

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

MAY, 1921.

No. 5.

The Endeavor after a Philosophical Faith.*

PROF. JOHN H. C. FRITZ, St. Louis, Mo.

Not human reason, but divine revelation is the source of faith. It is the very nature of faith to accept what God has revealed. The object of saving faith is Jesus, the Lord, the Savior.

"Abraham against hope believed in hope that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. 4, 18—25.

Abraham's faith is set forth in the Scriptures as an example for our faith. The source of Abraham's faith was *not his own reason*. His reason told him that he and Sarah must remain childless. But God said, "So shall thy seed be." That was a wonderful revelation to Abraham. Abraham believed what God had *revealed* to him; he "against hope believed in hope." "He was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform." God's promise was that of the Woman's Seed, the Savior. This promise Abraham believed. The *promised Messiah* was the object of his faith. "This was not written for his sake alone, but for us also."

* A Review of *Die Grundwahrheiten der christlichen Religion*, by Reinhold Seeberg. Seventh edition, 1921. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig and Erlangen. 182 pages, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —

The Teaching of English. *Paul E. Kretzmann, M. A., Ph. D., B. D.*
Vol. III. Concordia Teachers' Library. 118 pages. \$1.00, net.

"Little need be said regarding the value of English as a study. It is the official language of our country, and the ability to speak, read, and write our own tongue with at least some degree of correctness may be expected from every citizen as a matter of course."

The author is quite right in these remarks found in the opening chapter of his book. And the book is designed to be a guide to teachers, so that their pupils will be given at least a good working knowledge of English. We can dispense with many another thing in the school curriculum if our children learn their three R's well. What we like about Dr. Kretzmann's book is that it insists upon practical methods which will have practical results. A more detailed discussion of the book will be in place in a school journal.

Our Synodical Committee, which passed upon the manuscript, highly recommends this latest addition to the Concordia Teachers' Library because of its "wealth of valuable suggestions" and its "mass of pedagogical information, which is the ripe fruit of many years of scholarship and expert criticism."

FRTZ.'

Conservation in Matters Pertaining to the Church. *L. Franklin Gruber, D. D.* Reprint from the *Lutheran Quarterly*, January, 1920. 24 pages.

Dr. Gruber treats a very timely subject. "The need of conservation and of greater constructive statesmanship and generalship in the Church," says Dr. Gruber, "should be apparent to every interested observer."

Much of what the essayist says we can heartily subscribe. Speaking of conservation of men for the ministry, he says: "The Church should not only with great wisdom and tact choose out from among its young men such as might have the appropriate qualifications for the Gospel ministry, but it should implore the great Head of the Church so to direct their minds and hearts as to become laborers in the vineyard."

In these strenuous times in which unusually heavy demands are made upon the ministry, Dr. Gruber arraigns congregations and synodical organizations for overworking some of their men. He says: "There is another phase to the conservation of the individual in the Church, especially the individual pastor and professor. Our Church has often made the mistake of overworking, I had almost said abusing or wasting the powers of, some of its men, especially the ablest."

We are glad that the essayist has not overlooked what he chooses to call "conservation in the ramified machinery of the Church." "In the local congregation," he writes, "organizations, clubs, public gatherings of various kinds, etc., not to speak of various devices to raise money for the congregation, are multiplying so fast that they require so much of the pastor's time, as well as that of a select band of lay-workers, that he is just in that far prevented from developing the more important spiritual and other interests of the congregation, and from acquiring great pulpit power."

To the Church which adopts the world's ways in conducting her sacred affairs Dr. Gruber addresses himself thus: "And how about the mere club spirit of part of the modern Church? And how about the sanctimonious subterfuges on the part of the modern Church to raise money by indirect commercial methods, not to speak of questionable chance and other methods, on the plea that it is for a good cause? Just as if the end justifies the means! . . . The Lord's method is to lay by on the first days of the week, according to the blessings received, to give *directly* to His cause, not by some roundabout method whereby the giver gets something himself . . . and the Lord gets what is left. . . ."

