

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

August, 1931

No. 8

CONTENTS

	Page
KRETZMANN, P. E.: † Prof. Franz August Otto Pieper, Dr. theol. †.....	561
GRAEBNER, TH.: "What Is Unionism?".....	565
MUELLER, J. T.: Introduction to Sacred Theology.....	583
MAYER, F. E.: Artikel X der Variata.....	594
Dispositionen ueber die von der Synodalkonferenz ange- nommene Serie alttestamentlicher Texte.....	608
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	617
Book Review. — Literatur.....	633

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.



gehalten werden, sollten wir uns da nicht fürchten vor seinem Zorn und ausrufen: Lied 230, 1? Wenn wir hören von ewiger Höllestrafe, sollten wir da nicht ausbrechen in den Schrei: Lied 434, 1?

2.

a. Moses beruhigt das Volk mit den Worten: „Fürchtet euch nicht.“ Er zeigt ihnen nun, daß Gott gekommen sei, sie auf die Probe zu stellen, sie von der Allmacht Gottes zu überzeugen und sie durch diese gewaltige Offenbarung seiner Majestät von der Sünde abzuschrecken. Sie sollten mitnichten des Todes sterben; so war es nicht gemeint. Dies Ereignis sollte einen bleibenden Eindruck auf die Gemüter machen. Sonderlich warnte er, B. 22, 23, vor der schrecklichen Sünde der Abgötterei, die bei den heidnischen Völkern ringsumher, sonderlich auch im verheißenen Lande, gang und gäbe war. Sein Volk vor ähnlicher Sünde und vor ähnlicher Strafe, wie sie über die Heiden kam, zu bewahren, das war Zweck seiner Erscheinung, seiner Gesetzgebung. Seine Gnade war es also, die ihn trieb, sich in dieser Weise dem Volk zu offenbaren. So will er noch heute in seinem Wort uns vor Sünden warnen, uns bewahren vor dem Gericht.

b. Er zeigt den Kindern Israel den wahren Gottesdienst. Mose soll einen Altar machen und darauf nach Gottes Anweisung Opfertiere schlachten, Gott zum süßen Geruch. Diese Opfer sollten ein schwaches Vorbild sein des Opfers, das einst gebracht werden sollte. Dasselbst sollte auch sein Wort gepredigt werden.

c. Er verheißt seinen Segen. Wo ein Altar errichtet und Gottes Wort gepredigt wird, da ist Gott mit seinem Segen. „Da will ich zu dir kommen und dich segnen.“ Gott ist, wo sein Wort ist. Gottes Haus ist, wo sein Wort erschallt. So kam nun Gott zu dem Volke Israel in der Hütte des Stifts; er kam später zu ihnen im Tempel und wohnte unter ihnen. Ex. 29, 43; Deut. 12, 5; 1 Kön. 8, 29.

Diesen Segen seiner Erscheinung verspricht er uns auch. Er kommt auch zu uns in unsern Kirchen und segnet uns. Er wohnt daselbst mit seiner Gnadengegenwart. Wir können allsonntäglich Gottes Majestät und Höhe in seinem Evangelium bewundern. Dafür sollten wir uns recht dankbar erzeigen und vor allen Dingen da sein, wo Gott unter uns seines Namens Gedächtnis stiftet. D. R.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Dr. Wm. Schmidt, Deceased. — On May 31 the Ohio Synod, now a part of the American Lutheran Church, lost one of its old members, whose name had become a household word in German-speaking circles where good literature was valued — Prof. W. Schmidt, Litt. D. For many years he had been a member of the faculty of Luther College at St. Paul, Minn. At the

time of his death he was a member of the Board of Foreign Missions of the American Lutheran Church. As a member of the Intersynodical Committee of the Ohio Synod he took a prominent part in the negotiations which culminated in the elaboration of the so-called Chicago Theses. Through his wholesome, entertaining stories, *Aethelburga*, *Sieghardus*, *Ramuldu*, and many others, he endeared himself to thousands of families which still love and use the German language. A.

The Macintosh Decision of the Supreme Court. — If any matter in the sphere of our national affairs has furnished the religious press of the country strong provocation for vigorous dissent and attack, it is the recent decision of our Supreme Court at Washington, D. C., reached by a vote of 5 to 4, declaring that Prof. D. C. Macintosh of Yale Divinity School, a Canadian who had applied for citizenship in our country, is unacceptable on account of his statement that in a war which he should consider unjust or contrary to the will of God he would be unwilling to bear arms. To understand the consternation of religious editors and leaders one must bear in mind that Professor Macintosh does not condemn all wars and does not avow unwillingness ever to fight in defense of the nation, but merely declares that he will not participate in wars if they in his opinion clearly violate principles of right and justice. The views of the majority members of the court which led to the decision are given in this paragraph of the opinion from the pen of Justice Sutherland (the quotation is taken from the *Christian Century*): "When Dr. Macintosh speaks of putting his allegiance to the will of God above the allegiance to the Government, it is evident . . . that he means to make his own interpretation of the will of God the decisive test. . . . We are a nation with the duty to survive; a nation whose Constitution contemplates war as well as peace; whose government must go forward upon the assumption, and safely can proceed upon no other, that unqualified allegiance to the nation and submission and obedience to the laws of the land, as well those made for war as those made for peace, are not inconsistent with the will of God." The dissenting votes were cast by Chief Justice Hughes and Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone. In the minority opinion, written by Chief Justice Hughes himself, the argumentation is largely technical, it being pointed out that the Constitution does not contemplate any such test as the Supreme Court now imposes. However, that in the view of the minority the question of religious liberty and freedom of consciences enters in is evident from this sentence: "One cannot speak of religious liberty with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance without assuming a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God."

