

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1899.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

COSMOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ANTHROPOLOGY.

God created man in his own image.¹⁾ The creation of man was a part, the closing part, of the six days' work of creation. On the day of which the inspired record says, "And the evening and the morning was the sixth day,"²⁾ God, according to the same account, created man.³⁾ Man is not a product of spontaneous generation, not a result of a long continued process of evolution, but a distinct work of God, made at a definite period of time, and not a rudimentary work, but a complete and finished work.⁴⁾ This work of God was from that first day of its existence *man*, not a cell, a microbe, a saurian, an ape, but man, created according to the will and counsel of God. It was the triune God who said, "*Let us make MAN*,"⁵⁾ and God created *MAN*.⁶⁾ As the human individual, even in its embryonic state is at all times essentially human, so the human race never passed through a state of brute existence or through

1) Gen. 1, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1, 26.

6) Gen. 1, 27.

measure as to shut out the assiduous and active concern of the congregation in behalf of its young people. The backwardness of the young people of the congregation in making the interests of the congregation at large their own may often be in a measure due to the backwardness of the congregation at large to make the interests of the young people their own. Let the congregation show that the young people are worth something to their superiors in years, who manage the affairs of the church, and the probability will be enhanced that the interest of the young people will be enlisted for such affairs of the church long before they will accede to their management. And the performance of this duty of the congregation should also be conducted methodically and with the employment of proper ways and means; and hereof also a word or two may be said in a later chapter.

A. G.

RELIGION.

A lecture delivered before the Lutheran students of the Missouri State University.

Religion is the living relation of man to his god, wherein or whereby man is or endeavors to be at peace with his god; and the practice of religion is the exercise of the rights and the performance of the duties proper to such relation. This relation was concreated in man as he came from his Maker's hands. In his primeval state man lived in union and communion with his God and held converse with him in perfect peace. By the fall man's relation to God was changed. Instead of appearing before God to serve him in true holiness, fallen man went into hiding before God, with fear and an evil conscience in his heart. But fallen man was still man, a human being endowed with

reason and will and a moral and religious sense, not a brute void of all knowledge of a being infinitely superior to himself. Of all the heathen nations, even those in an advanced state of corruption, St. Paul says: "*That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.*"¹⁾ That religion is a mark of distinction between man and brute has been unwillingly acknowledged even by such as deny a specific difference between man and brute, claiming that man is a product of a process of evolution extending through ages, whereby a higher type of animal was developed from lower forms of animal life and organization. In their search after the missing link between man and brute these materialists endeavored to find some tribe of human beings with nothing that might deserve the name of religion in any sense, or in other words, some specimen of humanity human in form but void of this criterion which distinguishes man from brute. Of course they failed in their endeavors, though now and then a howl of exulting joy went up when in some remote wilderness some degenerate specimen of humanity was discovered, which, on a superficial view, appeared to show no vestige of religion. I quote the testimony of Dr. Brinton, Professor of American Archaeology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania, himself a pronounced evolutionist, who holds that man in his primeval state was far beneath even the most degraded savage now living on the face of the earth. In his book, "*Religions of Primitive Peoples,*" he says:—

"The fact is that there has not been a single tribe, no matter how rude, known in history or visited by travelers, which has been shown to be destitute of religion under some form.

1) Rom. 1, 19. 20.

"The contrary of this has been asserted by various modern writers of weight, for example by Herbert Spencer and Sir John Lubbock, not from their own observation, for neither ever saw a savage tribe, but from the reports of travelers and missionaries.

"I speak advisedly when I say that every assertion to this effect when tested by careful examination has proved erroneous." pp. 30 and 31. And again:

"No opinion can be more erroneous than the one sometimes advanced that savages are indifferent to their faiths. On the contrary, the rule with very few exceptions is that religion absorbs nearly the whole life of a man under primitive conditions from birth to death, but especially during adult years his daily actions are governed by ceremonial laws of the severest, often the most irksome and painful characters." pp. 37 and 38.