But while Dr. Gruber warns against "converting the Sunday pulpit into a mere lecture platform or an attractive entertainment stage," and would not allow "truth to be disregarded and trampled under foot, as if it made no difference what one believes," and rightly says that "it is becoming more and more apparent that it is largely to the Lutheran Church to which American Christianity must look, and is indeed already beginning to look, as the great bulwark of truth against open and more subtle and insidious onslaughts of error," he not only writes in another part of his essay that "to plant Lutheran churches of the same language, whatever that language may be, right under one another's shadow, simply because of difference of synods, is not only unbrotherly and un-Lutheran, but to all outward seeming un-Christian," but even goes so far as to accord first claim on the non-Lutheran Protestant home mission field to the sects and to speak in favor of a cooperative movement of the various Protestant church-bodies on the home and foreign mission fields. "Although the Lutheran Church," he writes, "is not as such *organically* in this great cooperative movement, we must surely look with favor upon such an application of business principles to the business of the Kingdom."

There is no consistency in Dr. Gruber's position, but a clear indication that he, too, as many others, has become infected with the spirit of indifferentism and has weakened under the pressure of the demand made for church union by disregarding the true unity in the Spirit. The plea for doctrinal purity and for "the Church of the *Conservative* Reformation," however, only then serves its purpose when we also reduce it to practise.

FRITZ.

George H. Doran Co., New York:—

A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ in Its Ecclesiastical Development. Robert S. Franks, M. A., B. Litt. Vol. I: XIII and 449 pages; Vol. II: VII and 443 pages.

This treatise must command the attention of theologians, not only because of its subject-matter, which is the heart of Christianity, but also

because of its thorough workmanship within the various limitations which the author has placed on himself. As regards these limitations, the author has, in the first place, restricted his research to the activity of the incarnate Logos, thus lopping off at the one end the preincarnation activity of the Messiah, and at the other end the operations coincident with the Second Advent of Christ. It has not been possible, however, to exclude all references to Christ before His First Coming and at His Second Coming. In the main, we have here the dogmatic materials grouped in the old terminology under the head "Office of Christ," in its triple aspect of Prophet, Priest, and King. That the term "work" of Christ has not been restricted to the suffering and death of Christ is a decision of the author that will be applauded. We fear the author will meet with less approbation for his second limitation: the exclusion of the Biblical material for the study of the work of Christ. His treatise deals with the *ecclesiastical* doctrine of the work of Christ and is a great dogmatico-historical essay. Not that Bible references are absolutely wanting in this book: that would be simply impossible, because the ecclesiastical doctrine of Christ is practically the understanding which the Church has had of the Christological texts of Scripture, and this understanding has been expressed either in Scripture terms, or has been accompanied by appeals to Scripture. These references the author has noted as historical facts, but has declined to examine them exegetically. However, his work is not on that account a non-committal reporter's tale, or a loosely connected catalog of declarations which the Church or her leading teachers have made regarding the work of Christ. The author tells us that a third self-limitation was suggested to him by his desire to show not only what had been ecclesiastical teaching regarding the work of Christ, but rather in what manner any particular phase of this teaching had been arrived at. His dominant interest is in system and method, and as he believes to have discovered, so he would lead his readers to observe, whether the Church's doctrine regarding the work of Christ has been determined at any time by authority, by reason, or by experience, or by a more or less subtle synergism of two or more of these factors. As a consequence the author has not recorded every spokesman in the Church who has made some statement regarding the work of Christ, but only those who made an effort "to reduce the doctrine to systematic unity." We believe this is what our age calls "scientific method." Of the authors who have made such an effort not all that they have said regarding the work of Christ is specially examined in this treatise, but only those of their literary products which indicate systematic effort. The rest of the writers, from the Apostolic Fathers to the present time, are mentioned, with more or less comment, for the purpose of establishing continuity. The perusal of the treatise thus becomes something like a journey through a territory that is rather hurried through the commonplace sections and is halted at points of extraordinary interest. Thus there are lifted into prominence for us Ignatius among the Apostolic Fathers; Justin among the apologists; Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen among the earlier, Athanasius, the two Gregories, Cyril, and the Damascene among the later Greek theologians; Tertullian, Hilary, and Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, and Gregory the Great among the Latin theologians. The peaks of medieval Christology the author finds in Anselm, Abelard, Bernard,

