

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVIII.

JULY, 1914.

No. 3.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AND ELECTION IN VIEW OF FAITH.

In his review of Dr. Pieper's treatise, "Conversion and Election," Dr. Keyser,¹⁾ of the General Synod, notes as the first "serious error" of the book which he reviews that "the Lutheran regulative doctrine," justification, has been dislocated from its dominating position in the body of Lutheran teaching. He says:—

"A serious doctrinal blemish in the book under review is this: It puts into a minor place the material, chief, and regulative principle of the Reformation, namely, justification by faith. This was the doctrine which Luther made central and pivotal, and by which he judged and decided all other doctrines in the Biblical system. He contended ever that justification by faith alone was 'the sign of a standing or a falling Church.' He would not subordinate this doctrine to any other doctrine, or to all other doctrines combined, but judged all by it, and assembled and coordinated all around it. This is also the view-point of the Augustana. To our mind it is the view-point of the Formula of Concord. If the eleventh chapter is read and studied in the search-light of this cardinal principle, it will be much more easily comprehended and evaluated.

1) Election and Conversion. A frank discussion of Dr. Pieper's book on "Conversion and Election," with suggestions on Lutheran concord and union on another basis. By *Leander S. Keyser*, D. D. Burlington, Iowa. The German Literary Board. 1914. 184 pages. 75 cts.

CURRENT EVENTS.

WHETHER TRAVELERS' IMPRESSIONS received during a journey in a foreign country are worth anything to the general public, depends very much on the character of the traveler. The following observation of Mr. Roosevelt, who was traveling in South America, we believe, possesses intrinsic value. Mr. Roosevelt relates: "The Argentines are thoroughly awake to the need of having small landowners, and also they have no faith whatsoever in any of

tion), "but 6,000 worlds could not pay for it." (*Simple Guide for Teaching Children the Catechism*, p. 138.) — *Dr. Rudelbach*: "Needless to say, for everybody knows that Martin Luther is the true father of the Catechism in the Evangelical Church. His heart filled with ardent love and strong faith impelled him to make a beginning of rearing a generation of men in the fear of God and true Christian knowledge by teaching the young. His experience, especially during the visitation of the churches in 1527—29, when he beheld the sad ignorance and corruption of the common people, and the unfitness of many parsons to teach their people, urged him to do something speedily to overcome this deficiency. Before the Evangelical Lutheran Church had produced its general confession, the Catechism had appeared; and though Luther was not the first to publish a catechism,—for Brenz and others had preceded him,—still he was the man to teach the people in the simplest, most sanctified and comprehensive manner. His was such a glorious simplicity that it takes one back to the first days of the confessing congregation of Christ." (*Official Opinion on the Reintroduction of Catechetical Examinations in the Kingdom of Saxony.*) — *Loehe*: "If thousands of expositions of the Catechism were published, so there would be a deluge of them, Luther's Small Catechism would float like the ark upon the flood." — *Palmer*: "The art to say much in a few words without becoming obscure, unwieldy, and unpopular through being concise; moreover, the warm, cordial language which enables us to use the Catechism in our prayers,—all this will, again and again, reserve for the Catechism its high place of honor." (REI, 8, 618.) — *Ranke*: "The Catechism which Luther published in 1529, and of which he said that he was reciting it in his prayers though he had become an old doctor, is as childlike as it is profound, as easily comprehensible as it is unfathomable, as simple as it is sublime. Happy the person who feeds his soul from it, and clings to it. He has an imperishable comfort at hand every moment; behind a thin shell there is here a kernel of truth that satisfies the wisest of the wise." (*Hist. of Germany in the Era of the Reformation*, II, 445.) See also the collection of sayings, ancient and modern, which Dr. Walther reprinted from *Freimund* in *Der Lutheraner* 16, 197 f., and also 34, 108.

the theories that would abolish private ownership in property, or even ownership in land. This may be due to the fact that part of the business of the nation in its northern country is even yet that of civilizing the Indian; and almost the worst obstruction in civilizing the Indian is the fact that the Indian actually practices the theories of certain advanced Socialists. The Indians of the Chaco, in practice, have no personal property. The result is, that they are all kept permanently at the level of the shiftless, the idle, and the incompetent. In practice it proves to be impossible to elevate them until they are given the chance to have personal property which is not to be shared with the shiftless and idle. Among these Indians applied Socialism has simply meant that any property acquired by anybody is shared with the worthless members of the tribe. The result has been the positive refusal of the thrifty and far-sighted to go into the business of accumulating goods for their less worthy brothers, so that the entire social life is stagnant. In the Argentine at present, and during the immediate past, it has been proved by actual experience that the only way to get a betterment of social and industrial conditions is to give the average man the chance to get property for himself if he possesses the necessary energy, industry, and thrift; and this means that not only must he be protected against the big man who would exploit him, but that he must also be protected against the small man who is lazy or thriftless or vicious. In practice the possession of property, and the chance to possess property as a result of honest and intelligent toil, offer the chief incentives for the growth of well-being and of civilization. Human rights must be recognized as standing above property rights, which represent a means and not an end; but it must also be recognized that property rights, if properly handled, represent one of the indispensable means of securing the human rights." (*Outlook*, April 18, 1914.) We who believe the Bible know and accept most of the discoveries of Mr. Roosevelt upon divine authority, and we denounce one of the basic principles of a certain form of Socialism as antibiblical. We have also held that the Socialistic theories are unreasonable, and that common sense is being offended by its advocacy. This testimony of our ex-president is a valuable testimony to establish the latter claim. D.

