

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

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

Vol. VIII

November, 1937

No. 11

CONTENTS

	Page
The Pastor and His Guide. O. A. Geiseman	809
Luther, seine Kaethe und seine Kinder. P. E. Kretzmann.....	815
A Christian's Certainty. H. Warneck	824
The Aims of Christian Education. P. E. Kretzmann.....	842
Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections	849
Miscellanea	859
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich Zeitgeschichtliches	867
Book Review. — Literatur	881

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.



ARCHIVES

 Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

What Is the Meaning of St. Paul's Statement "All Scripture is Given by Inspiration of God"? — Do not ask Dr. H. C. Alleman of Gettysburg. He refuses to discuss the term "inspiration." A book review published in *The Lutheran* of August 4 reads: "*The Inspiration of the Scriptures*. By Lorain Boettner. The reading of this little book strengthens our conviction that the framers of the Augustana did well in not including an article on inspiration. The inspiration of the Bible is what makes it a Bible, and when that is said all is said that can be said. We do not strengthen the case by definition or by controversy. The Bible is its own witness. In so far as that is the position of this book, we commend it. No affirmation, however positive, adds to the authority of the Bible. H. C. Alleman." This amounts to saying: We theologians of the U. L. C. are ready to teach that the Bible is inspired, but we refuse to say what that means. In other words, when Dr. Boettner declares: "By 'verbal inspiration' we mean that the divine influence which surrounded the sacred writers extended not only to the general thoughts, but also to the very words they employed, so that the thoughts which God intended to reveal to us have been conveyed with infallible accuracy — that the writers were the organs of God in such a sense that what they said God said" (*The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 13), "they have held that the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God as a pile of chaff contains some wheat, but that the Bible in all its parts is the Word of God" (p. 19); when Dr. P. Kretzmann declares: "The Bible is a series of books which plainly show the peculiarities of the writers and yet are, word for word, the product of God Himself" (*Popular Commentary*, on 2 Tim. 3, 16); when Dr. Luther declares: "The entire Holy Scriptures are given to the Holy Ghost," "you are to deal with the Scriptures so that you think God Himself is speaking" (III, 1890, 21), Dr. Alleman declares that such statements are out of place in discussing inspiration and weaken the case. — We cannot see that there is much strength in the case of the men who hold: We believe that the Bible is inspired, but we must not say that the words of the Bible, all the words of the Bible, are inspired.

Now comes Pastor Harold L. Creager to tell us what St. Paul meant when he wrote that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God. An article written by him for the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, July, 1937, bears the caption: "How God Inspired the Prophets." It states, in the first place, that inspiration does not insure the infallibility of the Bible. "We cannot ascribe to the prophets the infallibility that would be accorded to the stenographic report of the utterances of a supernatural visitor. . . . In foretelling events they were not speaking out of a miraculously imparted supernatural knowledge of the future. Their predictions of doom were simply the result of a combined spiritual and political insight. And their predictions of blessing were the result of an insight into the mercy as well as the righteousness of God." And, in the second

place, the article defines inspiration as the influence exerted by God upon the musings of pious minds. "There is also in the case of a prophet one even more pronounced divine element, which differentiates his 'inspiration' from that of a Milton or a Webster. The prophets had a first-hand impression of a Character—a feeling of direct contact with a Personal Influence, an intimate communion with a Living Spirit. . . . It was because God was such a vivid reality to these great souls that they could learn His thoughts. . . . As these men grappled with problems,—their own and the nation's,—their minds came in touch with the Supreme Mind, which was working out its purposes in the affairs of the world, and so learned to think His thoughts after Him and perceived the truth for which they sought. . . . We see Amos (8, 1—3) looking at a basket of *qayis* (a Hebrew word for 'fruit'); and, constantly alert as his mind was, he musingly says: '*Qayis — qayis qes!*' (*qes* being the Hebrew word for 'end'),—and immediately he has a message to proclaim that the *end* is about to come upon Israel (the quickness with which ripe fruit decays probably contributing to the genesis and application of his idea). . . . The subconscious mind is an even more helpful theory on the method of divine contact. Germinal conceptions slowly developing there would surge upward across the threshold of consciousness—probably with the assistance of direct spiritual influence from God to reinforce them and 'put them across'—when the appropriate occasion came." The article concludes with the sentence: "The prophets acquired and could forcefully present that idea" ["religion as a matter of Living According to God"] because their minds were open to God and ready to absorb and use His Spirit."

There you have a definition of inspiration. H. L. Creager knows that when you say that the Holy Scriptures were inspired by God you *must* tell people what you take inspiration to mean. Dr. Alleman does not want to tell it. He *must* do so. And he will do so, sooner or later. Will he accept the definition elaborated in the article "How God Inspired the Prophets"?

His colleague, Prof. W. C. Berkemeyer of Mount Airy (Philadelphia), also is ready to define inspiration. In the same issue of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* he writes on page 314: "In recommending this commentary (*The Pastoral Epistles*, by E. F. Scott) to Lutherans, we would commend especially an excellent interpretation of a passage which seems to have become a modern American Lutheran *crux interpretum*, 2 Tim. 3, 16. Dr. Scott writes: "To the Greek ear the word "Scripture" conveyed no idea but that of a "writing"; and the adjective "inspired" is attached to it to guard against possible misunderstanding. . . . The idea is simply that each of the sacred books has something to reveal to us of the mind of God." Will Dr. Alleman accept this definition of inspiration—"inspiration" means that the Bible has something to reveal to us of the mind of God?

