used in our country), which is in itself complete and therefore contains a definite opinion and verdict on the movement. Dr. H. Hamann, president of Concordia College, Unley, Australia, writes: "It was pleasing to find in the *Australian Christian World* of January 15, 1943, a sane and sound article from the pen of Principal E. S. Kiek of Parkin College, Adelaide, on what he calls 'British-Israelitism.' Stating that this movement claims more than two million adherents in the British Empire and in the United States, the writer first goes through the familiar list of the precious 'identifications' made by the leaders of that weird fraternity on the strength of accidental similarities of sound or spelling in the names of tribes and individuals, in geographical names, etc. One instance was new to us. 'One writer connects the Angles, one of the Teutonic tribes which invaded Britain in the fifth century A.D., with a Hebrew word which is said to mean *bull*; thus we get the designation *John Bull*. The Hebrew word, which this writer badly misspells, does in fact mean *calf*. The term *John Bull*, as representing the typical Englishman, only came

into use in the early 18th century.' The Hebrew word in question is probably the word *egel* which means *calf*. Principal Kiek sums up this matter thus: 'Indeed the etymologies on which B. I. writers lay stress are of a kind to make any scholar gasp; they only gain assent among people whose knowledge of scientific etymology is negligible.' On the origin of the theory Mr. Kiek writes as follows: 'The B. I. theory appears to have originated with one John Sadler, who in 1649 published a book called *The Rights of the Kingdom*. He sets out a legend to the effect that Jeremiah and Baruch, accompanied by an Israelitish princess named Tippi, escaped from the Babylonian captivity to land in Ireland about 550 B. C. These wanderers carried with them the Stone of Bethel, which had been rescued from the ruins of the First Temple. Tippi is said to have married an Irish chieftain. From this union H. M. George VI is said to have descended. The genealogies quoted to demonstrate this assertion are of a weird and wonderful, but mostly unhistorical nature. The Stone of Bethel is said to have been taken to Scotland, whence it was removed to Westminster by Edward I. Sadler, like other British Israelites, finds analogies between Hebrew and British law, cheerfully ignoring the startling differences. His book does not seem to have made much impression, for we hear no more of the B. I. theory until we come to Richard Brothers (1757—1824). He wrote no less than fifteen volumes on the subject. Brothers was a half-pay naval officer; British Israelitism has always appealed to retired admirals, generals, and suchlike people, which is natural in view of its strongly militaristic and imperialistic bias. (Natural also, perhaps, in view of the leisure to which such retired gentlemen are condemned and which affords them ample opportunity for their researches.—H. H.) Brothers claimed to be descended from David and even to be a nephew of the Almighty. He prophesied the immediate restoration of Israel-Britain to the Promised Land. He was himself to become Prince of the Hebrews and lord of the world. This demented individual ended his days in an asylum. Yet he gained some adherents, including an M. P. and a lawyer. The first intelligent exposition of the B. I. theory is John Wilson's *Our Israelitish Origin*, published in 1840. C. Paizzi Smith, at one time Astronomer Royal for Scotland, discovered support for the theory in the measurements of the Great Pyramid. Another well-known B. I. pioneer was Edward Hines, who profanely identified himself with the *deliverer* out of Zion mentioned in Is. 59:20.' Some of the spiritual brothers of Richard Brothers, it seems, were also in that condition which an Indian station-master at Ambur, South India, once described picturesquely and adequately, though somewhat unidiomatically, as *demi-cracked*. Principal Kiek declares that in the last fifty years the B. I. theory has carried on a vigorous and well-financed propaganda in Britain, the British Dominions, and the United States; but the reader wonders a little as to the exactness and the possible implications of the statement that 'it gains practically all its followers from the extreme Fundamentalists of British and American denominations, including not a few Low Church Anglicans.' One agrees heartily with the following: '*Recognized authorities on the Bible and the vast majority of scholars either ignore it or treat it with contempt.* (Italics ours.) Sir E. B. Tylor, the famous

anthropologist, remarks that *this abject nonsense* has a far wider circulation than all the *rational ethnology* in England. Speculation about what happened to the ten tribes has indeed run riot. Their descendants have been found marauding in the Afghan passes, tending reindeer in Lapland, chasing buffalo on the American prairies, and ministering in Aztec temples. Most of these wild identifications are supported by wild etymologies or wildly interpreted prophecies.' It strikes us that the supporters of the Anglo-Israel theory have no right to throw stones at Joseph Smith and the Mormons." On account of the length of the article we cannot quote it in full. But the given portions suffice to show that British-Israelitism is no more than a fanciful delusion, in fact, a comedy and a farce, would it not involve so much tragedy of false doctrine and misguided hope.

J. T. M.

Brief Items.—In Cazenovia, N. Y., a Presbyterian and an Episcopal church are trying a merger. For the period of half a year an experiment is to be made. The members of the Presbyterian church will attend services in the Episcopal church for a month, then the Episcopalians will worship in the Presbyterian church for a month, and this alternating process will continue throughout the period mentioned. Have both churches come to the conclusion that the issues separating them belong to the field of *adiaphora*, or are they definitely unionistic?

War-Orphaned Missions Face a Desperate Situation. This is true of the mission in Tanganyika, East Africa, with its 150,000 native Christians who had been served by German missionaries. Similar distress is witnessed in China, India, and Syria. One's heart bleeds as one visualizes these conditions pictured in the *Lutheran Standard*.

Of the change in position of the Supreme Court of the United States on the treatment to be accorded the "Jehovah's Witnesses" *America* (Roman Catholic) says, "Freedom of speech might almost be defined as freedom to disagree with the majority. . . . It is the small discordant groups who need protection. . . . It is refreshing and encouraging to find that our highest tribunal is not above having second thoughts." Well said! But will *America* favor adoption of the same course by the government of Spain and other Roman Catholic countries?

