

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

10737A

VOL. XVII.

JANUARY, 1913.

No. 1.

"MECHANICAL INSPIRATION"

THE STUMBLING-BLOCK OF MODERN THEOLOGY.

Again and again voices are raised in our day in protest against the old teaching of the Protestant churches in the age of the Reformation, that the human authors of the various books of the Bible composed their writings under a divine influence which made them "the penmen of the Holy Ghost," and their products "a divine dictation." Men profess themselves shocked at the statement that "God directed the hand of the sacred writers;" they are scandalized by hearing the prophets and apostles compared to strings of a harp or reeds of an organ from which the Spirit drew various notes at His will. Statements like these, which the older dogmaticians, both in the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, have made *secundum quid*, and for the sake of illustrating a mysterious fact, are taken up with avidity in our day, and pilloried as extreme literalism, bibliolatry, superstition, or as necessitarian fatalism and rationalism. It is claimed that no person can read his Bible with profit to himself, nor convey its teachings intelligently to others, while holding the "mechanical inspiration"-theory.

1.

In order to understand, in a measure, the reason for this antagonism to the verbal, or plenary, inspiration of the Scriptures,—for it is really this that is being attacked,—it is necessary to observe the manner in which the antagonists char-

CURRENT EVENTS.

PASTOR ROMOSER, editor-in-chief of the *Lutheran Witness*, in the issue of November 21, called attention, quite properly and not a bit too severely, to a charge raised by Prof. Phelps of Yale against Protestant preaching,—a charge which, to say the very least, was grievously faulty because of its sweeping assertion. The incident has been noted in *The Lutheran* of December 5, as follows:—

“OPEN LETTER TO PROF. PHELPS OF YALE.

“Prof. Wm. Lyon Phelps, head of the English Literature department at Yale, has just addressed Protestant pastors, and berated them for abandoning Gospel preaching. But when he then continues with the customary eulogy of Rome, nowadays the darling and idolized

model of Puritan descendants, he treads in dangerous paths. *The Lutheran Witness* for November 21st has a very pointed article on this method of appeal. In connection with the same the undersigned sent Prof. Phelps the following letter, which is published in *The Lutheran* in order to call still further attention to this ruinous pitting of Rome against Protestantism by members of the Protestant Church. In fact, we Lutherans should never let an opportunity for correcting this tendency slip by, for if the present movement of Rome-praising continues, the backbone of Protestant conviction will be softened. Ever so humble a protest serves a purpose.

“Prof. Wm. Lyon Phelps, New Haven, Conn.

“MY DEAR SIR:—I have just read of your late address to clergymen on the necessity of preaching the Gospel. So much of what you said is true that portions of the ‘Protestant Church’ have ceased to do that one needful thing. But as the enclosed clipping from the English organ of the largest Lutheran Synod in America (the Missouri) suggests: The case is not the same in all wings of Protestantism. The Lutheran Church, third in size of Protestants, and with a wonderful growth, does just what you exhort ‘Protestants’ to do.

“Although I think the writer, ‘R.’ whoever he is, uses in one place too sharp an expression as to your article, yet on the whole I do think it precarious of Protestants to set up Rome, publicly, as the example, in *such* matters, Rome that hates Protestantism, that is sowing the seed of cruel Jesuitism on all our fields in this fair, free land, that would wreck the liberty of Yale and every kindred school, had she the power; that curses by ever repeated bulls and encyclicals all religious freedom (but her own), all liberty of conscience (but submission to herself); Rome, that in her pulpits in free America is waging a constant inflammatory battle against the free Gospel! Oh, I think it a cruel irony of history that in New England, Rome should be commended in such matters, ignorantly superstitious Rome, the enemy of the open Bible, and the church that plans to extinguish right here in America every vestige of Gospel liberty which every informed Protestant ought to know!

“Commend Rome’s order, but for the sake of honesty let not Rome be commended in just such discussions as the one concerned. The blood of martyrs is upon her, and *she never has repented of that*. She teaches its renewal, through Aquinas, whose theology is by the Pope set forth as the model for her priests. She publicly teaches persecution of Protestants in the American pulpits. If Rome’s ‘hatred of compromise’ is to be commended, then let’s prepare for

what's coming on us: blood, fire, and grim cruelty — if she will carry out her constant threats in that direction.

“Two million and a quarter Lutherans in this land preach only the Gospel. If ‘Protestants’ must be scored, score, then, those denominations that deserve the chastisement. But why should Rome-gagged secular papers have the pleasure of reading a commendation of Rome? Thereby we Protestants only hang a millstone about our neck. Single out the guilty Protestant churches. But let Martin Luther’s Church in America stand as it is, a grand and ever grander protest as well against Romish error, superstition, and legalistic religion, as against Protestant apostasy from the Gospel.