It appears to us that the opinion of those who in this decision see a serious blow dealt to the cause of freedom of conscience in our country is only too well founded. What Professor Macintosh declared was, in effect, merely adherence to the principle, "We must obey God rather than men," and his intention to apply this principle to participation in wars. If the Supreme Court holds that the United States Government must be obeyed, whether its orders violate our consciences or not, and if that position prevails, then, in theory at least, religious liberty has ceased to exist in our country. The *Christian Century*, we fear, is not far wrong when it says of this decision: "It stretches over all citizens the pagan

panoply of a nationalistic God, before whom all must bow in reverence." Let us hope and pray that the danger to religious freedom which seems to be lurking in the pronouncement of the Supreme Court will soon be removed.

A.

The Paramount Duty of the Christian Church.— Under this heading the Presbyterian journal *Christianity To-day* writes among other things: "The paramount duty of the Christian Church is to bear witness, to make known a message, a message that has to do primarily with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as Paul tells us in the fifteenth chapter of his First Letter to the Corinthians. . . . It is somewhat surprising in view of the signal success that attended the efforts of the apostles—as well as the efforts of their imitators in later centuries—that there should be so many to-day, even within the Christian Church itself, to whom the apostolic method should seem so foolish that they have largely discarded it in the interest of other methods. For the 'foolishness of preaching' many professed followers of Christ—despite the clear instructions He left behind Him—are putting their main confidence in organizations, programs, mass movements, and the like, to such an extent that it is more proper to speak of them as 'men with a program' than it is to speak of them as 'men with a message.' It is true that plans and programs and organizations have an important part to play in the great task of Christianizing the world; but in view of the method commended by Christ Himself and followed by all His apostles it should be as clear as day that our chief emphasis should be on the purity and sincerity of our testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Christianity is indeed a life, but it is a life based on a message. In as far therefore as the Christian worker denies or ignores or falsifies that message, his labor is in vain in the Lord. The primary note of a true Church, as our Protestant fathers ever insisted, is that therein the Gospel is honored and proclaimed.

"The campaign of witnessing carried on by the apostles included two elements, both of which were constantly kept in the foreground. In the first place they made known what had taken place, the great historic events that lay at the basis of the Christian religion. In the second place they expounded the meaning, or significance, of those facts or events. In a word, facts and doctrines were inextricably bound together in their testimony. The apostles were not mere expounders and defenders of certain religious principles which they had learned from the great Nazarene; neither were they mere ethical teachers, interested primarily in persuading men to live as Jesus lived . . . ; but they were concerned, first of all, to tell men of certain events that had happened, together with their meaning, or significance. Here Paul's statement is classic: 'I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures and that He was buried and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.'"

So far, so good. Let these earnest Calvinists, whose testimony against modern Liberalists and liberalizing "Fundamentalists" is so well founded, now proceed a step farther and confess with Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Church that this Gospel-message of Christ's death and resurrection according to the Scriptures was declared by the apostles to be the only means of grace by which sinners are saved from perdition and that,

since the Gospel promises of grace and pardon in Christ Jesus are comprehended, too, in the holy Sacraments, also the two Sacraments instituted by our Lord are the means of grace by which sinners are regenerated and sanctified. Then the argument why Christ's holy Gospel, the gracious message of God's grace in Christ Jesus, must alone be preached by the Church as the unfailing message of salvation is completely clinched; and then, too, the doctrine of the Sacraments will find its rightful place in their theology.

It is deplorable to note that the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace is decidedly rejected in the same number from which we have quoted; for there "all those dying in infancy" are said to be elect and saved. We read: "It is obvious that the Lutheran system of thought provides no place for the notion that all dying in infancy are saved because of the necessity it attaches to the means of grace, especially the Word and the Sacraments. If grace is only in the means of grace, in the case of infants in Baptism, it seems clear that most of those who have died in infancy have not been the recipients of grace." That is true. Only this conclusion is not based on "the Lutheran system of thought," but upon Holy Scripture, which binds us to the means of grace as instituted for the very purpose that sinners, including infants, might be saved. All who reject the means of grace have no Scriptural assurance whatever on which to rest their hope of salvation. (Cp. Eph. 2, 12; Mark 16, 15, 16; etc.) To this our Lutheran dogmatists, however, have always added that God may, in exceptional cases (Luke 1, 15, 44), reserve for Himself the prerogative to work faith in a child without the ordinary means of grace, and to His infinite mercy Lutheran divines have invariably commended the infants of Christian parents who died before they could be baptized. Thus the Lutheran Church is truly Scriptural both in inculcating the Bible doctrine of the means of grace and in comforting Christians in cases where their infants died without Holy Baptism. When Calvinists declare that "all infants dying in infancy are saved," they go beyond Holy Scripture and establish their doctrine on grounds of reason. And that is a bad practise. J. T. M.

Belief in Immortality and the Present Age. — What is the attitude of our generation toward the great doctrine proclaimed by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15 and found in many other passages of the Bible? The *Christian Century*, in discussing this question, points out that, generally speaking, people to-day are altogether indifferent with respect to the question of immortality. Some of its statements are: "The difficulty of carrying over this sublime hope [of immortality] from a static universe into a dynamic and growing [?] universe has been so far insurmountable, and evolutionary cosmology affords as yet no evidence that men live after death. The older arguments from nature now seem inapropos and have survived for the most part as poetry, with but little conviction as to their having ground in objective reality. . . . The passing of 'otherworldliness' from religion is one of our most striking phenomena. Increasingly the religious emphasis is concentrating upon this world. Thoughts of 'heaven' are rare, and where our religious ritual keeps alive in prayer or hymn the language of the future life, the words are almost vacant of any distinct content. . . . It is not a mood of denial, but of disregard and neglect. . . . As a token of our own immortality, Easter has become more of an esthetic tradition

