

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XX.

JULY, 1916.

No. 3.

---

## “HOW OLD IS MAN?”

The antiquity of man is discussed in an article recently contributed by Theodore Roosevelt to the *National Geographic Magazine*.<sup>1)</sup> The article purports to give a brief summary of that which has been ascertained by anthropological science in answer to the question, “How old is man?” and by reason of the distinguished name of its author has received wide attention. Mr. Roosevelt intends to trace the prehistory of man, “the history of his development from an apelike creature struggling with his fellow-brutes.” He refers to a past geologic age, when “man was slowly developing from the half-human to the wholly human,” “from a strong and cunning brute into a man having dominion over all brutes, and kinship with worlds lying outside and beyond our own,” and intends to summarize “all that has been discovered and soundly determined” since Darwin wrote his *Descent of Man*. Mr. Roosevelt refers with undisguised disdain to those who once “disbelieved in the antiquity of man,” and his article leaves no doubt in the reader’s mind that in the opinion of Mr. Roosevelt this disbelief in the evolutionistic thesis concerning the origin and ancestry of man has been amply proven unfounded by the facts. His assertions are made with a calm emphasis, which cannot fail to impress the unsophisticated reader. We are invited to consider “man as he was up to the end of palcolithic times.” “*The records show that man has lived in France for at least 100,000 years.*”

The illustrations which accompany the article add to the

---

1) February, 1916: “How Old Is Man?”

---

## MISCELLANIES.

*IN THE QUINCY DAILY HERALD* for January 16, 1915, there appeared the following:—

The Parents' and Teachers' Association of Franklin School held its regular meeting last evening in the assembly hall of the school. The principal feature of the meeting was an address by Rev. Theodore Walz, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church.

## VIEWS OF REV. WALZ.

The address of Rev. Walz is given in detail because it touches a question of vital importance to all persons interested in the public schools. The following are the Lutheran pastor's views as expressed last night:—

"I am with you this evening to talk to you on the subject of 'Religion and the Public Schools.' The subject is a vast one, one that cannot be covered in a brief address. Fortunately, that is not my duty this evening, but I am simply to have a heart-to-heart talk to you on this matter.

"Lutherans, the Evangelical Churches, and the Roman Catholics maintain parochial schools. The Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church has over 1,000 teachers and 100,000 scholars. Many people are under the impression that Lutherans maintain their schools merely for the perpetuation of the German language. This is a mistake. It is true, Lutherans prize the German language highly, the language of Luther. It stands second to none. Even Longfellow acknowledged that. And its magnificent literature is the pride of the Germans, as its scholars are among the best teachers and thinkers of the world. But to maintain a school for the simple reason of propagating a language is outside a Christian congregation's sphere of action.

"There are others who seem to believe that Lutherans maintain parish schools out of antagonism to the public schools. Wrong again! Why, after confirmation many of our Lutheran children go to the public school. That does not show a spirit of antagonism, does it?

"Let me add: It is not the duty of the parochial school to compete in all things with the public school. No; its position is, and should be, this: First and foremost religion! I say, this first of all; but if, when this is attained, pupils of the Lutheran parochial schools still can well get along in the high school, all honor to the teachers! They have done more than their duty.

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPLENDID WORK.

"What is the attitude of Lutherans over against the public schools? We believe that the public schools are necessary institutions, doing splendid work. We are not blind to the fact that prominent men and women are exerting wholesome influence to enhance the efficiency of the public school. We cheerfully pay taxes for its maintenance. But our praise and appreciation of the public schools must and does cease at once, and we are compelled to antagonize them, when they make attempt to do that which the Constitution of our country and the State law forbid—the imparting of religious in-

struction to the children. Our public schools must be entirely non-religious. The education they are to give is one of the intellect, but not of the heart; they are to feed the head, but not the soul.

"How did that come about? Let us trace it briefly. You know that the whole common school system, as we have it everywhere to-day, is due to Luther's Reformation, — to Luther. Luther's Reformation firmly established a system of common schools for imparting religious instruction to the children. Now, wherever the influence of the Reformation went, with it went that religious school system. The Colonial Lutherans established religious schools here immediately after they had erected a church. I remind you of the Salzburgers, in Georgia, 1734. The Puritans, 1620, did the same. We hear so much of the three R's to-day. The original is the four R's, reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and religion. Why, for a long time the only textbooks from which to learn to read were the Bible and the catechism. But I must make a long story short. As time went on, we severed our connection with the mother country, a new Constitution was adopted, and one of its jewels is the First Amendment, granting complete separation of Church and State. This principle involves that religious instruction must be barred from the public schools.