“I thank you for the main idea you had; I thank you heartily. And believe me when I say that what I have written to the author of that otherwise excellent protest against substitution of worldly themes for the Gospel is made in a serious and sympathetic spirit.

“With sincerest regard,

“Yours,

“ADOLF HULT,

“Pastor Immanuel Lutheran Church.”

THE “AGE-HERALD” OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA., lately became a theological battleground, when Father Coyle advocated saint-worship as practiced by Rome in that journal, and was called to account in the same journal by our Pastor H. Reuter. After Father Coyle has replied to Rev. Reuter, and the incident seems closed, there appears upon the scene a Mr. Meyer, of Columbus, O., who, either because he was ignorant of Father Coyle’s reply or considered the same insufficient, makes an attack upon Rev. Reuter in the journal afore-mentioned. This has brought out Rev. Reuter once more in the *Age-Herald* of November 27. From his reply we have transferred, because of its general usefulness, the following portion:—

“Mr. Meyer says that he, as a Catholic, knows that no saint in the sense of Christ’s mediatorship ‘can be made a mediator before the throne of God.’ Does he? If he does, he certainly is not in harmony with the teachings of his church. I have before me a copy of extracts taken from a Catholic book of devotion bearing the title, ‘The Glories of Mary.’ Here are a few of the extracts: ‘It is the will of God that all graces should come to us by the hand of Mary.’ (p. 3.) ‘To honor the queen of angels is to gain eternal life.’ (p. 6.) ‘All who are saved are saved only by means of this divine mother.’ (p. 8.) ‘She opens the abyss of the mercy of God to whomsoever she wills, when she wills, and as she wills, so that there is no sinner, however great, who is lost if Mary protects him.’ (p. 16.) ‘Let us fly to thy feet,

and always fly to the feet of this most sweet queen, if we be certain of salvation.' (p. 10.) 'God has placed the whole price of redemption in the hands of Mary that she may dispose of it at will.' (p. 85.) 'Thou art the only advocate of sinners.' (p. 95.) Etc., etc. To deny that Mary and probably also other saints are adored as mediators in the sense of the mediatorship of Christ when the worship of Mary is clothed in language such as quoted here, *e. g.*; 'Thou art the only advocate of sinners,' is like denying that water is wet or that black is black."

AT FALL RIVER, MASS., a stirring debate took place in the columns of the *Evening Journal* of November 4 and 11. The Rt. Rev. Mgr. Cassidy, who in many respects had been a sort of theological lion in the community, and was accustomed to domineer public opinion through the press also in civil affairs, wrote an article full of misrepresentations by which an impending election for members of the local school board was to be made to turn out favorably to the Romanists. One of our young pastors (who for that reason was greatly scorned by this braying lion Cassidy) subjected the article of Cassidy to a searching criticism. The criticism was offered in courteous terms and stated simply facts. Result: the town in an uproar, everybody taking sides, the young Lutheran clergyman receiving honorable commendations for his courageous conduct, and Mr. Cassidy making a rather asinine exhibition of himself by inquiring through the press: "Whence came the Rev. Mr. —? Who brought him to Fall River? How numerous is his congregation?" — Our young brother desires to be nameless.

REV. ARTHUR H. C. BOTH, Chicago, Ill., writes us:—

"Last summer some of our bread turned moldy. The mold that formed on it was of a beautiful pale red color and velvety appearance. It looked fine. I had never seen mold like that before, and was very much surprised. Usually the mold on bread is green, black, or white. When I saw this, I had to think of the consecrated wafer which in some Catholic churches sometimes 'begins to bleed.' We know that this is regarded as a great wonder by the innocent Catholics, for they really imagine that the body of Christ is giving up its blood.

"Some time ago I read about this in *Lehre und Wehre*. There it was said that the blood was a kind of mold. Of course I believed it, though I had not seen it. Now, however, I can say that I did see it myself. I tried to produce this mold on a wafer, and for this purpose put one into a tin can in which I had the red moldy bread. To my great joy the red mold spread from the bread on to

that also. And though not the entire host was covered, there appeared fine red blotches on it.

"What made our bread turn red I do not know. I believe it must be due to a peculiarity of the flour, perhaps to the yeast. But we used the same flour (at least we think it is the same, since it's from the same sack) and no more red showed."

IN HIS OFFICIAL REPORT, President Johnston of the Augustana Synod said at the late convention at Chicago: "This is an extremely critical time of conflict, sifting, and affliction for the Church of Christ. Everywhere forces are astir which aim at effacing from the minds of men the Biblical conception of God and the world. The conflict is directed against the very cardinal truths, Christ and His work, and the divine revelation in the Holy Scriptures. But the God of the revelation of salvation, who speaks in Scripture, is still the only one who is able to satisfy the needs of the human heart. And it is living, personal faith of the heart in Him alone that can remain firm and unmoved over and against the attacks of unbelief." (*Referat 1912*, p. 18.)