Rupert of Deutz, Hugo of St. Victor, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, and, near the end of this period, in Duns Scotus, Occam and Biel, and Erasmus. The older Protestant theology the author makes culminate in Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon, and Calvin, but the former two he denominates "reformers," the latter two "theologians." The Post-Reformation period is treated in Vol. II, and the ramifications of Christological teaching, as far as it relates to the subject in hand, are traced in Socinus for Socinianism, and Limborch and Grotius for Arminianism, while Quenstedt and Heidegger are presented as types of the final form of the doctrine on the Lutheran and the Reformed side. (To a comparative study of the Lutheran and the Reformed doctrine a special paragraph of six pages is devoted.) The English branch of the Christological tree in this period is represented by Hooker and Pearson on the one hand, and by Owen on the other. The last part of the treatise — proportionately the greatest in this entire *ensemble* of studies — is devoted to Modern Protestant Theology. We are satisfied with the author's view that the beginnings of this theology lie in England and America, and are represented by Loeler, Chubbs, Butler, and Edwards, while it was in Germany that this type of theology was developed, and there the author assumes the following groups: 1. Steinbart, Kant, and Hegel for the incipient, 2. Schleiermacher for the central stage, which branches out 3. into the liberal and mediating school (Biedermann, Schweizer, Rothe, and Dorner), 4. the Erlangen School (Hofmann, Thomasius, Frank), 5. Ritschlianism (Ritschl, Lipsius, Kaehler). English and Scotch representatives of this theology up to 1860 are Coleridge, Erskine, Maurice, and Campbell; American and English contemporaries with a special tendency are Bushnell, Dale, Westcott, and Moberley.

At the end of a greater historical period the author sums up the dogmatical labor of that period in a "synthesis." Thus after John of Damascus he presents "the Greek synthesis." He finds in the Greek theology two main aspects that are related to one another: "On the one hand salvation is regarded as the direct result of the Incarnation (a) as a divine revelation, (b) as (along with the death and resurrection of Christ) a communication of life to mankind. Through the death and resurrection operates, according to this view, what is implicitly given already in the Incarnation." (I, 95.) The view of the work of Christ as a sacrifice to God or of a price paid to the devil the author treats as a "negative precondition" of salvation in the *via salutis* of the Greeks. The medieval theology the author introduces with a thoughtful paragraph on the development of the doctrine of penance in the early middle ages. This doctrine did indeed overshadow every other teaching of the Church in that age. The synthesis for this period the author begins to *form* after Alexander of Hales, thus: "There is a relative, but not an absolute necessity of the Incarnation and the Passion: all necessity in this matter ultimately depends upon the divine sovereignty. Subject to the divine decree, however, there was a necessity both of the Incarnation and of the Passion. The Incarnation was necessary even apart from the Fall, in so far as man, a creature of sense as well as intellect, needed a revelation to the senses as well as to the intellect. It agrees with this that the Sacraments were necessary even in the state of innocence, in so far as they serve

for the apprehension of grace." (I, 259.) However, in the author's view the medieval synthesis is not perfected until after Aquinas. (I, 298 f.)

