

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. VI

July, 1935

No. 7

CONTENTS

	Page
Notes on Chiliasm. Th. Engelder	481
Der Pietismus. Theo. Hoyer	496
Kleine Studien aus dem Galaterbrief. L. Fuerbringer.....	501
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	511
Predigtstudie ueber Apost. 8, 26—40. Theo. Laetsch.....	515
Dispositionen ueber die altkirchliche Evangelienreihe.....	524
Miscellanea.....	532
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	535
Book Review. — Literatur.....	553

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 veruehren 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.



 Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Let Us Get Together on the Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. — The *Pastor's Monthly* of May, 1935, carries an article on "Verbal Inspiration" by John Ohlinger Lang, from which we quote the following: —

"In a review of Dr. John Theodore Mueller's recently published work *Christian Dogmatics* the reviewer in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* had the following to say: 'Naturally the material is shaped into the form of the traditional presentation of the Missouri Synod's well-known doctrinal position. Underlying it is not only the generic Protestant doctrine of the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practise, but the Missouri doctrine of verbal inspiration.' (*Lutheran Church Quarterly*, January, 1935, p. 83.) Toward the close of the review appears also the following: 'What lends particular interest to the new book on Christian theology is not so much restatements of the great tracts of fundamental Christian teaching on which Christians are generally, and have for long been, agreed, but its differentiae. The book under review largely derives its differentiating features and conclusions from its underlying doctrine of the Scriptures as requiring for their proper interpretation the theory of verbal inspiration, a theory of which the author acknowledges: "In Germany there is at the present time hardly an outstanding university professor who upholds the doctrine of verbal inspiration."' (*Ibid.*, p. 84.) What is this reviewer really saying here? He is setting forth as the unique feature of Dr. Mueller's *Dogmatics* the fact that it upholds verbal inspiration, and this verbal inspiration is called 'the Missouri doctrine.' . . . What is this 'Missouri doctrine' to which the reviewer evidently objects? He gives a quotation from Dr. Mueller in which it is stated: 'The inspiration is not simply inspiration of thoughts nor inspiration of persons, but verbal inspiration, *i. e.*, an inspiration by which the Holy Ghost inbreathed the very words which the holy penmen were to write.' (*L. c.*, p. 83.) Is this idea of a verbal inspiration as stated by Dr. Mueller only a 'Missouri doctrine'? Can Lutherans outside of the Missouri Synod really find any fault with it? Is it not the clear statement of the generally accepted doctrine among Lutherans of America, even though perhaps in Germany to-day there is hardly a university professor of rank who adheres to it? Is it not in full accord with the usual phrase found in practically every Lutheran dogmatics book, namely, the *suggestio rerum et verborum*? The fact is that the doctrine of verbal inspiration is not only Missourian; it is Lutheran, Christian, and Biblical. But such a statement demands proof, and that is what this essay has set out to furnish. . . . Not only the Missouri Synod, but likewise the American Lutheran Church accepts the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Dr. R. C. H. Lenski emphatically upholds the doctrine in his *Dogmatic Notes*, which form the basis for his courses in dogmatics at the Columbus Seminary. Dr. Lenski states that 'verbal inspiration, then, is simply this, that the divine act, moving, enlightening, controlling, and governing the holy writers, extended to the words which they used, so that only those words were chosen which God wanted for the

conveyance of the thought.' (*Dogmatic Notes*, pp. 15.16.) The Doctor further argues: 'If the words are not inspired, then there is a vast element uninspired; for no thought can be expressed in anything but words, and the entire Bible consists of words.' 'Moreover, if the thought is said to be inspired and not the words, we can never be certain even as to the thoughts at any point; for it often turns on a single word and comes to us wholly in words.' (*L. c.*, p. 15.) . . . In his *New Gospel Selections* Dr. Lenski says in connection with Matt. 10, 20: 'Thought and word are always combined. There is no inspiration except verbal inspiration.' (P. 643.) (See also the sermon on this text, p. 652.) . . .

"Dr. Lenski's defense of verbal inspiration has also come to the attention of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*; for in a review of his recently published *Interpretation of St. John's Gospel*, which appeared in the October, 1932, issue of that publication, he is taken to task for it in a manner much similar to the fashion in which Dr. Mueller is taken to task in the January, 1935, issue. The reviewer says: 'While the author would count his verbal-inspiration theory the bulwark of his treatment, as a matter of fact it is its straitjacket. He sometimes misses the woods while counting the trees.' (Oct., 1932, p. 441.) . . . A paper entitled 'The Bible as the Inerrant Word of God' was presented by Rev. J. W. Schillinger at the 1928 convention of the Northern District of the Joint Synod of Ohio, and this paper was printed in the official minutes. In this paper Rev. Schillinger says: 'Inspiration means that the Holy Ghost impelled the prophets and apostles to write, showed them the truths which they should write, gave them the exact words in which they should clothe these truths, and guided them in writing, so that they recorded these words with infallible accuracy.' (*Minutes of Northern District*, 1928, pp. 34.35.) . . .

"In the *Dogmatics Notes* of Dr. M. Reu of Wartburg Seminary we read the following: 'Moreover, the Spirit supplied the writer with the word that exactly corresponded to the subject-matter and precisely conveyed its meaning. This is required by the formulae of citation, "Thus saith the Lord," "The Holy Spirit saith"; also by the fact that we would have no assurance that the divine message has been correctly and completely set forth; likewise Paul's habit of drawing important deductions from the literal wording of the Old Testament quotations (*e. g.*, Gal. 3, 16) and especially by 1 Cor. 2, 13.' (Reu, *Dogmatics Notes*; translated by J. Bodensieck, p. 295.) . . .

"The best and most complete work on verbal inspiration in the English language is the one by Jacob Aall Ottesen Stub of the Norwegians, *Verbal Inspiration*. . . . Dr. Stub states (p. 27) that 'to-day almost the entire Lutheran Church of America holds to this belief. The Synodical Conference in particular (German and English) and the Norwegian Lutherans are here in accord. The Norwegian Synod has stood as an unwavering champion of this doctrine.' From this it is quite evident that verbal inspiration is not simply a 'Missouri doctrine,' but that on this point the Norwegians are in full accord with the Missourians. In the conclusion of his book Dr. Stub says: 'We maintain that the Bible becomes dearer, the more we become convinced that it is from God. It is the epistle from the Beloved One, and the more we realize that its contents, words as well as thoughts, are from Him who so loved the world

that He gave His only-begotten Son and spared Him not, the more precious it becomes.' (*L. c.*, p. 107.) . . .

