

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1922.

No. 4.

At the Milestone.¹⁾

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

“It may be out of place to enter minutely upon the history of the Missouri Synod, the greatest and most important of the Lutheran synods of our country; but there is one fact that I do not like to pass over in silence, — I must at least suggest it, — *viz.*, I see before me no more striking instance of the blessing which God bestows on men’s faithfulness than this very Missouri Synod. If it had not with such iron tenacity held to its confession of the pure doctrine; if it had not offered such trenchant testimony, and had not fought against each and every deviation from the path which it had recognized to be the only true way; if it had shown itself more yielding in its church-polity (*Praxis*) than in its teaching; if it had adapted itself in ever so small a measure to the views of our rather impressionable age, it would *not* have achieved the results which it may now claim. The Missouri Synod has brought into captivity its every thought to the obedience of Christ, and that attitude of hers the Lord has rewarded. In the view of the earliest and the present members of the Missouri Synod the glory of God and the unalloyed truth of His Word, which has found its clearest expression in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, is to be esteemed more highly than the favor of men and airy human figments. If the Lord God had not taken pity upon the Lutheran Church in America by placing the Missouri Synod in its midst, we would to-day be an insignificant band, perhaps still bearing the name ‘Lutheran,’ but, for the rest, offering ourselves as an open pasturage for foxes and other game. If I call to mind what the grace of God has accomplished through the Missourians, I cannot join those who are barking at them. It is my conviction that the Missourians ascribe their success to the mercy of God, and not to

1) From *Ebenezer*, a memorial volume commemorative of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Missouri Synod, just published by Concordia Publishing House.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Synodical Conference. — In *Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende* for February 8, P. writes on the grace of God in Christ, and emphasizes the Scriptural conception of this term, which in modern theology and church-life is often lost sight of, to the great detriment of true spirituality. He says: "We have often said that the grace of God is His favor, kindness, love, and good will towards sinners, in order to save them and bring them to heaven. This grace is revealed in the sending of the Son for the redemption of sinners, in the sinner's justification; also in many other ways it shows itself powerful and efficient in man. For saving man it is necessary that he is rescued out of his corrupt, natural condition and renewed to the image of God. Whenever and wherever this takes place, it is due to God's grace alone. Grace makes man, dead in sin, alive again; it converts the sinner; it works faith and everything good in him. Grace communicates new powers and effects this, that the renewed man can make use of and employ these powers. Accordingly we will find that the context in the Bible-passages which treat of conversion and sanctification lets the word "grace" keep its proper and real meaning, namely, God's love to sinners. Accordingly, when we hear, speak, and read about God's grace, we must be careful not to think of a mysterious, magical power, a spiritual substance, or something that is, so to speak, infused into man. The statement that God's grace converts, renews, and sanctifies man we are to understand simply in this sense, that it is God Himself who does this, being moved thereto by His gracious disposition. Everything good in man and everything good that he does is wrought and produced by the living God Himself, and that absolutely and alone for God's own sake, because it agrees with His good pleasure and gracious will." — It is a rational view which the *Walther League Messenger* in its February issue takes, when it says: "Yours for a greater Lutheran Church here and abroad' is just another way of saying, 'Thy kingdom come.'" The editor specifies the extent of this Kingdom in its present-day meaning to us as follows: "To-day South Carolina is the only State in the Union in which the work of our Church is not represented in some way. In Canada our mission-posts reach almost four hundred miles north of Edmonton, and very recently the first messenger of our Church was sent into Mexico. In South America the Lord is continually increasing our Brazilian and Argentinian mission opportunities. In Europe the war has opened new fields and brought new responsibilities, not only in Germany, but also in Czecho-Slovakia, in Finland, and in other countries with large Lutheran populations. In Australia and New Zealand our churches are beginning to recover from the effects of the war, and our foreign mission opportunities in India and China are daily becoming much larger and more encouraging." — In *Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende* for February 22, Rev. M. F. Wiese publishes a good rendering into Norwegian of Schwedler's "Willst du wissen, was mein Preis," etc. — In the same