AT A PREVIOUS CONVENTION the Augustana Synod had passed this resolution: "That we as a synod strongly protest against the introduction of dancing and theatrical performances in our public schools; and that a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the State superintendents of public instruction of the several states of our nation. At its late convention at Chicago the President reported that answers favoring the standpoint of the Synod had been received from nearly all states." (*Referat 1912*, p. 31.)

DR. F. JACOBSEN, speaking for the New York Conference of the Augustana Synod, says in his report to the president of his Synod: "The Men and Religion Forward Movement has gained few adherents in our Conference, which regards this movement outside of the Lutheran Church as a bland effort of the Reformed Church to gain proselytes. This conservative standpoint rests on Biblical ground. It is the professed purpose of The Forward Movement 'to make Protestants good Protestants, Catholics good Catholics, and to say nothing which would hurt or offend our peevish friends or fellow-citizens, or in any way tend to lessen their faith in the universal Father of all mankind.'" (*Referat 1912*, p. 22.) We add this perfectly justifiable vote of distrust to others noted before.

A CERTAIN FEAR was expressed in the resolutions, offered at the General Council's convention of 1909, by Dr. E. Norelius, as follows:—

"WHEREAS, The General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America was, at its organization, designed to be a General Church Body, consisting of such District Synods as adopted and maintained its Principles of Faith and Church Polity; and whereas, it does appear that the General Council has nevertheless drifted more or less into the assumption of entering upon the functions of a District Synod, thereby not only inviting internal strife, but also deterring other Synods which otherwise would and could unite with it, but, fearing to lose their own identity, are standing aloof from it, — therefore, be it

"Resolved, 1. That the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America this day reiterates its steadfast adherence to the Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity adopted forty years ago;

"2. That the General Council will maintain its Lutheran eumenical character, and does not desire to enter upon the functions of a District Synod, nor to do any special legislation for any of the District Synods;

"3. That any Synod which professes with us the same Principles of Faith and Church Polity does not need to fear the loss of its own identity by uniting with the General Council."

These resolutions obtained the endorsement of the Augustana Synod in 1910, and led, in 1911, to the following action on the part of the General Council:—

"1. The General Council recognizes with devout gratitude to God the wonderful work that has been accomplished by the Augustana Synod, the efficiency of the manifold agencies that it has employed, the spread of its Home Mission activity into all parts of the land, and the establishment of most important and numerous attended institutions of learning, all of which has necessitated a growth of organization far beyond the scope of any ordinary District Synod, and justifies the preservation, with the greatest care, of what has thus been attained within the field given it to cultivate.

"2. It is not the purpose of the General Council to interfere with any of the functions of its District Synods.

"3. The General Council farther recognizes the peculiar character and calling of the Augustana Synod with its clearly defined sphere of operations among the Swedes and their descendants as not being an example or precedent for other Synods whose bounds are geographical, and which, therefore, are unable as District Synods to accomplish without the more direct agency of the General Council as satisfactory results as by a policy of centralization which is duly qualified and limited by constitutional provisions.

"4. That the General Council calls attention to the fact that its Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity are by the very term of the union of Synods within it absolutely unalterable. The General Council stands or falls according to its agreement or its dissent from these Principles. The Constitution of the General Council opens with the statement: 'We, the Synods representing the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America . . . do hereby declare the principles of doctrine and polity here annexed to be fundamental and unchangeable.' The constitution closes (Article IV, Sec. 2) with the words: 'The fundamental articles of faith and church polity shall not be changed; and if it be proposed to add any articles to the constitution to fix their meaning still more precisely, or to secure their object more thoroughly, such articles shall require the assent of every Synod within the General Council.'

"5. That in order to give these Principles their proper attention and place, they be printed in the minutes of the present convention.

"6. That wherever any Synods transfer to the General Council the administration of any of their interests which they believe can be more efficiently administered by a policy of unification, the constitutional rights of all other Synods that do not deem it advisable to adopt the same policy, shall be safeguarded and respected, and such Synods shall be regarded as no less loyal to the General Council.

"7. That in answer to the suggestion of the Augustana brethren, this General Council now, as at its foundation, will welcome to membership in its Conventions the representatives of all Synods of the Lutheran Church in America that 'profess with us the same Principles of Faith and Church polity,' and guarantee to them the preservation of their own identity and provisions of Synodical Constitution as set forth in the constitution of this Body and in their own Synodical constitutions as agreed upon at their admission."