"Are there still any voices in the United Lutheran Church which rise to the defense of verbal inspiration? Indeed there are. A very distinct voice comes from the theological seminary of the United Lutheran Church in Waterloo, Ont., Can. In 1933 Dr. C. H. Little, professor of Systematic Theology at that seminary, published a book entitled *Disputed Doctrines*, and in this book he devotes about a dozen pages to the subject of inspiration. Dr. Little has the following to say (p. 19): 'Inspiration is the activity of the Holy Spirit by which He put into the hearts and minds of chosen men the impulse to write and so controlled and directed them that they produced in a real and verbal sense a correct and inerrant record of God's revelation to men.' A little farther on appears the following: 'If the inspiration of the writers was of such a nature that the Holy Spirit merely suggested to them vague thoughts, which they put into words as best they could, we would always be in doubt whether they were successful in finding the right words with which to clothe their inspired thought.' Such clear testimony from a theologian of the United Lutheran Church is indeed refreshing." (The next sections quote "conservative Reformed theologians" and "theologians of Germany." Then follows a section on "The Lutheran Dogmaticians" and one on "Luther and the Confessions," from which we quote the following:)

"If we go back to the Lutheran dogmaticians, we find that they are unanimous in upholding verbal inspiration. Baier says: 'Divine inspiration was that agency by which God supernaturally communicated to the intellect of those who wrote not only the correct conception of all that was to be written, but also the conception of the words themselves and of everything by which they were to be expressed and by which He also instigated their will to the act of writing.' (Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 39.) . . . Professor Rohnert, in 1890, prepared a monograph, to which he gave the title *Was lehrt Luther von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift?* in which he shows that Luther must have believed in verbal inspiration. . . . With reference to the Confessions we ought to note that [in them] the Scriptures are spoken of as being 'of the Holy Ghost,' and the treatment of these Scriptures shows that they are regarded as in a verbal sense the product of 'the Holy Ghost.' In the Augsburg Confession, Article XXVIII, paragraph 49, we read: 'If bishops have the right to burden churches with infinite traditions and to ensnare consciences, why does Scripture so often prohibit to make, and to listen to, traditions? Why does it call them "doctrines of devils"? 1 Tim. 4, 1. Did the Holy Ghost in vain forewarn of these things?' (Jacobs, *Book of Concord*, pp. 64, 65.) In the Apology we read in the introduction: 'You have now therefore, reader, our apology; from which you will understand not only what the adversaries have judged (for we have reported this in good faith), but also that they have condemned several articles contrary to the manifest Scripture of the Holy Ghost.' (*Ibid.*, p. 74.) In Article XXIV of the Apology, for instance, an argument is based on a certain word which St. Paul used for 'sin.' In what other sense, then, could the Confessions understand 'the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost' except in a verbal sense? (Klotsche, *Outline of the History of Doctrines*, p. 32.)" (Section VIII

gives the teaching of "the Fathers" and Section IX the teaching of "the Scriptures." The last section deals with the objections raised against the Scripture doctrine of verbal inspiration. We quote only the following:)

"... We have now reserved our most important antithetical consideration for last. It deals with the 'theory' of verbal inspiration, and we boldly assert that we accept no 'theory' of verbal inspiration, but rather the 'fact' of verbal inspiration. When we speak of a theory of verbal inspiration, we speak of something which may not be true, and we are endeavoring to explain just how it took place, and the 'how' the Church has never attempted to describe because the Bible does not describe it. Inspiration belongs to the sphere of the miraculous, and there is no counterpart to it anywhere. However, when we state our doctrine of verbal inspiration, we are stating the fact which the Scriptures present, namely, that God so directed and controlled the holy writers that they wrote what He wanted them to write and in the form in which He wanted it written. This is no 'theory.' . . .

(The concluding paragraph of this fine article reads:)

"There is no doctrine of inspiration except the verbal. We agree with Dr. Mueller that 'all those who deny the verbal inspiration of the Bible and substitute for it "personal inspiration" or "thought inspiration" deny the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration altogether and are compelled to teach in its place a mere "illumination," which is common to all believers.' (Mueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 101. 102.) If there are any misgivings concerning the doctrine of verbal inspiration in certain quarters of the United Lutheran Church or if the opinion prevails that it is a mere 'Missouri doctrine,' surely this is a serious matter and a great hindrance toward closer fellowship. This point surely must be included in the things to be 'ironed out' before we of the American Lutheran Church or the American Lutheran Conference can with a clear conscience declare pulpit- and altar-fellowship, because the Lutheran, Christian, and Biblical doctrine of the Scriptures is the doctrine of verbal inspiration."

(The editor of the *Pastor's Monthly*, Prof. J. A. Dell, agrees with Pastor Lang. He writes:)

"Our main article this month brings to the attention of the Lutherans of America something which should be looked into. Do we believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, or do we not? Apparently we do, by a very large majority. But if there are any who do not, it is a kindness on our part to point out that this is a hindrance to the closer relations we are aiming to achieve."

In its April issue the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* launches a violent attack against the doctrine of verbal inspiration. The first section of an article by John Aberly, Gettysburg, on "The Bible the Word of God" is headed "Weakness of the Theory of Verbal Inspiration." We quote a few sentences: "What is meant when we call the Bible the Word of God? In times past and for not a few now the answer is a very simple one. The very words of Scripture are the Word of God. The Bible and the Word of God are one and the same. Should one question that they may thus be equated, he may be sharply rebuked or be pronounced guilty of equivocation; for they are either that or are not, and there is no middle ground. . . . May I here throw off reserve and state how I, in the calling

to which the greater part of my life has been given, have been compelled to revise my own approach to the Bible? It was both my duty and an exalted privilege to try to proclaim and bear witness to the truths taught in the Bible before men who professed loyalty to other sacred writings. . . . I found I could not meet these by falling back on my claim that this Bible was the literal Word of God by quoting passages of Scripture that are supposed to support this view. I found that other faiths make even stronger claims for their own sacred writings. The Hindu Vedas, for instance, claim that that portion of their scriptures which they call Sruti (that which is heard, or revelation *par excellence*) was the very utterance of God Himself. . . . It compels one to do what Dr. E. Stanley Jones found himself compelled to do, to shorten his lines of defense. He states that, when he went to India, he felt called on to defend the Bible from Genesis to Revelation; but he soon found it necessary to retire into the citadel and limit himself to Jesus Christ and Him crucified. . . . One wonders whether we are not compelled to shorten our defenses by the needs at home as well as abroad. When one reads articles by a distinguished teacher of history, — I refer to Harry Elmer Barnes, — in which he gives as the obstacles in his way of believing in the God of the Bible the fact that he cannot believe in a God who would sanction the cruelties recorded in some of the Old Testament histories, one may well ask the question whether men have not been repelled at times by a mishandling of the Scriptures, and that, too, by those who have been most zealous in their defense." E.

Let Us Get Together on the Lodge Question. — The Lutheran synods of America are not of one mind on this burning question. The following is taken from the *Lutheran Companion* of April 27, 1935: —

Question: 'Does our Lutheran Church sanction participation in burial services with the Masonic Lodge?' — C. P. P.