Sooner or later he will have to give a definition of inspiration. He has already given it. In the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of July, 1936, p. 240, he tells us that inspiration cannot mean that everything in the Bible is true, but that the Bible is an inspired book because portions of it deal with the saving truth. He writes: "The Bible contains the Word

of God. It is the rule of our faith because it enshrines the Word. Luther saw that it was this which made it an inspired book, without the necessity of claiming for it verbal inspiration. He is not the author of that theory. The Bible is not of uniform value and equal perspicuity. It has carried with it the husk as well as the kernel. There are many things in the Old Testament, and some in the New Testament, which are temporal and even provincial. When we read Old Testament stories of doubtful ethics and *lex-talionis* reprisals, with their cruelty and vengeance, their polygamy and adultery, it is difficult for us to sympathize with the theory of verbal inspiration, however much we may sympathize with the motive which led to it." Dr. Alleman said that in defining inspiration you must avoid "affirmations." Here he is stating that inspiration does not mean that the Bible is true throughout, but that it only means that the Bible contains truth. That is a very definite "affirmation."

E.

Was steht der Vereinigung im Wege? In einem Artikel, betitelt: „Ein neuer englischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament“ (Herbert C. Alleman, Editor, *New Testament Commentary*), der in der Augustnummer der „Kirchlichen Zeitschrift“ erschienen ist, schreibt D. M. Neu unter anderem: „So hat auch die liberale Theologie Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert angefangen; so sagt heute noch vielfach die liberale Theologie um uns her im eigenen Land. Aber während dort wie hier eine starke Reaktion dagegen eingesezt hat, muß nun hintennach ein Lutheraner Amerikas kommen und muß diese grundstürzenden Gedanken als Ertrag seiner ‚wissenschaftlichen‘ Arbeit in die Kreise der Sonntagschullehrer hineintragen. ‘For the benefit of the more conservative Christians’ kann man ja nach Johannes Vorbild auch heute noch ‘the older form of the hope’ erwähnen und den Passus ‚von dannen er kommen wird, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten‘ im Apostolikum stehenlassen, während man zugleich weiß, daß, ‘strictly speaking, Judgment is a present process’ und das Kommen Christi ein intwendiges, das sich ‘im Kommen des Geistes ins Herz vollzieht!“ „Erhebt der alte Nationalismus, dem die Auferweckungswunder (Jüngling zu Nain, Jairus’ Tochter) nur Erwachen aus Ohnmacht und Scheintod waren, in der lutherischen Kirche unsers Landes aufs neue sein Haupt? Wer weiß es besser, der vom Geiste Gottes inspirierte Lukas oder sein neuester Ausleger in Gettysburg?“ „Wenn nur sonst seine [Stamms] Auslegung neben manchen feinen Einzelzügen nicht so vieles enthielte, was völlig unhaltbar ist und einen Standpunkt verrät, der in der lutherischen Kirche unsers Landes keinen Raum gewinnen darf! Bei der Auferweckung des Töchterleins des Jairus lesen wir: ‘There can be no doubt that Mark meant to narrate an actual raising from the dead. It would have been inconceivable to the Christians of his day that Jesus had not done as great things as they read in the Scriptures about Elijah and Elisha. Similar stories are told of Jesus’ contemporaries and followers. In Acts 9, 36—42 Peter is reported to have raised Tabitha from the dead, and according to Acts 20, 8—10 Paul was thought to have restored the life of Eutychus. (The italics are ours.)’ Neben Stamm, Professor in Gettysburg, nannten wir oben W. C. Berkemeier, Fellow und Instructor am Seminar in Philadelphia. Derselbe ist der Bearbeiter der Pastoralbriefe. . . . Er kommt in