than a living conviction. Though the story of the open tomb still forms the central *motif* of our Easter celebration, the nature *motif* of an earth reawaking in the spring tends increasingly to compete with, if not to eclipse, the historic event." Continuing, the *Christian Century* expresses the belief that the old conviction of immortality must be rebuilt. It emphasizes that we need this conviction if we are to remain loyal to the highest dictates of morality. "When immortality goes, the dignity of life goes with it." Our total social order needs this conviction. "Our cynicism, our lawlessness, our swaggering attitudinizing, our profane cleverness, our substitution of the appeal of economic determinism for the appeal of righteousness, our blurring of ethical distinctions, our shallow and showy sentimentalism, our incapacity for moral wrath—these are the precise phenomena which one would expect to find in a society which has allowed the moral dignity of its individual members to be dethroned by their indifference to any life beyond this one." The strange tendency of our age to laugh at its own beliefs is pointed to as being in keeping with the lack of interest in the life beyond the grave. The movies and the Great War are mentioned as causes. The *Christian Century* says quite properly that "faith in immortality need not wait for the scholars to prove it to us." It holds (and here it falls into the prevailing haziness itself) that "faith in immortality is our way of evaluating the gift of life which we now possess." Evidently this is a poor foundation to offer to the anxious inquirer about the beyond. In its closing statements our contemporary speaks of our finding courage in the Easter revelation of Jesus Christ who rose from the grave "because it was not possible for Him to be holden of death." This indeed is the foundation on which St. Paul places himself and his fellow-Christians. After all, the only thing that can give us a worth-while conviction regarding the continuance of our existence after death is divine revelation as it comes to us in the resurrection and the Word of the Son of God.

A.

Rome and the Annulment of Marriages.—The plan of a committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church to submit to the General Convention of that Church in September for acceptance a canon to substitute decrees of nullity for divorce has received a good deal of attention, especially in the Roman Catholic press. The *Commonweal* uses this opportunity to reprint some statements of a Roman Catholic paper in England, the *Catholic Gazette*, which "analyzed the figures provided by the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* in the number containing the reports of the cases brought before the Sacred Tribunal of the Rota, the court which considers nullity suits, during the year 1930." The intention is to show that these nullity proceedings are not so numerous nor of such an ugly character as Protestants are wont to believe. The chief paragraphs of the report are illuminating, and hence we reprint them here:—

"Last year, 1930, the Rota had before it forty-three cases of marriages, which, for one reason or another, the parties concerned considered, or feared, to be invalid. It is to be noted, parenthetically, that the point at issue in them all was, not the dissolution of a valid marriage for any reason whatever, but the vital and fundamental reality of the validity of the marriage itself. Of these forty-three nullity suits thirty-three were dismissed, and in ten only were declarations of nullity rendered. There

were considered, moreover, ten appeals against previous judgments. Of the six cases in which judgment was reversed, all the decisions save one were in favor of the validity of the marriage. Striking evidence indeed, not of the Church's laxity, but of her solicitude!

"A still more illuminating fact—of the forty-three nullity suits twenty-four were sued *in forma pauperis*, i. e., by poor persons, an advocate being assigned *ex mandato gratuiti patrocinii*. Out of these twenty-four, eight declarations of nullity were rendered, while of the nineteen cases argued by fee advocates the declarations of nullity rendered were only three. It is even more noteworthy that of the ten appeals against previous judgments five were pleaded *in forma pauperis*. Thus, of all the matrimonial cases considered last year by the Rota either in the first or the second instance, amounting in all to fifty-three, twenty-nine were pleaded *in forma pauperis*, and in only fourteen was a declaration of nullity either rendered or confirmed. Surely these figures must be eloquent. . . . Clearly Rome is ready neither to grant declarations of nullity easily nor indeed to grant them more easily to the rich. After all, the Universal Church could hardly be expected to be an *acceptor personarum*."

What the Lutheran Church criticizes is not so much the great number of nullity suits or abuses connected with this system of declaring marriages null and void as the principle itself which is involved. That the Pope in Rome arrogates to himself the authority to annul marriages is certainly in flagrant opposition to the words of Jesus: "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." We must remember that Rome claims, not merely the authority to render an opinion or to give advice, but to legislate. There may be abuses connected with these nullity proceedings, but what is worse is the usurpation of that authority which belongs to Christ alone.

A.

"Papists and Other Idolaters."—*America*, the Roman Catholic journal, wrote last year: "It seems that in official Presbyterian eyes we poor papists are still idolaters. A year or so ago an attempt was made by some Presbyterian leaders to amend the ecclesiastical legislation which forbids Presbyterians to wed 'with infidels, papists, and other idolaters.' The assertion was made that, whatever the teaching of the Church might be, many Catholics recognized our Lord Jesus Christ as God; or, as Dr. Howard Johnston of Milwaukee told the General Assembly, convened in Cincinnati last week: 'We feel that there are members of the Catholic Church who are firm believers in Jesus Christ. In spite of Dr. Johnston's feeling in the matter the Assembly declined to change this clause in the Confession of Faith. . . . We have no hostile feeling toward the Presbyterians, nor do we deeply yearn for any special manifestation of their love. But we do consider that we are entitled to justice. . . .'"

Are the papists idolaters? The *Lutheran* makes out a good case for the affirmative. It writes: "We also thought 'infidels, papists, and other idolaters' a bit blunt, and when the Roman Catholic journals took exception to it, we sought information on the subject 'Idolater' and 'Idolatry.' In the new *Catholic Dictionary* we found the following: 'Idolatry, image-worship, broadly extends to all divine worship given to any one or anything but the true God. Opposed to the virtue of religion, it bestows reverence due to God alone directly on the image itself or on the creature