Answer: No, it does not. There may be Lutheran pastors who do it and get by with it because church discipline is at low ebb in the Christian Church both as to pastors and people. The Church is silent on many things while souls are being ensnared and destroyed. Yet as far as I know, no Augustana pastor has gone so far as to have fellowship with the Masonic lodge at funeral services. I am sorry to say that I know of other Lutheran pastors who have had such fellowship." E.

Let Us Get Together on the Doctrines of Conversion and Election. — We are far apart on this highly important matter. We must not tell the world and ourselves that the Lutherans of America are in doctrinal agreement. Dr. Joseph Stump of the United Lutheran Church insists they are not. He refuses to accept the doctrine of the election of grace as taught by other Lutherans. He quotes and repudiates the following statement from Dr. J. T. Mueller's *Christian Dogmatics* (p. 587): "God's election of grace did not take place in view of man's foreseen faith, but rather embraced this faith together with the whole way of salvation, such as conversion, justification, sanctification, and final preservation. Hence the believer is not elected on account of his foreseen faith; on the contrary, he has become a believer in time because of his eternal election to salvation. In other words, a person is brought to saving faith in time just because God from eternity has graciously elected him to salvation." And

"this," says Dr. Stump, "sounds very much like the Calvinistic doctrine of election to faith." (*Lutheran*, Dec. 13, 1934.) He refuses to teach "the election to faith." He abhors such a doctrine as Calvinism. He adds indeed the fine words: "Yet the author repudiates and condemns Calvinism. And we believe that he is not a Calvinist. The trouble with many persons outside of Missouri, however, is that they cannot see how anybody can hold the Missouri doctrine of election without falling into Calvinism. Yet evidently it can be done." We certainly appreciate this spirit of fair-mindedness. Dr. Stump is willing to give us the benefit of the doubt, — and we can assure him that he is not making a mistake. The fact, however, remains that he is constrained to abhor our doctrine of election. He cannot at present agree with it — "the Calvinistic doctrine of election to faith." He stands squarely on the *intuitu-fidei* doctrine of election. We are certainly not in agreement with him. Neither is Dr. M. Reu. He writes: "*Wir sind der Ueberzeugung, dass auch in diesem Streit [dem Praedestinationsstreit] Gott Positives im Auge hatte und auch erreicht hat; denn auch uns ist die praedestinatio intuitu fidei ein schriftloses Theologumenon, die praedestinatio ad fidem dagegen klare Lehre der Schrift.*" (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1933, p. 502.) Dr. Reu indeed adds: "*Wir setzen die Aussagen Pauli ueber die letztere bloss nicht in die Ewigkeit, wie Missouri tut, sondern lassen sie da stehen, wo sie Paulus macht: in der Zeit, nach erfolgter Berufung oder Bekehrung.*" That is another point of disagreement of a most important nature, which calls for serious consideration.

Dr. Stump sees Calvinism in "the election to faith." The *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) takes the same view. Answering the question: "How do you explain predestination?" Pastor J. P. Milton, whose column usually provides interesting and profitable information, says in the issue of December 16, 1933: "There are especially three differing interpretations. The one says in effect that God has sovereignly chosen and elected some unto salvation and some unto damnation. Since men are saved through faith in Jesus Christ, it follows that God has predestined some to believe and others not to believe in Jesus. To me this seems impossible if God (as the Scriptures declare) 'would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth,' 1 Tim. 2, 4. It seems to me to deny some a real chance to be saved. . . . The second interpretation says that God has elected some unto faith and salvation. It stresses just as strongly as the first that God sovereignly determines those who shall believe. It tries (as it seems to me, unsuccessfully) to ignore the negative side of the question, or the election unto unbelief and damnation. If God determines who shall believe, it follows that He thereby also determines those who shall not believe. Predestination unto unbelief is the natural corollary and consequence of predestination unto faith." Pastor Milton is convinced that our doctrine of election is essentially the Calvinistic doctrine. He would not permit it to be preached in his church. He views it as a horrible doctrine. And we agree with him, as we agree with Calvin, that the teaching of an "election unto unbelief and damnation" is a horrible teaching (Calvin: "The decree, I admit, is dreadful"; *Institutio*, Book III, chap. 23, § 7). But we do not agree with him nor with Calvin that "predestination unto unbelief is the natural corollary and con-

sequence of predestination unto faith." Let us get together on this fundamental principle of Lutheran theology. You must not construct doctrines by means of logical deductions. You must get your doctrine of election, for instance, from the express teaching of Scripture, and you have no right to add to that teaching what your reason says is a natural corollary and consequence of such teaching. When Scripture speaks of election, it never says that some are elected unto unbelief and damnation. It nowhere says that. But, says Pastor Milton, one cannot "ignore the negative side of the question." We assure him that we cheerfully ignore it. Scripture ignores it. There is no negative side to it. It is not Scripture, but blind reason which says that predestination unto unbelief is a natural corollary of the election to faith. If we can get together on this principle, one great cause of our disagreement will be removed. Men will no longer stigmatize the doctrine of election to faith as Calvinism.

What does Pastor Milton, on his side, teach on election and conversion? "The third interpretation says that God predestines unto salvation those whom He foreknows will believe in Jesus. Jesus died for all. The Holy Spirit, through the means of grace, gives to all the power to believe. In this sense faith is the gift of God; for it comes only through the hearing of the Word. But not all who hear believe; some will not use the power given. The responsibility for this lies wholly with man, hidden in that mysterious personality of man which is free (as Adam was free) to resist the God of grace. God foreknows who will and who will not believe when the Word of Grace is preached unto them. Foreknowing, He predestines those who believe unto salvation. In Rom. 8, 29 we find this order: 'Whom He foreknew He also foreordained [predestined].' This third interpretation seems to me to be the only one that correctly safeguards both the grace of God as the sole ground and means of man's salvation and also the individual responsibility of man. The Bible teaches both of these truths." This teaching operates with the synergistic *status medius* ("The Holy Spirit gives to all the power to believe") and the synergistic "responsibility of man" as to his non-conversion and his conversion. Therefore we abhor it. We think that Pastor Milton also abhors synergism. Then let him banish all thoughts of a *status medius*, in which the unconverted man decides, by exercising his "individual responsibility," for conversion. The synergistic background of this view of election and conversion becomes more distinct in *The Doctrines of Christianity*, by P. L. Mellenbruch of the U. L. C. We read there: "Election is in 'foreview' of faith (*electio intuitu fidei*). Predestination, like justification, is in view of faith accepting the merits of Jesus Christ. Holy Scripture throws the responsibility not on God, but on man. God has done, and is doing, all that He consistently can, without interfering with man's 'freedom of will.' Election or predestination, therefore, as far as man is concerned, is not absolute, but relative, being dependent upon man's fulfillment of certain conditions — personal faith in Jesus Christ. . . . Free will in man would be inoperative. . . . When the apostle says that 'faith is the gift of God,' he does not mean or teach that God does man's believing for him, but that the Holy Spirit, through vocation and regeneration, imparts the *ability* for believing; then the individual must freely *use* that divinely begotten ability. . . . The Holy Spirit does not convert

all men because some resist conversion. He is active, however, gently turning men about in proportion as they are willing. . . . Conversion is an act not necessarily complete or perfect at a given moment. Man allows God to turn him from unbelief to faith and from sin to righteousness — from less belief to greater faith and from lesser sins to greater righteousness." (Pp. 125, 138 ff.) There are Lutherans who will not consent to have this teaching preached in their pulpits; it employs the standard phraseology of the later, the subtle, synergism. Dr. M. Reu protests against it. "Only with regret we state that the doctrine of conversion as it is presented here" (in Mellenbruch's book) "is hardly Biblical, nor is the predestination *intuitu fidei* tenable, especially not since the doctrine of faith is not kept free from synergistic elements." (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1931, p. 423.)