#### CHURCH AND STATE SEPARATE.

"That Church and State shall be and remain separate, that civil authority shall have no jurisdiction over human conscience, that the Church shall take care of spiritual things, and leave the State and civil things alone, is in harmony with the Scriptures. The separation of Church and State, religious liberty, is guaranteed to our Republic in these words: 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' The prerogative of religious instruction is in the home and the church, and it must remain there. The public schools are doing their part, in their legitimate way, and they are doing all they can do. It is for the home and the church to do their part, in their legitimate sphere, and to do all they can.

"Says one: 'Parents are not doing their duty; they are not bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Sunday-school, blessed institution that it is, reaches only a corner of the field. Multitudes of children are dying or growing up without being brought to the knowledge of Christ. Countless children slip away from the Sunday-school, never becoming church-members, owing to the fact that religion soon ceases to interest and appeal to them.' Granted! What are you going to do about it? Ask the Government if it cannot do something in the matter? Ask

the public school if it cannot do something to promote the religious education of the people? Hands off the public school!

"The public schools shall not teach religion, for that would mean the mingling of Church and State. They can promote the moral, but not the religious education of the children. When a public school teacher says to her scholars, 'It is wrong to kill, to steal,' she is not necessarily teaching religion. The State law forbids murder and theft. But if she adds, 'Thus says the Lord God,' she then and there becomes a teacher of religion; she joins together what God has put asunder, Church and State. It is not for the State to expound the Word of God. It is not for the State to give answer to the question, 'What shall I do to become and remain a Christian? What shall I do to be saved?' But it is for the State to give answer to the question, 'What shall I do to become and remain a useful and law-abiding citizen?'

#### ATTEMPTS TO TEACH RELIGION.

"We cannot but view with concern the attempts which are made to override this fundamental law of our land, the separation of Church and State. There are schools in which portions of the Bible are read each morning. In addition to reading the Bible, the Lord's Prayer is recited audibly in concert under direction of the teachers. During school-hours sacred hymns are sung by the pupils. During such exercises the pupils are required to rise in their seats, fold their hands, and bow their heads. These exercises are in violation of the State law, because they are devotional exercises, and violate the right of free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship. One does not enjoy the free exercise of religious worship who is compelled to join in any form of worship.

"What is worship? Webster's Dictionary says: 'The act of paying divine honor to the Supreme Being.' Worship includes prayer, praise, thanksgiving. Prayer is always worship. Reading the Bible and singing may be worship. 'Rock of Ages,' 'There is a Fountain Filled with Blood, Drawn from Immanuel's Veins,' are devotional hymns of religious joy and praise for the flood of grace flowing from the cross on Calvary. Now, if children are required to join in the acts of worship against their consent and against the wishes of their parents, they are deprived of the freedom of religious worship guaranteed to them by the Constitution. The wrong arises, not out of the particular version of the Bible, or the form of prayer, or the particular songs sung, but out of the compulsion to join in any form of worship. The free enjoyment of religious worship includes freedom not to worship.

"I ask: What right have the teachers of the public school to compel the children of Roman Catholics to read the King James Version of the Bible? No more than a Catholic public school teacher would have to compel Protestant children to read the Douay Bible. What right has a teacher to teach her pupils a religious doctrine different from that which they are taught by their parents? What right has the State to teach the child of the Jew the Lord's Prayer? The Jew denies that Christ is the Messiah, and regards Him as an impostor. Is it right to compel his child to read daily from the New Testament, every chapter of which holds up Christ crucified as the Savior of the world? What right has the public school to compel the child of a Unitarian or a Christian Scientist to sing a song that treats of Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God and Savior of men? If their children may be compelled to listen to, and learn, the Gospel of Christ, the Savior, the same law will authorize them to compel our children to learn the doctrines of Unitarianism and Christian Science. Our Constitution has wisely provided against any such contest by excluding sectarian instruction altogether from the school.

#### ALL SHADES OF RELIGION.

"Clinging with utmost tenacity to this invaluable temporal possession, the separation of Church and State, zealous to retain for ourselves and our children the blessing of religious liberty in the fullest and truest sense of the term, we say: The public school shall not teach religion. And let me add: It cannot teach religion, at least not the true, the Christian, religion. All shades of religious opinions are represented in this country. It is utterly out of the question to attempt to teach the particular doctrines of any denomination or dogmatic theology of any kind. Even if Protestants could agree on some ground, which is improbable, what kind of a conglomerate would that be which would be acceptable alike to Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, and agnostics? It would not be the Christian religion. The thing is inconceivable. Even an attempt to introduce such religious education into the public school would be disastrous.