TERRITORIAL INTERESTS of the General Synod and General Council have been adjusted by a Joint Committee of Arbitration. This Committee succeeded in having the following agreement adopted by the respective Synods:—

"WHEREAS, In the course of time questions have arisen concerning the interpretation of the word 'field' in the compact and regulations for cooperation, concluded in 1895 and 1897, therefore be it

"Resolved, First, That in the territory conjointly occupied by two General Bodies, wherever one body of the Lutheran Church hereunto consenting is in occupation of a field, (a village or town or small city or a community, so occupied by one of the General Bodies as not to leave room for an additional congregation; or in a case where it

would overlap the natural parish bounds of congregations already in existence, or interfere with their work,) and when it is shown to be in a reasonable measure able to care for our Lutheran material therein, the other or others shall respect such occupancy, and abstain from any attempt to plant an additional congregation (to operate in the same language), and that, in case of any disagreement, the Home Mission Boards or Committees of the Bodies concerned shall seek to amicably adjust such differences. And in case of inability to effect such adjustment, the case be referred for final settlement to the Joint Commission of the Bodies.

Resolved, Secondly, That in territory not yet jointly occupied by the negotiating bodies in this compact, the word 'field' shall be construed as applying to certain large territories to be fixed and agreed upon by this Joint Commission, and definitely bounded by territorial lines."

With this action as a basis, the following division of territory was agreed upon at a later meeting of the Joint Committee:—

"I. In States not mentioned herein, general rule No. 1, adopted at Lancaster, Pa., shall apply.

"II. The States of Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, California, and Texas are to be regarded as the special fields of the General Synod.

"III. The States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, the Province of British Columbia, and the territory of Alaska are to be regarded as the special fields of the General Council.

"As to Wisconsin, it is understood that the assignment of this State to the General Council is not to be construed as an interference with the work of the congregations already there by the General Synod.

"IV. The work now being carried on by the General Synod of the General Council, in languages other than English, throughout the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick, shall not be interfered with in any way.

"Regarding the English Home Mission work, the division of this territory shall be referred to the Home Mission Boards of the General Bodies herein represented. In case the Boards shall fail to agree, the final assignment shall be made by this Joint Commission.

"V. The occupation of a special field assigned by this Commission to one of the General Bodies shall not be to the exclusion of a congregation or congregations belonging to the other General

Body already existing on the same territory, nor interfere with their development.

“VI. Should one General Body at any time be petitioned to do the work on the special field assigned to the other General Body, the petitioners shall first be directed to the Board in charge of the territory; and, in the event of their failure to satisfy the petitioners, application shall be made by the Mission Board of the party thus petitioned to the Mission Board of the party occupying the special field; nor shall such work be begun without the consent of both Boards. In case of disagreement of these Boards, the matter shall be referred to this Joint Commission for final adjudication.”

THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD, “as amended and declared adopted at Washington, D. C., May 14, 1869,” are still printed in the Proceedings of the General Synod, also the York-Canton Resolutions of 1864 and 1893. These Resolutions are remarkable for their rejection of popish errors (mass, *opus operatum* power of sacrament, auricular confession). They also reject “the doctrine of *the real presence or Transubstantiation*,”—thus actually and verily done and executed again this year of grace 1911! (*Proceedings*, p. 343.) The resolutions reject “priestly absolution,” and “maintain the divine obligations (obligation?) of the Sabbath; and rise to the pinnacle of Lutheran confessional loyalty by saying:—

“While we would with our whole heart reject any part of any Confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this our testimony, nevertheless, before God and His Church, we declare that, in our judgment, the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony, and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified.”

The casual reader must obtain the impression from reading these “resolutions” that the General Synod has been in greater danger from Romanizing tendencies in its own body than any other Lutheran synod of America, and that it is the staunchest opponent to Rome in the entire American Lutheran Church. The truth is that, in imagining to fight Rome, the General Synod has for years fought, and will continue to fight, some precious Lutheran doctrine. “Real presence or Transubstantiation”—this is exquisite.

Perhaps this is the last time that the old Constitution and By-laws are printed in the *Proceedings* of the General Synod, as the following item indicates.

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD is to be newly defined by amendments to its constitution. The Pro-

ceedings of the late convention at Washington contain the following committee's report:—

"At the last meeting of the General Synod, held at Richmond, Ind., the following action was taken (see Minutes, 1909, p. 115):

"*Resolved*, That the Common Service Committee be, and hereby are, instructed to codify the several resolutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod, adopted at York, Pa., in 1864; at Hagerstown, Md., in 1895; at Des Moines, Iowa, in 1901, and at the present session of the General Synod, and incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis, and to report the same at the next meeting of the General Synod with a view to placing it in the Constitution of the General Synod by amendment in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, there being no intention in this action in any way to change our present Doctrinal Basis."

"These 'several resolutions and statements' are all found in the printed Minutes of 1909, on pages 59—61 and 315.

"1. The York Resolution of 1864 contains a 'repudiation of alleged errors in the Augsburg Confession.'

"2. The Hagerstown Resolution of 1895 expresses the entire satisfaction of the General Synod 'with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription.' It expressly mentions the 'Unaltered Augsburg Confession.'

"3. The Des Moines Resolution of 1901 affirms the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, and denies the right 'to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession.'