If we are to agree on the doctrines of conversion and election, we shall have to agree to let the mystery why, grace being universal and all men equally guilty and corrupt, not all are saved, remain unsolved. On that point we are not yet agreed. A. E. Deitz of the U. L. C. writes in his book *Exploring the Deep*s, p. 44: "One way out of the dilemma is to say, as some theologians do, that there is an unsolvable mystery in both predestination and conversion and that it is quite impossible for us to determine either why God elects some men to salvation and passes others by" ("passes others by" is an inadmissible concept; it is deduced and formed by reason, but repudiated by Scripture) "or why some men actually believe and are saved while others are not. This postulation of a double mystery relieves the theologian of the effort to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable elements in the problem. Still the inquiring mind wistfully seeks for some other answer and wonders if it is a fact that this is the end of the investigation, if it is actually impossible to go further." Dr. Deitz proceeds to solve the question, and he gives the synergistic solution: "The difference in result in the case of two men one of whom finally believes while the other does not is due to the difference in the choice or decision which they make" (p. 47). There are other Lutherans who refuse to take up the discussion of this mystery for the purpose of solving it. They refuse to do so because the attempt to answer it can result only in either Calvinistic or synergistic ratiocinations. The Formula of Concord, for one, refuses to answer. "When we see that God gives His Word at one place, but not at another; removes it from one place and allows it to remain at another; also, that one is hardened, blinded, given over to a reprobate mind, while another, who is indeed in the same guilt, is converted again, etc., — in these and similar questions Paul (Rom. 11, 22 ff.) fixes a certain limit to us how far we should go," etc. (XI, *Sol. Decl.*, § 57; cp. § 60.) Dr. C. C. Hein, president of the American Lutheran Church, warns against the attempt to solve the mystery. In his address at the Lutheran World Convention (Copenhagen, 1929) he declared: "*Wie es dem Luthertum auf der einen Seite gewiss ist, dass Unglaube, Nichtbekehrung und endliche Verdammung in jedem Sinn einzig und allein des Menschen Schuld ist, so auf der andern, dass Bekehrung, Glaube und Seligkeit in jedem Sinn Gnadenwerk und Gnadengabe Gottes ist. Hier stehen wir vor einem Geheimnis. 'Der Selige,' sagt H. E. F. Guericke in seiner 'Symbolik' (3. Auflage, S. 425), 'wird selig allein durch Gottes Gnade in Christo, ohne alles eigene Verdienst, der Unselige unselig durch eigene Schuld, weil er der*

goettlichen Gnade fortwaehrend widersteht. Warum der Widerstand des ersteren gegen die goettliche Gnade endlich gebrochen wird, der des letzteren aber nicht, ist nicht des ersteren Verdienst, wohl aber des letzteren Schuld. Der Mensch jedoch' (auch der Theolog) 'mit seinem bloeden, durch die Suende getruebten Verstande vermag diese tiefste Tiefe der goettlichen Werkstatt nicht zu erforschen, und es ist groessere Weisheit, das goettliche Geheimnis anzuerkennen, als es gotteslaesterlich zu loesen,' naemlich nach der Weise Calvins, der Gott zur Ursache der Bekehrung und Nichtbekehrung macht, oder nach der Weise des Synergismus, der Bekehrung wie Nichtbekehrung ganz oder zum Teil von der Selbstentscheidung des Menschen abhaengig sein laesst." (*Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, June 29, 1929. Cp. CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 1930, p. 343.) Thus also Dr. R. C. H. Lenski (American Lutheran Church): "Why the Word melts some hearts while others deliberately and permanently harden themselves against it no man knows. The former is due wholly to God's grace; the latter is due wholly to man's guilt. No unit cause for the two exists. When synergism or determinism is taken to be such a cause, the mistake made is that both are fictitious." (*The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 294.) — The further statement: "The obduracy remains a mystery because of this very sufficiency of grace" does not cover the question. Well, we shall have to get together on that, too.

Shall we sidestep these doctrinal differences? Shall we declare that there are "no doctrinal reasons against complete and organic union" of the Lutheran synods of America? (Washington Declaration, 1920; Savannah Resolutions, 1934; United Lutheran Church.) The *Lutheran* warns us against following such a policy. It concludes an editorial discussing the Machen trial with these words: "We have in the past inclined toward admiring the way in which the Presbyterian General Assembly, U. S. A., has kept its Fundamentalist and Modernist sections from bringing their doctrinal differences to an issue. It looks now as if sidestepping controversy was a mistaken policy. Doctrines were not properly valued by the Church. Now it appears that they demand recognition. The 'teachings' of the Christian religion are vital to the Church. The confessions are more than temporal agreements for the purposes of organizations." And now: "If we Lutherans are seriously considering union, we must not sacrifice integrity of doctrine." (May 2, 1935.) E.

Shall We Remain Lutheran? — Under this heading the *Lutheran Herald* quotes approvingly an article in the *Chicago Lutheran* on the perils of Liberalism and unionism, against which the latter voices the following timely warning: "We hear many encouraging reports on the growth and progress of the Lutheran Church. Paradoxical as it may seem, the elements of danger are bound up with the very growth and progress of the Church. There are two strong currents the drift of which the Lutheran Church cannot escape. They are the tendencies toward Liberalism and unionism. Both tendencies are as inevitable as the coming of the seasons. The manner in which those impacts are met will determine the character of the Lutheran Church, whether we shall be Lutherans in faith or in name only. In the matter of Liberalism the Reformed churches sound a definite warning. Liberalism first captured the denominational schools, then the seminaries; next to surrender were the official church organs. Then the