In a later chapter he goes into detail and asserts that prayer is "a very prominent and high universal element in primitive religions." Among the savages of Terra del Fuego the seekers after the missing link had found types of humanity as nearly answering their ideal as anything they had anywhere discovered. But Dr. Brinton says:

"Some writers have claimed that certain tribes have been found without a notion of appeal to unseen agencies and have quoted the Yahgans of Terra del Fuego and the Mincopies of the Andaman Islands. But closer examinations prove that the priests of the Yahgans call upon a mysterious being, Aiapakal, and other invisible existences, and the Mincopies are acknowledged to have prayers at the present time." p. 104.

And of religion as a mark of distinction between man and what he calls the lower animals the author says: "It is the only trait in which he is qualitatively separated from them." p. 36.

While, however, it is certain that man at all times and everywhere has distinguished himself from brutes by what

may and must in some sense be called religion, it is equally certain that religion as it exists and is practiced among men is not everywhere the same, but that a great variety of religions has existed and still exists among the tribes and nations of man. And here the question arises: Is there among all the multitudes of various religions practiced on the face of the earth one which, as distinguished from all the rest, is the true religion, while all the rest are false? You have probably heard a certain story found by Lessing in the *Decamerone* of Boccaccio and embodied in his drama "*Nathan der Weise*," the story of the three rings, two or all of which were imitations of a certain precious heirloom handed down in a certain family, until the last possessor of the jewel, in order to avoid open discrimination in favor of one of his three sons and against the others, employed an artist to make imitations of the original rings, and the likeness was so perfect that ever after it was impossible to determine which of the three, if any, was the genuine ring. Thus, argues Nathan, it is with the various religions. No man can tell which is true and which is false, or whether the original true religion is at all extant. The same argument is advanced by many to-day. All religions, we are told, are good in their way, and all that is required of man is to be honest in the exercise of religion which is his by choice or heredity. Frederic the Great of Prussia declared in one of his marginal notes that in his kingdom every man might be saved according to his own fashion.

But Nathan's argument has several very serious flaws, one of which is that the various religions are not, as the rings of the story, so much alike that they can not be distinguished from one another. In fact, the differences among the various religions are so great that among many the points of distinction are far more numerous and radical than the points of resemblance upon which their being classed as religions in some sense may be based. And here again a question forcibly presents itself. It is this: Do we find

among all the numerous religions one which is so thoroughly and fundamentally distinct from all the rest that, while they may be variously classified, this one is *sui generis*, differing from all religions in its nature and in its fundamental principles? This question must be answered in the affirmative. There is one and only one religion which differs from all the rest not only in degree but in kind, not only in some incidental points but fundamentally, not only as green and blue, but as white and black and as yea and nay. There is one which emphatically and uncompromisingly affirms what all the rest deny, and as emphatically and uncompromisingly denies what all the rest assert, as the ruling principle of religion.

We have defined religion as the relation between man and his god, wherein and whereby man is or endeavors to be at peace with his god, and there is no religion which does not in some way come under this definition. Religion is at all times and everywhere on earth a relation between man and his god. The denial of God is also the denial of religion, just as truly as the denial of that which is specifically human in man. But the denial of the specific difference between man and brute is ultimately prompted by the same motive which underlies the denial of God. If man is not truly man, or God is not truly God, the relation between man and God is no longer possible, and that relation is the relation of an inferior to a superior, a sinful creature to a righteous ruler and judge. But while man is man and God is God, the leading interest of man is to be at peace with God, and this is the scope of all religions. How man is to be and to remain at peace with God, is the question to which every religion must endeavor to provide an answer. Or, since man in his present state is sinful and God is righteous, the question is in other words, how can man, the sinner, be saved? And now when we enquire of all the various religions what answer they have to give to this question, we find that one religion, the Christian religion,

clearly and distinctly teaches and firmly maintains that peace between God and man is established by God alone, or in other words, that man can be saved by God and by God only. In direct opposition to this answer and to the Christian religion, of which it is a fundamental principle, we find all other religions agreed in teaching and firmly maintaining that peace between God and man must be established by man, or in other words, that man can, and ultimately must, work out his own salvation.

