

# Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

Lehre und Wehre (Vol. LXXVI)

Magazin fuer Ev.-Luth. Homiletik (Vol. LIV)

Theol. Quarterly (1897—1920)-Theol. Monthly (Vol. X)

Vol. II

January, 1931

No. 1

## CONTENTS

	Page
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Vorwort .....	1
DALLMANN, WM.: How Peter Became Pope.....	9
BRAND, FREDERICK: Religious Education in Mission- schools in China .....	25
BERNER, E.: Abhaltung einer Gemeindevisitation. (Schluss.)	30
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Josiah and the Battle of Megiddo	38
Entwurf zu einer Silvesterpredigt ueber Ps. 103, 2.....	45
Dispositionen ueber die von der Synodalkonferenz ange- nommene Serie alttestamentlicher Texte.....	47
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	56
Book Review. — Literatur.....	72

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 ein-  
fuehren. — *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.



ARCHIVE

Das war eine Selbstverherrlichung Gottes. Denn von Gott erbat sich Daniel diese Kraft in täglichem Gebet und Flehen, B. 11, wie er ja auch sonst die Ehre allein Gott gab. Vgl. Kap. 2, 27. 28; 4, 21. 22; 5, 17 ff. Alles, was im Leben eines Christen rühmendswert ist, hat er seinem Gott allein zu verdanken, der noch heute sich durch die Befehrung, Heiligung und Erhaltung seiner Christen verherrlicht. Eph. 1, 19. 20; 2, 7—10; 1 Petr. 1, 5.

2.

Gott läßt es zu, daß Daniel in die Löwengrube geworfen wird. Er bedeckt ihn nicht mit Finsternis, noch schlägt er die Feinde mit Blindheit, daß sie ihn nicht finden können. Im Gegenteil: B. 11—17. Aber während die Feinde jubeln, während der König eine schlaflose Nacht zubringt, geschieht das Wunder, B. 19—23. Ja noch größer erscheint die Macht Gottes, die Daniel beschützte, B. 24.

Gottes Hand ist noch nicht verkürzt. Wohl läßt er die Seinen in allerlei Not und Trübsal geraten, aber nur zu dem Zweck, sich an ihnen zu verherrlichen. Pies 357, 2. 5. Er läßt sie wohl sinken, aber nicht ertrinken. Hiob 5, 19; 1 Kor. 10, 13; Jes. 54, 7. 8. Zu seiner Zeit wird er herrlich mit seiner Hilfe erscheinen, daß wir, errettet, ganz fröhlich rühmen können seine Gnade und Macht, die wir erfahren haben. Ihm allein die Ehre!

T. L.

## Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

### I. Amerika.

Aus der Synode. Über die Revolution in Brasilien und unsere Anstalt in Porto Alegre teilt der Direktor der Anstalt, Dr. Jahn, im „Kirchenblatt“ vom 15. Oktober v. J. folgendes mit: „Am Abend des 3. Oktober kündete uns das Geknatter von Maschinengewehren an, daß die erwartete Erhebung des Volkes gegen die bisherige Bundesregierung in unserer Stadt begonnen habe. Bald schlugen auch einzelne Kugeln, die ihr Ziel verfehlt hatten oder absichtlich in die Höhe geschossen worden waren, bei uns ein. Nachbarn, die aus der Stadt nach Hause geeilt waren, bestätigten unsere Vermutungen, daß der Aufstand nun zur Tat geworden war. Am nächsten Morgen erfuhren wir, daß der Aufstand in unserer Stadt schon siegreich zu Ende geführt sei, und die Zeitungen berichteten am folgenden Tage, daß die Revolution in unserm ganzen Staate wie auch in vielen andern Staaten, wo sie gleichzeitig stattfand, ohne viel Blutvergießen gesiegt habe. Die letzten Nachrichten besagen aber, daß die Bundesregierung gesonnen sei, Widerstand zu leisten, und daß ein Heer, das sich beständig mehrt, auf dem Zuge nach dem Norden begriffen sei, um die Regierung abzusetzen. Es ist daher noch nicht vorauszusehen, was die nächsten Wochen uns bringen werden. Gott bewahre das Land und schenke ihm bald den Frieden wieder! Da manche der Eltern unserer Schüler vielleicht in Sorge um diese leben, sei hier mitgeteilt, daß zwar zwanzig unserer Schüler Reservisten oder Kandidaten für das Reservistenexamen sind und daher bald zum Dienste herangezogen werden können, daß sie aber vorläufig für den Wachtdienst in unserer Stadt bestimmt sind.“

F. P.

**Wünschen auch eine Fortbildung des Luthertums.** Auch die protestantischen Sektenkirchen von St. Louis, soweit sie in der Metropolitan Church Federation of St. Louis vertreten sind, forderten zu einer besonderen Reformationsfeier am 2. November v. J. auf. In dem Lokalblatt *The Church at Work* hieß es: "Reformation Day this year takes on a special significance in view of the fact that this is the four-hundredth anniversary of the issuing of the Augsburg Confession. That confession embodied the consensus of opinion of those who had discovered the significance of Martin Luther's entrance upon the freer domain of obedience to the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. What thus happened four hundred year ago has become momentous in the history of the world, has profoundly affected all the generations since that day, and has left its mark indelibly upon human institutions." Auf dieses allgemein gehaltene Lob der Reformation der Kirche durch Luthers Dienst folgte nun aber dieser Schlußparagraph, worin auf eine wünschenswerte Fortbildung des Luthertums hingewiesen wird: "It is appropriate that, with the spiritual meaning of such occurrences in our minds, we should observe this day this year with particular thankfulness and with a renewal of devotion to the ideals, perhaps not fully seen then by Luther and his associates, which come closer to the mind and heart of Jesus Christ, our Lord." Das ist zart ausgedrückt. Einzelheiten werden nicht genannt. Dagegen haben einige Glieder der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in *What Is Lutheranism?* das „Zurück zu Luther und zum lutherischen Bekenntnis!“ für ganz unmöglich erklärt, und zwar unter Angabe einzelner Lehren, die zu unserer Zeit nicht mehr festgehalten werden könnten. Sie nennen die Irrtumslosigkeit der Heiligen Schrift, die gänzliche Verderbtheit der menschlichen Natur, die Mitteilung der göttlichen Eigenschaften an die menschliche Natur Christi, auch die lutherische Lehre vom Abendmahl. Die Belege sind mitgeteilt im MONTHLY, im Novemberheft v. J., S. 866 ff. Wenn wir uns nicht irren, war es der „Lutherische Herold“, das offizielle deutsche Organ der U. L. C., das dem Wunsche Ausdruck gab, *What Is Lutheranism?* möchte gar nicht erschienen sein. Wir sind hinsichtlich dieses Punktes anderer Meinung. Lassen wir es völlig klar unter uns werden, wie es innerhalb der amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche in bezug auf das Festhalten an der schriftgemäßen lutherischen Lehre steht. Das kann und soll die Veranlassung werden, durch klare Belehrung und Ermahnung den Schaden zu heilen.