pulpits capitulated. Liberalism had swept the field. To think that the Lutheran Church is immune to a tendency which is so characteristic of the age is to live in a fool's paradise. So far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, it is not now a matter of cure, but prevention. Eternal vigilance is the price of safety. The vigilance must begin with the pastor in thorough catechetical instruction in the Sunday-school, definite indoctrination of the confirmation class, and the preaching of Law and Gospel. The absorption of membership must not exceed the capacity of proper assimilation. *There must be unbending insistence that pastors, professors, and such as man the affairs of the Church shall either adhere to the confession of the Lutheran faith or step out.* [Italics our own.] — Unionism is a child of Liberalism. When doctrinal differences have been obliterated, the field is clear for unionism. The lion and the lamb lie down in peace, the lamb inside the lion. Of course, the lamb has added substantially to size. *Even where a union may be effected on the basis of faith and practise, the feasibility of such a project should be clearly demonstrated.* [Italics our own.] We are obsessed with the idea of bulk, size, and statistics. God has a smashing disregard for mere numbers. Witness the stories of Abraham and Gideon. The Lord is not mathematically minded; for He said: 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.' Let us not think that He who trod the wine-press alone and carried to completion single-handed the redemption of the world is now counting heads. Have no fear; a living faith in the Lord Jesus Christ will keep orthodoxy supple and flexible. To submit ourselves, His humble and surrendered servants, faithful to the confessions of faith handed down to us is to find ourselves in the full sweep of His advancing kingdom."

It is needless to say that these earnest words of warning deserve careful consideration also in circles that are still positively and perhaps also aggressively orthodox. The writer correctly states that Liberalism is the parent of unionism. But also the opposite is true — unionism promotes and spreads Liberalism; and unionism is by far the more dangerous of the two because its destructive tendency is more subtle and thus harder to discern. Both unionism and Liberalism have their source in spiritual satiety, a most deadly snare in which Satan entraps both pastors and hearers. We are glad that the article places emphasis on the preaching of Law and Gospel; for that is the only cure for both Liberalism and unionism.

J. T. M.

A Heartening Word for the Christian Day-school. — In the *Living Church* of May 18 we find a letter by Harold G. Holt of Oak Park, Ill., which properly evaluates the importance of Christian day-schools. Having dwelt on the unsatisfactory character of a course of instruction in which religion is not represented, he says: "Is not a possible answer to this problem to be found in the private church-schools? It seems that too few churchmen are wholly aware of the value of these schools in giving final Christian meaningfulness to education. If into the consciousness of more churchmen who have children would come a realization of the dangers inherent in an educational system which is divorced from the teachings of the Church, surely we should soon find diocesan schools in every diocese and all church-sponsored schools enjoying such increased enrolment that

the development of the whole personality could become more nearly a reality for more children of churchmen than is now the case. Due to what may be in part a spiritual lethargy our private church-schools, especially in the Middle West, are floundering near or in the depths of financial despair. If tuitions seem prohibitive, an awakening consciousness upon the part of Episcopalian parents to the value of these schools as developers of the full Christian personality would soon solve the tuition problem, and these schools would be freed to do more thoroughly their work of giving to more boys and girls a Christian meaningfulness to their educational experiences and to their total outlook upon life. Much more might worthily be written concerning this problem engendered by our dual educational theory, a problem with which, as Bishop Anderson has said, 'many thoughtful educators are deeply concerned.' May it be that soon many more of our parents may become as deeply concerned!" Mr. Holt intimates that he has had experience as an instructor in the public high school and as a church-school supervisor, which has helped him "to see more clearly the serious error in our educational theory whereby general and religious education are separated."

A.

Aus der Synode. Im *Atlantic Bulletin* wird mitgeteilt, daß die Gesellschaft für Innere Mission in New York seit dem 20. Januar wieder sonntäglich 300 heimatlose Personen speist, und zwar nach dem Vormittags-gottesdienst. Während der Woche werden Hunderte von Kleidungsstücken, Schuhen usw. unter Bedürftige verteilt. — Die „St. Johannespassion“ von Heinrich Schütz (1585—1672) kam Sonntag, den 7. April, in der St. Mat-thäuskirche in New York zur Aufführung. — Der *Northern Illinois Messenger* berichtet gleichfalls über die Arbeit in der Inneren Mission, besonders über die Mission an den Kindern, die in Chicago getrieben wird. über die Schulen des Distrikts wird berichtet, daß die Zahl der Schulkinder im Distrikt nahezu 12,500 beträgt. In den Schulen unterrichten 8 Pastoren, 2 Professoren, 224 Lehrer, 39 Lehrerinnen und 33 Gehilfen, im ganzen 306 Lehrkräfte. — Die Nachrichten aus den westcanadischen Distrikten sind recht ermutigend. Aus dem Alberta- und British Columbia-Distrikt wird berichtet, daß während des Jahres 1934 von den Missionaren 3,910 Gottesdienste abgehalten wurden, in denen 163,326 Zuhörer anwesend waren, ein ansehnlicher Zuwachs gegen das Vorjahr. Die Missionsbesuche der Missionare beliefen sich auf 18,546. — Im „Kirchenboten“ des Argentinischen Distrikts lesen wir über die Tagung der Synode im Februar: „Die Herausgabe eines besonderen theologischen Fachblattes wurde des längeren besprochen. Der Gedanke wurde ausgesprochen, daß Brasilien und Argentinien zusammen mit der Freikirche an der Herausgabe des Blattes arbeiten sollten. Feste Beschlüsse konnten in der Sache nicht gefaßt werden.“ „Mit unserer ‚Colegio‘-Bibliothek ist es schlecht bestellt. Bisher hatte der Distrikt jährlich 50 Pesos für diese Sache bewilligt. Damit kann aber nicht viel gekauft werden. In einer Eingabe wurde um 200 Pesos gebeten; doch konnte der Distrikt nur 100 bewilligen. Größere oder kleinere Gaben für die ‚Colegio‘-Bibliothek sind stets willkommen.“

B. C. R.

The Ultimate of Union Tendencies. — There is no doubt a valuable lesson for all genuinely Christian and confessional churches in the experiences depicted in the following excerpts quoted from the *Watchman-Examiner* (May 2, 1935, p. 500 f.). If professing believers are inclined to