If any thing is clear at all it is this, that the two principles here stated are not only different from, but in direct contradiction with, each other, and that if the one is true the other must necessarily be false. The difference between the Christian religion and all other religions is far more thoroughgoing than that between Homoeopathy and what has been called Allopathy in medicine, between the Republican party and the Democratic party in politics, between the Copernican system and that of Ptolemy in astronomy. Christianity is the religion of salvation by the grace of God; all other religions are religions of salvation by the works of man. The Christian religion is based upon and determined by the truth that *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,*¹⁾ that *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have everlasting life,*²⁾ and that there is no salvation in any other than Christ, the son of God; *for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,*³⁾ that a man *is justified by faith without the deeds of the law,*⁴⁾ and that *being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.*⁵⁾ Of all this there is no vestige in any other religion, while on the contrary all other religions are based upon and determined by the maxim, that by doing right and bringing

1) 2 Cor. 5, 19.

4) Rom. 3, 28.

2) John 3, 16.

5) Rom. 5, 1.

3) Acts 4, 12.

sacrifice and practicing selfdenial, or in some way conforming himself to his god, man may and must propitiate his god in order to enjoy his benefits and forego his displeasure. Thus, also, all other religions have human priests to intercede between man and his god, while the Christian religion has only a high priest who is God himself and higher than the heavens.¹⁾ And again of the person and work of this divine High Priest, *who is of God made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption,*²⁾ all other religions are profoundly and totally ignorant, having no place for him anywhere. The Christian voices forth his religion in words of sacred song as these,

Not the labor of my hands
Can fulfill the law's demands.
Should my zeal no respite know,
Could my tears forever flow,
All for sin could not atone,
Thou canst save, and thou alone.

There is no religion besides Christianity which has anything to place side by side with these lines, and if they were to be adapted for use at any temple or at any shrine of any heathen religion, they would have to run something in this wise:

By the labor of my hands
I must meet the law's demands.
Let my zeal no respite know,
Tears, and blood of victims flow,
That for sin I may atone;
This can save, and this alone.

Such strains as these would present heathenism at its very best. We know that other sentiments than these have resounded in heathen temples and sacred groves, that voluptuous songs accompanied voluptuous practices, orgies, the mere description of which would drive the blush of shame

1) Hebr. 7, 26.

2) 1 Cor. 1, 30.

over a modest face. Thus did the prophets and priests of ancient Greece picture their fabled paradise on high Olympus as a pandemonium of vice, ascribing to the menagerie of gods supposed to be assembled there all manner of sins conceivable, adultery and rape, murder and theft, drunken brawls and noisy wranglings, falsehood and deceit, and even practices which must not be so much as named where decency is at home. The purpose of all this is easily explained. For if the gods themselves indulged in iniquity and vice as gross as any which pollute the earth, then man, however sinful he may be, might feel himself not only justified in such lusts and works of the flesh, but even pride himself with being all the more in the likeness of the gods the more his life and conduct resembled or equaled theirs. And thus man might feel himself at peace with God, not only in spite of, but by virtue of, his sin, which would not separate him from, but unite him with, the gods. This is the true solution of all the abominations pictured in heathen mythologies and practiced in heathen cults. Thus were and are the devotees of false religions occupied in working out their own salvation, either by works of a selfconstituted righteousness as bloated Pharisees, and by sacrifices even to the offering up of their own children in the fiery arms of Molech, or in works of wantonness and debauchery teeming and reeking with the filth of sin, even to bottomless depths of grossest immorality. And now behold once more in sharp contrast with all this the one true religion, Christianity! It is the relation of a holy people to a holy God, who himself has saved his people from sin to walk before him in true holiness and to serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness.

But to still another remarkable and noteworthy consideration I would direct your attention. Wherever and whenever the Christian religion was assailed by, or contaminated with, error, it was in every or nearly every instance with a view of disestablishing the fundamental and

distinctive truth of Christianity, or to establish the opposite and distinctive fundamental error. When Arius denied the divinity of Christ, the attack was directed against the heart of Christianity, and if his heresy had prevailed over the faith and doctrine of the church, Christianity would have ceased to exist as the church which holds and teaches that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and Arianism would have been but an addition to the number of religions which, knowing of no divine Savior, leave man to save himself if he can. When Pelagius taught that man by proper application might fulfill the commandments of God, that heresy was calculated to render a divine Savior superfluous, and a consistent Pelagian religion would again be but another addition to those religions which make man his own savior. The church of papal Rome is contaminated with false doctrine chiefly and most grievously in this very point that it denies the sufficiency of Christ's vicarious atonement and justification by faith alone without the works of the law. Thus the Council of Trent in the canons of its sixth session (1547) has delivered itself in terms as these:

“Whoever affirms that the ungodly is justified by faith only, so that it is to be understood that nothing else is to be required to cooperate therewith in order to obtain justification, and that it is on no account necessary that he should prepare and dispose himself by the effort of his own will: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ or remission of sin to the exclusion of grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts and adheres in them, or that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy by which sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, or that it is that confidence only by which we are justified: let him be accursed.”

It is evident that these statements are not Christian but unchristian and antichristian, denying that fundamental truth of Christianity that God alone saves sinners for Christ's sake only, by faith alone, which is the gift of God, and not by works or any cooperation or contribution on the part of man. On the contrary, every heathen or Mohammedan could and would quite consistently join in these anathemas hurled against the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, thus showing that these antitheses are in full keeping with, and of the nature of, the fundamental doctrine of all false religions in which they all agree, the doctrine of man's working his own salvation. Thus again, when rationalistic theologians and their followers in modern times, some of them in glowing terms, pictured Christ as the Savior of mankind inasmuch as he had set to the world a sublime example of love, noble, self-sacrificing love, in order that by following his example we might be well-pleasing in the sight of God and prepared for life everlasting, such teaching and any practice of religion shaped according thereto was not in any true sense of the word Christian, but essentially unchristian. For the salvation thus taught and sought was again not salvation by the grace and power of God, but salvation by the zeal and works of men, working out their own salvation. And when in our day there are many who claim that their religion is the religion of the Golden Rule: "*All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,*"¹⁾ these people by their profession declare themselves to be no longer Christians in any true sense of the word, but adherents of a religion diametrically opposite to Christianity. For that Golden Rule, golden as it is, was never intended to be a summary of Christianity, never meant by Him who spoke it as a light to show the way of salvation, and those who would make it their creed grossly abuse it and pervert its true meaning, and by such

1) Matt. 7, 12.

perversion set themselves down as ignorant of the very first principle of the Christian religion, that religion which is not based upon and determined by anything that we should do to God or our fellowmen, but what God has done for us and is still doing toward our salvation.

Thus, then, we understand that there is one religion on earth, the Christian religion, which differs fundamentally in its leading and governing principle from all other religions, affirming what they deny and denying what they affirm. It is, therefore, palpably improper to look upon the Christian religion as one of a numerous sisterhood of religions, differing from them, perhaps, in having and shedding forth more light of religious truth than they, while on the other hand it might borrow from them certain rays of light of which it were itself destitute. The difference between Christianity and all other religions is not the difference of more truth and less truth, but the difference between truth and error, true religion and false religion, the religion of life and salvation and a host of religions without life and salvation. The Christian religion on the one side and all the rest on the other can not be true at the same time. Either the material principle of all religions except Christianity is right; then Christianity of all religions alone is wrong. Or the material principle of Christianity is right, and then all other religions are wrong. But that a religion which would lead or prompt man to work his own salvation is of necessity vain, even the light of reason may discern, and is proved conclusively even by a single argument, the argument taken from the universality of sin. A sin committed is a sin everywhere and can nowhere be anything but sin. Now, then, if it is true what Paul says, that *all have sinned and come short of the glory of God*, Rom. 3, 23, and what St. John says, "*If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves*," 1 John 1, 8, and what Seneca says, "We are all wicked; what one blames in another he will find in his own bosom; we live among the wicked, our-

selves being wicked," and what Ovid says, "We strive after that which is forbidden," and what every man's conscience will tell him, that he is not free from sin, then every religion which leaves it to man, the sinner, to make his peace with God and work his own salvation is certainly a religion without salvation and leaves man under the curse as long as the wages of sin is death, which is forever. On the other hand, that Christianity knows and shows a way of salvation is a matter of certainty, but of the certainty of faith, by which we have and enjoy *the peace of God which surpasseth all understanding*, Phil. 4, 7. And herein again the true religion differs from every false religion, the latter being the religion of natural man, the former, the religion of regenerate man.

