

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1921.

No. 10.

Concordia Triglotta.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. *Rom. 10, 10.*

I.

In 1917, the quadricentennial year of the Reformation, the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States passed a resolution to publish, as a memorial of the Jubilee, a German-Latin-English edition of the symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In the present year, memorable as the quadricentennial of Luther's epochal confession before Church and Empire at Worms, the task was completed, and the trilingual *Concordia* is now on the market.

The writer approaches with some trepidation the task, with which he has been commissioned, of writing an announcement of this volume for the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. The publication of the *Triglot Concordia* is more than a bold book-making venture; it is more than an achievement of Christian scholarship even; it is an event that marks an epoch in the history of the Lutheran Church. A century hence, if the world stands, it will be easier to appraise its importance than it is to-day, when with eager eyes we are scanning the pages of this fine volume, with the faint odor of bindery still upon it. Even a generation hence there will be a better perspective than we possess to-day, to measure its importance to the Church of the Reformation and to the kingdom of God. And this all the more so if it is true, as we hold it to be, that the Lutheran Church is even now entering upon a new era of growth and development, greater than any of the past. Who, then, standing at the threshold of a new day for Lutheranism, shall say what this book, containing the history of its great trials and the memorials of its triumphs, the platform upon which it invites the Church Visible to unite for future labor and conquest, — what this *Concordia Triglotta* means to the Church of the coming years?

So much we can discern even now, that its publication at this time will hearten every faithful disciple of Luther in the age of conflict that lies ahead. For let it be said, if there ever was an age in which men ought to hesitate before venturing the issuance

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Swedish Lutherans at the Parting of the Ways.

The unholy union of Church and State which exists in Sweden has precipitated an issue which plainly indicates the fork in the road for the Lutheran Church of that country. Both the upper and the lower houses of the Riksdag have asked the King not to sanction the use of the new hymn-book, adopted and recommended at the late meeting of the Ecclesiastical Assembly. The Riksdag had authorized the revision of the hymnal. Since 1868 committees had been at work, the changes had been fully discussed by annual assemblies since, and finally the revised book was adopted and recommended for use in the congregations. Now the Riksdag refuses to sanction the use of the

book. The editor of *Augustana* (Rock Island) pronounces the hymnal, as revised, to be of excellent character. It seems as if precisely the religious conservatism evident in the work of the revisers has caused the rejection of the book. The majority of the Riksdag, says a contributor to the *Lutheran*, "consists not only of the unchurchly and indifferent, but many of them prefer no religion at all." The writer then says: "If the Riksdag can control the use of the hymn-book, what will prevent it from controlling other religious books which the Church does not want and cannot use? . . . Is it possible that the time is drawing near when the Church must disobey the temporal power or deny the Savior?"

We should formulate this question differently: Is it possible that the Lutherans of Sweden will, through this action of the godless element in power, be led to investigate the advantages of complete separation of Church and State? Will they be brought to realize the contradiction which exists between the state-church system of Sweden and the sixteenth and twenty-eighth articles of the Augsburg Confession, the official creed of Swedish Lutherans? Will they begin to see that caesaropapism in the end will prove in Sweden, as it has proved everywhere since the days of Constantine, a millstone around the neck of the Church?

The Lutheran Church of Sweden is an established church, the King being *summus episcopus*. It is by virtue of his right of "oversight, care, and protection of the Church and Congregation of God in Sweden" that the Riksdag by formal resolution calls upon him to reject a hymnal adopted by the General Church Assembly composed of the bishops, representatives of the clergy, and thirty laymen at large from the realm.

While the issue as to who shall rule the affairs of Lutherans in Sweden, — the Church through its duly elected representatives, or parliament, — is clearly drawn through this interference of the lawgivers with the declared will of the General Church Assembly, it cannot be said that this is the first or even the most notable instance of unwholesome reaction of political authority upon the life of the Church in Sweden. Archbishop Ekman died in 1913, and a general vote of the proper authorities was taken with reference to his successors and forwarded to the King, who has the power of final choice. Two "conservative" bishops received the highest votes, Danell 14, and Eklund 13, while the rationalistic professor of Upsala, then lent temporarily to Leipsic, Nathan Soederblom, received only six, and this amid much division of the constituency at work with the third place. The King, it was said, did not wish to select Soederblom, as his own leanings have been rather "conservative." But the Council of State urged him "for political reasons" to do so, "perhaps," — we were informed at the time by an American Swedish Lutheran who possessed "inside" knowledge, — "to offset the bitter feeling in radical ranks against the King's *army policy*" — !