become indifferent with respect to the perils lurking in cooperative enterprises even of a purely secular or external nature between churches not united in doctrine and practise, the words of the writer may serve them as a timely and stirring warning. We are sorry that we can quote the fine, illuminating article only in part. We read: "Northern Baptists know that it has been the policy of our Foreign Mission Society to unite with other religious denominations in division of territory, as for instance, in the Philippines and elsewhere. As is now also recognized, this later became the policy of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, as, for example, in Montana and elsewhere. The policy of the Foreign Mission Society was also extended to union effort in educational institutions and in hospitals, as in China, Japan, and India. When publicity of this unionizing effort with other denominations was given out more than fifteen years ago, many in the Baptist denomination became alarmed as to what might be the final consequences, and the writer of this article, then working in the Kansas State Convention, joined with other leaders in making a protest against this unionizing movement, giving warning that it would inevitably lead later to organic church union. In making the protest, the situation in the Philippines and elsewhere was cited. . . . Let all our Baptist people note that thus long ago warning was given that the *ultimate result would be organic union and the virtual loss of our Baptist work*. As early as in 1900 the missions in the Philippines formed a federation called the Evangelical Union of Philippine Missions. This agreed at first upon a division of territory, and gradually, as the missionary leaders of the various evangelical groups 'drew together more and more, denominational lines disappeared, and the missionaries and nationals worked together in union effort, such as hospitals, schools, and dormitories.' Later, in 1920, we are told, the constitution was changed, making the organization a union, *not of the missions, but of the churches*, and admitting nationals to membership. Later the constitution was still further changed, and this union body was called the National Christian Council. By simple progression the concentration has grown. Following this, the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and United Brethren bodies joined forces to form the United Evangelical Church of the Philippines, and strong efforts were made to bring the other missions within the fold. In these efforts, it is said, the Methodists declined to participate, but the Baptists were more favorable. In view of this union movement in the Philippines two important conferences were held; but it seems that nothing has been done to stem the tide of these unionizing efforts in the Philippines. As a direct result of this liberalizing work in the Philippines and elsewhere *we have doubt and hesitancy on the part of large numbers of churches and individuals in the denomination, cutting the nerve of enthusiasm, reducing the giving of our Baptist people from year to year, cutting down our missionary force and activity, preventing extension into new fields, and causing interminable controversy among our Baptist hosts throughout the country*. [Italics everywhere our own.] Another direct result is *the disintegration of our Baptist forces and churches*, creating a separatist body known as the Association of Regular Baptists, who decline to make further contributions to our organized work.

It is an undisputed fact that many of our strong churches as well as many more of the smaller churches have already withdrawn from our Northern Baptist Convention, and hundreds of others will doubtless follow unless something is done to correct this shallow, liberalizing, unionizing work within the denomination. This disintegration of our forces can be stopped if we only make it a matter of thought and prayer. But it cannot be arrested by ignoring it, as we have been doing for more than fifteen years."

We doubt whether the Baptist antiunionists are able to stop the pitiable disintegration of forces and churches which the writer so greatly deplors. At least so we are forced to judge as we consider the experiences of Fundamentalists along other, but similar lines. Our own interest in the matter, as Lutherans who firmly stand on an honest confessional basis, just because we desire the well-being and progress of the entire Lutheran Church in America, lies chiefly in measures by which such a situation as is here represented can be prevented. That there is cause for alarm no one can deny. We are thinking, for example, of the cooperative efforts of the Lutheran Missionary Conference and similar organizations, which are quasi mergers, created for the very purpose which drew the various denominations into union in the Philippines, that is to say, for dividing territories, economizing man- and money-power, supporting educational and charitable endeavors, enhancing the editorial and publicity values of Lutheran synods, and the like. That means cooperation *in externis*; however, the goal is organic union. But unless the heterogeneous issues of doctrine and practise between the synods thus affiliated are properly taken care of, we fear that the cooperating synods cannot escape the fate of the churches in the Philippines. As they draw together more and more, denominational lines will disappear, constitutions will be changed, new national councils will be formed, and in the end a new United Lutheran Church of America will appear, outwardly strong and knitted together perhaps, but inwardly holding all the weaknesses and vices that ultimately make for the total disintegration of the Lutheran Church as an outspoken, fearless, and truth-loving confessional denomination. If denominational lines disappear because first the greater and lesser differences in doctrine and practise have disappeared, then let us all shout out our joy from the housetops. But if denominational lines disappear because there is a "shallow, liberalizing, unionizing" tendency at work, or because synods are tired of standing alone or because the constituents are weary of the so-called everlasting squabble about doctrine and practise, or for any other reason of the flesh, then in the end we shall be in the same condemnation in which churches now find themselves which years ago made the huge mistake that now will-o'-the-wisps itself before our eyes as a grand and glorious virtue. In the United Lutheran Church leaders are now openly rejecting the doctrine of verbal inspiration; in the American Lutheran Church and in affiliated synods the doctrine is cherished and confessed. The house is therefore divided against itself. Will the breach be repaired *ante festum*, or will it be allowed to widen and to destroy the whole house? Articles like "The Ultimate of Union Tendencies" certainly ought to be read and heeded by all who have the welfare of the Church at heart. J. T. M.

A Sample of Union Seminary Theology. — The *Lutheran Standard* informs us that one of the professors of Union Seminary, Dr. Bruce Curry, a man who has written extensively, recently was touring the United States and delivering addresses to the students of the colleges and universities of America from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Since he, as an editor puts it, is “a member of what is probably the most distinguished theological faculty in the United States,” we naturally are interested in the religious views which he places before our youth. The *Standard* credits him with having written the following paragraphs: “He [the modern Christian] may develop his religious thought, philosophy, and experience in the light of the best knowledge and insight of himself and his spiritual kindred, past and present. Where he finds himself indebted to Jesus or to later Christianity, he will be glad to make acknowledgment of the fact. But he will be under no initial obligation to alline his faith with that of Jesus or with any one else in the Christian tradition. Nor will he feel that he must impress Jesus into the service and support of his own developing religion. He will recognize that the basis of authority has shifted to the informed insight of the best-qualified individuals and groups, and he will welcome any organized fellowship in one who sincerely seeks the truth and life at its highest. Whether this man may then be called a ‘Christian’ is a serious question. Perhaps he should be so accepted if he confessed that the major contribution to his experience and faith came from Jesus, making Jesus still ‘the Master.’ For many this seems to be the only position which makes full place for truth and leaves some place for Jesus.”

So this is what Union Seminary stands for! Perhaps it would refuse to be judged by what Bruce Curry affirms. It probably would insist that all its teachers are at liberty to pronounce whatever views their conscience approves of and that their opinion must not be imputed to the seminary itself. But every fair-minded person will hold it responsible for having on its faculty a man who definitely rejects the authority of Jesus, our only Savior. May God have mercy on the congregations and groups whose pastors receive their theology from such a teacher! A.

Southern Baptists. — A writer in the *Watchman-Examiner*, April 4, 1935, compares Northern and Southern Baptists. In his opinion “the Northern body seems to lack the denominational consciousness as compared with the Southern Convention.” (It is evident that he is speaking of the large denominations, which we usually refer to simply as Northern and Southern Baptists.) He continues: “There is in the South a sort of pride in the convention and its work, a sense of an essential oneness, that is sometimes called boastfulness, pride in numbers, often bigotry, and even phariseism. The poverty of the South following the Civil War drove the churches into a consolidation of every interest in their struggle to survive and make any progress. There also arose a race of great preachers, strong doctrinarians. The strength of the Southern Convention has been, and still is, in the rural churches. These members desire the strong meat of the Word, are not soon swept from their theological moorings, nor do they readily adopt new methods. These and other influences have built up a sense of *camaraderie* and pride in denominational accomplishments that I have never felt outside of the bands of the Southern Convention.” Other characteristics which this writer emphasizes as distinctive of Southern

Baptists are an evangelistic zeal and aversion to unionism. While the ministers of the Northern Convention are better educated, broadly speaking, he thinks the inability of many theological candidates in the South to attend theological schools has kept the Southern branch orthodox in its theology. With respect to emphasis on the social gospel, which is very strong in the North, we are told: "There is a strong social-righteousness conscience in the South. But righteousness is looked upon more as a result or product of a man being in right relations with God. It is not sought so much through human societies nor even through any wide cooperation with others, especially with those who seem to lack a spiritual motivation." In this respect they may well serve as exemplars to their Northern *confrères*.