represented. . . . Catholic veneration of images is not directed to the images as such, but is a form of respect paid to them as representative of the original, to whom alone honor is due and attributed. The matter is treated with much greater detail in the *Catholic Cyclopaedia* under the title 'Images.' . . . 'Lastly something must be said about Catholic principles concerning the worship of images.' A curiously literal deduction is made of our Lord's use of the words of Moses (Deut. 6, 13) during the temptation: "Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou adore (serve)," Matt. 4, 10. From this the principle is deduced that God limits only adoration to Himself; but worship is permissible for other creatures. . . . The argument is too extensive to quote; it develops the distinction between *absolute* and *relative* worship. 'Absolute worship (but not adoration) is paid to any person for his own sake. Relative worship is paid to the sign, not at all for its own sake, but for the sake of the thing signified.' . . . Our Roman Catholic friends can certainly plead an official 'not guilty' so far as the theory of their use of the images is concerned. If a vast percentage of their people do not get the distinction between absolute and relative, it is the misfortune of simple ignorance and not a sin. [?] When the evangelical reads the 'ads' in Roman Catholic periodicals advising the purchase of emblems of one saint as a protection against accidents to travelers and of another as a claim on the favor of the saint whose fame rests on the power to heal, he is expected to distinguish between what the Church really teaches and what its adherents think is their doctrine. . . . The Lutheran cyclopedias omit the mention of images, but the one-volume publication of Missouri, the *Concordia Cyclopaedia*, gives a brief, but instructive treatment of *relic* worship. We draw on this, on the *Hastings Cyclopaedia of Ethics*, and on the paragraph in the *Catholic Dictionary* for comment on this feature of Roman reverence. The *Catholic Dictionary's* definition reads: 'Relic, an object connected with a saint. It may be the whole or a part of the saint's body or something the saint has touched. Such objects are venerated with the approval of the Church because . . . those who practise heroic virtue or die for the faith and are honored by the Church as exceptionally holy merit the veneration of the faithful. This is paid by special respect for their remains as well as imitation of their virtues. *Their relics are therefore enshrined on altars, carried in processions, and used to obtain cures and other favors.*' . . . In the fourth century, when Christians through Emperor Constantine regained entry into Palestine, fragments of 'the true cross were discovered' and other relics of the Lord's ministry. Objects connected with the Virgin Mary are mentioned from the sixth and seventh centuries on, among them a stone on which she rested on her journey to Bethlehem. Articles to which sanctity was attached by their contact with the apostles were added to the list about the same period.' At first none were so popular as the chains which had bound St. Peter and St. Paul. Filings from these chains enclosed in keys and crosses were greatly valued, and Pope Gregory the Great (540—604) was accustomed to send keys containing them as gifts. . . . Fragments of the true cross in the sixteenth century, wrote Calvin, were enough to burden 300 men instead of that Simon who was deputed to carry it when the Master sank beneath its weight. A veritable traffic arose, and the credulity of the people was very literally made the source

of profit to ingenious representatives of the Holy Church. The Council of Trent (1563) undertook to regulate the use of relics. . . . The phrase 'infidels, papists, and other idolaters' with whom Presbyterians are still forbidden to wed, has at least a definite historic background. Its erasure by the General Assembly in 1930 could not rest on an abandonment by Roman Catholics of the cult to which the Presbyterian founders made radical objection. On images the present Catholicism holds to the decree adopted at Nicaea in 787 and on relics to the decision reached at Trent in 1563. . . . Those of you who have the *Book of Concord* (Jacobs) on your shelves can verify this assertion by tracing the references given in the index under the word 'Idolatry.' The last of our creeds, the Formula of Concord, declares the Augsburg Confession, its Apology, and the Smalcald Articles to be a declaration of our Christian faith and confession, 'especially against the Papacy and its false worship, idolatry, and superstition.' Particularly do we Lutherans find in the Roman Catholic doctrine of the *Mass* a concentration of erroneous doctrines. *Catholic Dictionary*: 'The Mass is a true, proper sacrifice, namely, the external offering up of a sensible gift, which is destroyed, transformed, by an authorized minister in recognition of God's dominion. . . . Christ is mystically slain in the separate consecration of the bread and wine; the offering is perfected in the communion of the priest. The value of this offering is infinite from the application of the merits of Christ's Passion and death, giving adequate praise and thanksgiving to God. Inexhaustible also are its fruits as satisfaction for sins and punishment due them and for obtaining all benefits. These fruits are applied, partly by the will of the Church, partly by the intention of the priest offering them, and partly by those devoutly assisting, for both the living and the dead. Whether the satisfactory fruits of each mass are infinite in application or limited by the will of Christ is not certainly known.' . . . We have no partiality for the word 'idolatrous' when by that word the grosser forms of worship practised by pagans is meant. Whether the wide-spread attention given images and relics and their doctrine of the Mass invites the charge of 'subtle idolatrousness' we leave for our readers' conclusions from the quotations taken from Catholic books."

The Roman Catholic Church does practise gross idolatry. But we need not be at pains to call particular attention to *that*. The common people can easily form their judgment on the worship of images and relics. "Here we do not as yet recite the abuses of the common people (how manifestly idolatry is practised at pilgrimages). We are still speaking of the opinions of the Doctors. As regards the rest, even the inexperienced [common people] can judge." (Apology, p. 347.) But the "subtle idolatrousness" needs to be uncovered. "Therefore we shall show that they truly make of the saints, not only intercessors, but propitiators, *i. e.*, mediators of redemption." (*L. c.*) (One is, of course, at a loss whether to classify the invocation of the saints and the adoration of Mary as subtle or as gross idolatry.) Then, the Mass is truly idolatry; "above and before all other popish idolatries it has been the chief and most specious" (Smalcald Art., p. 463) and, being of the subtle kind, the more dangerous and seductive. In fact, the whole popish religion is idolatry, being, like the Mass, "fabricated and invented without the will and Word of God." (*L. c.*)

What is idolatry? Luther: "Any and all such worship by which one would serve God without His word and command is idolatry, and the more holy and spiritual it appears to be, the more pernicious and destructive it is." (9, 706.) "Thus the Pope and his band is altogether an idolater and servant of Satan by the very nature of his teaching. For he cares nothing for God's Word; indeed, he condemns and persecutes it, and putting forth a great show of holiness, he aims at destroying the true faith in Christ." (13, 1692.) Setting up a worship of God contrary to God's Word is at bottom self-deification. And it leads to all manner of idolatry. The gross idolatry practised with images and relics is a by-product of the subtle idolatry.—There is a reason, however, why this provision of the Westminster Confession should be stricken out. See *Pastorale*, p. 228: "The pastor will most strongly warn against a mixed marriage; but if the matter be no longer *in integro*, he may not stop it."

E.