To the Lutheran the most interesting part of this study in Christology is Part III, "The Older Protestant Theology" (I, 351—II, 150), and in this part the review of Luther (I, 353—388), Melancthon (I, 401—413), the Formula of Concord (I, 413—422), Quenstedt (II, 74—94), and the parallelization of the Lutheran and the Reformed doctrines (II, 115—120). The author's acquaintance with Luther's writings seems to be limited to the two Catechisms, Cole's translation of *De Servo Arbitrio*, Stange's Collection of the earlier disputations of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, the Commentary on Galatians, and the Dissertation on the Trinity. For the rest of his source material he relies on the citations in Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History*, A. Ritschl's *Justification and Reconciliation*, O. Ritschl's *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, Th. Harnack's *Luthers Theologie*, Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, Seeburg's *Dogmengeschichte*, Koestlin's *Luthers Theologie*, and Beard's *Reformation*. In other words, the author works chiefly with secondary sources. He has completely taken over into his treatise O. Ritschl's view of "the fundamental irrationalism which characterizes Luther's doctrine even in its clearest statements, and which becomes almost its hallmark and distinguishing stamp." But he has immensely weakened the best feature of Ritschl's view, *viz.*, that "the positive origin of Luther's irrationalism is in Scripture itself" by claiming for Luther's "irrationalism" "at least a negative preparation" in Luther's Occamist studies. As his authority for this "negative preparation" he claims Hermelink's recent remark: "From the contradictions of the Occamist theology, and especially of the *Collectorium* of Biel, is to be understood the development of the Reformer." The "preparation," then, which Luther received from Occam simmers down to the fact that Luther *opposed* Occam's teaching, and presumably developed his convictions according to the law by which a person learns from his enemies. But before a person can fight an enemy he must have recognized him as an enemy, and that puts us back to the further question: Who taught Luther that Occam must not be accepted as a guide in Christology? Scripture, of course. The Occamist preparation which Luther received becomes thus very "negative." In transcribing O. Ritschl's five essential features of Luther's doctrine of justification the author has missed the cardinal point in Luther's teaching by accepting (at least seeming to do so) Ritschl's fourth feature: "Faith justifies, in that it is the righteousness of Christ, entirely alien to sinners, but infused into their hearts, and in so far is the ideal fulfilment of the Law." It will be difficult to establish the part in this statement which we have italicized even from Luther's earlier writings. Luther takes the so-called *forensic* view of the justifying act: God pronounces the sinner not guilty. The persons whom God justifies are "the ungodly," and these have in their heart nothing but sin and Christ the Atoner. If God justifies those who have "ideally fulfilled the Law," He does a useless thing; for He justifies a person who is already just. Not even Luther's "irrationalism" can be brought in to explain such a view. Luther never entertained it. It is just as much a myth as his "negative preparation by Occam," as regards Christological teaching. The following state-

ment of the author is good: "In order, properly to understand Luther's principle of justification, and especially its conflict with the preceding Catholic doctrine, the following further points must be noted: (1) Luther reinterpreted the word grace. Grace meant originally for the Greek Church little more than the gift through the Logos of the knowledge of God and of the promise of immortality. Augustine gave it a deeper meaning in so far as he took it to mean, on the one hand, the forgiveness of sin, on the other, and this was the chief idea, the infusion of charity which makes merit possible. For Luther grace is not a quality of the soul, the *gratia creata* of the Schoolmen, which is charity, but God's free unmerited favor to the sinner, shown above all in the forgiveness of sins, which, however, is accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit. (2) Luther also gave a new meaning to faith. From the beginning of the systematic theology of the Church faith had been conceived as in itself belief or acceptance of Christian doctrine especially as embodied in the Articles of the Creed. According to Clement and Origen this faith was but a beginning, and in order to become a free principle of virtue needed to be transformed into knowledge. According to Augustine and the Schoolmen, on the other hand, belief, in order to become saving faith, needed to be informed by love, the principle of merit. Faith is not in Western Catholicism confidence (*fiducia*). According to Lombard (III, 26, A) such *fiducia* belongs to hope based on merit. Hope apart from merit is presumption. For Luther, on the other hand, faith, though presupposing belief of the Articles of the Creed, is essentially *fiducia*, confidence or trust in the mercy of God revealed in Jesus Christ." By this paragraph the author adjusts himself to the true Luther in his teaching on justification, and incidentally helps to break down the view of Luther's "Augustinism," falsely claimed to have been asserted by Luther himself.

Somebody seems to have nodded in the author's sanctum when the following was written: "With Melanchthon we pass from the Reformers themselves to the theologians of the Reformation. *Melanchthon*, like Zwingli, *was a Humanist*." This leaves the Lutheran Reformation without any "theologians"; for Luther, in the author's view, was none, and in passing from Luther to the real theologian, Melanchthon, behold, we are introduced to a Humanist, whose "work it was to unite the traditions of Erasmus and of Luther." The author's meaning, of course, is that Melanchthon entered the reformatory movement as a Humanist, and in the course of time became its chief theological exponent, or, to speak with Loofs, whose *Dogmengeschichte* the author here follows, gave the Reformation "a masterly expression." Melanchthon's *intellectual* antecedents have been correctly stated. His *theology*, however, was obtained from Luther, as the earlier Melanchthon more than once acknowledged. The Melanchthon of the first edition of the *Loci*, and of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, has done genuine theological work. Well does the author say: "The difference between the earlier and the later theology of Melanchthon is seen especially in the change of attitude with regard to the question of authority and reason. In the first edition he thoroughly shares Luther's irrationalism. Christian doctrine is altogether different from philosophy and human reason. Plato and Aristotle have been the ruin of theology in the time of the Fathers and