J. P.

**The Oversupply of Ministers.** — *The Lutheran* of October 9, 1930, after investigating the situation which gave currency to the report that there will be an oversupply of ministerial candidates in the United Lutheran Church, characterizes that report as a "disgraceful rumor." It writes editorially: "We recently met a young man who will be graduated from one of our theological seminaries in 1931. He knew that the number of students now in training for pastorates in the United Lutheran Church is larger than ever in the past, and he had heard the rumor that there are too few vacancies to provide them with places of labor. Where this rumor originated he did not tell us, but that it has reached young men now studying theology, the conversation cited above makes evident. The *Lutheran* has sought to run down the report and hereby transmits the information received. . . . It can also be declared without fear of con-

tradition that the U. L. C. would lack 'men right now if its program of expansion were in operation instead of on paper in the minutes of its boards. There has been a distinct slowing down in the rate of starting missions both at home and abroad during the past two bienniums. The Board of American Missions reports new missions, but it just about balances these with 'congregations that have become self-supporting.' The Board of Foreign Missions makes an equivalent confession when it indicates only replacements instead of entrance into new fields. The problem of student-pastors in non-Lutheran colleges and universities is no nearer solution now than it was two years or four years ago. Inner Mission calls for ordained men are not given in the clarion tones the ministry of mercy deserves. Yet when every thoughtful Christian realizes that a kind of crisis confronts the Church and when there is evidence that the supply of men available for sending is encouraging, the report gets currency that these young men may not be needed. We can tell you where this disgraceful rumor got its start. It came, not from lack of opportunities to use ministers, but from the Church's failure to finance a program of expansion. How can the Board of Foreign Missions commission missionaries when its receipts are insufficient to extend the work under its care? How can the Board of American Missions realize on its opportunities when its financial resources are absorbed by a fixed number of pastors' salaries and its church extension capital is liquid only to the degree that loans are repaid? Instead of being faced with an oversupply of ministers, we are in the midst of an underconviction of the opportunity to extend the kingdom of God. Let the churches meet their apportionments this year, and there will be plenty of places for all the graduates in 1931 and in 1932. We 'feel' that that is how the situation will be met. We have too much confidence in the faith of the membership of the United Lutheran Church to believe that those willing and able to be its pastors will lack parishes and pulpits."

Every thoughtful Christian in our Synod, too, realizes that a crisis confronts us. Are we ready, while supporting the other minor and major activities of the Church, to restrict the one great activity of the Church, the spreading of the Gospel by means of preparing and placing ministers of the Gospel?

E.

**A Presbyterian on Dr. Ferm's Symposium in "What Is Lutheranism?"** — While there have been some Lutherans who have found nothing to criticize in the collection of essays made by Dr. Ferm except a few soundly and distinctively Lutheran statements made by some of the contributors, there is a Presbyterian who discerns the chaff among the wheat and does not hesitate to draw attention to it. It is Dr. Samuel G. Craig, editor of *Christianity To-day*. Our readers will be interested in the following paragraph from his review on "What Is Lutheranism?" "The least satisfactory of all is the foreword and conclusion by the editor of the book, Dr. Ferm, who, by the way, is the professor of philosophy in Wooster College, a fact that is not fitted to add to the reputation of that institution as a sound Presbyterian institution. The contributions by Drs. Evjen and Wendell are of doubtful value, while that by Dr. Weigle (who is no longer a Lutheran) is slight and not very significant. Those, however, by Drs. Offerman, Wentz, Reu, Hefelbower, Scherer, Haas, Dau,

and Rohne, while not of equal value, are all of high value and breathe a spirit of genuine Lutheran culture and scholarship. It is regrettable, it seems to us, that such worthy articles should have been published under the auspices of one occupying not merely so un-Lutheran, but so unchristian a position as that of Dr. Ferm. Dr. Ferm has done what he could (unwittingly, of course) to destroy the value of this volume; but despite his efforts it has great worth and is to be commended to the attention of all those interested in learning about contemporary Lutheranism." Will the unionists in the Lutheran Church of America please take notice and ask themselves whether it is in keeping with the principles of Holy Scripture if men of negative views, like Dr. Ferm, are received as brethren by those who squarely stand on the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions?

A.

Eine Anweisung zum weisen Gebrauch des Radios lesen wir im „Zeitschrift“ der Wisconsin-Synode. Es heißt da in der Nummer vom 30. November v. J.: „Alle Erfindungen in dieser Welt, gestern wie auch heute, die der Verbreitung von Gedanken dienen und diese zu ändern hinaustragen, werden von zwei gewaltigen Mächten, die in dieser Welt herrschen, bald nachdem die Erfindung gemacht wurde, in ihren Dienst gestellt. Die eine dieser Mächte, die erste und allerhöchste, ist unser Gott; die andere ist der Teufel. Beide, wie schon gesagt, ergreifen, sobald eine der Verbreitung von Gedanken dienende Erfindung gemacht worden ist, von ihr Besitz, um durch sie ihre Gedanken in alle Welt hinauszutragen. Gottes Gedanken sind immer gut, vollkommen, heilsam und köstlich, denn sie sind auf unser Heil gerichtet; wenn daher eine Erfindung von Gott in seinen Dienst gestellt ist, so wird sie den Menschen zum Segen. Des Teufels Gedanken sind immer böse, erlogen, denn er ist ein Lügner von Anfang; des Teufels Gedanken sind immer nur darauf gerichtet, die Sünde zu mehren und damit die Verdammnis. Wenn nun der Teufel eine Erfindung in seine Hand nimmt, so wird sie den Menschen zum Fluch. Wie merken wir das doch an einer der wunderbarsten Erfindungen unserer Zeit, dem Radio! Gott hat es in seinen Dienst gestellt und läßt dadurch sein seligmachendes Evangelium über die ganze Welt hin erschallen. Da ist das Radio ein Segen. Aber der Teufel braucht es auch und überschwemmt damit die Welt mit seinem Gift, das die Seele tötet. Was sollen wir da tun? Das Radio abschaffen? Gewiß nicht. Damit würden wir ja wohl verhüten, daß das Radio uns und den Unserigen schade, zugleich aber auch den Segen, der von Gott ausgeht und über das Radio in unser Haus kommt, von uns fernhalten. Wir brauchen das Radio nicht abzuschaffen, sondern nur abzustellen, sobald wir merken, daß das, was dasselbe mitteilt, arg ist und vom Teufel ausgesandt ist; ebenso brauchen wir nur anzustellen, wenn Gott über das Radio zu uns redet. Wer das tut, braucht sein Radio recht; und diese so wertvolle, heute fast unentbehrliche Erfindung wird uns nicht zum Fluch, sondern zum Segen gereichen.“