"4 and 5. The Richmond Resolutions of 1909 affirm:

"First, that while the Augsburg Confession is 'an adequate and sufficient standard of Lutheran doctrine,' the 'Secondary Symbols of the Book of Concord' are not to be ignored, rejected, repudiated, or antagonized, but to be held in high esteem and faithfully studied by our ministers and laymen.

"Secondly, that the General Synod interprets its Confessional Basis when it says 'the Bible contains the Word of God' as synonymous with 'the Bible is the Word of God.'

"In accordance with the instructions of the General Synod, the Committee on the Common Service has prepared the following amendments to the Constitution and recommend their submission to the District Synods:

"*First Amendment.* The insertion of a new article to be known as

“ARTICLE II. DOCTRINAL BASIS.

“With the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the fathers the General Synod receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and of practice; and it receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of our church as founded upon that Word.

“*Second Amendment.* The insertion of another new article, namely,

“ARTICLE III. THE SECONDARY SYMBOLS.

“While the General Synod regards the Augsburg Confession as a sufficient and altogether adequate doctrinal basis for the cooperation of Lutheran Synods, it also recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalkald Articles, the Small Catechism of Luther, the Large Catechism of Luther, and the Formula of Concord as expositions of Lutheran doctrine of great historical and interpretative value, and especially commends the Small Catechism as a book of instruction.

“*Third Amendment.* Change the number of the present Article II to IV, strike out its third Section and substitute for it the following:

“ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3.

“Any properly organized Lutheran Synod may be received into the General Synod at any meeting, provided it shall have adopted this Constitution with its Doctrinal Basis as set forth in Article II.

“The proposed amendments, if adopted, will demand a renumbering of the remaining articles in consistency therewith. This we recommend, and also that an appropriate title be given to each of the Articles.

“With these amendments, there remains only the York Resolution of 1864, concerning alleged errors, to be disposed of. As this is simply of an explanatory and apologetic character, it cannot well be incorporated in the Constitution. It seems to your committee that this resolution has served its purpose, and needs no further repetition, especially as it remains on record for reference. We believe that both the Constitution and the Confession will appear more dignified, and will inspire greater confidence unbuttressed by subsidiary statements.

“Therefore, to carry the foregoing report into effect, your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

“*Resolved,* That in accordance with Article VI, Section 2, of the Constitution, the Secretary of the General Synod be, and hereby

is, instructed to make 'an exact copy of the intended alterations' of the Constitution and send the same to the Presidents of the District Synods.

"Resolved, That if the proposed amendments are adopted, thereafter no explanatory statements or resolutions be appended to the printed copies of the Augsburg Confession or of the Constitution of the General Synod in any of its publications.

"Resolved, That if the proposed amendments are adopted, or any part of them, alterations in all of the publications of the General Synod to conform therewith are hereby authorized and directed."

This report having been adopted, the situation in the General Synod as regards its confessional status promises to become very much clearer than it has been hitherto, whether the amendments are adopted by the District Synods or not.

DR. G. M. GRAU, the General Synod's fraternal delegate to the General Council, reported to his body:—

"Inasmuch as the convention of the General Council met so soon after the meeting of the General Synod, and as the minutes of the General Synod were not at that time published, your delegate felt it to be his duty to call the attention of the General Council to the action of the General Synod relative to the theses adopted by the General Council to which Dr. Jacobs, the Official Visitor to the General Council, called the attention of the General Synod in his greetings at Richmond, Ind.

"The reply of the General Synod to the theses was presented in detail, and was received with marked interest and attention.

"As it seemed to your delegate, the crucial question was the adequacy of the General Synod's subscription to the Augsburg Confession. This point was discussed more fully than some of the others. The theses declare that 'The General Synod endorses the Augsburg Confession.' Your delegate declared that to so characterize our acceptance of the Augustana is not an adequate statement. It can no more be said that we endorse the Augsburg Confession than that we endorse the Canonical Scriptures.

"We receive and hold two things, the Scriptures and the Augsburg Confession, and we claim that the acceptance of the Augsburg Confession by the General Synod is as adequate and full as that of the General Council, that, while the subscription is not identical in language, it is so in spirit and in fact.

"The General Council defines by saying that it accepts 'the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession in their original and only true sense,' and this is right and fair. When an organization accepts

the principles or doctrines of a document, it declares upon it to state in what sense and manner and to what extent it accepts the same. But when an organization accepts and holds not the doctrine but the document itself, and when it says, as says the General Synod, *viz.*, "That it receives and holds *with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers* the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God," then it says, to all intents and purposes, that it receives and holds the same in the one, original, and only true sense. For what is that one original and only true sense? It is the sense in which it was received and held by the originators of the Augsburg Confession, and if we receive and hold *with* them, then we receive and hold in the sense in which they held it, which is the one and only true sense. While the confessional bases differ in respect of the minor confessions, in respect to the Great Confession of the Lutheran Church the subscription and acceptance of the Augsburg Confession by the General Synod is as full and complete as that of any body of Lutherans whatever in any land or time.