THE BISHOPS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH (South) have lost their lawsuit against the trustees of Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tenn. The bishops sought to establish the right of their church to a control of the institution, and, incidentally, to keep the trustees from accepting a gift of

\$1,000,000 from Mr. Carnegie. The *Outlook* is pleased with the decision of the court and remarks: "For the same reason that we are glad to see the schools of France taken from under the control of the Roman Catholic Church, for the same reason that we desire to see the schools in England taken from under the control of the Established Church, we are glad to see such an institution as Vanderbilt University taken from under the control of the Methodist Church. An educational institution controlled by an ecclesiastical organization is naturally, and almost necessarily, administered partly in the interest of the Church which controls it." The sentiment here expressed is widely diffused throughout our country, and the Carnegie millions, from which every "sectarian" school is barred, are the most emphatic utterance of this sentiment in our day. The sentiment works harm to every kind of church-schools: it depreciates the educational value of these schools and weakens the loyalty of church-members toward their denominational schools. It is intended to do this. The sentiment is not merely a justifiable protest against undue restraint such as the French schools suffered under Rome-rule, but it is distinctly hostile to any direct influence of the Church on the minds of the young. Evolutionism, skepticism, agnosticism are more readily permitted to control modern education than the Church and the Bible and Jesus Christ. We are not pleading for the control of public education by the churches, or by any particular church, but we are pleading for more church-schools, founded and maintained by the churches and for the churches. D.

THE PAPAL INTERDICT was recently applied to two Italian cities, Galatina, in the archdiocese of Otranto, and Genoa. In the former place the inhabitants, resenting the active part taken by the archbishop in a recent election, mobbed the reverend politician. For this "sacrilegious aggression" the Pope "forbade all celebrations of public worship, the ringing of church-bells, and the administration of sacraments" in Galatina. The only exceptions allowed were private baptisms and marriages and the last sacrament to the dying. The people of Galatina should have rejoiced at being spared the pastoral ministrations of the Holy Father, and should have made the interdict permanent by deposing the Pope who had dared to take from them what Christ has given them, but they became terrorized by the interdict, repented of their action, and were restored to the papal grace after a few weeks. — At Genoa the Italian Government disapproved of the appointment of an archbishop by the Pope, refusing the appointee permission to live in the archiepiscopal palace, over which the Government has jurisdiction. The Pope has suspended all

archiepiscopal functions for the diocese, thus serving notice on the Italian Government that he will have either his appointee or no archbishop at Genoa. D.

A REVIVAL OF THE SPIRIT AND PRACTICE OF THE SPANISH INQUISITION took place recently in the town of Vigan, Philippine Islands. The representatives of the American Bible Society were selling Bibles. To facilitate their work, they gave a cine, or moving picture show. Every person purchasing a Bible received a free ticket, and every person purchasing a ticket received a free Bible. A sale of over 6,000 Bibles is reported at the close of this cine. The Catholics started another picture show, and charged a Bible for admission. This was the only fee for entrance. They are reported to have received 2,500 Bibles. The next day the town was invited to see an unusual sight on the plaza of the church. When the multitude gathered, they were surprised to see the Bibles piled up and publicly burned. The act has caused much excitement, but it has produced a wonderful reaction against the Catholics, and 6,000 Bibles have been sold as a consequence. The editor of the *Renacimiento Filipino*, an independent daily paper of Manila, had a clean-cut editorial condemning the action of the Catholic Church, which was instigated by an American priest. The following is his closing paragraph:—

“It is sad to have to record that the act was ever done. It bespeaks a narrowness of vision that can be attributed only to the religious fanatic. It is an example of the lesson that the Catholic Church taught six centuries ago. It is a species of hollow reverence for the teachings of Him who preached brotherly love. While the question involved is one that has taken up the time of humanity, arrested the attention of the greatest minds, and cost the lives of the most worthy men, it is a question that the *Renacimiento* is not afraid to touch upon. Independence of religious thought encourages it here to brand that scene as a remnant of religious barbarism, as one of the most iniquitous and uncalled-for acts ever done in the name of a world-wide religious belief. The Bibles could have been secured otherwise, but to burn those Books in public in the presence of an invited and awe-struck populace, is the last word of intolerance in this age of religious enlightenment.”