The advantage of teaching Modernism in the Christian day-school lies in this, that things are made easier for the boys and girls when they are later on brought into contact with the teachings of Modernism. They will not then have to unlearn their faith. Incidentally things are made easier for the modernistic seducers. These thoughts underlie an article appearing in the *Living Church*, in which Dr. H. Darlington, rector of a New York church, describes the nature and aims of the school operated by his church. "The third and perhaps in many ways the most important principle operating in our efforts for young people at this church is the insistence on honesty in what we teach them. Young people of to-day are intrinsically honest. Their predecessors thought things, but did not dare to say them. Youth to-day has the courage to say what it is thinking. We seek to provide in all our class-work a habit of thought which makes religious teaching something boys and girls can accept for their own help and guidance, *regardless of whether Bible-stories may or may not be factual in the light of modern investigation*. For example, many an older man has said to me, 'I still believe the religion I learned at my mother's knee.' And all the time one knows that he has a mental reservation, that, while his experience in life has tended to make him doubt much that was taught him as a youth, yet he will stubbornly affirm, because he thinks he should do so, that which he no longer believes. In contrast to this the young people of to-day will acknowledge truthfully what seems reasonable to them and will tell you honestly what they believe and what they do not believe. If we wish our young people to grow up able to supply constructive leadership, which is needed for the future, we must honestly meet their doubts and attempt to answer them with all candor, so that they will not become intellectual hypocrites. It is our earnest attempt to teach these young people *things they will not have to unlearn later in life*. Surely it is better to help them to an independence of thinking, where they are able to say, 'I believe this,' and, 'I do not believe that,' than to let them go along acquiescing and thus perhaps preventing them from finding the truth. The eternal values of religion are as much needed by the young people of to-day as in the past. There is still the same soul-hunger. It can be fed with a food that will not turn sour later in life, as happened in so many cases for our parents, who were

brought up under the old *régime*. That our beliefs in them and our methods for thinking with them bear fruit we frequently have testimonials. Recently, when a group of graduates from our church-school returned for a vacation from colleges and 'prep' schools, they met with me for lunch, as is their custom. Said one of them to me: 'I am so glad I was rightly taught the truth about the Old Testament. When I got away to school, I found that many of the other boys were hearing for the first time of these things which I already knew. They were much upset over what they called "*the experience of losing their faith.*" But this did not upset me at all. I had been instructed as to what it all meant and how it related to modern life.' It was made so much easier for him and for his professors. E.

Dr. George Foot Moore, Deceased. — On May 16 the press of our country announced that on that day Dr. George Foot Moore, professor emeritus of Harvard, died at Cambridge, Mass., in his eightieth year. He was a graduate of Yale and had studied at Union Theological Seminary, New York, and at Tuebingen, Germany. Having served as Presbyterian pastor, he became professor of Hebrew at Andover Theological Seminary in 1883. From 1899 to 1901 he was president of Andover. In 1904 he received the appointment of professor of the History of Religion at Harvard. In 1909 and 1910 he served as visiting professor at the University of Berlin. While he was a Modernist, his scholarship was prodigious. He wielded a prolific pen, his chief production being a work in two volumes, entitled *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. A.

Birth Control in the Light of the Bible. — In *Christianity To-day* the Rev. J. H. Gauss, D. D., Dean of Brookes Bible Institute, St. Louis, publishes an earnest warning against the sin of "birth control." The matter deserves careful attention. He writes: —

"The reports of a committee appointed by the Federation of Churches on birth control have been made public. Undoubtedly thousands of right-thinking people are sadly perplexed and some justly indignant at the majority report approving the use of 'contraceptives' in marital relations; also undoubtedly other thousands will be encouraged to resort to the use of such means to indulge sexual lust without marriage or, if married, without incurring the care of children.

"The majority report refers to the Church and the Bible as 'silent upon the subject' and intimates that such silence gives consent or at least does not forbid. Its reference to the Bible is quite misleading, though doubtless unintentionally so. The Bible is not as silent as the report implies. Read Gen. 1, 26, 'multiply,' and again after the Flood, Gen. 9, 1, 'multiply'; 1 Chron. 4, 27, Judah's superiority to Simeon, Simeon's tribal family did *not* 'multiply'; Ps. 127, 3—5, many children a matter for congratulation as an expression of God's favor; Prov. 31, 28, the 'virtuous woman's' 'household' consists of 'husband' and 'children'; 1 Sam. 2, 21, the birth of prayer-answered Samuel is followed by 'three sons and two daughters.' Zech. 8, 5 promises that the streets of Jerusalem shall one day be full of boys and girls at play. 1 Tim. 3, 4 sets forth the fitness of one for the office of bishop as having 'one wife' and being the father of 'children.' 1 Tim. 5, 10 states as a condition that an aged widow receive aid from the church that she has 'brought up children,' and v. 14 directs that 'younger

women marry, *bear children*, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to reproach.' 1 Cor. 7, 14 declares God's special interest in a Christian's children. Eph. 6, 4 commands fathers to bring them up for God. Mark 10, 14 records the Savior of our race welcoming children to His blessing and a large place in the kingdom of God. Most truly did the heathen women say to the Christian missionary, 'Yours is a God that cares for little children.'

"God instituted marriage, and that for birth of children, and that according to the physical laws He had created in man; true, not as a means for gratifying selfish passion resulting in births too frequent for the health of mother or child, yet not avoiding such births by use of 'contraceptives' to prevent them.

"*Birth denial* is not birth control, but sinful, selfish refusal to fulfil God's purpose in marriage.

"*True birth control*, or abstinence, is God-fearing, marital self-control, as we are taught in 1 Cor. 7, 5.

"Not a child, but '*children*' are necessary in God's ideal family on earth. Such ideal families are vital to our race, to every nation, to our nation, to the Church of Jesus Christ. Let us not live lower than beasts, but as men, being spirits, created in the 'image' of God, with bodies made in the 'likeness' of God.

"'Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's,' 1 Cor. 6, 20. 'Your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it,' 1 Thess. 5, 23. 24."