J. P.

Die Jungfrau Maria gegen die „Missourier“ zu Hilfe gern. Wir lesen im „Kirchenblatt“ von Porto Alegre, dem Organ unserer Brasilianischen Diözese, folgendes: „Die letzte Nummer der Monatsmeinung, eines katholischen Blättchens der Diözese Porto Alegre, widmet sich besonders der Abwehr protestantischer Missionen in katholischen Ländern. Zu diesen katho-

lischen Ländern rechnet das Blatt auch Brasilien und beklagt es, daß so viele nordamerikanische Kirchengemeinschaften hier Mission treiben. Zu diesen zählt der Schreiber auch unsere Kirche. Er ermahnt die Leser: „Sorgen wir nur dafür, daß unsern Pfarreien der religiöse Eifer erhalten bleibe; dann werden die Amerikaner und auch die deutschen Missourianer sich nicht hineintwagen. Wenn aber je einer es versuchen sollte, auf unsern Weizenacker Unkraut zu säen, legen wir ihm das Handwerk mit aller Energie, ohne jedoch mit den Gesetzeswächtern in Streit zu geraten.“ Die Katholiken scheinen also in großer Gefahr zu stehen, den Spruch zu vergessen: „Die Waffen unserer Ritterschaft sind nicht fleischlich“, 2 Kor. 10, 4, denn sonst hätte der Schreiber sie wohl nicht gewarnt vor der Anwendung solcher Mittel, die sie mit der Polizei in Konflikt brächten. Das katholische Blatt fragt weiter: „Wie sollen wir nun gegen diese religiöse Gefahr ankämpfen?“ Antwort: „Zunächst mit den Waffen des Gebetes, aber beharrlichen Gebetes. Sodann müssen wir in Brasilien die Andacht zu Maria, der Besiegerin der Irrlehren, nicht nur erhalten, sondern noch mehr verbreiten und vertiefen.“ Wollte Gott, die Katholiken würden den Jhrigen nicht eine Marienandacht empfehlen, sondern ihnen Christi Erlösungswerk verkündigen! Aber der Papst ist ja der Antichrist. Kein Wunder, daß seine Anhänger die Heiligen anrufen, um das Evangelium von ihnen fernzuhalten.“ J. P.

**Apostolic Succession.** — How firmly the believers in the Apostolic Succession believe in the reality of an apostolic succession and what great blessings they believe it confers on the Church that possesses it, is brought out in the sermon preached by Bishop W. T. Manning at the consecration of his suffragan bishop. “There has just now been much discussion as to the origin of episcopacy. In the light of all this discussion the report presented to the Lambeth Conference by the Committee on the Unity of the Church says: ‘Without entering into the discussion of theories which divide scholars, we may affirm shortly that we see no reason to doubt the statement made in the preface to our ordinal that from the apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church — bishops, priests, and deacons.’ ‘What we uphold,’ this report states, ‘is the episcopate maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times.’ In common with all the ancient Catholic communions, which include to-day three-fourths of all Christendom, the Episcopal Church believes that, when our Lord founded His Church in this world, He Himself appointed a ministry and that this ministry has come down to the present time through the succession of the bishops. . . . The Episcopal Church holds the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood. No one who reads and understands her *Prayer-book* can be in doubt as to this. It is this which constitutes the difference between the ministry of the Episcopal Church and that of the Protestant churches; not that one is a real ministry and the other is not. — the Episcopal Church holds no such view, — but that one is a ministerial priesthood and the other does not so regard itself and definitely rejects the doctrine of the priesthood. This explains the fact that a priest of the Roman Catholic Church or of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church or of any Catholic communion who comes into the ministry of the Anglican communion is not reordained, whereas a minister of any Protestant communion . . . must be ordained to the priest-

hood through the laying on of hands by a bishop. . . . The report presented to the recent Lambeth Conference says: 'We hold the catholic faith in its entirety, that is to say, the truth of Christ contained in Holy Scripture stated in the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, and safeguarded by the historic threefold order of the ministry.' . . . The unbroken succession of the episcopate, coming down to us from apostolic times, is the visible, living witness of God's coming into this world in the Incarnation; for the episcopate is the successor of the apostolate, and the apostolate was the direct representative of the risen and ascended Christ." (*The Living Church*, November 8, 1930.)

The story is continued in *Time* (November 17, 1930): "Several days were necessary for this high view to spread. Then, last week, the brickbats began twirling. . . . The Protestant Episcopal Church League ordered its secretary to denounce 'amazing lack of scholarship. . . . The simple fact is that, in defiance of every scrap of historical evidence, about which, in reality, there is not the slightest ambiguity, he [Bishop Manning] faithfully follows a tradition which took its origin, not from Jesus or His apostles, but from Greek thinkers of the second and following centuries. It is not a matter of doubt that the early Church was neither Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, nor Episcopalian; it was a free brotherhood of the Spirit, where its members were all of one heart and mind. Obviously some simple organization soon became necessary in view of the growing number of converts. This assumed different forms in different centers, as, for instance, presbyterian [elders] at Rome, episcopalian [overseers, supervisors] in some parts of Asia, and congregational in other localities. It is also a matter of history that, as the centuries rolled on, the episcopalian form of government ultimately superseded all others until the Reformation. A building can be no stronger than its foundation. There is no evidence to show that Jesus instituted the episcopalian form of government or any particular form of government.' . . ."

To conclude the story, it is necessary to point out that, while Jesus certainly did not institute the episcopal form of government nor any apostolic succession, He certainly did institute the office of the ministry. It was not so much in view of the growing number of converts that some simple organization became necessary as it was by order of the Head of the Church, given through the apostles, that the Christians of any particular locality formed communities and called pastors to minister to them, a form of "organization" maintained in the Lutheran Church to the present day. Paul and Barnabas "ordained them elders in every church," Acts 14, 23. And Paul gave these orders to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders [v.7: "bishops"] in every city, as I had appointed thee," Titus 1, 5.

E.