issue there is published a letter in which Rev. P. C. Forseth announces to the President of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America his withdrawal from that body. "The reason for it is that, after being troubled a long time, I finally became convinced, while alone with God, without any person's influence, that it is my duty both as a Christian and as a true Lutheran pastor to sever my connection with a body that is incorporated on the basis of the 'Opgjoer.' 1) It is my duty as a Christian to sever my connection with the body, because full and entire salvation by the grace and mercy of God through the merit of Christ alone, without anything in us, becomes considerably uncertain among brethren who preach that conversion consists in this, that 'the unconverted person decides, makes up his mind, in favor of grace,' etc., that 'faith is the good conduct which man adopts toward God.' Unless I separate from such brethren, I cannot fully and entirely rely upon God's grace. Since such brethren are among the leaders in the body, it is my plain duty to come out from among them. Nor can I expect of God that He will be gracious to me and forgive me all my sins as long as I myself serve Satan by being a partaker in my brethren's sins. Among such sins the following may be named: the doctrine that the historical part of the Bible is not inspired; chiliasm in its odious form; revival meetings and union services conducted by ministers of the body together with ministers and bodies of the Reformed Church or of some other faith. Among these sins belongs also this, that brethren who personally refrain from such teaching and practise do not protest against such teaching and practise finding unhindered entrance into the body, either because for one reason or other they dare not, or because in their new body they have lost the inclination to emphasize and defend the most important doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. 2) It is my duty as a Lutheran minister to quit the body; for in the new body one does not receive the same impulse as in the old Norwegian Synod to bear witness for the truth. — It is manifest from paragraph 1 that as a member of this body I would stand on rather unsafe ground as regards my salvation, with a confused conscience and only a partial forgiveness of sins. That is sufficient to make one unfit to be a minister, but there is another weighty reason that must be named. As a basis of union 'Opgjoer' made men brethren in the faith who had belonged to entirely different trends of belief, without their changing their faith. Only one of these trends defended the pure and correct doctrine. 'Opgjoer' is, accordingly, a compromise between correct and false teaching and, consequently, unionistic. By such unionism one gives the slip to the truth, and at that point the Holy Spirit forthwith departs from one. During the past years I have often been in a predicament when I met with Scripture-truths that had points of contact with 'Opgjoer.' For a long time this was a riddle to me. When at last I arrived at the conviction that it was a sin to belong to such a body, I also received the courage to say farewell to the body in my heart. Thus I came out of Satan's wily snares and thereby became free from 'Opgjoer' with its compromising and unionism. I am unconcerned about what I shall take up, as I have left that in

God's hand." We have always thought that something like this must happen in the new Norwegian body. Nor should we feel surprised if other instances like the above were to occur. D.

The Swedish Lutherans. — The *Lutheran Companion* for February 18 connects the Swedish Archbishop Soederblom with the World Alliance that was started in 1907 and has just now issued a statement concerning its object and aim through its Constituent Councils in 1916. The paper just cited gives the object as follows: "The object of the Alliance is to carry into effect the following resolutions passed at the Conference at Constance on the 2d of August, 1914, viz.: 1. That, inasmuch as the work of conciliation and promotion of amity is essentially a Christian task, it is expedient that the churches in all lands should use their influence with the people, parliaments, and governments of the world to bring about good and friendly relations between the nations, so that along the path of peaceful civilization they may reach that universal good will which Christianity has taught man to aspire after. 2. That, inasmuch as all sections of the Church of Christ are equally concerned in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among all the races of the world, it is advisable for them to act in concert in their efforts to carry the foregoing resolution into effect. 3. That, in order to enable the different Churches to be brought into touch with one another, steps should be taken to form in every country councils of either denominational or interdenominational character (as the circumstances of each case require), whose object it will be to enlist the churches, in their corporate capacity, in a joint endeavor to achieve the promotion of international friendship and the avoidance of war, and that for this purpose a central bureau should be established for facilitating correspondence between such councils, collecting and distributing information, and generally coordinating the work connected with the movement." — *Lutheraneren* for February 15 reports the visit of Archbishop Soederblom to America during the coming year upon invitation of various societies in America, and remarks: "It seems that the archbishop was not invited by any Lutheran organization except the Augustana Synod. Theologically the archbishop belongs to the liberal *Richtung*. It is not such a long time since Dr. Hallesby, the spokesman of the Conservatives in Norway, was denied the pulpit at the Dome Church in Upsala." D.

Dr. David H. Bauslin, Dean of Hamma Divinity School at Springfield, O., died suddenly March 3, after attending the funeral of a brother minister at Bucyrus, O. D.

Ohio Synod. — In the *Lutheran Standard* for February 11, C. W. P. writes on "That Vexing Lodge Question," and says: "Untold harm has been done in times past in our Synod by a legalistic practise in dealing with the lodge evil. And now, by way of reaction, a lax practise threatens to overwhelm us like a flood." The writer now proceeds to remind the readers that the lodge evil in a congregation must not be magnified above other evils which war against the spiritual life of the people, such as covetousness, intemperance in eating and drinking and smoking, impurity, neglect of the means of