"True, it was not always so, but it is so now. In this respect the General Synod, like all other bodies of Lutherans in this country, has constantly tended to a more definite and precise doctrinal and confessional statement and unqualified subscription."

SPEAKING TO THE GENERAL SYNOD on "the State of the Church," Dr. Troxell remarked:—

"As we have been able to feel the pulse of the Church, we believe there is a growing desire for a closer fraternal affiliation with all those who bear and share with us the honor and responsibility of historic ranking among Protestant churches and peoples. May we not express the hope that the Spirit of God is moving the hearts of our people quietly, steadily, toward that day and hour when we may in the unity of the Spirit and the bonds of peace see eye to eye and face to face! The heated controversies are becoming fewer, the spirit of fellowship and loving service is growing. Where there are differences of view or of administration, there is a growing mutual regard and a wholesome respect. Differences do not have in them so much of bitterness, agreements are the more kind and sweet. Remembering that it is not for us to become like others, but to be ourselves, by patient, persistent continuance in well-doing, we will do that which God has commandingly called us to do—'be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.' We may say it truly, as we ought to say it in all humility and modesty, we of the General Synod stand in the Lutheran family of churches

where it oft has been affirmed the Lutheran family stands among all the family of believers of whatever earthly name, in the golden mean between all extremes—faith and works in happy union, thoroughly evangelical in spirit, therefore never extreme in position as to non-essentials; thoroughly Christocentric in doctrine, therefore ever turned face-forward to meet God.”

ACCORDING TO ITS REPRESENTATIVE, Dr. G. U. Wenner, D. D., the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America “is the federal union of 32 church-bodies having together 100,000 Christian ministers, and 16 million communicants. If attendants and adherents are considered, this represents a constituency equal to half the population of the United States. The Council is composed of 400 officially appointed delegates from the 32 denominations federated. It holds its general meetings every fourth year. In the interim its activities are in charge of an Executive Committee of 60, with a subcommittee of 11 as a permanent Business Committee. Meetings of the Executive Committee are held annually, and of the Business Committee on the second Wednesday of each month. During 1910, more progress was made toward the solution of the problems of denominational cooperation than in any previous half decade.”

THE SYNOD OF EAST PENNSYLVANIA had called the attention of the General Synod to the fact that the Wartburg Synod and the German Synod of Nebraska have a clause in their constitutions “forbidding ministers belonging to these Synods to hold membership in secret societies,” also to a certain “action of the Wartburg Synod which would exclude other than Lutheran ministers from its pulpits and other than Lutheran communicants from its altars.” This action of the East Pennsylvania Synod, if it was not meant as a charge or complaint, surely was meant to draw from the present body, the General Synod, a declaration. This is the way the matter was disposed of: A report of a committee was adopted, which says that these matters are “questions of discipline and administration which, in the judgment of your committee, are properly left to be determined by the Synods themselves. We would, however, express the judgment, which we believe to be in harmony with the genius of the General Synod and with Lutheran Church polity, that all such questions may more properly be settled by remanding them to the wisdom of pastors and Church councils than by making them subjects of Synodical action.” (*Proceedings*, etc., p. 25.) This action is non-committal, and yet commits the General Synod to the policy of non-interference. This “genius of the General Synod” is a genius, to be sure. By the way, this report was brought in by the same

committee which made the recommendations of amendments affecting the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. The same parties who had developed such laudable fervor in recommending "the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and of practice" suddenly became afflicted with confessional *frigido-peditis* when the plain "rule of faith and practice" was to be applied. It appears that the son in the parable who *said* yes and acted *no* still has his followers.

COOPERATION between the Synod of California (G. S.) and the Pacific Synod (G. C.) in "the establishment of a Theological Seminary on a confessional basis at variance with that of the General Synod" has been abandoned.

THE THREE QUESTIONS relating to the Office of the Keys cannot be inserted in the General Synod's edition of Luther's Small Catechism until the action of the Synod in 1901 shall have been rescinded. This view of the committee reporting on the matter was adopted at the convention at Washington (p. 25 f.). The committee stated as its judgment "that the Office of the Keys is already stated and explained with sufficient clearness in the Catechism in the part 'On Confession.'" The same committee which reported on the doctrinal basis of the General Synod brought in this report. The *potestas clavium* in Luther's Small Catechism, as embodied in the Book of Concord, takes no notice of the power to bind, nor of the general validity of ministerial acts performed "by divine command." In this respect the three questions on the "Office of the Keys," though not by Luther and not found in the Book of Concord, possess independent value, and the doctrine contained in them must certainly be taught to Lutheran catechumens.