In view of all this it is only by ignorance or unmindfulness of the radical difference between the two kinds of religion, it is, in fact, preposterous that any man should place Christianity in a line with all the other religions of our day, calling upon the representatives of the Christian church to meet as on equal ground with the representatives of Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism and Unitarianism and to join hands with them in the religious elevation of mankind. Truth can never go hand in hand with error without denying itself, and Christianity can work the religious improvement of mankind, not by joining hands with other religions, but by openly and frankly and uncompromisingly combating the errors with which they are fraught, especially the fundamental error of man's salvation by his own exertions and works. The duty of the Christian religion is not to improve other religions but to overthrow them in the hearts of men and to do what is in its power to make true Christians of Mohammedans and unbelieving Jews and followers of Buddha and Confucius and all adherents to false religions of any kind and name. And the means whereby this duty must be performed and this end may be achieved is above all the promulgation of the cardi-

nal truth of the Christian religion, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and that there is salvation in Christ alone, there being none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

There is, however, still another point which I will recall from what has been said. I have pointed out a number of instances in which the Christian religion has been and is to-day encroached upon and contaminated in doctrine and practice by elements foreign to its nature and at variance with the cardinal truth whereby it is distinguished from all other religions. In other words, Christianity is not everywhere pure and unadulterated Christianity, and in some cases what passes for Christianity is not Christianity at all, but a craft sailing under false colors. Thus, Unitarians are in religious statistics and elsewhere frequently classed with the Christian churches, while it is evident that a religion which has discarded the doctrine of the divinity of Christ the Savior can not be that religion which stands and falls with the divine Redeemer of mankind, Christ, the Son of God, the Savior of sinners. In other cases the cardinal doctrine of Christianity is still the doctrine of a church, but false doctrine, and especially the doctrine of salvation by works and human cooperation, dwell under the same roof and are likewise recognized as truths and preached from the same pulpits. These churches are still Christian churches, in which souls are saved by the saving truth they teach and profess. But they are contaminated churches, inasmuch as they harbor false doctrines contrary to such saving truth. In view hereof it is no more than proper to ask: Is there among the Christian churches one church which represents the Christian religion unalloyed and unadulterated, in perfect purity? There are those in our day who will answer this question by an emphatic "No." They would call it vain presumption to claim this prerogative for any one particular church among the many who bear the Christian name.

But here we must remember that there are not a few who likewise put it down as vain presumption to claim for the Christian religion the prerogative of being the only true religion, or perhaps even to point out Christianity as the favored one among a family of sisters. And yet besides the reason already shown there is still another reason why the Christian religion may justly claim the prerogative of being the one and only true religion among all the religions of the globe. Christianity holds, beside the fundamental principle that salvation is of God alone, which is its material principle, another fundamental principle, its formal principle, which is that religious truth also is of God alone. The second principle is in full and perfect keeping with the first. If it is man's business to save himself and to make his peace with God, it is, of course, likewise man's business to find out the way and devise the means of working a reconciliation between himself and God. But if, as Christianity maintains, God, and he alone, is the Savior of sinful man, it is but consistent that it must rest with God to devise his plan of salvation and the means of its execution, and that if man should be made cognizant of such plan and execution and enjoy the benefits thereof, God must reveal to man his counsel of salvation and authoritatively proclaim and promulgate the peace which he has established between himself and man and furnish forth and administer the benefits accruing from such peace. This is even more highly consistent than that the physician and not the patient should prescribe the medicine and give the directions for diet and regimen calculated and intended to work a cure in physical disease. Thus, then, the material principle and the formal principle of Christianity must necessarily go together. Christianity is, and by its very nature must be, a revealed religion. And, furthermore, since Christianity is the only religion of the nature described above as distinguished from all other religions, Christianity is also, as distinguished from all other religions, the only revealed religion. Modern Judaism, as