grace, and the like. Furthermore, he calls attention to a number of disparities that appear as regards the creeping out of certain evils and the difficulties of combating them. He relates his experience that the lodge evil is far more rampant and far more difficult to put down in a town congregation than in a country congregation; also, that congregations of German ideals and training do not feel the fearful pressure of temptation from lodgery to the same extent as congregations which have become thoroughly Americanized. As regards the legalistic treatment of the lodge evil, the author says: "When a man leaves his lodge without being convinced that lodge-membership is inconsistent with his Christian profession, simply to escape your persistent efforts, little or nothing has been gained. When a lodge man leaves a congregation without being convinced, because your persistent efforts have made membership in the congregation distasteful to him, not only has nothing been gained, but a great deal has been lost, a precious, immortal, blood-bought soul has been cut off from the means of grace. It is vain to wash our hands of his blood by saying that at all hazards the congregations must be kept 'clean' of the lodge evil. Must we not, then, also keep the congregation 'clean' of all those who do not give unto sacrifice to save a dying world?" etc. The writer holds that in order to avoid a legalistic treatment of the lodge evil, two things must be borne in mind: "One is the fact that in the case of those who desire to be members of our Lutheran congregations, the sin of lodgery is usually a sin of complicity which, thank God, has taken little or no hold upon the heart. They are often not consciously guilty of idolatry or of denying Christ. Another thing is this: So as it is in theory, in practise it is often exceedingly difficult to convince a man that membership in the lodge makes him responsible for the religious tenets of the lodge as set forth in its ritual and other official documents." However, the writer also calls upon his constituency to beware of the lax treatment of the lodge evil, and says that the word "evangelical," in the demand that our lodge practise must be so, may be used as a screen behind which to hide our unfaithfulness in testifying against sin. The lodge evil must not be minimized nor palliated by pointing to other evils which are equally as prevalent and dangerous. He considers it a disgrace to say, as he has heard a pastor say recently, "The lodge is a dead issue in my congregation." The pastor meant to say that the lodge evil was so prevalent in his congregation that it was useless to raise his voice against it. Rightly the writer argues that the very prevalence of an evil makes it a live issue that must be met all the more courageously. He concludes his article by saying: "Brethren, on our knees let us seek a larger measure of the Holy Spirit, so that more may be done to check the sad tragedy of Lutheran congregations' becoming the recruiting ground of deistic organizations. May God bless our efforts to the end that more and more of our people may be constrained by their enlightened Christian conscience to get out and to stay out of all those lodges which in their official teachings deny Christ and teach a way of salvation other than the atoning blood of the God-man."

The thoughts herewith submitted are such as we all will have to weigh, because we are not immune from the lodge evil. One thing should be said in regard to the treatment of lodge-members in our congregations. That this treatment must be evangelical goes without saying. This means that the object in dealing by way of brotherly admonition and church discipline with a member of our congregation who happens to be in the lodge must be to win him from the error of his way. There comes a time, however, which is clearly shown in Matt. 18, when the efforts of the brethren to convince an erring brother are no longer of any avail, and then the action which our Savior commanded in the text cited must be taken. Evangelical treatment of lodge-members in our churches embraces this very obedience to the Word of our Lord. D.

The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. — An editorial in *Lutheraneren* for February 8 treats the relation of justification to the means of grace. Pointing to Rom. 10, 6—8, the writer declares that it is the Word of God itself that puts justification in the very closest connection with the means of grace. "Since God saw that justification is His and not our work, He had to come to us; we cannot first come to Him. We are not able to do this. We cannot upon the wings of faith and trust mount up to Him in order to rejoice in what we have there, before He has first come to us and given us that which can rouse faith and confidence and give us wings."

Is there not a slip in this view of the editor? Is it necessary at all for the sinner to mount up and to have wings for mounting up to God in order to be justified? The very text cited contradicts this view, and the editor's own statement also contradicts it. God has placed the sinner's justification, which means nothing else than the forgiveness of sins, as the editor rightly says, "in His Word. In which word? Why, in 'the Word of faith which we proclaim,' says St. Paul. That is the same which he also calls 'my Gospel.'" The editor is conscious of opposing with his teaching the false view of the Reformed churches regarding the means of grace. "We decline the view of the Reformed that the 'inner Word' and the remission of sins is imparted by the Holy Ghost without external means. For this view makes justification to be something that takes place within man. . . . But it is strange how extremes meet. The Catholics condemn the Lutheran teaching that justification is a declaration (a judicial action) on the part of God. They say that justification is something that takes place within man. The Reformed reach the same conclusion, only in another way. For this reason Luther could say that 'a papist and a fanatic are in the last analysis one and the same thing.' We shall not stop here to expatiate on the fact that when a Christian tries to prove from his experience that he is justified by holding to what he finds in his inner self, he builds upon sinking sand. No, justifying grace must never be separated from the means of grace, and the true art of faith consists in this, that one clings to the means of grace and puts his trust in what God gives us there. But we must understand that it is not *our use* of the means

that we must put our confidence in. To take comfort in the fact that one has been baptized, confirmed, goes to the Lord's Supper, hears and reads God's Word, and therefore thinks that he is a Christian and for that reason shall go to heaven, — that is making of our outward worship an idol; that means, in the last analysis, to put one's confidence in one's self and one's own doing." D.

The United Lutheran Church. — In the *Christian Advocate* Dr. Carroll had commented on union movements in the Lutheran Church, mentioning especially that which united the three Norwegian bodies into one, and that which resulted in the organization of the U. L. C. Dr. Carroll thinks that these unions were effected by a process of "leveling up and leveling down" in the matter of confessional subscription. The *Lutheran* of February 9 corrects this statement to the following effect: "It would be more correct to say that in spite of certain differences there was a marked tendency toward unity in both faith and practise on the old confessional basis to which all these bodies subscribed. In other words, there was an opening up of the Lutheran conscience in harmony with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. Otherwise there could have been no union. Lutherans do not believe in compromising for the sake of even so desirable a thing as union. They have a clearly defined standard of faith, and where that is sincerely acknowledged and confessed, the pathway to union is rendered easy. What has proved to be a chief obstacle, and is so still, are the nationalistic differences as to language, custom, forms of worship, and church policy." Concerning the National Lutheran Council, which Dr. Carroll had likened to the Federal Council of Churches, the editor of the *Lutheran* says that this comparison is not admissible, because the N. L. C. "is virtually only an intersynodical committee charged with certain tasks growing out of the exigencies of the war. The bodies associated with the National Council are still too closely tied to their specific tasks to make even an elastic form of union desirable at this time, though the future will bring it." The distinctions which are made in this article are worth noting in order to understand the true state of union that has been reached in the U. L. C. and in the N. L. C. D.