starkem Anschluß an Moffat zu dem Resultat, daß insonderheit die Theologie der Briefe die Annahme der paulinischen Verfasserschaft verbiete. Er geht höchstens zu, daß vielleicht 'some Reliquiae Paulinae' dem Verfasser zur Verfügung gestanden haben. In der Verbindung hören wir: 'It seemed legitimate in that age to put words on the lips of a man whose mind was being interpreted.' . . . Zu 1 Tim. 2, 9—15 lesen wir: 'Whatever conclusions we may reach on the point in question, we ought to regard such an allegorical exegesis of Genesis, with the belief in the literal historicity of the Biblical account of the creation of man and woman which is implied, as part of the intellectual-philosophical milieu of the writer, which we need neither accept nor consider as the testimony of his religious consciousness as an inspired Christian prophet.' — Der Artikel schließt mit den Sätzen: „Würde es sich um die Privatarbeit eines einzelnen handeln, dann könnte man bei den betreibenden Partien darauf rechnen, daß die offizielle Betretung sie abschüttelt und dafür sorgt, daß sie keinen Einfluß auf das Ganze der Kirche ausüben können. Aber der Kommentar geht als Ganzes im Namen der Publikationsbehörde hinaus, hat also offiziellen Charakter. Wir fürchten, es wird ein Markstein in der Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche unsers Landes werden und auf Degennien hinausgeschoben, was manche in unmittelbare Nähe gerückt glaubten. Was zwischen einer Kirche mit solchem offiziellen Kommentar und vielen andern lutherischen Kirchen als Scheidewand steht, ist nicht mehr bloß die Frage nach der Verbalinspiration, die man jetzt — ohne sie näher zu definieren — bei jeder Gelegenheit desavouiert; es handelt sich jetzt um die Frage nach der Gültigkeit der Schrift selber, nicht etwa bloß in antiquarischen und naturkundigen Dingen, sondern auch in religiösen. . . . Das schreiben wir mit großem Schmerz. Wir gehörten zu denen, die auf die gegenseitige Anerkennung der Amerikanisch-Lutherischen Kirche und der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika gehofft haben. . . . Ich weiß, daß auch weiterhin von vielen ihrer Glieder treu lutherisch gelehrt und gepredigt und von ihnen nimmermehr eine erst durch kritische Deutung hindurchgegangene und gereinigte Bibel als Norm für Lehre und Leben anerkannt werden wird. Aber all das darf nicht abhalten, Zeugnis gegen eine Richtung abzulegen, deren kritische Stellung zur Schrift, wenn sie die Oberhand gewinnt, nur zum Schaden der Kirche ausschlagen muß.“

Diese Sachlage steht der Vereinigung im Wege. P. Gerhard C. Lenski sieht die Sache anders an. In seinem Artikel "The Road to Lutheran Unity" (*The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, July, 1937, p. 237 ff.) sagt er unter anderm: "In regard to a highly debatable doctrine like that of inspiration, if one set of official committees cannot bring about an understanding, let us appoint another that can." G.

The Leaven of the American Lutheran Church at Work. — Our readers are aware of it that the American Lutheran Church is one of the constituent synods of the American Lutheran Conference, which latter is composed of the following bodies: the American Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the Augustana Synod, the Danish Lutheran Church of America, and the Lutheran Free Church. The American Lutheran Church is a conservative body, and it endeavors to uphold the banner of confessional Lutheranism in the

American Lutheran Conference. Does it meet with success? That its influence is being felt is evident from an article in the *Lutheran Companion* of September 2 having the title "Whither Augustana?" The writer is Rev. C. A. Wendell, pastor of Grace Church, Minneapolis, Minn., a member of the Augustana Synod. We shall quote significant paragraphs from this article, regretting that space does not permit our reprinting all of it.

"At its meeting in Omaha last June the synod was informed that several of its clerical members had been accused of violating the Galesburg Rule at both points: they had permitted non-Lutherans to speak to their people, and they had allowed non-Lutherans to come to the Lord's Table.

"The official reprimand which followed this report should have sealed all lips, but some of the men did not seem to remember the rumor that Mussolini had declared democracy dead. They talked as if they thought they had a right to their own opinions. Some of them did not seem to be sure that the Galesburg Rule (alias Minneapolis Theses) is a product of plenary inspiration. One said that he would feel in duty bound to do as he has done in the past, regardless of what the synod may decide. Another explained how in his community,—a small country town in Illinois, where everybody knows everybody else and where the church people and the pastors of various denominations meet and mingle as Christian friends,—how in that community the Galesburg Rule would work havoc and do the Lutheran Church itself no end of harm. A third pointed out that one of the five synods which constitute the group to which we now belong has never paid much attention to the 'Rule'; while a fourth said (in private conversation), 'If that affair is pushed, I am through with the synod.'

"The pulpit,' we were told, 'is not merely a piece of wooden furniture. It is a symbol of preaching, regardless of where the preacher stands.' Thereupon, like the voice of many waters, the Synod voted its adherence to the 'Rule' which forbids all non-Lutherans to speak to Lutheran people. . . . And a few hours later a Presbyterian was introduced to the Synod and courteously granted the floor, which he occupied for ten or fifteen minutes. At the great Lutheran Youth Conference, which took place in Minneapolis a little later, a Methodist woman missionary was on the program, a Mission Covenant pastor spoke words of cordial welcome, a Congregationalist presided at the organ, and a non-Lutheran sang a solo. And the whole great event was sponsored by the American Lutheran Conference, mother of the Minneapolis Theses! Verily, it is easy to be neighborly, and hard to live in a vacuum.

"Whither Augustana? Just now we are moving rapidly in the direction of a doctrinal emphasis. We are working ourselves into a hectic fear of all who cannot see the truth as we see it. Some people praise—or blame—our new associates for this trend. Others point also to certain neighbors who are so orthodox that they would scorn association with us and will not even meet us at the throne of grace in prayer, yet somehow influence us. Whatever may be the source of the power which is moving us, one thing is clear to every alert observer, and that

is that we are not only moving, but are moving in the direction of orthodoxism. Perhaps we should rejoice over this. Perhaps we should read a certain chapter in church history. At all events may God have mercy on us if we allow the trend to draw us away from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus."