J. T. M.

Is the Pulpit Forgetting God? — Under this heading the Rev. Wm. Childs Robinson, A. M., Th. D., professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga., writes in *Christianity To-day* of Dr. Fosdick's "non-theological religion" as follows: "But more subtle and more dangerous is the repeated declaration of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick that he is not preaching a theological religion, but a psychological religion. And the great American radio public is sipping this psychological religion every Sunday afternoon. As you know, there are 'fifty-seven varieties' of psychology. Probably there is only one thing in which these conflicting psychologies agree — every one of them is a study of man. It may be a study of man's soul, or it may be a study of his behavior. It may be the stream of his consciousness, the stream of his muscular actions, the release of his *libido*, or only the study of the 'lyric note' in the midst of business. In any event it is a study of man. And therefore a psychological religion must be a humanistic religion; it must be anthropomorphic and anthropocentric. Too often the exposition of Scripture drivels down into a frantic effort to decode the text into the latest phrases of psychology and philosophy and a clutching after human or social values by forced exegesis, eisegesis, and 'sanctified imagination.' That God's self-revelation is the chief purpose of the text seems to be alien to the thought of the expositor. The center of gravity in public prayer is on earth, in sharp differentiation from the Lord's Prayer, of which the center of gravity is clearly in heaven." This may help our readers in showing their members just why they must tune out Dr. Fosdick's sermons. The article goes to the very core of the whole matter.

J. T. M.

Ban on Radio Sermons in Mexico. — We clip this from the *Christian Century*: "The *Catholic Citizen* reports that the Department of the Interior of the Mexican Government has ordered that no more sermons in Mexican churches are to be broadcast over the radio. The *Citizen* says of this move: 'Catholic circles believe that it is a move to block Catholic propaganda, because the Church was preparing to take advantage of the enormous sales of radios in Mexico during the last year to reach greater numbers through this medium.' A.

II. Ausland.

über das Predigerseminar Breklum-Kropp. Letzten Herbst faßte die United Lutheran Church auf ihrer Versammlung in Milwaukee den Beschluß, die Verbindung, die viele Jahre zwischen der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche und der genannten Anstalt bestand, zu lösen. Von Deutschland kommt nun die Nachricht, daß als Folge dieses Beschlusses voraussichtlich das Doppelseminar Breklum-Kropp im Laufe des Jahres 1931 geschlossen werden wird. Da auch in unsern Kreisen die Namen jener Seminare oft genannt worden sind und außerdem eine Anzahl Pastoren in der Synodalkonferenz dort ihre Ausbildung, wenigstens zum Teil, erhalten haben, so werden unsere Leser dankbar sein für historische Auskunft über jene Institute, die Professor Lehninger vom Seminar zu Thiensville, Wis., in der „Theologischen Quartalschrift“ (April 1931) unterbreitet. Er schreibt unter anderem:

„Es war in den Tagen der deutschen Masseneinwanderung, im Jahre 1882, als P. Johannes Paulsen in dem weltentlegenen Heideort Kropp bei Schleswig ein Predigerseminar zur Versorgung der nach Amerika ausgewanderten Deutschen mit lutherischen Pastoren eröffnete. Im deutschen Teil des Generalkonzils namentlich wurde diesem Unternehmen lebhaftes Interesse entgegengebracht. Unter den Freunden Kropps waren solche führenden Männer wie die Pastoren Moldehnke, Protel, Krüling, Heischmann, Wischan und Ründig. Sie versprachen sich von den jungen Kroppern eine wirksame Hilfe im Kampf gegen die Anglisierungsbestrebungen, die damals in den öflichen Synoden zu erregen und unerquicklichen Auseinandersetzungen geführt hatten. Paulsens glühender Eifer, seine volkstümliche Beredsamkeit und machtvolle Persönlichkeit gewannen der Sache eines Predigerseminars für Amerika viele Freunde in Schleswig-Holstein und weit darüber hinaus, die ihm mit ihren Gaben die Ausführung seines Planes ermöglichten. Landleute in seiner Kropper Gemeinde stellten ihm für ihre Verhältnisse bedeutende Summen zur Verfügung; er selber opferte der Sache sein eigenes Vermögen. Aufnahme in dieses Seminar sollten solche Jünglinge finden, die zum mindesten die Primareife eines deutschen humanistischen Gymnasiums hatten. Für solche, deren Vorbildung Mängel aufwies, wurde ein Proseminar eingerichtet, das schließlich zu einem dreijährigen Kursus erweitert wurde. Hier wurde jungen Leuten Gelegenheit geboten, sich zur Vorbereitung auf das Studium der Theologie namentlich historischen und sprachwissenschaftlichen Studien in Latein, Griechisch und Hebräisch zu widmen.

„Die Blütezeit Kropps lag wohl in der zweiten Hälfte der achtziger und in den neunziger Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts. Damals war P. F. Beer Dozent der Dogmatik und der neutestamentlichen Exegese. Ein

Sohn der hannoverschen lutherischen Landeskirche, hatte sein entschiedenes Auftreten gegen den überhandnehmenden Unionismus und Liberalismus schließlich zu seiner Disziplinierung seitens des Konsistoriums und zur Amtsniederlegung geführt. Ein gründlich wissenschaftlich gebildeter Theolog und Dialektiker, hielt er in unverbrüchlicher Treue am lutherischen Bekenntnis fest. Seinem entschiedenen Eintreten für Schrift und Bekenntnis und seinem unnachsichtigen Dringen auf fleißige Arbeit und ernstes Studium verdanken die Kropper Studenten jener Jahre mehr, als sich überhaupt in Worten ausdrücken läßt.