The Bible Institutes. — Writing on "Bible Institutes and Theological Seminaries" in the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, March, 1922, pp. 353 and 354, the Rev. Robert Clark says: "Bible institutes are beginning to attract attention now in quarters where they once were looked upon with pity or contempt. . . . In view of this it is a good time to appraise the schools. They have been long enough in existence and their students long enough out in the work so that a correct judgment can be formed by any who care to look at the facts."

The writer then gives five reasons justifying, in his estimation, the existence of the Bible institutes, to wit: "1. The Bible schools are institutions raised up by God to take the place of other institutions that have been unfaithful to their call and opportunities to witness to the truth of the Gospel. 2. The Bible schools are justified because they meet a need in the life of the Church. 3. The Bible

schools have justified their existence because they set an example in Christian unity. 4. The Bible schools have justified themselves because of the practical nature of their courses. 5. The Bible schools have justified their existence because of their wise and economical management.

Elaborating on the first reason, the Rev. Mr. Clark writes: "This is in harmony with God's constant method in dealing with the human race. We find again and again that, when a God-made instrument or institution failed, He set it aside and turned to something else.

"This was true in regard to the priesthood in Israel. When the priests became corrupt and no longer fit channels of divine grace, God raised up prophets like Samuel, David, and Isaiah.

"The same thing was true of Israel as a nation. When she failed to witness to the one true God, she was set aside and her place given to the Gentiles.

"This does not imply that when God ceases to use an institution, the said institution ceases to exist. Far from it; many times it will continue with a great show of worldly power and prosperity. The priesthood and the Temple continued long after the glory had departed. Israel continues still, but in unbelief and without power in testimony for God.

"Earnest Christians are asking to-day if it is not possible that some of our ministerial training colleges have been thus abandoned by the Spirit of God.

"And they are justified in their suspicions. The older seminaries were founded by godly men to train men to perpetuate the Gospel-ministry. The teachers chosen were men of piety and experience, men who believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible and in its authority in doctrine, faith, and practise.

"But with the passing of time error crept in; men began to have liberal views, and their own opinions were put above the Word of God.

"Now there are seminaries where the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith are denied, and the philosophies of men are taught in their place. In fact, they are more conspicuous by denials than by their affirmations of the Christian faith. They deny the unique inspiration and authority of the Bible, the virgin birth and deity of our Lord, His substitutionary death, His bodily resurrection, His glorious appearing to reign on the earth, the fall of man, and the universal need of regeneration. Salvation with them is a work of character building, and social service is about all the heaven they promise.

"And these denials are supported by their manifest lack of spiritual discernment and power in actual service.

"Is it any wonder, then, that people are asking if God has not left them in their unbelief and gone outside and raised up the Bible schools to be witnesses to His truths?

"If this is true (and who will deny it), the Bible schools have justified their existence. They are in line with God's constant method of dealing with men. And so long as they are true to their call and their opportunity to witness to the truth, they shall prosper in the things of the Spirit. If they ever become 'modernized' in their atti-

tude to the Gospel, they can write 'Ichabod' upon their doors no matter how well they stand with the world."

The Bible institutes, it is true, stand as a protest against the liberal theology taught in not a few of the theological seminaries of our day. But aside from the fact that the Bible institutes, according to their own admission, cannot, for obvious reasons, thoroughly equip their students for larger work in the Church, they, also according to their own admission, do not, after all, stand for a positive Christianity which gives unto man the fulness of God's blessings through the Scriptures and which can, in the end, successfully resist all the onslaughts of the enemies of the Church. Elaborating on the third reason given above for the justification of the existence of the Bible institutes, the Rev. Mr. Clark says: "They do not stand for any particular tenet or polity, but put the emphasis upon the fundamentals of the Christian faith and leave church ordinances and polity to the individual conscience.

"In this way they bring together students of all evangelical denominations to live, study, and work together as one body in the Lord.

"They do not destroy denominationalism, but they encourage feelings of mutual respect, trust, and cooperation among the denominations. The seminaries, with some exceptions, are denominational, and they stand to encourage the denominational spirit."