It is evident that the leaven of the American Lutheran Church is asserting itself and that certain sections of the American Lutheran Conference are feeling uncomfortable. The famous "Four Points" are again in the forefront of theological thinking, and, what is interesting to observe, Ohio and Iowa, which urged them in discussions in the sixties of the last century when membership in the General Council was at issue, are now, associated with Buffalo in the American Lutheran Church, striving for adherence to confessional Lutheranism in the matter of pulpit and altar fellowship and urging their brethren in the American Lutheran Conference to be loyal to the flag of our Church. History is repeating itself. We say, More power to this leaven! A.

Why the Presbyterian Church of America Split. — A brief explanation of this regrettable occurrence — regrettable chiefly because it so greatly endangers the splendid work of Dr. Machen against Modernism — is given by *Christianity Today* (July, 1937). Substantially the cause may be sought in the departure by the group now known as the Presbyterian Bible Fellowship from the doctrinal sanity which Dr. Machen has usually evinced and emphasized, a remarkable sanity, rooted in God's Word, which led him to repudiate both premillennialism and total abstinence, but which evidently was not shared by the group which has now left and weakened the Presbyterian Church of America. In its report on the split *Christianity Today* sums up the schism as follows: "At the close of the meeting of the General Assembly, June 1 to 4, which had been given over to dissension between the group now in control of Westminster Seminary and the group in control of the Independent Board, the latter group withdrew from the Church and formed the Presbyterian Bible Fellowship. This split was the culmination of the struggle between the two groups over the two questions of premillennialism and total abstinence. The group which remains in the Presbyterian Church of America on May 31, at the meeting of the Independent Board, resigned from the Board. At the meeting of the General Assembly, this group, being in the majority, succeeded in passing motions repudiating the Independent Board and setting up a Committee on Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of America. The question of total abstinence came before the Assembly in an overture from the Chicago Presbytery, asking that the Church affirm the historic position of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in advising its members to practise total abstinence. The overture was decisively defeated. A statement was then adopted declaring that the Westminster Standards speak with adequacy and force on the subject of Christian life and conduct, including the use of intoxicating beverages, and that no further statement was required." It is likely that both groups will now forget the great offensive against Modernism, which originally caused them to leave the mother church, and engage in endless wrangling. Meanwhile the Presbyterian League of Faith, which

is opposed to Modernism, has held two meetings at Columbus, O., at which Dr. Macartney presided and Dr. Burrell of Williamsport, Pa., was elected president for the ensuing year and Dr. Gantz of New York City secretary and treasurer. The sixth and last of the paragraphs of the "Testimony" adopted reads: "We testify anew to our loyalty to, and our firm purpose to defend, our historic and Scriptural Confession of Faith, especially in its declarations as to the complete inspiration of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of our Savior Jesus Christ, the miracles which He worked to show His power and glory, His death on the Cross to satisfy divine justice and reconcile man to God, His resurrection from the dead in the same body in which He suffered, His ascension into heaven and His present intercession at the right hand of God for all believers, and His return to judge men and angels at the end of the world." The first paragraph setting forth the "objects of the Association" reads in part: "The objects . . . shall be 1) to promote loyalty to the Scriptures and to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. on the part of all its ministers and members." The third paragraph says: ". . . to work within the Church for the eradication of such tendencies as are destructive of her life and witness, to the end that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. may be faithful to her divine Lord and fruitful in her witness to Him."

J. T. M.

Pitfalls for Faith in Modern Magazines.—Under this heading Dr. Dan Gilbert (San Diego, Cal.), in the *Sunday-school Times* (Aug. 8, 1937) publishes a report so alarming in its nature and scope that every Christian pastor ought to take notice of it. The *Sunday-school Times* writes on Dr. Gilbert's article editorially: "It is bad enough when Christian young people have to meet the insinuations of unbelieving teachers in schools and colleges. But there is another channel by which false teaching is filtering into the homes. Many good secular magazines today are publishing clever, well-written, plausible articles by Modernists and evolutionists. In a recent editorial (May 29) a Christian mother showed vividly what a menace this is to the Christian family life. In this fourth article of his series Mr. Gilbert gives more light on the same subject, taking his facts from official documents, and he suggests something that can be done about it." In his article Dan Gilbert writes: "Christians have during recent years come more and more to realize that the most widely circulating American magazines are increasingly expressing an attitude of antagonism toward fundamental Christianity. This evil is one which needs thoroughly to be understood in order effectively to be combated. The most reliable source of knowledge as to the extent of the growing antichristian content of popular magazines lies in the statistical survey made by Ex-President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends and published in Volume I of *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1935). The Committee found that in periodicals listed in the *Reader's Guide* the percentage of articles indicating an 'approving attitude' toward 'traditional' or 'fundamental' Christianity declined from 78 in 1905 to 33 in 1930. To quote directly from the Committee's report: 'In *Reader's Guide* periodicals, as thus sampled, the infallible Bible, traditional creeds, church organization, and the propagation

of organized Christianity have dropped from relatively high favor into a state of being severely criticized and opposed. This group of concepts will hereafter be referred to in brief as 'traditional Christianity.'"