„Beer teilte voll und ganz die Stellung unserer Synodalkonferenz. Neben Philippi nannte er Walthers in St. Louis als einen der wenigen Theologen der lutherischen Kirche, die in unsern Tagen noch mit ganzem Ernst an Schrift und Bekenntnis festhielten. Bei der Behandlung der Prädestinationslehre und der Lehre von der Bekehrung führte er D. Walthers in extenso an und nannte ihn den einzigen hervorragenden Theologen, der in diesen Lehren recht stehe, unter allen, die mit der Feder in den Streit eingegriffen hätten. Doch konnte sich Beer nicht zum Austritt aus der Landeskirche entschließen. Noch, meinte er, sei es Pflicht, das von den Vätern ererbte Haus der lutherischen Landeskirche gegen den Ansturm der Feinde zu verteidigen, zu versuchen die schon eingedrungenen Gegner hinauszutreiben und ihnen jeden Fußbreit Bodens streitig zu machen. Manche seiner Schüler konnten ihm darin nicht folgen, singen dagegen an, im Hinblick auf ihr zukünftiges Arbeitsfeld sich um die Lehrunterschiede der lutherischen Synoden Amerikas zu kümmern. Einige verließen Kroppe und vollendeten ihre Studien auf dem Concordia-Seminar zu St. Louis. Andere traten entgegen der Kropper Tradition nach bestandnem Examen in eine der Synoden der Synodalkonferenz, auch in unsere Wisconsinynode, ein. Das war, menschlich geredet, eine Frucht der Lehrtätigkeit Beers. Paulsen dagegen teilte die Ansicht der meisten deutschländischen Lutheraner, so daß er gelegentlich vor den beiden extremen Richtungen innerhalb der lutherischen Kirche Amerikas warnen konnte — der Generalsynode einerseits und der Missouriynode andererseits.

„Im Jahre 1910 trat Kroppe in ein festes Verhältnis zum Generalkonzil. Das Konzil verpflichtete sich zu einer bestimmten jährlichen Unterstützung, und die Kropper Kandidaten wurden zur Arbeit auf dem deutschen Missionsfeld des Konzils bestimmt. Da kam der Weltkrieg, und die Hörsäle des Seminars wurden leer, da seine Studenten entweder zum Dienst mit der Waffe oder zu anderer vaterländischer Arbeit eingezogen wurden.

„Aber nach Kriegsende stellten sich die Feldgrauen wieder ein, die der Kriegsmoloch nicht verschlungen hatte, und der Unterricht wurde wieder aufgenommen. Inzwischen hatten sich aber hier in Amerika die kirchlichen Verhältnisse insofern verändert, als durch Vereinigung des Generalkonzils, der Generalsynode und der Vereinigten Synode des Südens im Jahre 1918 ein neuer, der als U. L. C. bekannte, Kirchenkörper entstanden war. Als man nun hüben und drüben wieder miteinander Fühlung gewann, wurde auch Kroppe von der hiesigen kirchlichen Neuordnung in Mitleidenschaft gezogen.

„Seit geraumer Zeit bestand nämlich in Schleswig-Holstein noch ein anderes Seminar für Nordamerika, das von P. Chr. Jensen in Breklum bei Husum gegründet worden war. Hier wurde der Ton nicht so sehr auf

wissenschaftliche Tüchtigkeit als vielmehr auf praktische Ausrüstung zur Verwaltung des Pfarramts gelegt. Breklum bildete Pastoren für die Generalsynode aus, während die Kropfer, wie schon gesagt, größtenteils in das Generalkonzil eintraten. Beide Seminare waren bisher gänzlich getrennt und unabhängig voneinander gewesen, ja hatten eher in einem gewissen Gegensatz zueinander gestanden. Der Eigenart ihrer Gründer entsprechend hatte Breklum einen mehr pietistischen Einschlag, während Kropf dagegen mehr Gewicht auf das Konfessionelle legte.

„Nach dem Kriege wurde Kropf auf Betreiben von Amerika hin mit Breklum in der Weise verbunden, daß Breklum als Vorschule die etwa noch fehlende sprachliche und allgemeine Vorbildung gibt, während in Kropf lediglich das theologische Studium betrieben wird. Seit 1920 wird im Seminar Breklum-Kropf unter Zubilligung und auf Anordnung der U. L. C. gemäß dieser Vereinbarung gearbeitet.

„Während des Krieges, im Jahre 1916, ist P. Paulsen gestorben. Die von ihm gegründeten charitativen Anstalten, wie das christliche Asyl für Geistesranke und die Diakonissenanstalt Bethanien, bestehen natürlich weiter, während das Seminar wohl bald seine Tore schließen wird, das den Namen Kropf in alle Welt hinausgetragen hat.

„Es liegt auf der Linie der natürlichen geschichtlichen Entwicklung, daß früher oder später die Zeit kommen mußte, wann die Kirche Amerikas des Dienstes einer ausländischen theologischen Schule entraten konnte. Die Zeiten der großen deutschen Einwanderung sind vorbei. Wir haben es jetzt mit der zweiten und dritten Generation, mit bodenständigen Amerikanern, zu tun, auf die der frisch eingewanderte Deutsche als Fremdling wirkt. Vertrautheit mit der englischen Sprache und mit amerikanischen allgemeinen und kirchlichen Einrichtungen ist heute unerläßliche Vorbedingung für den Seelsorger, der für und mit den ihm Anbefohlenen leben, sich mit ihnen zusammenfühlen will. Darum bestand schon seit dem Jahre 1910 die Einrichtung, daß die Kropfer Kandidaten nach drüben bestandener Examen vor ihrem Eintritt ins Amt längere Zeit auf einem hiesigen Seminar Aufenthalt zu nehmen hatten.“

Prof. Lehninger zitiert im folgenden noch einen Artikel von Dr. Kohner, dem jetzigen Direktor des Doppelseminars, der ausführt, daß im Laufe der Jahre vielleicht 360 Prediger dort ihre ganze oder partielle theologische Schulung erhalten haben und tatsächlich in alle Welt hinausgegangen sind und daß u. a. mehrere hochgestellte Pastoren und Professoren der U. L. C. Breklum-Kropf ihre alma mater nennen. Prof. Lehninger schließt mit den Worten: „Wenn die Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche unsers Landes geschrieben wird und man der Opfer gedenkt, die die lutherische Heimatkirche Deutschlands bei ihrer Gründung und zu ihrem Aufbau gebracht hat, so gehört darin neben andern auch Kropf ein Blatt.“