From these remarks it clearly follows that the Bible institutes are not striving to bring about, on the basis of the Scriptures, real unity in a Church that has been torn asunder by the differing opinions of men. The Bible institutes, we are told, stand for the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. At the same time we are told that the Bible institutes "do not stand for any particular tenet or polity, . . . do not destroy denominationalism, but encourage . . . cooperation among the denominations." This is plain language. But faith in the verbal inspiration of the Bible and denominationalism are exclusive terms. If any one really believes that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God, then, to be consistent, he must for himself take the Bible as it reads and must demand that others do likewise; then there can be no room for the differing opinions of men or, what is the same, for denominationalism.

Denominationalism is not encouraged by the Word of God. The Lord bids us abide by His Word. After St. Paul had reminded Timothy that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," 2 Tim. 3, 16, he continues: "I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom; *preach the Word*; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4, 1—4. Peter complained against those who do not accept the words in Paul's epistles and in the other Scriptures as they read, but

wrested them. He says: "Which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3, 16. The Lord often warns against false prophets. What are false prophets? The Bible describes them to be such as put their own words in the place of God's revealed Word. "Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, Ho saith. Behold, I am against them that prophecy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause My people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." Jer. 23, 31, 32.

How else did denominationalism come into existence, and how else does it maintain its existence, than by departing from the express words of Scripture? A false principle of Scripture interpretation — man interpreting Scripture according to his own reason — has opened the flood-gates for the many differing opinions of men in the Church. Every man has the right of *private judgment*, that is, the right to take his religion directly from the Bible and thus make sure that he gets his religion from God, but no man has the right of *private interpretation*, that is, the right to interpret the Bible according to his own reason.

A writer in the *Watchman-Examiner* recently pointed out that the differences in the Church are the result of a wrong attitude towards the doctrine of inspiration. He calls this the crux of the matter. Very true. The Bible institutes have started out on the right premises, — the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, — but have failed in their practical application of this fundamental truth. Thus in the end they will defeat their own purpose. 'Tis a pity! In fact, by giving denominationalism, or the differing opinions of men, a place in their theological system, they are already "modernized in their attitude to the Gospel."

FRITZ.

The Teaching of Missions in our Seminaries. — Under this heading the *Watchman-Examiner* (March, 1922) writes: "The subject of missionary education in the seminaries deserves more thorough attention than it has yet received. The greatest work of the Church is its missionary task. The pastor is the key to the problem at home, and the missionary is the one who is to win success on the field. Both need more than a superficial training. Probably every one of our seminaries would be prepared to organize a thorough department of missions if financial resources were available. The endowment of a chair of missions at one of our seminaries would be a contribution of incalculable value to the world kingdom of Christ." — While we do not believe in the realization of a "world kingdom of Christ," we recognize the importance of the study of missions in our theological schools, and admit that the importance of this study is not given full recognition, and that both required and elective courses in the principles and methods of missionary activity ought to be arranged at once. However, we cannot help quoting in this connection what a prominent Baptist minister, himself president of a prominent institution of learning in the South, recently wrote to us on this score.

He says: "The greatest trouble is that some of the teachers at our seminaries who are preparing our missionaries for the foreign field do not believe the Bible as the Word of God, do not believe the divinity of Jesus Christ and the atonement. It is my candid opinion that if we send men to the foreign field to do missionary work with no better conception of what Christianity is and what it means to the world, we might as well send a Y. M. C. A. with a moving-picture outfit. I believe that one man, a loyal Christian, consecrated and devoted to the Master and His kingdom's cause, will accomplish more in our foreign fields than a whole band of these half-hearted fellows who are sometimes sent out." The main prerequisite of a Christian missionary in any country and among any people is that he is able to preach the Word of God. MUELLER.

Does the World Need "Reformed Theology"?—Writing editorially, the *Presbyterian* (March 2, 1922) says: "The fundamental difference between the old and new theology he [Dr. C. W. Hodge] finds in the difference between naturalism and supernaturalism. By naturalism he does not merely mean the denial of teleology and the assertion of the mechanical view of the world; he means the 'denial of the power of God to make bare His arm and intrude in the world for man's salvation.' Of such naturalism he says: *This* chiefly, nay, we may say, *this* almost alone, is the false root from which the whole movement of the new theology has sprung."

"Dr. Hodge has the insight to perceive that in meeting this all-embracing naturalism, half-way measures will not suffice us. 'We cannot withdraw into the citadel of our hearts, and suppose that thereby we have saved the Christian religion. We cannot set up an apologetic minimum and hope to defend it and escape with the essence of Christianity from the flood of this naturalistic stream. Only by a bold assertion and adequate defense of the opposite principle—that of *Christian supernaturalism*—can we maintain our common Christian faith.' Now, according to Dr. Hodge, it is in the Reformed theology, and in the Reformed theology alone, that Christian supernaturalism comes to its full rights. Hence the significance of the Reformed theology to-day lies in the fact that it gives us *the only adequate support for supernaturalism against a naturalism which, when it has run its logical course and borne its bitter fruit, not only robs us of a supernatural salvation, but of supernatural Christianity and a supernatural Bible, and which does not stay in its course till it has robbed us of Christ and even of God.*'"

"Dr. Hodge is well aware of the wide-spread revolt against the Reformed theology even in religious circles. This is merely an indication, however, of the extent to which the new theology, whose essence is naturalism, pervades modern religious thought. Men may tell us that the Reformed theology is dead, or at least about dead; none the less, it offers the only standpoint from which we can both defend and propagate our Christian faith over against encroaching naturalism, because in it alone we find the principle of Christian supernaturalism in its purity and thoroughly grounded on an adequate basis. *Whether or no the world wants the Reformed theology,*

it never needed it more than it needs it to-day; and we rejoice that Dr. Hodge promises to give himself whole-heartedly to its exposition and defense."