**Marriage and Divorce.** — The *Presbyterian*, criticizing a recent marriage-and-divorce plan suggested by Dean Inge, offers timely comment on the important question of marriage. We read: —

"Gloomy Dean Inge has come forth again, this time on the subject of marriage. His plan is that marriages by the state shall be easily dissolved, but marriages by the Church should be indissoluble. That has

the distinction of being new. A considerable company of the clergy seem bound to make over God's plan to suit the whims and lusts of men. Marriage is very irksome to a certain type of people, and it often happens that they want release. It is not now very difficult to secure freedom if people have the price. But high-minded people have been quite unanimous in the opinion that easy and frequent divorce works badly from every point of view. There is a Christian ground for divorce, and we to-day put no stigma upon the innocent party and very little on the guilty party. It often happens that there is no innocent party, both having violated the promise to keep self only for the other, 'so long as you both shall live.' We are not going to solve the difficulty by catering to human caprice. A majority of couples have a period when continuing true to each other is a hard and serious task, but a great majority of that majority endure the strain and grow into a true unity. To be sure, some women are tied to very trying men, and men also have, in some instances, wives who are far from perfect; but they entered into marriage of their own volition and by God's help can live together until death shall part them. It happens so frequently that one who secures one divorce desires very much to secure another. It is a deep question with many perplexities when we follow human reason or human desires. The best and safest way for family and society is to find God's ideal and stick to it. That there have been tragic blunders no one will deny; but we believe in every case it will be found that they are due to too much haste, too little listening to wise and loving counselors, too little prayer to God for guidance before the event, and no prayer at all together after.

"Dean Inge opens a way for sheer lust to have state sanction. Like that far less able American Ben Lindsay he is pandering to the lower rather than the higher in man. What it amounts to in both cases is that young people will gain a standing for the selfish desires, which are at times very strong. No, we cannot degrade our God-ordained institution of marriage by any device. Once in it, we are to stay in spite of all the friction, burden, trial, that sometimes come, until death intervenes. Hard, you say? Yes, in some instances, very hard; but it is always hard to be fine, righteous, and noble. Shall we reduce the standard because it is hard? It is too bad that so many church leaders try so persistently to let unholy cravings have approval. Let the standards alone. One man, one woman, joined in the most noble union until earthly life for one or the other is finished. Dean Inge is interesting, but very, very wrong."

J. T. M.

**A. Noted Biblical Scholar.**—To all who are acquainted with the excellent work which Prof. Dr. R. D. Wilson, first at Princeton and then at Westminster Seminary, did to expose the fallacies and lies of destructive higher critics, the notice of his death came as a severe shock. The *Sunday-school Times* accords to him the following words of rare praise and appreciation:—

"Biblical scholarship has had in the past thirty years no self-sacrificing devotee, no competent leader more distinguished or more learned than Robert Dick Wilson. Thousands of students and thousands outside seminary classrooms have been blessedly strengthened in the faith by the findings of that tireless scholar, whose amazing linguistic knowledge,



whole-hearted consecration, and mastery of factual evidence in support of the Biblical text have given him preeminence in the defense of the Scriptures. And now, in his seventy-fifth year, Dr. Wilson has been called to be with Christ, whom he so devotedly loved and so nobly served. He died after a brief illness in the Presbyterian Hospital, Philadelphia, on October 11. Two of his most significant books were published by the Sunday-school Times Company: *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* and *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*. Dr. Wilson resigned from the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1929, where he had served for thirty years, and was one of the leaders in organizing the new Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, where he was Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism. He was widely known as a lecturer here and abroad. What he was to his associates, how he did his really prodigious work of linguistic research, and an appraisal of his place among the foremost Biblical scholars of our time will be told in an early issue of the *Sunday-school Times* by Prof. Oswald T. Allis, his coworker for many years in his chosen field." J. T. M.

**The American Anti-Bible Society.** — The *Sunday-school Times* (September 13) reports: "The American Bible Society is in the old Bible House on Fourth Avenue in New York City. Not far away, on East Fourteenth Street, is the American Anti-Bible Society. 'If it's against the Bible, we have it,' is the announcement of this 'headquarters for anti-Biblical literature.' 'Catalog free on request.' The legal representative of the Soviet government in the United States sought incorporation for this society. The spirit of Moscow is seen in the announced purposes of the society: 'to bar the Bible from the public school; to dislodge it from the guest-room in hotels; to discourage its use at gubernatorial and presidential inaugurations; to remove it from the witness stand; to check and ultimately stop its unsolicited distribution among soldiers, seamen, patients, and prisoners; to counteract the work of societies circulating it as the Word of God.' 'The American Anti-Bible Society,' we are told, 'offers a broad platform upon which Modernists, higher critics, Unitarians, evolutionists, rationalists, freethinkers, agnostics, and atheists may unite to discredit the Bible as an infallible book. . . . Liberals of every shade are eligible for membership.'"

"These people 'desire the names and addresses of students preparing for the ministry. Copies of current catalogs of preacher factories will be gladly received.' This is obviously a move to break down or remove the future leadership of the Church. They continue: 'Most denominational schools are hotbeds of heresy as it is impossible for an educational institution to maintain any degree of dignity without teaching evolution. Higher criticism produces skeptics. Whoever accepts evolution should stop preaching Christianity. The descendants of apes don't need a Savior. Christmas is more and more being celebrated without reference to Jesus.' The call is sounded to establish forums wherever possible (wherever atheism can be popularized). It is noticeable that among the vice-presidents of the Freethinkers of America are Prof. Ellen Hayes of Wellesley and Prof. H. E. Barnes of Smith. Both colleges were founded by Christians with specifically Christian purpose." J. T. M.

**Modernism and Prayer.**—Some time ago the *Christian Century Magazine* conducted a symposium in which prominent American clergymen were asked to express their views on the efficacy of prayer for rain. The replies which were made showed the great cleavage between positive Christian faith and modernistic agnosticism. As the *Presbyterian* reports, Dr. Mary Matthews of Seattle and Dr. James D. Gray of Chicago were among the minority in the symposium, declaring that God made the weather and could change it. Dr. H. E. Fosdick of New York said: "No imaginable connection exists between man's inward spiritual attitude and a rain-storm." Dr. W. P. Lemon of Minneapolis called praying for rain an attempt to "involve God in a cooperative scheme to maintain present American living standards." The *Presbyterian* comments on this: "Any utterance which leads men to think that any part of life can be safely divorced from God is very harmful. We would have been in the minority in the gathering referred to."

We can well understand why modernistic preachers should affirm the futility of prayers for rain. Modernism denies both the creative and the sustaining providence of God. Its supreme god is either fate or chance, and neither leaves any room for prayer, just as it allows no trust in a gracious divine providence. Wherever Modernism reigns, there is place only for the Egyptian darkness of utter despair.