distinguished from, and opposed to, Christianity is what it is, not by, but in spite of, divine revelation. Mohammedanism is what it specifically is, partly by human speculation, partly by falsehood and false pretence of divine revelation made by one of the greatest imposters the world has seen. The various heathen religions are based upon the insufficient truths and numerous errors of benighted human reason blinded in spiritual things and darkened by sin. The Christian religion alone draws its truths directly from a source given to man by divine revelation, the writings of Moses and the Prophets in the Old Testament and of the Apostles and Evangelists in the New Testament. These holy penmen wrote under divine inspiration, the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, who suggested to them the thoughts they were to utter and the words whereby they gave utterance to those thoughts. Whatever doctrine is not laid down in, and in all its parts taken from, this book of divine revelation can not lay claim to the dignity of Christian doctrine. And here again it must be said that no statement concerning the way of salvation, no doctrine specifically Christian, is found in any of the so-called sacred books of other religions, but only in the Christian Bible these truths are laid down by the spirit of God as in the first source accessible to man. Whatever doctrine pertaining to salvation is not scriptural can not properly be termed Christian. Other religions may assimilate elements from a variety of sources, and there is probably no false religion which is not in part made up of foreign elements, where opportunity for the acquisition of such elements has been offered. The Christian religion alone is thoroughly exclusive in point of doctrine, and any element not derived from the one legitimate source of Christian doctrine, but from any other source, is not an enrichment or improvement, but a contamination and deterioration of Christianity. In fact, Christianity, being a revealed religion, the religion of the holy Scriptures, can never change essentially. It is incapable of improvement.

There is no such thing as perfectibility of Christianity. Christianity is what God made it. It is established and perpetuated by the word of God and by nothing on earth besides. All endeavors to perfect Christianity result in its deterioration, and all efforts to promote it by new measures besides or in place of the revealed word of God either flow from or lead to dangerous, damaging fanaticism.

It is true that not all the various representatives of Christianity have always been true and consistent in the maintenance of the nature and character of the Christian religion in this respect. Thus the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages contains scriptural, papistical, heathen, Jewish, and even Mohammedan elements. Even among the creeds of Christendom there are those in which speculation has usurped the province of divine revelation.

And now once more, as we have done with regard to the material principle of Christianity, we propose the question with reference to the formal principle of the true religion: Is there among the various Christian churches one particular church which can justly claim to have as a church adhered strictly to this distinctive principle of the Christian religion, that all religious truth must come from God and from God alone as he has revealed it in the holy Scriptures? Again we hear the cry of, "Vain presumption!" awaiting the affirmation of this question. No church, it is said, can truly claim to possess the truth and nothing but the truth in its doctrinal standards. There are even those who go beyond this and declare that it was not the will of God that any man or any society of men, any church or part of a church, should be in possession of the truth in all its divine purity. It was a wise providence, they say, which has so disposed that we should be continually in search of the truth, gaining more light from day to day and from generation to generation. For thus the seekers after truth, vying with one another in their zeal, are being continually goaded onward toward greater perfection, and thus a con-

tinual extensive and intensive growth in spiritual knowledge is secured. But such language, whatever it may be, is certainly not Christian. Christian religion is revealed religion, and divine revelation comes to us in this world's eventide only by the written word of God. What is not there revealed will not be revealed before the light of glory shall encompass God's elect, and whatever is revealed is accessible to those who *search the Scriptures, thinking that in them they have eternal life, and that they are they which testify of Christ.*¹⁾ And now, to answer the question twice proposed, I say to the glory of God that, as there is only one among all the religions of the world, one and one only true religion, Christianity, so also there is among the various Christian churches one and one only which, viewed both according to the material principle and according to the formal principle of Christianity, holds, teaches and confesses the doctrine of the true Christian religion in all its purity and unalloyed and unadulterated with falsehood or error of any kind, and *that church is the LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

A. G.

NOTE.—We have given this lecture as a specimen of what we are offering once a month to our young people at the State University at Columbia, Mo. The lectures are not delivered on the University grounds, but in a building located near the Campus and owned by a number of students as their private property.

PARAGRAPHS ON PREACHING.

The first requisite for preaching is something to preach, just as the first requisite for giving is something to give, and for cooking, something to cook. The chief reason why a brute can not say anything, is that the brute has nothing to say. When a man insists upon speaking on a subject of which he is ignorant, he will make a fool either of himself, or of those who hear him, or of both, and that is certainly

1) John 5, 39.