What has struck us particularly in this editorial is the remark that "Reformed theology offers the only standpoint from which we can best defend and propagate our Christian faith over against encroaching naturalism, because in it alone we find the principles of Christian supernaturalism in its purity and grounded on an adequate basis." We claim that these words are not in accord with the facts. Modern rationalistic theology is, in the main, a denial of universal grace, of the *unio personalis*, the *communio naturarum*, of the vicarious satisfaction which the God-man, Christ Jesus, made for the sins of the whole world, of the power of the Gospel to convert sinners, of the efficacy of the Sacraments as means of grace, etc. These very Scripture-truths are denied not only in Calvin's *Institutiones*, but also in the confessions of the Reformed churches. Hence "Reformed theology," in so far as it stands for a particular type of theology, is rationalistic theology. All the germs of modern rationalistic thought are to be found in the teachings of Zwingli and Calvin. What the world needs to-day is not Reformed theology, but a theology which accepts and proclaims the whole divine counsel of salvation in its truth and purity as taught in the Holy Scriptures. MUELLER.

Was St. Paul a Spiritualist?— In answering this question, the *Watchman-Examiner* (February 23, 1922) says: Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the novelist and creator of "Sherlock Holmes," is, as everybody knows, an ardent spiritualist. It seems that he has been exercising his rare detective gifts in a new direction, with somewhat surprising results. He has just given to an eager and anxious world an outline of what he terms "The New Revelation," in which he announces the discovery of a number of things hitherto hidden from the eyes and minds of most men. For instance, he finds that Paul was a spiritualist; or, at least, that his writings "include every form of mediumship now known, save only psychic photography!" That is certainly a "new revelation"! Some of us have been reading Paul for a good many years and have never suspected that he knew anything about spiritualism or mediumship! But we are a bit concerned about the sad lack of this psychic photography business. We have such a high regard for Paul that we do not want to see him beaten out by any of these dollar-a-shot mediums of the present day. Perhaps if Sir Arthur will look a little harder he may get a still newer "revelation" in which the missing element will be found; all things seem to be possible to the thoroughgoing spiritualist. What nonsense all this is! St. Paul a spiritualist! Anybody who could believe that could believe anything! We would not give a cent to hear or read what Doyle has to say about Paul, but we would give a good deal to hear what Paul would be likely to say about Doyle — and his crowd. MUELLER.

Why Prolong Such an Existence?— We have often wondered why the Evangelical Synod of North America, now that its people are also becoming English in language, should wish to continue to exist as a separate body or denomination. This synod teaches that it

really makes no difference whether one accepts the Reformed view or the Lutheran view of the doctrines in dispute between the Reformed and Lutheran churches. It carries on its work on a basis of fraternity with many of the other denominations of this country. The synod consists of a conglomeration of many heterogeneous elements, and its people therefore could all find homes in one of the different denominations of America. Those who are inclined to be emotional would feel perfectly at home among the Methodists. Those who love ceremony and clericalism and social prestige might join the Episcopalians. Those who are conscientious and wish to be real Lutherans should join the Lutheran churches, and those who are Reformed and wish to abide with the Reformed doctrine could join the Presbyterians. Why hold these people in a separate denomination? What is their *raison d'être*? At last this question has been answered. Dr. Otto Dibelius, in an address, tells these people why they should continue to exist. His words are given in the *Evangelical Herald*, January 5, 1922:—

“One thing is certain, however, that the German evangelical spirit born in Martin Luther, nurtured by the great pious men of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, reborn in Schleiermacher and Richard Rothe, in Wichern and in Bodelschwingh, must not perish and will not perish. Nor must it be lacking in the melting-pot of American Christianity. To foster this spirit, to find the place to which it is entitled over against the Presbyterian-Methodist type which England has brought out, — this seems to me to be the special task of American Protestants of German descent, and therefore also the task of your synod. That your synod has other tasks besides this, above all the task of *warring against the exclusive, petrified Lutheranism of certain American synods*, that I know quite well.”

Oh, the sadness of it!

What a pity that any American or Christian should feel called upon to give his strength, time, and ability to such purposes as these: to propagate the spirit of Schleiermacher and to oppose the orthodox Lutheran Church! And this is the synod which claims to be working for peace among the churches. After all, here is the statement that they are here to war against the “exclusive, petrified Lutheranism of certain American synods.” Who is meant? We, the Missourians, are meant; we have come to be known as “exclusive and petrified Lutherans.” Think of a church whose purpose it is to war against those people who preach the true Word of God and are loyal to the Savior’s words: “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

We give Dr. Dibelius credit for frank speech. Now that this purpose has been thus publicly avowed and published, no one need be in doubt why these people are here and what aim they are pursuing. But should not this avowal open the eyes of the earnest Christians who are in this Evangelical Synod?