Soederblom's election came not only in contravention of the declared preferences of the nominating bodies, but as a stinging rebuff to the Christian convictions of Swedish Lutherans. Soederblom rep-

resents the Troeltsch type of Science of Religion rationalism, the most extreme form of the New Theology. While an amiable man and a brilliant scholar, he has, in his *Religionsproblemet* and other works, undermined all faith. Jehovah is to him, as to the *Religionsgeschichtler* generally, an "animistic" divinity, "a genuine nature-god, an animistic, exacting will with strong and violent expressions." When in 1914 he published his *Origin of the God-Faith*, Prof. Adolf Hult of Rock Island Theological Seminary confessed that a reading of it awakened within him "a cry of horror and a wail of piercing sorrows at the utter devastation which reigns in the decadent liberalism." Concerning another work, published in the same year, the dean of Science of Religion theologians, Prof. Troeltsch, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, affirms his perfect agreement with Soederblom in his position, which, says Troeltsch, definitely removes the distinction between *Heidentum* and the Christian system of belief. And when this frankly naturalistic and evolutionistic theologian, who is in full accord with Harnack, Bossuet, Harper, and the rest of the moderns in his rejection of every element of Christian belief, was elected archbishop of Sweden, the *Lutheran Companion* reported: "The Augustana Synod has responded to the recent invitation from Sweden to take part in the inauguration of the newly appointed Archbishop Nathan Soederblom by the appointment, through its officers, of Dr. L. G. Abrahamson," — editor of the official organ, *Augustana*, — "to represent the Synod on that solemn occasion." Dr. Abrahamson was present at the installation, and the organs of the Augustana Synod at the time brought complete and enthusiastic descriptions of the solemn pomp of the ceremonies.

Opinion among Lutheran Swedes in America is divided with reference to the relation which the Augustana Synod ought to sustain towards the state-church of Sweden. As late as 1919 fraternal greetings were exchanged between Archbishop Soederblom and the Augustana convention. Writing in the *Lutheran* of October 26, 1911, a Swedish American contributor, after establishing the detrimental effect which the connection with the State has had especially upon the influence of the Church on higher education, asserts that "it would be a sad day when the old historic bond between the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Swedish nation would be severed." And again: "The Church of Sweden has ever remembered that she has a daughter in the New World, and is now extending loving hands to this daughter in order to establish mutual cordial relations." That such relations ought to exist appeared very desirable to the writer, Dr. C. M. Esbjörn, although in the same article he describes the "fearful inroads" which the New Theology had made in the theological faculties of both universities and the clergy, and reports that a man who in his pastoral letter openly denied the divinity of Christ and scoffed at the atonement had been elected to the bishopric in 1910 without a protest from any of the other bishops. We cannot understand this attitude, though it must be said that it is fairly representative of opinion in the Augustana Synod. We have seen only two or three expressions of Augustana men protesting against the main-

tenance of fraternal relations with the Church of Sweden. Until Soederblom turns a "simple Biblical confessor," wrote Prof. Hult in the *Lutheran* in 1914, "the confessional Lutheran Church of America finds itself, at the risk of its conscience-peace, forced to keep separate from all entanglements. 'Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr,'—all the glory and the genius of this world dare not entice us by word or deed to betray the unsullied shield of American Lutheran confessionalism." And Rev. Norelius, the venerable ex-president of the Augustana Synod, wrote at the same time, in the *Lutheran Companion*: "The main question with me is not Soederblom and his theological standpoint, but the relation of the Augustana Synod to the state-church of Sweden. . . . I am severely opposed to all entangling alliances with the state-church of Sweden, not because I believe that there are no Christians and no orthodox Lutherans in the Church of Sweden, but because the church people are not allowed to govern that Church according to her laws and regulations, and because the State powers govern the Church arbitrarily and do so in opposition to the well-known desires and vote of the Church. Do we need a plainer illustration of this fact than the latest appointment of an archbishop? The majority of the church people have expressed their deep sorrow over this arbitrary act of the state powers. How will this majority of the honest Lutherans of Sweden feel, and what will they think of the Augustana Synod, a free Lutheran Church of America, which sends a representative to Upsala with congratulations upon what has taken place? If that is not an entangling alliance with the state-church I do not know what is."