A.

II. Ausland.

„Ein fünftes Evangelium?“ Unter dieser Aufschrift gibt die „Köln. Zeitung“ (Nr. 51, Abendblatt) ihren Lesern näheren Bericht über die jüngste Entdeckung der ältesten christlichen Evangelienhandschrift. Daß sie älter ist als alle bisher bekannten, stimmt. Aber ein „fünftes Evangelium“ dürfte sie wohl nicht sein, wie uns ein deutscher Fachgelehrter schreibt; vielmehr handle es sich nach den mitgetheilten Proben nur um eine Evangelienharmonie, die Synoptiker und Johannes benutzt (also voraussetzt) und aus eigener Phantasie ausmalet. Der Bericht der „Köln. Zeitung“ lautet:

„Es ist ein eigenartiger Zufall, daß das Britische Museum im vorigen Jahr nicht nur den Codex Sinaiticus, die berühmte Bibelhandschrift, für den Betrag von 100.000 Pfund Sterling von der russischen Regierung kaufte, sondern auch für einen geringen Preis ein Bündel griechischer Papyri erwarb, worin sich zwei Blätter befanden, die nichts weniger zu sein scheinen als Bruchstücke eines neuen, fünften Evangeliums. Ihre Entdeckung erfolgte durch den Kustos der Manuskriptabteilung des Britischen Museums, S. Jdris Bell, bei der Durchsicht dieser in Ägypten wahrscheinlich von Felachen gefundenen Papyri, die ein Händler im vorigen Sommer nach London brachte und dem Museum mit Erfolg zum Kauf anbot. Dem Gelehrten fielen sofort die beiden Buchstaben IH auf, eine bekannte Form der Abkürzung für den Namen Iesus in griechischer Schreibweise, und er beschäftigte sich daraufhin eingehend mit dem Text. Die Prüfung ergab, daß es sich um das älteste Bruchstück eines christlichen Manuskripts handelt, das bisher bekannt geworden ist. Die Handschrift weist unzweideutig auf eine Zeit hin, die nicht später als die Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts sein kann, während bisher kein christliches Manuskript weiter zurückgeht als auf den Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts. Aber nicht allein das Alter, sondern auch der Inhalt verleiht dem Fund eine besondere Bedeutung. Es gibt bekanntlich Apokryphe Evangelien und Aussprüche Iesu, die als spätere Zusammenstellungen zu gelten haben. Der neue Fund fällt nicht in diese Kategorie. Der Text, der auf den beiden doppelseitig beschriebenen Blättern zu finden ist, stellt nach Auffassung der Sachverständigen Bruchstücke einer Lebensgeschichte Iesu dar, die nicht auf Grund der vorhandenen Evangelien zusammengestellt ist. Es gilt sogar als möglich, daß das so entdeckte neue Evangelium, von dem bisher nur die beiden Blätter vorhanden sind, die Quelle oder eine der Quellen war, die der Schreiber des Johannes-Evangeliums benutzte.“ (Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg.)

Sächsische Pastoren in Schutzhaft. Über solche und ähnliche Vorkommnisse darf die kirchliche Presse nichts berichten. Die „Allg. Ev.=Luth. N.=Z.“ weiß sich aber zu helfen. Die Nummer vom 3. Mai läßt die Polizei selbst berichten: „In Sachsen ist eine Reihe von Geistlichen in Schutzhaft (Konzentrationslager) genommen worden. Wir haben wegen des Presseerlasses des Reichsministers bisher davon geschwiegen. Nun aber nimmt die Nachrichtenstelle der Staatskanzlei selbst öffentlich das Wort und gibt in der Tagespresse folgendes bekannt: „In letzter Zeit ist in verschiedenen Teilen Sachsens wiederholt beobachtet worden, daß unter dem Deckmantel religiöser Glaubensäußerungen Versuche unternommen worden sind, den Gemeinchaftswillen des deutschen Volks zu schwächen. Die Auslassungen, die sogar zum Teil von den Kanzeln während des Gottesdienstes gemacht wurden, sind in ihren Auswirkungen geeignet, die Autorität des Staates und der Bewegung zu schädigen; sie geben jener feindseliggefinnten Auslandspresse, die von Emigranten und Juden geleitet wird, Material für die Fortführung ihrer Heße gegen das nationalsozialistische Deutschland und schaffen im Innern des Reichs Unfrieden und Unruhe. . . . [O. T. M. ist nicht verpflichtet, den vollen Text der Bekanntmachung abzudrucken, teilt darum nur noch die Schlusssätze mit:] Einige Pastoren haben sich in Kanzelerklärungen öffentlich gegen den Willen der Regierung gerichtet. Gegenüber diesen politischen Verfehlungen blieb kein anderer Weg übrig, als sie zur Vermeidung stärkerer Unruhe weiter Volkskreise in Schutzhaft zu nehmen. Die Diener der Kirche genießen den ihnen zugesagten Schutz in Dingen der Religion; wo sie aber den Staat und die Bewegung politisch antasten, trifft sie die Schärfe des Gesetzes in der gleichen Weise wie jeden andern Staatsbürger.“ — Das ähnelt gar sehr den Verfügungen und Bekanntmachungen der heidnischen römischen Kaiser und ihrer Reichsminister. Man ließ die ersten Christen verhaften als staatsgefährliche Leute und Unruhestifter. E.

Frankreichs Luthertum. Von den 43 Millionen Einwohnern Frankreichs sind nach dem „Lutherischen Weltalmanach“ etwas über 40 Millionen römisch=katholisch (die Zahl dürfte reichlich hoch sein) und etwas über eine Million protestantisch. Genaue Zahlen kann man überhaupt nicht angeben, weil die französische Regierung keinen Religionszensus (wie wir ihn in unserm Lande kennen) durchführen läßt. So braucht es uns auch nicht zu wundern, daß die Zahl der Lutheraner in Frankreich an einem Orte auf 250,000, an einem andern auf 300,000 und an einem dritten auf 400,000 geschätzt wird. Die Leser wissen, daß es den blutigen Verfolgungen durch die Regierung und die römische Kirche gelungen ist, den Protestantismus fast gänzlich auszurotten, der doch im sechzehnten Jahrhundert viele Herzen in Frankreich ergriffen hatte.