These findings, as is next shown, were confirmed by analysis of several sets of samples independent of the set just cited. In a group, comprising the *American*, *Collier's*, *Cosmopolitan*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Literary Digest*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and *Woman's Home Companion*, the percentage of material "approving traditional Christianity" was 90 per cent. in 1900 but only 60 per cent. in 1930. In a group comprising the "intellectual" magazines, such as the *Atlantic*, *World's Work*, *Survey*, the "approval" of traditional Christianity declined from 57 per cent. in the period 1912—1914 to 18 per cent. in 1931. But that is not all. Dr. Gilbert continues: "In its survey of a number of selected representative magazines the Committee found a large majority of the articles *antagonistic to Christianity*. The report states: 'In analyzing these articles careful record was kept of every indication of favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward each of 148 different concepts or values related to religion. Toward the Church and ministers there were recorded 131 indications of favorable attitudes and 83 of unfavorable in 1905. The corresponding figures in 1920 were 38 favorable and 109 unfavorable, while in 1930 only 22 favorable and 90 unfavorable were recorded. The percentages of the attitude indicators which were favorable to the Church and ministers were therefore 60 per cent. in 1905, 26 per cent. in 1920, and 20 per cent. in 1930. . . . Closely related to the attitudes just discussed have been those toward the divinity of Jesus, the inspiration of the Bible, life beyond death, creeds, dogmas, theology, atonement, Baptism, Sunday-school, evangelism, and missions. On these topics, 282 favorable and only 35 unfavorable indications of attitude were noted in 1905. In 1920 there were 125 favorable and 37 unfavorable, while in 1930 there were 58 favorable and 76 unfavorable.'" The tendencies of our common magazines still regarded as of high class are therefore away from, and antagonistic to, the traditional Christian faith. But the statistics of the Committee go only to 1930, and quite plausibly Dr. Gilbert suggests: "The survey of this Committee of course does not cover the period from 1931 to 1936. But there is every indication that the trends disclosed in its report have continued unabated during the past several years. The probabilities are that, on the whole, magazines today have an even larger content of articles unfavorable to traditional Christianity than they did in 1930." On the danger lurking in the study of these magazines Mr. Gilbert says: "All thinking people will agree that vast multitudes, especially of young people, are being alienated from the Christian faith by contact with present-day periodical literature. College students in different courses are obliged to study the contents of the so-called 'intellectual' magazines; and after graduation they frequently continue to read regularly these periodicals, which, according to the committee's report, contained in 1931 five times as many articles opposed to fundamental Christianity as they did in favor of it. The percentage of approving articles was only 18 in 1931, although in 1912—1914 it was 57. But more important even than the 'intellectual' magazines in their influence are what the Committee

calls the 'huge-circulation magazines,' such as the *American*, *Collier's*, *Cosmopolitan*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Literary Digest*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and *Woman's Home Companion*. One or more of these magazines probably goes regularly into the vast majority of American homes. In 1930 these magazines were rated as still being 60 per cent. favorable to traditional Christianity; yet in 1900 about 90 per cent. of their articles 'approved' of traditional Christianity. From 1928 to 1930 the decline was 25 per cent., and if this trend has continued, it is plain that the majority or articles in these magazines today are unfavorable to the old-fashioned Christian faith."

"But what can be done about it?" Mr. Gilbert asks and says in reply: "The question of what Christians can do to combat and correct this condition of such a large antichristian content in popular magazines presents a difficult problem. They can and should of course keep out of their homes the more sensational and blatantly antireligious magazines of the miscalled 'intellectual' type. But the genuine family magazines that contain wholesome stories as well as valuable articles on household management have a place which it is hard to fill in many homes. That these magazines should contain a marked percentage of articles opposed to traditional Christianity presents a condition that Christians can and should endeavor to correct." And in what way? Mr. Gilbert suggests: "Christian subscribers to magazines should make known to the editors the fact that articles assailing traditional Christianity are not acceptable to them. It is a known fact that religious as well as political liberals and radicals have frequently altered the whole policy and content of certain magazines by the exertion of 'subscriber pressure' upon them. When articles 'unacceptable' to their state of mind have appeared, they have protested *en masse* to the editors. Editors of popular magazines have frequently said that the 'public' does not have any interest in articles favorable to fundamental Christianity. They have expressed the belief, and put it into effect in their magazines, that there is no 'reader interest' in articles on religion save those which treat Christianity from a modernistic and critical standpoint. This impression has grown in editorial offices simply because Christians have remained silent when articles antagonistic to their faith have appeared in the very magazines to which they subscribe. *Christian public opinion should make itself felt!* It is the only medium whereby the rising flood of antichristian propaganda in periodical literature can be stemmed." The question certainly is one of tremendous importance.

J. T. M.

The Scriptures in Nearly 1,000 Languages.—The Bible or some part of it has been translated into 991 languages and dialects, according to a statement issued by the American Bible Society, New York City. Nine new translations were added and published in 1936, seven of these being African dialects and two European, the Gospel of St. Luke in Bern German and the Book of Acts in Moravian Romany. One complete Bible was issued last year, that in the Venda language spoken in the Transvaal and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, with headquarters in London. The Olunyore New Testaments, one of the six New Testaments now to become available, was published

in July by the American Bible Society. This is the first complete Testament for some 300,000 natives in Kenya, north of Lake Victoria Nyanza. It required three years after the receipt of the manuscript to complete this publication. The book was proofread in Africa, but the delay was largely due to changes in the spelling which had developed in the language since the writing of the manuscript. — *The Presbyterian*.