J. T. M.

**A Blessing of the Tercentenary Celebration.**—There are certain facts in the history which are being stubbornly overlooked; one of these pertains to our boasted liberty of conscience or religion, which certain school-text-book writers present as having existed even in the earliest New England colonies. The *Watchman-Examiner*, among others, explodes this myth in an editorial on the recent *Bay State Tercentenary Celebration*. We read: "The Bay State Tercentenary Celebration reached its climax on September 17. On that day, three hundred years ago, Boston received its name. Over in Lancashire, England, there is another Boston, so aged that our Boston seems but a child. It was from that Lancashire Boston that our Boston received its name. . . . The intensive study of New England's history during the past year will prove a blessing to the multitudes who have been engaged in this study. The Puritans came here to escape persecution and then became persecutors themselves. John Cotton in old Boston could not stand interference. John Cotton in new Boston became an intolerant fanatic. . . . The Puritans believed so profoundly in their interpretation of Christianity that they tried to force everybody else to accept that interpretation." It is well for us to keep this fact in mind, for it proved itself a potent factor in shaping many subsequent events. The intolerant spirit of the spiritual descendants of those early settlers, which to-day crops out in Sunday-enforcement laws and insistence on political and economic reforms in the name of religion, is a heritage of those early Colonial days.

Yet there is another fact which must not be ignored. After all, no one can blame the Puritans for believing so profoundly in their religious tenets that they whole-heartedly rejected all opposite views. True conviction never compromises with what it believes to be error. The confessional and missionary spirit of the New England colonists in itself

cannot be condemned. Earnest Christians have always tried to win others to their beliefs. But the great fault of those early settlers lay in their mingling of Church and State, so that recourse was had to the police power of the government to enforce religious submission. It is this fault that explains the religious persecutions of those early times; for wherever Church and State cooperate in the maintenance of certain religious tenets, persecution needs must follow. To-day the mistaken ideas of those early settlers still prevail in the minds of our sectarian churchmen, who, like their fathers, mingle Church and State and in this way create confusion and cause antagonism to the Church. We certainly hope that the intensive study of New England's history will prove a blessing to those engaged in this study.

J. T. M.

**The Characteristics of Baptist Churches.** — In an article entitled "Needed: A Harmony Church," published in the *Churchman* (September 13), Gerald Cunningham discusses the characteristics of several denominations, particularly the Roman Catholics, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and the Episcopalians. The *Watchman-Examiner*, taking issue with the writer's "farical and untrue" description of these churches, charges him with "culpable ignorance" of the Baptist churches and criticizes especially the following paragraph: —

"If the Methodist and Baptist churches had not found the liquor traffic ready to hand, they would have to invent some other 'social problem.' Indeed, they are now beginning to turn to sex hygiene, not too frankly treated, of course, as the next reform program. The skilled mechanic who has begun to graduate into the shopkeeper and smaller business-man group is great on ethics. He has not the cultural background to grasp beauty or symbolism without a very practical basis (which may be to his credit, for all we know). His doctrinal approach is the Ten Commandments and morality. His delight is in numbers; his thrill is to slogans and crusades; his ritual is found in a secret order, but his religion is in reform."

We are not partial to the liberalistic, agnostic, and frivolous *Churchman*; but in spite of the *Watchman-Examiner's* protests it seems to us as if Mr. Cunningham's description of present-day sectarianism contains more than a modicum of truth. The interest of modern sectarian churches in "social problems," their emphasis on ethics and morality, their delight in numbers, slogans, and crusades, their toleration of, and often even attachment to, secret orders, and their mania for social reforms are too conspicuous to be denied.

J. T. M.

**The American Lutheran Conference and the U. L. C.** — When writing about the American Lutheran Conference, the editor of the *Lutheran Companion* makes a reference to the United Lutheran Church in America which ought not to pass unnoticed. It seems to us that it requires an explanation. The editor writes: "When we stop to consider that 'the new federation will devote its energies toward elimination of overlapping of work of the various bodies which will compose it, treating the problems of the churches as a whole, without in any way encroaching upon individual prerogatives or independence,' there is one Lutheran body which, in our opinion, should be a part of this American Lutheran Con-

ference, namely, the United Lutheran Church in America. There should be no desire on the part of the new conference to see any part of the Lutheran Church in America isolated from the rest when the cause of the whole Church is the object for which we are striving. The U. L. C. does not desire, we believe, to stand alone, and in our mind there is no danger that its coming into the conference will in any way affect the comity that we expect to see ruling in the organization. What we all desire is the growth of American Lutheranism and the extension of God's kingdom on earth and the fulfilment of that wish will depend, not only on the rank and file of the Lutheran Church, but also and primarily on Lutheran church leaders. If we cannot as yet expect the Synodical Conference to join in a larger Lutheran confederation, we can prevent that there shall be three instead of two large Lutheran groups."

We are at a loss what to think of the declaration contained in the above remarks in which the editor of the *Lutheran Companion* favors the reception of the U. L. C. into the American Lutheran Conference. The American Lutheran Conference, if the recommendations of the committee originating it are followed, will have a definite doctrinal platform. Would the U. L. C. and all its members be willing to place themselves on that platform? Would they, for instance, subscribe to its paragraphs on the inerrancy of the Scriptures and the opposition to membership in lodges? These are the great questions which have to be answered. Perhaps the editor of the *Lutheran Companion* wishes to suggest that the U. L. C. should be invited to study the platform of the new conference and, if it can, adopt it and be received as a member. That, of course, would throw an altogether different light on his statement. Our interest in drawing attention to the editorial in the *Lutheran Companion* is the earnest desire that the important truth be not overlooked which Professor Elert of Erlangen, whom we quote at length elsewhere, has expressed thus: "Our Church's chief concern has been purity of doctrine, to which she, together with the Augustana, pledges herself." A.

## II. Ausland.

Eine Anweisung zum Studium des Alten Testaments. Prof. Dr. Emil Balla-Marburg schreibt in „Theologische Mitteilungen aus dem Antiquariat Bernh. Liebig“ vom 15. November v. J. u. a.: „Bei allen seinen Bemühungen um das Verständnis des Alten Testaments in seinen Teilen und als Ganzes vergesse der Student jedoch eins nicht. Das Alte Testament ist für uns nicht ein Dokument einer beliebigen Religion, deren Kenntnis vielleicht interessant ist, die uns aber innerlich nichts angeht. Das Alte Testament ist ein Stück unserer Bibel, von der wir glauben, daß sie Gottes Wort enthält. Jeder Student muß es von seinem ersten Semester an als eine heilige, ihm ganz persönlich gestellte Aufgabe ansehen, immer wieder durch die zeitgeschichtlich bedingten Formen der alttestamentlichen Offenbarung zu dem eigentlichen Inhalt des im Alten Testament enthaltenen Gotteswortes hindurchzudringen, der Ewigkeitsbedeutung hat. Wer das Alte Testament studiert, ohne selber in seinem Innersten von dem einen, lebendigen, unbedingten Anspruch erhebenden Gott des Alten Testaments ergriffen zu werden, hat im Grunde Zeit und Mühe verschwendet.“ Hier ist hinzuzufügen: Christus und seine heiligen Apostel

lehren, daß die Schrift Alten Testaments Gottes Wort nicht bloß „enthält“, sondern Gottes eigenes unfehlbares Wort ist, Joh. 10, 35: „Die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden“; 2 Tim. 3, 16: „Alle Schrift von Gott eingegeben.“ Auch 2 Petr. 1, 21 beziehen sich die Worte: „Die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet, getrieben von dem Heiligen Geist“, auf die Schrift des Alten Testaments, wie aus dem griechischen Text (B. 20) hervorgeht. In bezug auf die Erlernung der hebräischen Sprache gibt Prof. Balla einige gute Winke, z. B. den, möglichst viel hebräische Vokabeln auswendig zu lernen und laut hebräisch zu lesen.