That an American priest should instigate such a barbarism and a Filipino editor condemn it, is certainly significant. The American Catholics would do well to repent and amend, or they will fall under the condemnation of the whole world, savage and civilized.

The Presbyterian, April 8, 1914.

THE UNUTTERABLE NIETZSCHE of the *Herrenmoral* seems to be among the saints of the "Independent Religious Society (Rationalist)"; for they quote him even in "programs" used during their "services." One program of this kind for a service at the Studebaker Theater at Chicago, February 1, gives the "creed" of the Society as follows:—

"Recognizing the right of private judgment, the sacredness of individual conviction, and the moral obligation to be faithful to one's best thoughts, we require no assent to any theological or philosophical doctrine as a basis for fellowship, but cordially welcome all who desire to promote the religion of truth, righteousness, and freedom."

The "opening selection" at the service was a quotation from an article in the *Forum* by Dr. Hellems, to this effect:—

"If my ears have heard aright, science is standing before the congregation of combined mankind and declaring this gospel: 'Come unto me, and ye shall not labor with wrong hands unto bitterness, nor be heavy laden unto faintness. Come unto me, and for the peace which passeth understanding I will give you the peace that is based upon reason and knowledge. Come unto me, and for the inveterate hope of a life to be, ye shall learn the glorious meaning of the life that is.'"

The pastor of the Chicago flock announces on the program:—

"Should the services of Mr. Mangasarian be needed by those in bereavement, or for the marriage ceremony, or again for the naming ceremony, he can be reached at 922 Lakeside Place. Telephone: Ravenswood 2855."

He pays his respects to some of his critics on the third page of the program as follows:—

"TO THE CEDAR RAPIDS CLERGY.

"Gentlemen:— This is the first of a few epistles I am going to do myself the honor of addressing to you. In your pulpit comments on my recent lecture in Cedar Rapids, you made a number of important criticisms. 'It would be amusing,' says one of your number, 'were it not so pitiful, to see men practicing heroics in fighting for a freedom which no one denies.' I infer that this also expresses the opinion of the other clergymen.

"Will you tell me, then, the name of the creed which grants liberty of thought and speech to all men, be they believers or unbelievers? Is it not true that even the Unitarians refused to fellowship with Theodore Parker, and expelled Emerson from his pulpit? Was not Swing tried for heresy? Was not Thomas thrown out of his Methodist church? Are heresy trials over now? The strongest argu-

ment you could bring against my position would be to mention a single evangelical denomination which always has, or does now, advocate full religious liberty. But a stronger argument than that which you could advance would be to quote a single Bible text which recommends liberty of conscience. 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' Could a religion with such a text respect anybody's liberty? Could such a religion be moral even? Can there be any morality where there is coercion of conscience? You may reply that this text is an interpolation. Why, then, do you keep it in your 'holy' book? And *you*, Mr. Liberal Preacher, have you removed this text from the Bible in your pulpit? And what about the common people who are not clever enough to know that not all of the 'holy' book is holy — that when you say, 'the Word of God,' you mean only those parts which you — *you*, consider holy? And does not that make *your* opinion the 'Word of God'? Is the 'There is no other name given under heaven whereby men can be saved' also an interpolation? Is Jesus' 'All that came before me were thieves and robbers' another of the unholy texts which has crept into the 'Holy Bible'?

"Will you also explain to your congregations how a religion could be divine and infallible, and still tolerate dissent or opposition? Be good enough to explain that point very clearly. In your reply to this, if you should favor me with one, please do not forget to quote the texts from the Bible or the creeds which make freedom of thought one of the indispensables of the moral life. And let me have your candid opinion as to how a religion may coax belief by the promise of crowns, thrones, white robes, and golden harps, or coerce belief by threats of 'everlasting damnation' and still respect liberty of conscience. Is morality possible without liberty of conscience? Do you really think then that, 'like Don Quixote I am fighting windmills,' as one of you gentlemen remarked from his pulpit, when I combat a religion which has hanged innocent women as witches, burnt philosophers as criminals, and shed more blood than any other institution? Yet I could forgive and forget all that,—the one thing I cannot overlook is that a religion which denies liberty can only produce slave-morality.

"Seeing that the Cedar Rapids papers gave many columns to the report of your criticisms of my lecture, will you not do me the fraternal favor to ask the papers to show the same courtesy to me by inserting this and the other brief letters which will follow?

"M. M. MANGASARIAN." D.