May a Church Criticize and Discipline Its Members? — In Chicago an Episcopalian rector was sued by one of his members on account of criticism he had voiced. Since the case is of general interest and importance, we are submitting an account of it as it appeared in the *Living Church*:

"The slander case was based upon a sermon in which the rector publicly criticized those responsible for the music in the church and also, without mentioning names, referred to certain questionable practices on the part of some members of his congregation. One member, putting on the shoe and finding that it not only fit, but pinched, identified himself as one of those criticized and brought the slander suit, in which a former vestryman of the parish acted as his lawyer.

"The judge found that the rector's criticism was without malice and that indeed 'the so-called malice appears to be the product of the fertile imagination of gossipy persons in the congregation.' The judge added:

"The uncontradicted evidence would indicate that he [the rector] had some justification in rebuking those responsible for the character of the music rendered, and when he spoke the utterances admitted, the court is of the opinion he did so in good faith and in the belief it was within the discharge of his duty. As to malice, the record is entirely silent.

"In addition, privileges established by long usage in the Protestant Episcopal Church authorized him to deal with members for any misdemeanor or misconduct and to administer proper punishment by way of rebuke, censure, or suspension, and to this jurisdiction every member by entering into the church submits and is bound when he consents to membership.'

"The ruling of Judge Harrington is important in that it clearly recognizes the disciplinary powers of the rector of a parish in the Episcopal Church and his freedom from conviction for slander, provided that the discipline he administers is without malice. Unless this decision is reversed by a higher court, it will stand as an important precedent, reinforcing in the civil courts the canon law of the Church." A.

A False Truce between Evolution and Christianity. — Dr. Dan Gilbert, a leading apologist and zealous protagonist of the Christian faith against Modernism, raises a timely and necessary warning against those who put too favorable a construction upon the assurances of present-day scientists like Dr. Robert A. Millikan that there is no conflict or discrepancy between science and religion. Prof. Robert Andrews Millikan, director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics at the California Institute of Technology, is a scientist of note, who was the first to isolate the electron, won the Comstock Prize of the National Academy of Science in 1913, the Nobel Prize in physics in 1923, rendered valuable service as

lieutenant-colonel during the War, and is the author of many scientific books of highest rating. Now, in one of his books, *Evolution in Science and Religion*, Dr. Millikan, as Dan Gilbert points out in the *Sunday-school Times* (May 23, 1937), attempts a reconciliation of science and religion, but by no means on a sound basis; for he treats the Bible as “merely the product of natural evolution.” Hence a warning is in place on this score, since Modernists today are trying to persuade believing Christians that there is no conflict between evolution and religion, quoting in proof of their contention the assurances and reassurances of just such men as Millikan, who are noted for their high character and deep sincerity and are free from the deeply rooted prejudice and innate hostility toward religion characteristic of so many scientists of our day. Dr. Gilbert writes: “Modernists seem to take the position that because a great scientist formulates a certain set of religious convictions, the people as a whole should immediately follow the formula. We should become ‘religiously scientific’ like the great masters of science! When Dr. Millikan promulgates a ‘settlement’ of the conflicting claims of evolutionary science and the Bible, we should accept it without question!” Dr. Gilbert then shows that the trouble with Dr. Millikan’s “reconciliation” of evolution and the Christian is this, that he exacts from Christianity virtually all the concessions. “According to the terms of the ‘settlement,’” he writes, “Christianity, in effect, gives up all claim to authority regarding those problems upon which science has stamped its own solution. Christianity cedes to science all the territory to which the latter has laid claim. Religion, having been evacuated from the whole domain of thought and reality usurped by science, is supposed to content itself with wandering in the wilderness that science has not yet penetrated. In other words, regarding questions that science has not yet answered — such as the question of immortality — Dr. Millikan leaves religion free to speak. But regarding such a question as the origin of human life on earth, Christianity has no right to speak because science has already set forth the answer.” Dr. Gilbert then goes on to prove his proposition by saying: “In this *Evolution in Science and Religion* Dr. Millikan explains: ‘Concerning what ultimately becomes of the individual in the process [of dying] science has added nothing, and it has subtracted nothing. So far as science is concerned, religion can treat the problem precisely as it has in the past, or it can treat it in some entirely new way if it wishes. For that problem is entirely outside the field of science now, though it need not necessarily remain so.’” To this Dr. Gilbert remarks: “So long as the problem of immortality remains outside the field of science, Dr. Millikan is willing that religion should offer a treatment of it; but if and when the time comes that science takes hold of the problem, then, apparently, religion will have no more right to consider it.” Here is, as Dr. Gilbert rightly says, “a one-sided compromise” indeed. Science sets itself up as the sole teacher in the whole realm of physical and metaphysical thought, and when it has spoken, then *res decisa est*; religion has nothing more to say. However, Dr. Gilbert contests Dr. Millikan’s claim that science has “subtracted nothing” from religion’s teaching regarding immortality. He writes: “While it is true that science