F. F.

**Verbal Inspiration Denied in Australia.** — The *Australian Lutheran* reports the following: “Again and again the Anglican bishop of Adelaide has given evidence of his Modernism in theology. Another evidence of this was given when he recently stated in his pastoral address that, although recent Biblical criticism had only strengthened the position of the Bible and excavations and research had confirmed the Bible narrative in unexpected ways, yet the contentions of the Fundamentalists (those who stick to the old faith), who believed that every word of the Bible was inspired and that everything happened historically as the Bible records, were not confirmed and could not be. Naturally a public statement of this kind brought forth many protests from believing children of God. Letters written to the press gave evidence that the Lord still has His seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the modern Baal of skepticism. Possibly more letters were written than were published, and those published were possibly much abridged. The following, sent in to the *Advertiser* by Pastor Th. Lutze, appeared only in part: —

“To the deep sorrow of thousands of earnest Christians Dr. Thomas, in his pastoral address, has again attacked the Bible, God’s Book, declaring that not all of its historical statements are true. Fortunately there are many thousands who know and believe the Bible to be in its each and every statement the inspired, inerrant Word of God, it having proved itself to be such in their lives and daily experience. For the benefit, however, of those who are inclined to follow the bishop rather than the Book of God, will Dr. Thomas give your readers a list of the historical inaccuracies he so confidently alleges the Bible contains? Those who have read but a little about the Higher Criticism know of its bombastic assertions and its many humiliating defeats at the hands of able scholars who accept the verbal inspiration of every part of the Bible. The history of the Higher Criticism is a tragic one and too sad for words. Surely, ’tis true that “the time is out of joint” when leaders in the Church charge God’s Book with untruthfulness. Let me quote what the learned Bishop Ryle wrote: “Once admit the principle that the writers of the Bible could make mistakes and were not in all things guided by the Spirit, and I know not where I am. I see nothing certain, nothing solid, nothing trustworthy, in the foundations of my faith. A fog has descended on the Book of God and enveloped every chapter in uncertainty. Who shall decide when the writers of Scripture made mistakes and when they did not? How am I to know where inspiration ends and where it begins? What I think inspired another may think uninspired. The texts I rest upon may possibly have been put in by a slip of the pen! The

words and phrases that I love to feed upon may possibly be weak, earthly expressions, in writing which the author was left to his own private, un-inspired mind. The glory is departed from my Bible at this rate. A cold feeling of suspicion and doubt creeps over me as I read it. I am almost tempted to lay it down in flat despair. A partially inspired Bible is little better than no Bible at all."

"That is perfectly true. Our Christian faith rests on the Bible. If the Bible is a hoax, then also is Christianity. Let Christians continue to believe that they have a sure word of prophecy. The Scriptures cannot be broken.

"At a conference of the Southern Subdivision of the South Australian Pastoral Conference, held at Birdwood on September 9 and 10, 1930, the following resolution with regard to this matter was adopted:—

"This conference notes with deep regret the seemingly determined efforts on the part of leaders of some churches to discredit the Bible in some of its historical statements and to undermine the Biblical truth of verbal inspiration, and it pledges itself to resist to the utmost the insidious attacks of Higher Criticism and Modernism, which, under the specious plea that verbal inspiration is not acceptable to the intellectual man of to-day, make concessions to man's innate unbelief and in fact charge those with insincerity who still hold the doctrine of verbal inspiration.'"

J. T. M.

**The Lutheran Church in Russia.**—In an open news-letter Dr. John A. Morehead touches on this subject and presents what we might look upon as the latest information available. He says: "The Christian churches in Russia, after suffering the distresses of the World War, succeeding civil wars, change of form of government, and famine, have been caught in the toils of a thoroughgoing social and economic revolution. To what extent the almost unendurable afflictions of organized religion are due to the temporarily unavoidable hardships and excesses of the period of transition and to what extent they grow out of permanent elements of the Soviet system, are not yet entirely clear. The process of the execution of the five-year plan for the nationalization of industry, including agriculture, is impoverishing well-to-do farmers (Kulaks), a large class, upon whom the churches have largely depended for support. Moreover, although the new Russian constitution proclaims the separation of Church and State and provides, in a way, for religious freedom, limiting decrees and practise raise the gravest questions as to the real attitude of the Soviet government toward religion and as to whether there really is genuine religious liberty in Russia. Is the Soviet system with its background of antireligious philosophy, with its secularization of education, the press, and charity, and with its unofficial support of the activities of the 'Society of the Godless' compatible with the existence and development of the Christian Church in Russia?" In a later paragraph Dr. Morehead relates that in the closing months of 1929 and in the first part of 1930 the hostility against churches amounted to persecution. Among others, Lutheran pastors were arrested, imprisoned, and exiled. The Lutheran theological seminary in Leningrad was compelled to quit its quarters, although the rental contract was still good for three years. However, the students were housed in farmers' homes, and with exemplary devotion on the part of students and professors the

instruction continued. Early in April the clouds dispersed a little, when Mr. Stalin issued a proclamation ordering that all physical religious persecution cease and that religion be opposed by no other means than education. For the seminary at Leningrad the tide quite unexpectedly has turned for the better. "A wealthy citizen of a foreign country offered his residence near the center of the city of Leningrad at a rental no more than previously paid for the use of this vitally necessary institution for the recruiting of the ministry of the Lutheran Church. The building is larger and more commodious than that previously occupied, providing ample facilities for classrooms, dormitories for the students, and apartments for professors. . . . Hence the outlook now is favorable." It will be remembered that this seminary, which means so much for the Lutheran Church of Russia, was opened in 1924. A.