Relativity and Theology. — Karl F. Herzfeld, writing in the *Commonweal* (February 11) expresses his gratitude to Professor Einstein for having convinced him in his Catholic belief that the “world has finite dimensions, but without any end to it.” What he means to say he expresses more lucidly in another place, where he writes: “If the new theory of relativity is true, it has had one important consequence which is of interest to Catholic philosophy and theology in so far as it has proved

that the universe does not extend beyond all limits. Of course, this statement is familiar to all Catholics; but if the question was asked what is beyond these limits, there was no definite answer. The answer given by the theory of relativity is that the universe is bounded because it is curved and closed. That is a thing which cannot be visualized, but it can be made plausible with the help of a method which is common in geometry. . . ." We shall spare our readers the agony of following that "method which is common in geometry." Nor did we quote the paragraph merely to acquaint them with the discovery of the Roman Catholic Herzfeld. Our purpose was rather to call the readers' attention to Dr. F. Pieper's invaluable *Christliche Dogmatik*, where (Vol. I, p. 546) we read: "*Gibt es einen Raum ausserhalb der Welt? Diese Frage ist entschieden mit Nein zu beantworten. Der Raum gehoert zur Welt, ist ein Geschoepf Gottes wie die Welt selbst und erstreckt sich nicht ueber die Welt hinaus. Wo die Welt aufhoert, ist Gott.*" Most assuredly: "*Hier ist mehr denn Einstein!*"

J. T. M.

Are English Clergymen Drifting into "Socialism"? — Of the sad chaos prevailing in large sections of Protestantism a meeting held in London and reported on by a correspondent of the *Christian Century* furnishes only too convincing evidence. We are told that about a hundred ministers met to consider the Christian Socialist crusade. The proposition was discussed "that the main proposals gathered under the name of Socialism are essential to the economic expression of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." While it is true that not all clergymen present accepted this thesis and some "deprecated the alliance of the Church with any political party," there were prominent ministers like Dr. Herbert Gray and Canon Donaldson who championed acceptance of this thesis and were willing to sponsor the crusade which is to proceed from this thesis as its basis. Undoubtedly many of these people have turned their backs upon the authority of the Scriptures, and now they are drifting like a ship without a rudder.

A.

Eine deutsche Minderheitenkirche in Jugoslawien. Nach einer Mittheilung im „Friedensboten“ hat jetzt die Neuordnung der 130,000 Seelen umschließenden Kirche der deutschen evangelischen Minderheit in Jugoslawien ihren Abschluß gefunden. Die jugoslawische Regierung hat der jungen Kirche mit der Genehmigung ihrer Verfassung ein freundliches Entgegenkommen bewiesen und ihr den Namen „Deutsch=evangelische Landeskirche“ gelassen. Zugleich hat sie ihr auch das Recht zugestanden, die Erziehung der Jugend zu überwachen und in den Schulen Religionsunterricht in der deutschen Muttersprache zu erteilen. Andere Staaten, wie zum Beispiel Polen, dürften diesem Beispiel zu ihrem eigenen Nutzen folgen. Der von dem ersten Landeskirchentag der „Deutsch=evangelischen Landeskirche Augsburgischer Konfession in Jugoslawien“ eingefetzte Ausschuß hat zum Bischof und obersten Führer dieser Kirche den bisherigen Administrator Dr. Philipp Popp gewählt.

J. T. M.

Did Diseases of Great Men Influence History and Religion? — On this theme a copyrighted article appeared lately in the *Omaha Bee*, which calls for a few comments. The author first points to the recent statement of Dean Inge to the effect that St. Paul's conversion and his

consequent religious fervor were the result of epilepsy. Next he presents the views of an Australian physician, Dr. C. MacLaurin, author of a book dealing with the effects of diseases in great men (*Postmortems of Mere Mortals*), on the cases of Luther, Joan D'Arc, and Charles V. If the article was not intended as an attack on the belief in the actuality of divine revelation, we can at least well imagine an agnostic using it to bolster up his wicked views. However, the reader who is looking for convincing proofs for the position taken by the author will be disappointed.

The case of St. Paul is not discussed at length. It is to serve merely as a stepping-stone. The simple fact is that no evidence can be adduced for the position of Dean Inge. The one Scripture statement pointed to at times by radical critics in support of it (Gal. 4, 14: "My temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected"—the word *rejected*, translated literally, signifies "nor did ye spit out," an expression of horror and disgust commonly employed, it is alleged, when people found themselves spectators of epileptic convulsions) can very well be explained in other ways. If we assume that St. Paul in the swampy regions of Pamphylia had contracted the serious eye trouble which was very prevalent there and which could well make a pitiful spectacle of him, we can understand why his condition should constitute a temptation for the people of Antioch in Pisidia and make them feel inclined to expectorate at the sight of his suffering. When discussing the physical infirmities of Luther, Dr. MacLaurin voices the view that these infirmities were responsible for those moods of despondency in which Luther believed himself harassed by the devil and that it was his belief of the nearness and the persecution of supernatural enemies which made him so stalwart, bold, and vehement in opposing his earthly enemies—qualities without which the Reformation would not have been accomplished. The good doctor overlooks that to explain Luther's attitude and career we have to go back to the time when he was twenty-two years old and entered the convent at Erfurt. What induced him to take this step was not illness or despondency, but the conviction that he was a sinner whose only hope for entering heaven depended on the success of his efforts to appease an angry God. We cannot imagine Dr. MacLaurin holding and defending the theory that wherever there is a deep sense of sin and guilt we are dealing with a pathological phenomenon. The doctor labors to show that Luther was a sufferer from what is called Ménière's disease, a distressing disease of the middle ear. He may be right, but between showing that the Reformer was thus afflicted and proving that this misfortune had a vast influence on his accomplishments evidently a big gulf is yawning, and the bridge our doctor constructs consists entirely of that flimsy material we call conjecture. The cases of Joan D'Arc and Charles V do not interest us here. Concerning the latter we merely wish to say that if he, as Dr. MacLaurin contends, was compelled by ill health to resign his crown, giving it to his bigoted son Philip, we may grant that his physical condition was a real factor in the history and politics of the times. But has anybody ever felt tempted to deny that? To emphasize this fact merely means that one stresses a commonplace of ancient standing.