the Schoolmen, respectively. In the last edition philosophy is, however, at least allowed a usefulness in the explication of theology, and the general attitude towards reason is more favorable." The change in Melancthon which the author has noted, and dilated upon, is a fact; it is, however, not merely a change of theological method, but of the quality of theology. *Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum*, is a good old axiom. Hence, while intending to praise Melancthon, the author really describes Melancthon's growing theological unfitness when he says: "It goes along with this difference that while in the first edition Melancthon intentionally devotes attention only to the practical doctrine of the Reformation, in the last he enlarges his view to take in their metaphysical presuppositions, both theological and Christological. But this procedure again inevitably brings about a more favorable attitude to ecclesiastical tradition. Thus while in the first edition Melancthon expresses his purpose as simply to offer a guide to the study of the Scripture, and tells us that the *Loci Theologici* grew out of lectures delivered on Romans, in the last edition he says that his intention is to gather the doctrine of the Catholic Church on things necessary, as it is handed down in the apostolic literature and the received writers of the Church. In other words, there is an express harking back to ecclesiastical tradition. While Melancthon originally said, 'Besides the canonical Scriptures there are in the Church no genuine writings,' he later refers not only to the Epistle to the Romans, but to Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, John of Damascus, and Lombard. In a word, in Melancthon's later theology the old landmarks submerged by the flood of Luther's revolutionary thought begin to reappear."

The Protestant "synthesis," the author thinks, *emerged* in Calvin, whose *Institutes* the author, following Ritschl, regards as "the masterpiece of Protestant theology," and as "a complete and harmonious expression" of the essential Protestant view. Yet he sees the *completion* of the Protestant synthesis" (a) in the general acceptance of the doctrine of the twofold obedience of Christ, as taught in the Formula of Concord, (b) in the tendency more and more to bring the whole material of the doctrine (including the twofold obedience) under the conceptual scheme of the threefold office."

There is a multitude of other points of interest that cannot be touched upon in this review which has already become unusually extended. Suffice it to add one more remark. The author has declared his purpose in this entire study to be this: "to trace the antecedents of the modern doctrine of Christ. The result of my investigation is to show that this doctrine in its most typical form, as developed by Schleiermacher and Ritschl, is no arbitrary opinion on the subject, but that the whole course of doctrinal development has led to it by an immanent necessity." The reviewer was at first inclined to view this statement as one of the limitations under which the author has performed his work, but it seems on second thought that it is more than that: it is an inward limitation such as is wrought by bias. Schleiermacher is the idol of modern theology. Many have become captivated with his seductive thought and his persuasive style. But this is the first time, we believe, that the assertion has been made that in his Christology the silent growth of two thousand years has burst into flower.

A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig and Erlangen: —

Kirchliche Volksmission. *Dr. Gerhard Hilbert.* Second revised edition. 52 pages. M. 1.

Volksmission und Innere Mission. *Dr. Gerhard Hilbert.* 24 pages. M. .80.

In these two brochures Dr. Hilbert describes the sad religious conditions in the Protestant churches of Germany and suggests a remedy.

"Under the terrible experiences of the war," says the author, "thousands have, no doubt, found their God and have learned firmly to believe in their Lord and Savior; but, perhaps, more, both in the field and at home, did not know what to make of God, and have consciously forsaken the faith of their fathers. . . . Insubordination and unchastity, pleasure-madness and wild concupiscence, laziness and aversion to labor, contempt of all human and divine authority — all that we have, a falling away practically from Christianity as, perhaps, no one in our German nation would have believed it to be possible. We have pagan conditions in the very midst of Christendom. . . .