"Doctors of Philosophy Look at the Bible" is the title of a little pamphlet which has been issued by the Student Welfare Committee (Rev. R. W. Hahn, Executive Secretary, 1226 N. Austin Blvd., Oak Park, Ill.) of our Synod. What is offered consists of statements made by scholars eminent in their professions in which the Christian faith is confessed. Brief Bible passages are printed at the bottom of each page. Here is something which we have found appealing and helpful.

The Army and Navy have entered a request for 5,000,000 Bibles for soldiers and sailors for the next four years. President Roosevelt in his approval to the request, writes, "As Commander-in-Chief I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the armed forces of the United States. Through the centuries men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book words of wisdom, counsel, and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength."—*News Bulletin of N. L. C.*

The average Protestant minister is inadequately equipped to speak "intelligibly and significantly" to his congregation because theological seminaries have neglected to require a "true general education" as a condition for enrollment, according to Ernest C. Colwell, dean of the University of Chicago's Divinity School. In the current issue of the *Journal of Religion* Dean Colwell proposes: Seminary control of pre-divinity school curricula beginning with the end of the second college year; more careful check by seminaries on the source of Bachelor degrees; stiffening of general education requirements and prohibiting theological students from taking professional training before general education.—*Christian Century*, May 5.

From New York comes a report that Governor Dewey has vetoed a bill introduced in the State legislature which was intended to permit religious, social, and fraternal organizations to operate bingo games "under supervision of the community authorities when five per cent of the voters asked for such games." The governor's action has our hearty approval.

According to an editorial in the *Christian Century* based on the *Information Service* of the Federal Council, two million Jews have been killed in Europe. Of 599,000 Jews in Germany only 40,000 were still in that country in December, 1942. In Austria the two figures are 185,000 for 1933 and 15,000 for the end of 1942 (7,000 at present). In Poland, out of 3,130,000 more than one million have perished, and those that remain are in utter misery. The report sounds unbelievable. What woes and heartaches are here spread out before us!

Trustees of St. Olaf College in Northfield have announced that Clemens Matthew Grauskon, who at present is president of Augustana College in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has been chosen to succeed Dr. Boe as president of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. Dr. Grauskon is himself a graduate of St. Olaf.

Under the leadership of our esteemed colleague Dr. Bretscher, a group of students of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, drew up a list of the major articles and reviews that appeared in twenty-nine important religious or theological journals in 1942 and is offering this list, in mimeographed form, for sale at 50 cents. We greet this publication with joy and hope that it will appear annually in the future. Copies may be ordered from Prof. Paul Bretscher, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

According to a report in the *Milwaukee Journal* of May 12, Episcopalians of Southern Wisconsin, led by their bishop, Rt. Rev. B. F. P. Ivins of Milwaukee, have rejected the plan looking to a merger of their denomination with Presbyterians, and have instructed their delegates to vote against the project at the general convention to be held in Cleveland this fall.

In Washington, memorial services attended by Government officials were held in honor of Bishop Adna Wright Leonard (Methodist) who was killed in an aeroplane accident in Iceland together with Gen. Andrews and other high-ranking officers. The bishop as representative of the Federal Council of Churches had begun a tour of inspection and intended to visit all the camps of American soldiers abroad.

According to press reports Virginia Baptists, holding their General Association meeting in Lynchburg, rejected the plan proposed that the Southern Convention of Baptists join the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the World Council of Churches. Of the representatives 204 voted for rejection, 134 against it.

In a meeting of the Committee on Missionary Personnel and Training of the Foreign Missions Conference Prof. Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Seminary, New York, stated, according to a report in the *Christian Century*, "The Christian World Mission must be made the focal center of the whole seminary course." More acceptable was the declaration made by Prof. A. C. McGiffert, president of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., that the seminary must be organized around theology which must be concerned with the whole Gospel for the whole world. The discussion was participated in by the heads of 35 to 40 training institutions and board secretaries. A person is pleased to see this emphasis on missions, but how important that the message to be preached have the proper content!

Via Scotland comes the complaint that the cost of living, affecting our missionaries, of course, as well as the natives, has risen enormously in China. The writer reporting them, speaking of conditions in Chungking, the present capital, says of the prices now obtaining: "They make one ashamed of having grumbled at the comparatively moderate rise in the cost of living in this country. A British-made bicycle worth about £ 8 sold for £ 250; a shilling riding boot cost 10 shillings; sugar had risen to 4 shillings 3 pence per pound, and rice, the staple article of food, had risen to 1 shilling per pound. It is little wonder that relief organizations working in China find their resources strained to the utmost."

From Victoria, British Columbia, comes the statement that in that province divorces have increased alarmingly. In 1922 the number of divorces represented 3.71 per cent of the marriages for that year. In 1942 the number had risen to 7.4 per cent of the total marriages. This is one of the many distressing symptoms of the last times.

Selective Service headquarters have issued a revision of Occupational Bulletin No. 11, dated March 1, which states that undergraduate students in pretheological courses will be eligible for deferment if they are full-time students in recognized colleges, have been certified by a recognized theological seminary, and will complete their college studies before July 1, 1945. — *Christian Century*.

In reply to a question from a Catholic journalist Madame Chiang Kai-shek paid a warm tribute to the Christian missionaries in China. Their constancy in their work in the face of great loss and personal danger, not only in China but also in Burma, received her most cordial and earnest commendation. China's debt to them, she said, is very great. — Special Correspondence from Chicago in the *Christian Century*.

Federico Cardinal Cattani-Amadori, the third of the college cardinals to die since March 17, passed away at Rome. Only 46 of the college now remain, 27 being Italians. — *America* (Roman Catholic). A.