As for the defiant move of the Riksdag with reference to the new hymnal, we hardly dare to hope for an awakening of Lutherans in Sweden to the iniquitous nature of the state-church system, as a result of this indignity. As a Swedish Lutheran wrote us in 1914: "Many earnest pastors and laymen in Sweden grieve deeply, but in a state-church Christians are so accustomed to be insulted and betrayed and derided that it is become second nature to be a martyr and silent." Nevertheless, the Lutherans of Sweden are now at the fork in the road. If they have no longer enough moral force to oppose this move of the Riksdag, even at the risk of those material losses which are involved in separation of the Church, as an organization, from the State, their future condition will be worse than their present one. They will definitely, by acquiescence in this outrage of their religious rights, accept the position of not a handmaid even, but of a scullion to the state. And whatever is to be done in this matter must be done by the Swedes themselves. Whether they would have in such a move even the moral support of Swedish Lutherans in America, may seriously be questioned. After entertaining relations of fellowship with the "mother church" for three generations, it would be rather surprising if the Swedish Synod in America would now encourage a move for separation in Sweden, though to every close observer it must become more and more evident that the condition of the state-church of that country, never ideal, is fast becoming intolerable.

GRAEBNER.

The Bohemian "Away from Rome" Movement.

That a mass-movement away from Roman Catholicism is taking place in Czecho-Slovakia and has even now gained great momentum, seems to be confirmed by recent private advices. In a communication addressed to American Presbyterians, Dr. James I. Good, writing from Carlsbad July 17, refers to a celebration, by an open-air meeting of 10,000, on June 21, of the anniversary of the execution, by Austrian Catholics, of 27 Protestant nobles in the city hall square of Prague in 1621. Professor Good then continues:—

"But what I am writing is back of this festival. As doubtless you know, there is a great spontaneous movement out of the Catholic Church, a movement still growing in power. The new Czecho-Slovak Church claims 850,000 members. It is a cross between Protestantism and Catholicism. It retains the Catholic mode of worship, in the Bohemian instead of the Latin language, and has repudiated the authority of the Pope, permits the priests to marry (and insists upon the free circulation of the Holy Scriptures and the right of private interpretation). The Protestant Church—Czecho-Slovak Brethren—is reaping results from this movement. Fifty thousand have been added to it in the last six months. The Catholics come of their own free will by scores and join the Church. As a result of such a mass movement, the Protestant pastors are becoming dreadfully over-worked. A number of them are on the verge of a breakdown, nervously, or in their throats. I have been to several places where, four months ago, there was not a Protestant, and now there are five hundred or more. I know whereof I speak. Just one illustration: I went to Pilsen last Sabbath. Six months ago there were 1,000 Protestants in the city. Now there are 7,000, and in the vicinity 15,000. There are only two pastors there, one of whom is away on his vacation, almost broken down in health. The other, whom I met, is a frail, but very earnest man, and is almost a nervous wreck. Yet he tells me that around Pilsen this movement has broken out in twenty places. He preaches three times every Sabbath in different places, besides several times a week. He pleaded with me for helpers. He said, 'Cannot the Presbyterians of America send over some of their Bohemian preachers?'

"Really, Protestantism has never had a chance like this. This is the largest movement out of Rome since the Reformation. At Pilsen, where the Czecho-Slovak Church had not yet arisen, there is an open field. They say that Protestantism could get 50,000 adherents if she acts wisely. The people are disgusted with the tyranny and immorality of the Catholic priests; they want greater liberty, and they want to get back to Huss, who is their national idol. The Presbyterian Church could do no greater missionary work for a year or two than to send several Bohemian missionaries here. Now perhaps I have said too much for one who belongs to another Church. I hope you will pardon me. Nothing but this miraculous opportunity for Protestants could make me do so. The Reformed Church [to which Dr. Good belongs] has only three Bohemian churches, but I am coming home to

stir them up. May the Lord bless you and your work, and may God guide us all in these great matters!"