IN AN ARTICLE "QUEBEC VS. ONTARIO," Pastor G. R. McFaul, of the French Baptist Church, Ottawa, speaking of the inferiority of Quebec to other Canadian provinces, says:—

"It is not a question of *race*, but of *religion*. Who has had charge of the Roman Catholic schools of Quebec? Who is responsible for the inferiority of the school system? Who is it that opposes the appointment of a Minister of Education for Quebec and uniformity in school books? Who is it that threatens to put under the ban *Le Pays*, the only French Roman Catholic paper that has the courage to demand an improvement in the educational system of Quebec? Who is it that does not want public libraries for the French people? Who is it that wants to group the French in colonies in the West, and keep them isolated from the English in the East? Who is it that declares that you cannot be a good Frenchman if you are not a Roman Catholic? Who is it that floats the Pope's flag in preference

to the Union Jack? Who is it that refuses the open Bible to the people, and hounds the footsteps of the Protestant missionary? *The French Roman clergy. Roman clericalism is the enemy. The priest is the cause of Quebec's inferiority, and the reason why the Frenchman has been unable to take his rightful place in the progress and prosperity of our growing country.*—*The Liberator*, September, 1912.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, according to the daily press, has rescinded the regulation forbidding the conferment of the degree of Doctor of Divinity on nonconformists. The vote in the University Senate which effected this change of policy was 435 to 326.—Are there any nonconformists who are sufficiently solicitous about obtaining their D. D. at Cambridge, to justify this action of the Senate?

THE EPISCOPATE IN THE LUTHERAN STATE-CHURCH OF SWEDEN has ever proved a bridge to the Episcopal Church. Fears of more absorption of Swedish Lutherans by Episcopalians seem to have been rife lately. For the Committee on Foreign Correspondence of the General Synod reported:—

“*Bishop Von Scheele* was asked about the seeming efforts of Episcopacy to swallow the Swedish Lutheran Church in this country. He says: ‘A union of the Swedish Lutheran Church with the Church of England is not an open question. It could never be effected, as was recently emphatically acknowledged in Stockholm by an English Church representative himself.’ The incidents giving rise to the question are, the Bishop states, strictly private, and can lead no further than to certain mutual recognitions of the official acts of the other. From German sources we learn that the Swedes are interested in the Allgemeine Lutherische Konferenz, and in a closer union with the Lutherans of Germany.”

In this connection it is interesting to note that Dr. P. G. Thelander, the delegate of the Augustana Synod to the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Konferenz at its late convention at Uppsala, reported to his synod that he had made complaint in his address to the Conference of the propaganda of the Episcopalians. He had said: “Without all prejudice whatsoever against the episcopate as it exists in the Swedish Church, the Augustana Synod nevertheless intends to retain its synodical form (‘synodala författning’), because it harmonizes so well with the free, popular government of America, and agrees most excellently with the innermost life (‘väsen’) of a free church. The episcopate, as we have seen it in operation among the American Methodists, holds out no inducement whatever to us, to let go of what we have.” Continuing, the speaker said: “With unrest, though not at all with any degree of fear, we are watching the outcome of

the sly efforts ('listiga försök') of Episcopalians to have their pet dogma accepted ('erkänd') by the Swedish Church, and thus to receive a mighty help in its contemptible proselytizing." Prof. Haussleiter of Greifswald, privately, complained to Dr. Sandt, the representative of the General Council, that Dr. Thelander's remarks were "rather strong," and he desired to have them "modified," but was told: "It is just fine." (*Augustana Synodens* [53.] *Referat*, p. 33 f.)

IN HIS ADDRESS AT UPPSALA to the General Ev. Luth. Conference, Dr. Thelander, the representative of the Augustana Synod, declared, amongst other things, his "Synod's standpoint in questions of doctrine: As long as the Bible remains what according to our conviction it is, so long the Confession of our Church will also remain. The Synod, with all respect for *honest* research, is animated with the joyful confidence that 'the Lord is still guarding His Word,' and is both willing and able to preserve those who in singleness of heart abide in the same, from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world. The words once spoken by Tacitus: 'Serva Deum, et Deus te servabit,' may now be rendered thus: Abide in God's Word, and God's Word will protect you." The address, which was received with lively applause, especially by the German delegate, was on the following day subjected to a very stern criticism ("mycket omild Kritik") in *Stockholms Dagblad* by Dompropst L., and the *coryphei* of Uppsala in general treated the speaker with great coolness ("mycket kyliga") after his address. Dr. Thelander remarks: "If the attitude of the Swedish Church toward the Augustana Synod were determined by the sentiment which prevails among persons in high station at Uppsala, we would have no sympathy to look for from them, for their sympathies really belong only to the Anglican Church. For to them doctrine and confession are a small matter, if they are a matter at all; the church-organization ('Kyrkligheten') is their all."