**The Augsburg Confession a Bond of Union.**—Writing on this subject, Prof. Werner Elert of Erlangen, Germany, expresses some thoughts which merit quotation. He points out that at the time when the Augsburg Confession was drawn up, three views were held as to how the unity of faith should be given expression. "The Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who was greatly influenced by Zwingli, demanded a political federation against the emperor and the Pope. The Margrave of Brandenburg advocated as a necessary condition of union, not only agreement in doctrine, but acceptance of a common church constitution as well. Saxony declined to enter into such an agreement. Unity of doctrine was essential. Freedom in determining matters pertaining to external ceremonials must be granted to each province." We all know that this view prevailed, and we thank God for it. Professor Elert reminds us how in the centuries that followed the Augsburg Confession united the Lutherans of Germany with those of the Scandinavian countries. What of other peoples? He says: "The Evangelicals east of the empire, the churches in Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, among the Transylvanians as well as in the Netherlands, were united into a great communion of faith with the Germans in the unity of the Augsburg Confession. Dissension in most of these regions, especially in Poland and Hungary, was caused by Calvinism. If at this time constant pressure for union is being exerted, if the Lutherans are accused of endangering the unity of Protestantism by faithfully adhering to the [Augsburg] Confession, we might well ask why the propaganda for Calvinistic doctrine was made in these regions, which destroyed the unity of faith; for Calvinism did not enter these countries till the Lutheran Reformation had been introduced or where the Lutheran Church was already prospering. The Slovenian and Croatian Church became the prey of the Counter-Reformation." We hope that the following declaration of Professor Elert will more and more be recognized as true by all who call themselves Lutherans: "Our Church's chief concern has been purity of doctrine, to which she, together with the Augustana, pledges herself. Our Church therefore has been, and ever will be, true to herself so long as she holds fast to this Confession." A.

Was Einstein nicht weiß, darüber hat er sich selbst nach einem Bericht der Associated Press, datiert Berlin, den 15. November 1930, so ausgesprochen: "Dr. Albert Einstein, originator of the relativity theory, lectured on the laws of cause and effect last night before a crowd of young

radicals in Humboldt Hall. He encouraged his audience to ask questions and not to imagine they were foolish questions. 'For before God we are relatively all equally wise or — equally foolish,' he remarked. He touched on the metaphysical and psychological aspects of causation, beginning with the ideas of primitive peoples, who are able to conceive only an 'animistic will cause'; who, in other words, believe all happenings are directly caused by a thinking agency, human, divine, or demoniacal. He said he saw nothing to prove that the world was 'causal.' As to the 'first cause,' he said, he couldn't even now tell which came first, the hen or the egg. Determinism, which lays down that everything that happens is due to the law of necessity, Einstein said, 'is belief, not knowledge.' Physicists no longer believe in strict determinism, he added. Mankind, he said, has not gone very far in knowledge. 'The farther we proceed, the more formidable are the riddles facing us,' he asserted. He said the ultimate issues were beyond man's ken." Das ist bescheiden geredet. Und diese Bescheidenheit ist am Plage. Es gibt ein „metaphysisches Problem“. Es wird wahr bleiben, daß in das Innere der Natur kein geschaffener Geist dringt. Es ist auch in neuerer Zeit von Naturforschern darauf hingewiesen worden, daß die Rätsel in der Natur sich mehren, je schärfer das Handwerkszeug wird, womit wir die Natur beobachten. Der Grund hierfür ist der: Wie Gott alle Dinge geschaffen hat, so ist er es auch, der alle Dinge in ihrem Sein und Leben und in Bewegung erhält, Kol. 1, 16. 17. Gott aber ist unsichtbar, 1 Tim. 6, 16, also unerreichbar für Mikroskop und Teleskop. Daher das Resultat, daß bei der zunehmenden Schärfe unserer Beobachtungsinstrumente die Rätsel sich mehren. Aber die „Bescheidenheit“ kann auch zu weit getrieben werden. Das geschieht dann, wenn sie in Agnostizismus ausartet. Die Welt ist „causal“ in dem Sinne, daß sie, auch abgesehen von der Offenbarung der Schrift, als von Gott gemacht erkannt wird, wenn sie mit Verstand (νοῦς) betrachtet wird, Röm. 1, 20; „Gottes unsichtbares Wesen, das ist, seine ewige Kraft und Gottheit, wird ersehen, so man des wahrnimmt an den Werken, nämlich an der Schöpfung der Welt.“ Was die berühmt gewordene Prioritätsfrage betrifft, ob das Huhn oder das Ei oder — was auf gleicher Linie liegt — ob der Eichbaum oder die Eichel das erste sei, so lehrt die Schrift bekanntlich, daß durch Gottes Schöpfungswort eine fertige, vollkommen ausgebildete Pflanzen- und Tierwelt ins Dasein trat. Die Pflanzen sind eher als ihr Same und die Tiere eher als ihre Jungen. Ebenso ist der Mensch fertig und vollkommen ausgebildet geschaffen. Für die gegenteilige Annahme, die ganze und die halbe Evolution, fehlen die „ausfüllenden Mittelglieder“, wie besonnene Naturwissenschaftler auch der Neuzeit zugeben. F. P.

Der Papst will „die christliche Einheitsfront“ nicht mitmachen. Der Berliner „Reichsbote“ schreibt: „Man kann es in Deutschland noch immer nicht lassen, mehr oder weniger vernehmlich und deutlich von der ‚christlichen Einheitsfront‘ zu reden und zu schwärmen, in der sich der Protestantismus und Katholizismus zusammenfinden müsse und werde gegen die Mächte der Gottlosigkeit und des Untermenschentums. Daß man mit diesen Träumen tatsächlich einem Phantom nachjagt, zeigt mit wünschenswerter Deutlichkeit wieder einmal der *Osservatore Romano*, den die ‚Schönere Zukunft‘ vom 29. Juni 1930 zitiert. Das Vatikanische Organ nimmt seine ablehnende Stellungnahme gegenüber einer Ligue pour le Christianisme



zum Anlaß, um grundsätzliche Erwägungen zum Problem interkonfessioneller Zusammenfassungen überhaupt zu veröffentlichen. Wir lesen u. a.: Wir erinnern vor allem daran, daß das sichtbare Band, das die Christen zusammenschließt, von Jesu Christo, unserm Herrn, festgesetzt worden ist in seiner wahren Kirche, die, wie St. Ambrosius sagte, dort ist, wo Petrus ist. Die christlichen Dissidenten verschiedener Denominationen haben sich leider von diesem Bande losgemacht, und darum nehmen die Spaltungen und Sekten immer mehr zu. Das einzige Mittel, sie zu vereinigen, kann kein anderes sein als das von Christo gewollte, das von ihm eingesetzte Bindemittel der einen Herde unter dem einen Hirten Petrus, dem er auftrug: „Weide meine Lämmer, weide meine Schafe!“. . . Ein Bindemittel unter den bestehenden christlichen Institutionen ist eben unmöglich, gerade weil es dem einzigen von Christo in der Einheit seiner wahren sichtbar auf Petrus gegründeten Kirche entgegengesetzt ist. . . . Viele halten sich absichtlich fern von dem einen Weg und bilden sich ein, die Einheit zu erreichen auf dem Wege von Vergleichen, Vereinbarungen, Abschwächungen in Glaubenssachen oder durch Beiseitelegen, Ausschließen oder Absehen vom Glauben mit dem Zwecke, eine Art Überkirche ohne Glaube und ohne Dogma herzustellen. . . . Die Vereinigung der christlichen Kräfte gegen die Mächte des Bösen ist unmöglich ohne die Einheit des christlichen Geistes, der sich Gehorsam der einen und höchsten Leitung im Glauben und in christlicher Disziplin unterwirft. Eine solche Einheit ist unmöglich ohne das oberste Lehr- und Hirtenamt der Christenheit, das von Christo in Petrus eingesetzt worden ist.“ Das ist deutlich. . . . Das wird die deutschen Schwarmgeister freilich nicht hindern, weiter ihre Schlösser in die leere Luft zu bauen, sich selbst zum Schaden.“