"There are country churches in the north which often had to omit their services, because not one single churchgoer came! And everybody knows that Sunday after Sunday in the large churches of many of the large cities not more than fifty people attended the services. . . .

"Immediately after confirmation the youth is lost to the church. . . . Our church-work proceeds on the supposition that we already have real congregations. But those who can and will see things as they are agree, we think, that we scarcely have real 'living churches' anywhere."

Quoting Martin Kaehler, the author closes his one brochure with these words: "The deplorable spiritual condition in Germany is to be found mainly in the fact that in Germany real mission-work has never been done. First the Irish monks came and bestowed upon us their pastoral care (*haben uns pastoriert*). The Reformation gave us many a Christian preacher, but no congregations. Now in many districts we have parishes, but no congregations. We must now do the mission-work which ought to have been done long ago."

The manner in which Dr. Hilbert would meet the situation in Germany disappoints us. The purpose of the sermon which is preached in the regular church service, he says, is neither to convert sinners, nor to lead the hearers to a deeper knowledge and better understanding of the Scriptures and to their application to spiritual needs. The sermon in the regular church service, he says, presupposes, as is indicated by the liturgy, that the people who come are Christians who need not be converted nor increase their spiritual knowledge, but who would be *edified*. Therefore, Dr. Hilbert says, "the Church cannot expect, much less ask, that its services be attended by those for whom they are not intended." For these, that is, for those without and also for those within who need to be led to a deeper and better understanding of the Bible, he would hold so-called "Bibelstunden."

The Bible conception of preaching is an altogether different one. Christ says, without restriction or limitation as to time, place, or people: "*Preach the Gospel.*" And Paul, bidding farewell to the elders of Ephesus, says:

"I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel of God.*" And he bids these elders, the preachers of the church at Ephesus, "to feed the Church of God," and he commends them and their people to "God and to *the Word of His grace*, which," he says, "is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." To Timothy the same Apostle writes: "Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." We are sure that Timothy did not understand that in the regular church service he was to preach the Word with restrictions and limitations, but that he was to preach it *so as to supply the needs of his hearers*. And that is the purpose of all preaching and religious teaching, whether in or out of the pulpit.

The "Bibelstunden" which Dr. Hilbert has in mind are similar to the instructions which we give to our adult catechumens. That for the ingathering of those who are without these will serve a real purpose, we, of course, do not deny. Their purpose, however, is not to do something essentially different from what is done by means of the sermon, but to give a quick, systematic, and comprehensive course in Christian doctrine for the purpose of preparing people for membership in the Lutheran Church.

And if we have so-called Bible-classes for young people and adults on Sundays or on other days, we do not have them for the purpose of giving them something essentially different from what we give them in the sermon, but for the purpose of giving them additional opportunities to increase their Bible knowledge.

We fear that Dr. Hilbert resembles the "reformers" before the Reformation, who, indeed, clearly noticed that conditions were not what they ought to have been, who deplored them, and felt the need of a change, *but who failed in their diagnosis and, therefore, also in their remedy*. We fail to read in his brochures that Dr. Hilbert understands that the real trouble in Germany, both before and after the war, is that the Protestant churches of Germany have forsaken the old Gospel of Jesus Christ, and that this has been their ruination and that of their country.

The pure Gospel of Jesus Christ as Luther taught it in Germany and confessed it before the Diet of Worms, that, and only that, is the remedy for the sad condition of the Church in Germany and elsewhere. If Dr. Hilbert and others in Germany will realize this, and then preach and teach this Gospel, the pure Word of God, in sermons and "Bibelstunden," as the opportunity presents itself, he will do the German people a real and much-needed service. For such "Volksmission" we wish him Godspeed! FRITZ.

A Historical Sketch of St. John's Ev. Luth. Church at Alma, Kansas, for its Golden Jubilee. *Pastor F. A. Fischer.* 31 pages. 75 cts.

A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig and Erlangen: —

Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift mit literarischer Beilage: Die Theologie der Gegenwart. One Semester, M. 31.

O. Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden and Leipzig: —

Pastoralblaetter fuer Predigt, Seelsorge und kirchliche Unterweisung.