SOMMER.

State Control of Education. — Says *Mosby's Missouri Message* (January 13): “Education, be it distinctly understood, is not a natural function of the state. Consequently, its rights in the matter are

merely auxiliary and limited. All efforts to give the state control of education, therefore, are attempts to extend its limitations and to exceed its rights." This was published on Friday the thirteenth: is it the dawn of returning political reason, or the last bright ray of its setting sun? Michigan will help decide the question. D.

"Treason in Text-Books." — Charles Grant Miller has published *Treason to American Tradition*, and an excerpt from this book is scattered throughout our country by an "All America National Committee," to arouse our citizens to the danger of having their national history rewritten and inculcated upon their youth in a British revision. It is surprising that this attempt at forgery for political ends has not been discovered sooner; for the Cole lecturer for 1917 advocated this very enterprise before Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tenn. The Cole lecturer was James A. Macdonald, LL. D., editor of the *Toronto Globe*, and his audience was composed of ardent 100 per cent. Americans. His lecture has since been published, with the title *The North American Idea*. To the American pages 77—82 will be especially illuminating. This movement will not stop at revising our history, but will proceed to more fundamental matters in our national life. The prayer for the preservation of our liberty in our Sunday services is becoming an eminently opportune and practical petition. We may also embody it in the Fourth Petition whenever we pray the Lord's Prayer. D.

Breeding Lawlessness. — All Christians who love their government, pray for it, loyally support its servants in their arduous tasks, and hunger after that righteousness which exalteth a nation, will feel that just censure should be meted out to the resolution by which Truman H. Newberry of Michigan, charged with having obtained his election by bribery, was seated in the Senate of the United States on January 12. The resolution adopted in his behalf is a study in self-contradiction and bold defiance of right. It reads:—

"Resolved, first, That the contest of Henry Ford against Truman H. Newberry be and it is hereby dismissed;

"Secondly, That Truman H. Newberry is hereby declared duly elected senator from the State of Michigan for the term of six years, beginning on the fourth day of March, 1919, and is entitled to his seat in the Senate of the United States.

"Thirdly, That, whether the amount expended in the Michigan primary was \$195,000, — as was fully reported and openly acknowledged, — or whether there were some few thousand dollars in excess, the amount expended was in either case too large, much larger than ought to have been expended; that the expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate, either with or without his knowledge and consent, being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby severely condemned and disapproved."

The third item in the resolution is the sop which the devil throws to virtue. Thus a faithless husband bows decorously to his wife and

walks off with his paramour. Such acts of our lawmakers breed contempt of our laws and established institutions, and are a propaedeutic for anarchy and Bolshevism. D.

Germany. — Pastor P. H. Petersen (*Rundschau*, February 2) draws a comparison between the political and the ecclesiastical condition of Germany. He finds that confusion is the dominant characteristic in both. "Within the State Church all sorts of *Richtungen* are found, to such an extent, that not two ministers are in perfect doctrinal harmony. At the same time these people treat ecclesiastical questions and Lutheranism with a great deal of conceit. A proof of this is offered in *Die Landeskirche*. In this paper Pastor G. Horstmann, under the caption 'Regarding the Confessional Question,' said the following: 'What about the future of the Church? Everybody who knows anything of the history of churches and sects knows how terribly the idea of right works in the end, if it obtains influence in matters of faith. For an illustration I need only point to the history of the Missouri Synod. The Missourians thought that they must protect the pure doctrine by a sharply formulated Lutheran Confession, which they applied in a juridical manner. But the purity of doctrine had hardly been safeguarded in this manner, when, behold, new ulcers began to break out from within the body: still purer doctrinal views forged to the front and caused many splits, because their advocates thought that the old church was not pure enough. That is the curse of wanting to be right, that is ecclesiastical hardening of the arteries, that is the church in a corner (*Winkelkirche*).' I would like to remark regarding the foregoing, that Pastor Horstmann knows neither the history of the Missouri Synod nor its present condition, otherwise he could not have presented the foregoing caricature. If one writes for the public, he ought to know the subject on which he is writing and ought not launch matters into publicity which do not exist anywhere except in his own imagination. As regards the point in question, I might say this: 1. The Missourians have never wanted anything else than the old Lutheran truth as it is presented in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church. The Missouri Synod has nowhere and never set up a new confession. 2. The Missouri Synod, without qualification, stands upon the basis of the Lutheran Confession. It is for this Confession that she waged her battles and is still waging them. This Confession has not been laid down in the form of a law, as in the State Church; for in the Missouri Synod the individual congregations stand united in living communion as representatives of the Lutheran Confession. Every congregation — to state it briefly — is pledged unqualifiedly to the Lutheran Catechism, and tolerates no deviation from it. If you choose to call this juridical, a congregation would calmly accept that term in the consciousness that they themselves have in them sufficient spiritual life to prevent 'hardening of the arteries.' 3. The Missouri Synod is anything rather than 'a church in a corner.'" And now Pastor Petersen exhausts our latest statistics in order to show that the Lutheran Church has extended its operations into nearly all countries of the