J. P.

Die „amerikanische Religion“ in der Türkei. In einer Mitteilung in der „N. E. L. R.“ lesen wir: „Die ‚amerikanische Religion‘ wird den Türken als Vorbild vorgehalten. Was ist sie? Einer der prominenten Staatsmänner der Türkei, naher Freund des Mustafa Kemal Pascha, Faleh Rafiq Bey, Mitglied des türkischen Parlaments, schreibt in der Regierungszeitung „Melat“: „In einem Lande, dessen Natur, Städte, Technik, Wissenschaft und Volk erneuert werden sollten, wie das von unserm Lande gilt, sollte amerikanische Zivilisation die Grundlage aller Anstrengungen sein. Eine Nachahmung der Zivilisation Europas ist nicht gut für uns. Der erste Schritt diesem Ziel entgegen wird die Ausbreitung der englischen Sprache in unserm Volke sein, weil wir, um den Stand amerikanischer Zivilisation und amerikanischen Geistes zu erreichen, nicht nur unsere Produktionsorganisation usw. ändern sollten, sondern zuerst unser Erziehungssystem. Die geistige Verfassung, die man durch Erziehung erreicht und die einen alles mit Erfolg angreifen läßt, mit andern Worten Initiative, kann man erlangen durch amerikanischen Geist und Zivilisation. Das ist das gerade Gegenteil des Geistes, den unsere türkischen Mollas uns gelehrt haben, und zwar jahrhundertlang. Wir sollten entweder von diesem Wege abbiegen oder in unserer Starre bleiben wie zuvor und so sterben. Wir sollten die amerikanische Religion annehmen mit ganzem Herzen und sie als unsere wahre Religion anerkennen, weil das Ideal dieser Religion schöpferischer Angriffsgeist ist. Der Gott der Amerikaner liebt nicht die Leute, die als Parasiten auf den Straßen Hungers sterben, sondern liebt und segnet einen Menschen, der arbeitet und einen Palast für sich baut.“ Faleh Rafiq Bey

machte eine Reise durch Südamerika und Europa und begann seine Propaganda danach. Der Einfluß der Vereinigten Staaten in Latein-Amerika machte einen großen Eindruck auf ihn und führte ihn dazu, die amerikanische Zivilisation zu propagieren. Und jetzt hilft ihm die türkische Regierung. Im fremdsprachlichen Unterricht ist weithin das Englische an die Stelle des Französischen getreten. — Daß der Türke die dollartichtige Initiative der Amerikaner für ‚Religion‘ hält, ist niederschlagend.“ J. L. M.

## Book Review. — Literatur.

**Allgemeine Missionsstudien.** Herausgegeben von Prof. D. Julius Richter und Prof. D. M. Schünk. Siebtes Heft: „Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus als missionarische Sendschreiben.“ Von Prof. D. Julius Richter. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 1929. 212 Seiten 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  × 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ , in Weinwand mit Deckel- und Rückentitel gebunden. Preis: M. 8.

Eine Fülle interessanter Punkte wird in diesem Buche berührt, die namentlich denjenigen, der sich mit paulinischer Exegese beschäftigt, interessieren werden, und immer werden diese Punkte vom missionarischen Gesichtspunkt aus betrachtet. So mag es wirklich der Fall sein, daß der bekannte Missionsmann der Gegenwart D. Richter in diesem Buche das Beste seiner Lebensarbeit darbietet, wie wir kürzlich in einer Anzeige dieses Werkes lasen. Richter erweist sich auf jeder Seite als einen, der die mancherlei Fragen über die Entstehung der paulinischen Briefe kennt. Er weiß auch in der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschung der Neuzeit gut Bescheid, weist sie mehr als einmal ab und sagt ganz richtig: „Es vertieft sich bei mir immer mehr die Überzeugung, daß der wirkliche Schlüssel zum Verständnis des Apostels seine Missionaufgabe ist, die Botschaft von der Versöhnung der Welt durch den Kreuzestod und die Auferstehung Jesu Christi der hellenischen und hellenistischen Welt zu verkündigen und voll verständlich zu machen“ (S. 3). Und so behandelt er der Reihe nach die folgenden Kapitel: Der Apostel Paulus als Persönlichkeit; Paulus als Missionar; Die Botschaft; Pauli Missionsmethode; Die beiden Thessalonicherbriefe; Der Galaterbrief; Die Geschichte der Korinthergemeinde von ihrer Gründung bis zum zweiten Korintherbriefe; Streifzüge durch die Korintherbriefe; Der Römerbrief; Der Philipperbrief; Der Kolosserbrief; Der Epheserbrief; Die Pastoralbriefe. — Wir können nicht allen seinen Ausführungen zustimmen. Wenn er sagt: „Paulus war, wenn wir den innersten Kern seiner Frömmigkeit charakterisieren wollen, Mystiker“ (S. 12), so ist das nicht richtig, es sei denn, daß man jeden gläubigen Christen, der mit Paulus sagt: „Ich lebe, doch nun nicht ich, sondern Christus lebet in mir“, Gal. 2, 20, einen Mystiker nennen will. Richter sagt auch, daß „der Charakter des Paulus vielleicht nicht ganz ohne Makel ist. Es hängt wohl mit der Leidenschaftlichkeit seines Temperaments, mit der heißen Liebe zu seinen geistlichen Kindern zusammen, daß er im Kampfe mit seinen Gegnern vielleicht nicht immer die strenge Grenze des Zulässigen in der Kritik eingehalten hat“ (S. 13). Aber es gibt auch einen heiligen Born, einen heiligen Eifer um Gottes Ehre und um die Wahrheit des Evangeliums und gegen dessen Feinde. Und so haben wir uns noch eine Reihe fraglicher oder irriger Sätze angemerkt. Aber dabei ist auch so viel Wichtiges und Gutes gesagt, die einzelnen Briefe werden inhaltlich dem Leser so nahe gebracht, und die Gründe