has added nothing to the Christian position regarding immortality, it decidedly is not true that it has 'subtracted nothing.' In the last analysis the Christian case for immortality rests upon the belief that the Bible is God's Word. Yet admittedly science, with its dogma of evolution, seriously undermines belief in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Evolutionary science weakens, if it does not destroy, the foundation of our faith in a life beyond the grave. And it adds nothing in place of that which it takes away as the basic support of our hope for eternal life." To this Dr. Gilbert appends a severe indictment of Dr. Millikan's arrogant attitude toward religion. He says: "In 'reconciling' Christianity with evolutionary science, Dr. Millikan repudiates the Christian doctrine of the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. He treats the Bible as merely the product of natural evolution in the field of religion. For instance, he writes: 'Human sacrifice apparently has been practised by most, if not by all, primitive peoples. You find it in Palestine, where Abraham started to offer up his son Isaac. Now look at the first forward step in the evolution of religion. Somebody arises somewhere, somehow, who begins to do a little reflecting on his own account. In the Bible-story it was Abraham who began to wonder whether nature was after all just a powerful, cruel, vengeful brute like the king of the adjacent tribe, who delighted in, or was appeased by, human blood; whether, in other words, the real God was a being who could be propitiated by the sacrifice on the part of a father of his only son. And he answered, No! and decided then and there to break with the past.' Such amazing distortion of the Bible does not appear to be a 'reconciliation' of it with the 'scientific' view of the 'evolution of religion'; rather, it seems to be the assassination and destruction of Christianity. Of course, that is *one* way of ending Christianity's conflict with, and challenge to, evolutionary science." Omitting other given proofs of Dr. Millikan's "one-sided compromise" in the "settlement" of the conflict between science and religion, we wish to add that, according to Millikan, God spoke to Abraham in no other way than He spoke to Lyncurgus when that Spartan lawgiver ordered human sacrifice stopped in Sparta; moreover, that he denies Christ's deity and believes he could be a Christian even if Jesus had never lived ("The service of the Christian religion and my own faith in essential Christianity would not be diminished one iota if it should in some way be discovered that no such individual as Jesus ever existed"). Dr. Gilbert closes his enlightening article with the important challenge: "Is it not plain that Dr. Millikan's type of 'essential Christianity' is essentially and irreconcilably in conflict with Paul's? In endeavoring to 'reconcile' religion with evolutionary science, Dr. Millikan has given us a kind of religion that is itself in deadly conflict with true Christianity." J. T. M.

II. Ausland

Vierhundertjahrfeier in Schmalkalden. Unter dieser Überschrift berichtet „Das Ev. Deutschland“ von der Vierhundertjahrfeier, die man diesen Sommer in der „Meinen Stadt am Südbahng des Thüringer Waldes“ gehalten hat. Wir lesen im Auszug: „Die Stadt war festlich geschmückt; Lutherworte und Lutherbilder grüßten von überall her. In den Schaufenstern der

Geschäfte waren frühe Bibelausgaben, Lebensbeschreibungen Luthers, zeitgenössische Flugzettel mit Bildern von seinem Leben und Wirken zu sehen. Alter, sorgsam gehüteter Familienbesitz kam zum Vorschein und gab einen Begriff von der Luthertradition dieser Stadt. Als in den Abendstunden der beiden Hauptfesttage die reformationsgeschichtlichen Erinnerungsorte Schmalkalden, das Lutherhaus, in dem D. Martin Luther damals als Gast des hessischen Rentmeisters Walthasar Wilhelm gewohnt hat, der Hessenhof, der die Beratungen der Theologen beherbergte, das Rathaus, in dem die Fürsten und Stände sich versammelten, und die alte Stadtkirche, St. Georg, in der auch Luther damals zweimal gepredigt hat, im festlichen Lichtglanz standen, durchzog eine frohgestimmte Menge die Gassen der Altstadt. Und alle Kundgebungen und Veranstaltungen durchzog der wichtige Klang des Lutherliedes „Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott“. Das war wie ein gesungenes Bekenntnis der Versammelten zu Luthers gegenwärtigem Wirken. Turmblasen und Kurrendesingen leiteten den Hauptfesttag ein. Vom Lutherhaus aus zogen der Rat der Stadt, die theologischen Dekane der bei dem Fest vertretenen Universitäten in ihren malerischen alten Trachten und die evangelischen Geistlichen in feierlichem Zug zum Festgottesdienst. In der Festpredigt zeichnete Prof. Abt D. Stange, Göttingen, ein Bild des Volksmannes Luther, der seine größten Taten für unser Volk gerade in Erfüllung seiner rein kirchlichen Aufgaben getan habe. Wir bewunderten, so sagte er, an Luther seinen Mannesmut, seine ungeheure Arbeitsleistung und die Kraft seines Geistes, den Schlüssel aber zu seinem Charakter und zu seinem Lebenswerk bilde noch ein anderes, nämlich sein Gottesglaube. Seine Schmalkaldischen Artikel kennen nur einen Zentralpunkt des Glaubens, nur einen Weg zur Gewissheit: Jesus Christus! Nach der Predigt überbrachte der Vorsitzende des Landeskirchenausschusses der feiernden Gemeinde die Grüße der Landeskirche Kurhessen-Waldeck. Die Universitäten Marburg, Halle-Wittenberg und Leipzig grüßten durch kurze Ansprachen ihrer theologischen Dekane. In einer Stunde höchster politischer Verantwortung für ihr Volk, so wurde betont, hätten die Männer von Schmalkalden nach nichts andern als nach der ewigen Wahrheit Gottes gefragt und danach gehandelt. Daraus hätten wir zu lernen. Mit einem großen geschichtlichen Festzug und einer Aufführung des Lutherdramas von Hanns Johst „Propheten“ in der Stadtkirche wurde der Festsonntag beschlossen.“ Das Glaubensbekenntnis Luthers von Schmalkalden, das sich so ganz zu dem sola fide zuspitzte und darin verankert war, kam bei der Schmalkaldenfeier allerdings eigentlich nicht zur Geltung. D. Stange erklärte zum Beispiel nicht genau, was er mit seinem „Jesus Christus“ meinte. Auch Schleiermacher und Ritschl operierten äußerst pietätvoll mit diesem Gottesnamen, ohne daß sie damit einen kirchlich-christlichen Sinn verbanden. Was soll zum Beispiel Stanges Satz in der Predigt: „Daß wir von Luther wieder lernten, daß der Glaube an den Vater Jesus Christi der Weg zum Leben ist!“? Auch Harnack redete von dem „Glauben an den Vater Jesus Christi“ und war dabei doch ein guter Unitarier. Recht die Annahme der Schmalkaldischen Artikel feiern kann nur der, der des Geistes Luthers ist. Das ist auch etwas, was wir zu beachten haben.