AT BELFAST thousands of Orangemen to-day signed a solemn covenant never to recognize an Irish Parliament, to obey its laws, or pay any taxes it may impose. Sir Edward Carson, former Solicitor-General of England, a member of King George's Privy Council, a permanent advisory branch of the Cabinet, and leader of the anti-home rule campaign, was the first to place his name upon the roll.

In an interview just before signing, Sir Edward said:—

"It is in no spirit of defiance that we take this pledge, but in the determination, with God's help, to keep what we have, defeating the wickedest conspiracy against civil and religious liberty that ever endangered a free, blameless, and God-fearing people.

"The Government, for party purposes, proposes to deprive us of

our constitutional rights. It says we must submit to a substitute constitution which never has been submitted to us or to the electors of the United Kingdom. The thing is absurd. We have equal rights. We have an equal share in all that belongs to the British Empire. We receive equal justice. That is what we are asked to give up in order that there may be in this country ascendency of one religion over another, an ascendency which we have been attempting to put down through all these past centuries.

"We are asked to accept what is admittedly a subordinate place under the empire, to dissolve partnership with the richest exchequer in the world, to surrender our part in the direction of imperial affairs, in the expansion of which all who have gone before us have shed their best blood, and to have our daily lives managed by those who have never been anything but a disloyal faction, and no part of the great United Empire.

"If this policy is persisted in, there is no length to which we may not be compelled to go, no sacrifice we may not be compelled to make.

"You cannot coerce a nation for being loyal. This question arose at the time of the American war, when our soldiers were sent to coerce our own fellow-subjects. History may repeat itself, and it is worth remembering that when our troops were last employed in fratricidal strife, the natural result was disgrace and disaster to British arms."

After Sir Edward Carson had signed, the Duke of Devonshire, the Marquises of Londonderry and Salisbury, Admiral Lord Charles Beresford, Lord Hugh Cecil, former Irish Attorney-General James H. Campbell, and F. E. Smith, a leading conservative member of Parliament, affixed their names. The leaders having signed, the rank and file trooped forward in thousands to add their signatures to the roll.

Throughout Ulster similar gatherings were held, news of them being transmitted to Belfast by heliograph, flag wigwagging, and automobile and bicycle messengers.

In Belfast hundreds of extra policemen were on duty, 2,000 of the Royal Irish Constabulary were kept under arms in barracks, and the Cheshire Regiment, with ball cartridges and sharpened bayonets, was held in readiness to be called out at a moment's notice.

The St. Louis Times, September 28, 1912.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT VIENNA. The Eucharistic Congress is a conference which is held annually to emphasize and magnify that cardinal doctrine of the Romish Church, the Eucharist or Mass, wherein the elements are transmuted, as they believe, into the veritable body and blood of Christ. Depending

upon this fatal misconception of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper, the whole fabric of a supernatural priesthood and the prelatial system with all its ecclesiastical and political power has been built up, and naturally therefore the maintenance and exploitation of this particular dogma seems to the Romish Church a most vital matter. The Congress which has just adjourned is declared to be:

"The most imposing religious demonstration ever held. The whole power of the Austrian government and of its venerable Emperor has been brought into use, and ancient Madrid, where the Congress was held last year, is being eclipsed. The new Archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Nagl, has had complete charge and has done nearly everything in the name of Emperor Francis Joseph. Ancient St. Stephen's Cathedral has been headquarters, and the procession, always a feature of these congresses, has the most magnificent setting in the way of streets that any European capital, London or Paris not excepted, could offer.

"Two years ago the Congress was held at Montreal. Next year it is to be held at Malta, and it is expected that in 1914 it will be held in the United States, when will occur the greatest demonstration of Catholic numbers and loyalty to the Eucharist that the New World has yet seen. These congresses started in a very small way in Belgium about twenty years ago, and are a part of a modernization to the extent of adopting new methods in which Belgium and western Germany have led within the past one or two decades. Social weeks and houses of retreats for laymen are two other forms of this adaptation of modern methods. If the 1914 congress is held in America, the city most likely to entertain it is Baltimore. Some mention is made of Boston, New York, Chicago, and St. Louis."

Christian Intelligencer.

ROME AND THE BIBLE. In the National Library at Paris there is preserved a document containing advice given to Pope Julius III, by the cardinals, on his election to the pontifical throne in 1550. It contains the following passages:

"Of all the counsels that we can offer Your Holiness, we have kept the most necessary to the last. We must open our eyes well, and exercise all possible force in the matter, *viz.*, to permit the reading of the Gospel as little as possible, especially in the common tongue, in all those countries under your jurisdiction. This is the book, which, more than any other, has raised against us the disturbances and tempests by which we are almost lost. Therefore, it is necessary to withdraw the Bible from the sight of the people, but with great caution, in order not to raise tumults." (Fol. B, No. 1088, Vol. 2, pp. 641—650.)—*The Liberator*, September, 1912.