world, and that its work is very varied. He proceeds: "And this is to be called hardening of the arteries? This is to be the church in a corner?"—In Schleswig-Holstein a gathering of 600 people professing the old faith from all parts of the province met at Neumuenster on December 1 in order to take a stand on questions which are now engaging the attention of all earnest members of the former State Church. (This church has, in the mean time, joined the German Evangelical Church Federations.) The discussion that took place at this gathering has not satisfied all who took part in the same. While a resolution was passed by which the general convention of the German State Church is to be asked to insert in its new constitution a paragraph satisfying the confessional standpoint of the new church, very many people doubt whether this paragraph will be adopted. One of the speakers, Pastor Clausen, stated: "If conditions in the Church are to improve, everything depends on the pastors' proclaiming the Word of God in truth and purity. The great number of Bible critics (also to be found in a new body) will do this in the future as little as they have done it in the past." For this reason the speaker added that he himself was not satisfied with the proceedings of the convention and that he regards the entire discussion as beating the air, unless the believing circles in Schleswig-Holstein will firmly unite in a new organization. He suggests that these circles meet annually and discuss doctrinal topics. In this way they will soon discover that even the believing circles are not united. *Die Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche* for January 22 remarks rightly that Pastor Clausen does not seem to see that what he is striving for in Schleswig-Holstein has already been achieved in the Free Church of Germany that is true to the Confessions, and deprecates that he still believes it to be his duty to remain in the State Church although he finds it necessary to criticize the same. The editor asks: "How long?"

D.

Russia.—The report published in many of our leading papers, for instance, in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (Sunday morning edition, February 26), which speaks of a Bolshevik propaganda launched by the aid of German universities, should be taken with reserve until definite facts establishing the claim of the writer are offered with his article. The article is sent out copyrighted by the Edward Marshall Syndicate, and charges that "the emperor's countrymen, juggling and terribly dissatisfied with their defeat, are flirting with the Yellows (Mongol tribes) not as a peril, but as a possible salvation. Russia was districted at Berlin, from whence into each district a German agent went, instructed to become a Russian speedily, but promised a small weekly stipend from the German Foreign Office. These agents, placed at the intersections of lines, forming a checkerboard design on the Russian map, were ready when the war broke to begin a campaign of this organization, not only among Russian soldiers, but among those back at home. It did not work at once, but presently it did, and Russia broke. Through all the succeeding disruption and disaster the German organization has remained unbroken. That

very disorder now enables it to work with new effectiveness. The Germans were the instructors of the Red army, and they are the instructors of the Red leaders to-day, as they are the instructors, even the commanders, under Gen. von Eiche, of the army in the *camouflage* republic of Chita, which was unexpectedly shut out of the conference at Washington." It is, of course, possible that German revolutionaries are striving to connect with the most radical elements in Russia and with their aid to seek domination of the entire world. But we shall have to obtain fuller evidence on this matter before crediting syndicated alarm reports. D.

Palestine. — To the League of Nations there was submitted by the British government a draft of its mandate for Palestine which grants to the Jews admittance to the country, the privilege of offering advice and cooperation in social and economic problems, of establishing exclusive Jewish settlements, of acquiring citizenship in Palestine, and of engaging in public works. "Jewish holidays will receive public recognition, and Hebrew will be used officially together with Arabic and English. There are attached such a number of conditions, reservations, limitations and stipulations, that the Zionists are greatly disappointed and displeased, because they expected a charter of a sovereign Jewish commonwealth, for which they had hoped and fought hard, and now they have to be satisfied with a sort of national homestead on the community plan, and are expected to be good neighbors. Palestine is losing its peculiar charm as the Holy Land, whose highways and by-ways reminded the visitor of the manners and customs of by-gone Bible times illustrating sacred history. To a romantic traveler the very thought is almost sacrilegious that Mary and Joseph might have run from Nazareth to Bethlehem on a motor truck in six hours, or that the Lord might have entered Jerusalem in an automobile. The railroads and trolley cars multiply, and there is no merit any more for the pilgrims to acquire since transportation has become so convenient." D.

China. — In an interesting account of the *Lutheran Sentinel* for February 15 we are informed of the rather perilous journey which Rev. Gebhardt, a graduate of our Concordia Seminary, had to perform through the Szechuanese revolutionary army to reach his appointed field of labor at Shihnanfu. The kind protection of Providence was afforded him, and he reached his destination unharmed. During the most perilous times his colleagues, Rev. Schwartzkopf and Rev. Lillegard, went to meet him, and in spite of many handicaps finally reached him through the line of Chinese pickets. Rev. Gebhardt has now gone to labor at Hankow, while Revs. Schwartzkopf and Lillegard have gone to open up the work at Ichang. Rev. Lillegard, who reports these experiences of our brethren, closes his account: "We entreat the prayers of our home church for that measure of quiet and peace which will enable us to do this work unhindered and without interruption." D.