J. L. M.

Evolution and Its Danger. Under this heading W. Bell Dawson, M. A., D. Sc., F. R. S. C., gold medalist in geology and natural science, gold medalist in the Institution of Civil Engineers (London), laureate of the

Academy of Science (Paris), author of *The Bible Confirmed by Science*, publishes a striking testimony to the Christian doctrine of creation against the pagan doctrine of evolution, in *Christianity Today* (September, 1937). Because of the importance of the issue and the high standing of this bold confessor we offer our readers the last paragraph of his excellent statement. We read: "The outstanding doctrine of Christianity is that man is responsible for his wrong-doing, that he needs to be forgiven and cleansed if he is ever to stand in the presence of a holy God, and that it is only through the atonement made by Christ that this is possible. The central Sacrament of the Christian Church (the Holy Supper) testifies to the truth of this belief. But the evolutionary view of continuous development sets all this aside, because it makes any atonement for sin superfluous and unnecessary. If any of our church leaders are unable to see this, it is at least plain to the atheist, who stresses this outcome of evolution as his most powerful argument against Christianity. Who, then, can gainsay the right of strenuous objection to the instilling of evolutionary ideas into the minds of our young people of school age, when this can only turn them aside from belief in the Gospel? If evolution must be taught, its place is among the philosophies in the advanced classes in the university. The student can then make his choice between accepting views which closely resemble the old pagan philosophies or believing the revelation from God which the Scriptures give us as the guiding star of his life." Simple though the statement is, and offering nothing new, it nevertheless sets forth a vital thought which deserves constant emphasis also in our own teaching and witnessing; and it is all the more to be considered since so prominent a man is again directing our attention to it.

J. T. M.

Unterrichtsziele in Württemberg. Im Amtsblatt des württembergischen Kultusministeriums veröffentlicht der Kultusminister Prof. Mergenthaler folgenden Erlaß über die Gestaltung des Religionsunterrichts: „Die Erziehung der deutschen Jugend hat einheitlich im Geist des Nationalsozialismus zu erfolgen. In der Schule ist diesem Grundsatz in allen Fächern Rechnung zu tragen. Es darf nicht sein, daß durch Einflüsse, die der nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauung entgegenstehen, irgendein Zwiespalt in die Seelen der jungen deutschen Menschen hereingetragen wird. Da die Religion ordentliches Lehrfach der Schule ist, ist dieser Notwendigkeit auch im Religionsunterricht Rechnung zu tragen. Das hat zur Folge, daß Stoffe, die dem Sittlichkeitsempfinden der germanischen Rasse widersprechen, im Unterricht nicht zu behandeln sind. Gewisse Teile des Alten Testaments können daher für den Unterricht nicht in Frage kommen; andere werden stark in den Hintergrund treten müssen. Da heute nicht der Zeitpunkt gekommen ist, eine ins einzelne gehende stoffliche Regelung für den Religionsunterricht zu treffen, muß ich von den nationalsozialistischen Schulleitern und Lehrern sowie von den Geistlichen, denen die deutsche Volksgemeinschaft als hohes Gut am Herzen liegt, erwarten, daß sie in der Schule den richtigen Weg finden zur Neugestaltung der religiösen Unterweisung im nationalsozialistischen Sinne. Soweit veraltete Bestimmungen dem entgegenstehen, gelten sie als aufgehoben.“

A. E. R.