Wenn der „Lutherische Weltalmanach“ recht hat, so gibt es in Frankreich 398,000 Lutheraner, 268 Pfarochien, 321 Gemeinden, 309 Pastoren. Bei weitem der größte Teil der Lutheraner Frankreichs findet sich natürlich in dem früher deutschen Gebiet Elsaß=Lothringen, nämlich 238,578 Seelen, 210 Gemeinden und 174 Pastoren.

Man kann vier Gruppen von Lutheranern in Frankreich unterscheiden. Als erste zählen wir die „Eglise de la Confession d'Augsbourg“ auf, die sich in zwei Distrikte (Paris und Montbeliard, früher Mömpelgard) zerlegt. Im Distrikt Paris finden sich 13,000 Glieder in 20 Pfarochien, die vom

22 Pastoren bedient werden. Präses ist Graf P. de Bourtales; Inspektor ist P. L. Appia. Das Kirchenblatt dieser Gruppe ist *Le Temoignage* (Das Zeugnis). Zu diesem Distrikt gehören auch die sechs Gemeinden in Algier in Afrika mit ihren 2,000 Gliedern. — Der Distrikt Montbeliard zählt 37 Parochien mit 90 Gemeinden, in denen etwa 35,000 Glieder von 45 Pastoren bedient werden. Das Blatt dieses Distrikts heißt *L'Ami Chrétien des Familles* (Christlicher Familienfreund). Beide Distrikte betreiben besonders die lutherische Mission auf Madagaskar, sind aber auch auf dem Gebiet der Inneren Mission durchaus nicht untätig.

Die zweite Gruppe ist „Kirche Augsburgischer Konfession in Elsaß-Lothringen“. Präses des Direktoriums ist Fr. Erwein in Strassbourg. Die Kirche umfaßt weit über die Hälfte aller Lutheraner in Frankreich. Eine eigene Heidenmission hat sie nicht; sie unterstützt besonders Hermannsburg sowie Neuendettelsau und Leipzig. Sehr rühmig ist sie in der Inneren Mission; besonders hervorzuheben wäre etwa, daß sie drei Diakonissenanstalten hat (Strassbourg, Neuenberg und Sarepta bei Dorlisheim).

Als dritte Gruppe wäre aufzuzählen die kürzlich gegründete Synode von Elsaß-Lothringen, die mit der Synodal-konferenz (Missourisynode) in Verbindung steht. Zwölf Predigtplätze werden von den fünf Pastoren dieser Synode bedient.

Viertens sind noch die deutsch-lutherischen Gemeinden zu nennen und andere lutherische Gemeinden, die in Alt-Frankreich bestehen und eine fremde Sprache benutzen. Vor dem Krieg gab es eine ganze Reihe deutschsprechender lutherischer Gemeinden in Frankreich; jetzt gibt es nur noch die eine Christuskirche in Paris, an der seinerzeit Vater Bodelschwingh einige Jahre stand. Diese Gemeinde zählt 1,200 Glieder, hat ihr eigenes Gemeindeblatt und unterhält ein Frauen- und Mädchenheim. Der Pastor der Gemeinde heißt Erich Dahlgrün. — Ebenfalls in Paris ist eine dänisch-lutherische Gemeinde und in Dunkerque (Dünkirchen) eine schwedische Seemannsmission. (Kirchenblatt. Abgedruckt im „Lutherischen Herold“.)

A Criticism of the Course of Anglicans in India. — Will the Anglicans in South India amalgamate with the Methodists and the Protestant bodies which constitute the South India United Church? The present status of the union movement reflected in this question is described in the *Living Church* as follows: “It appears that the majority of the Indian bishops are willing to concur in the virtual abandonment of confirmation, the recognition of all sacraments as equally valid, since all ministries are equally invalid, and the participation of Protestant ministers in the consecration of bishops of the proposed United Church. . . . It is further reported that certain of the Indian bishops have taken the amazing position that they have the power to dispense congregations from the rule that only a bishop or priest may celebrate the Holy Communion for them.” It is interesting to read the comment of the *Living Church* editor on the last item. “This is a startling claim indeed; for not even the Pope of Rome has ever contended that such power is inherent in his office. By what authority do these Anglican bishops in India arrogate to themselves power greater than that claimed by the Pope and hitherto unheard of in all of Catholic Christendom? . . . If the Anglican Church of India persists in going through with the scheme of union with the

Protestant denominations on the terms now apparently contemplated, it will thereby cut itself off from the fellowship of the Anglican union and the body of Catholic Christendom. The other autonomous Anglican churches will then be faced with the problem of officially severing the union with the Church of India and will have to consider the sending of new missionaries to that country to teach anew the Catholic faith 'as this Church hath received the same.' One cannot suppress the wish that this zeal which is exerting itself in opposition to the spirit of unionism and indifference might be better informed on what is essential and what is unessential. A.

No Bible-Reading in the Public Schools of Southern Australia. In commenting on this matter, the *Australian Lutheran* writes: "State-school teachers did not approve of the amendment to the Education Act in Southern Australia. The proposed amendment provided for Bible-reading during school-hours and also for the right of entry for ministers of religion and their representatives. The editor of the *Southern Australia Teachers' Journal* comments as follows: 'Many of our members [of the Teachers' Association] favor Bible-reading, and some advocate Scripture-lessons, but so far we have not heard of any member supporting the proposal that ministers should have access to the schools. Our members regret the apparent indifference of many people to their religious duties; but their experience with children does not encourage them in the belief that religious instruction in the schools would cure that ill.' While admitting that it is in the interest of the child to have a sound religious education, he asks whether it is the duty of the state to provide for more than a 'sound moral, physical, and intellectual training for the pupils.' He believes that the sponsors of the bill have not yet justified the proposed amendment and that therefore the measure should not be carried. We Lutherans were not very much impressed by the amendment, although as far as it provided only for reading of the Scriptures, we did not protest against it. However, the bill has now been rejected, and, as it would appear, mainly on the arguments of Mr. Craigie, whose denunciations of the Bible equal anything that the Bolsheviks have produced in that direction. From the Hansard report it therefore looks as if the Southern Australian Parliament has declared that the Bible is not worthy of a place in the state school on account of its untrue and immoral contents. Of course, there were also those Parliamentarians who defended the honor of the Bible."

While the contention of the editor of the *S. A. Teachers' Journal* is well founded and the educational duty of the state does not go farther than to provide for more than a "sound moral, physical, and intellectual training for the pupils," it was wisdom on the part of our brethren not to protest the proposed amendment in its provision for Bible-reading in the public schools. J. T. M.

A New Translation of the New Testament. — The *United Presbyterian* informs us of a translation of the New Testament into modern Czech speech by Professor Zilka. The first translation into that language since the sixteenth century, this book has become the best seller of the year in that land. — *N. B. N. L. C.*