"In certain quarters of the Church it is claimed that the State ought to contribute a portion of the school fund for the support of the parochial schools. Lutherans answer, 'We do not want a cent of public money for Lutheran schools,' and we are opposed to a division of the school fund, because it is beset with dangers to religious freedom. The Constitution, Article 8, Section 3, prohibits the appropriation of any public funds in aid of any Church or sectarian

purpose, or for the support of any school, academy, college, or university controlled by any Church or sectarian denomination.

“In 1876, General Grant feelingly said: ‘If we are to have another contest in the future of our national existence, the dividing line will not be the Mason and the Dixon’s, but between intelligence and patriotism, and ignorance and ambition. Let us labor for free press, free speech; keep Church and State distinct. Let not one dollar appropriated for education be given over to sectarian schools.’

“And to Grant’s sentiment all true Americans, from the lakes to the gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, will say Amen, and Amen.”

---

*REV. A. BOTT*, of Chicago, communicates the following excerpt, which he copied from the Bible published by John Murphy Co., 44 N. Baltimore St., Baltimore, Md., and 70 Fifth St., New York, printers to the Holy See:

THE  
HOLY BIBLE  
Translated from the Latin Vulgate.

- - -  
APPROBATION  
of  
HIS EMINENCE JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,  
Archbishop of Baltimore.

- - -

We hereby approve of the publication by Messrs. John Murphy Co. of the Catholic Bible, which is an accurate reprint of the Rheims and Douay edition with Dr. Challoner’s Notes.

The sacred volume is printed in an attractive style.

Baltimore, September 1, 1899.

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

- - -  
PREFACE.

At the earnest solicitation of large numbers of the religious bodies and laity, we herewith beg leave to introduce to the public a most convenient edition of the Sacred Scriptures, approved by his Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, whose recommendation we herewith append.

The Sacred Scriptures form a part of divine revelation, the other part being contained in the depository of the Church, and designated as the unwritten Word of God.

This distinction is most happily found couched in the language of St. Paul (2 Thess. 2, 14): “Wherefore, brethren, stand fast, and

hold the traditions which ye have learned, whether by word or by our epistle." The Apostle of the Gentiles thus gives precedence to the unwritten Word of God presented to man by the Church, whilst she, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, assumes the office of sole interpreter of the written Word, thereby rendering her the sole guardian of the deposit of divine revelation in its twofold form.

On the written revelation it is highly appropriate that we should here address a few remarks to our readers.

As the book about to be once more presented to the public in a new form claims for itself an origin exclusively divine, we deem it not out of place to furnish, in outline at least, the grounds of that claim.

The work is divided unequally into two parts, *viz.*, the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament is a record of God's relations with man antecedently to the advent of the incarnate Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. The New Testament contains a compendium of the lives of our Savior and His Apostles, as recorded by the Evangelists and other Apostles.

As to the first part, or Old Testament, the version always recognized by the Church contains many more books than that used by other than Catholics. The reason of this discrepancy is that the Church's version, the Septuagint, the Greek translation from the original Hebrew, and which contained all the writings now found in the Douay Version, as it is called, was the version used by the Savior and His Apostles and by the Church from her infancy, and translated into Latin, known under the title of Latin Vulgate, and ever recognized as the true version of the written Word of God.

Hence the Old Testament, containing as it does all embraced in the Septuagint, is not only genuine and authentic, but having the approbation of our Savior and His Apostles, who quoted it exclusively whilst on earth, has superadded to it the supreme character of divine inspiration, which it possesses to the exclusion of all other versions. It stands, therefore, before the world as the sole claimant for integrity, genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration; in a word, as the possessor of every attribute necessary to constitute what no other work can lay claim to, *viz.*, a divinely inspired volume.

Of the genuineness and authenticity of the more recent part of this sacred Book, *viz.*, the New Testament, there exists no doubt; but as to its inspiration the gravest doubts may exist unless an infallible witness thereof can be produced. Whatever grounds may exist vouching for the inspiration of the Apostles as writers, no security whatsoever can be forthcoming for the inspiration of the quotas

furnished by Sts. Mark and Luke, the former the writer of a Gospel, the latter also the writer of a Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles; these quotas, forming a prominent part in the composition of the New Testament, remain uninspired, their authors not being Apostles. The only solution to this difficulty is to be found in the testimony of the Church of Christ, which He commands to "hear," and against which He pledges Himself that "the gates of hell cannot prevail." Her decision, by virtue of the guaranty of her Founder, exalts the New Testament to the dignity of a divinely inspired production, and as she vouches also for the divine character of the Old Testament, we submit to our readers a work that, alone of all publications, comprises, with all the evidences of infallible certitude, the only divine production on earth. The Church of Jesus Christ, by virtue of her divinely endowed infallibility, vouches for the divine origin of the Sacred Scriptures, and as such we respectfully, but confidently, submit them to the public.