The writer of this letter, Dr. James I. Good, has been professor of Reformed Church History in Central Theological Seminary of Pella, Iowa. His appeal has found a response in the Presbyterian (North) Committee on Work in Europe, which has resolved to send three men to Czecho-Slovakia "to assist and cooperate with the proper authorities of the historic Reformed and Lutheran Churches." GRAEBNER.

A Scientist Reviews Prof. Graebner's Book on Evolution.

We are glad to reprint from the *Moody Monthly*, September issue, Dr. G. M. Price's review of Prof. Graebner's book on evolution. Dr. Price is Professor of Geology at the Pacific Union College, Lodi, Cal. Dr. Price says:—

"As a scientist I do not often find any great comfort or enlightenment in reading the average book against the evolution theory when written by a theologian.

"However, this book is an exception to the general rule. It is not flippantly nor sarcastically written, but is candid and does not dodge essential points. Its methods of looking at the problem are essentially sound, while the facts adduced are based on good authorities and are of a fairly modern character.

"Unlike most books on this subject, it is not chiefly occupied in the diverting task of knocking down straw men or of slaying men that have been dead for twenty years.

"It has a good deal to say regarding the moral and religious objections to this doctrine, a phase of the subject that is seldom dealt with adequately by those to whom we naturally look for the development of this side of the question; and its treatment of the religious history of mankind as a testimony against the application of the theory to this department of life is splendid and shows strong, original work.

"In addition to all this, it is almost the solitary book dealing with this problem which I remember having read which seriously questions the accuracy and the reliability of the accepted geological classification of the stratified rocks off into successive 'ages.'

"Why other writers have so universally missed this point as the weakest (and yet the most essential) in the whole evolution theory I cannot tell; but it is a satisfaction to find at least one writer who can look at this matter in its broadest aspects, and who has enough of logic in his marrow to discern how essential the scheme of the geological 'ages' is for the theory of biological evolution, and yet how intrinsically illogical and unscientific the whole geological scheme of Smith and Cuvier and Lyell really is.

"And since modern biology has now got to the *impasse* where a man like John Burroughs could say a few months before he died that Darwin 'has been shorn of his selection theories as completely as Samson was shorn of his locks,' where no well-informed scientist any longer believes in the transmission in heredity of acquired characters,

and where Mendelism has disposed of about all the rest of the nonsense about variation which used to be so popular thirty years ago, — since biology now finds itself in this blind alley, *about the only part left of the theory of organic evolution is the scheme of the geological succession of life*, and it cannot be long before this feature of the problem will receive more adequate treatment.

“The present volume is good so far as it goes, and it is quite a new thing under the sun to find a book that deals with this part of the matter at all.

“I am sorry that the typographical work on this book is so unsatisfactory. [This book was not published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.] It is to be hoped that the numerous slips of this character will be corrected in future editions. But it is a book which ought to be read by every one who has a sufficient familiarity with the general subject to understand and appreciate its line of argument.

“It is good medicine for one of the worst intellectual diseases of the modern world. Radical criticism and false science were cunning enough to begin at the beginning; for if confidence is destroyed in the first chapters of the Bible, which tell us of God’s first creation of the heaven and the earth and of a sinless man made in the image of God, what is the use of talking about faith in the last chapters of the Bible, which tell us of the new heaven and the new earth and of redeemed man restored to open communion with his Maker? Evolution or Christianity is the greatest problem before our modern world.”

FRTZ.

Christian Science and the Trinity.

In the *Christian Science Journal* of August, 1921, we read the following under the heading of “The Trinity”:—

“The doctrine of the Trinity is the most complex and difficult question in orthodox theology. It is not to be found in a concrete form in the Old or the New Testament, but has to be reached by a process of deduction or inference. . . . Indeed, it may be said that the theory of three persons in one is arrived at by accepting everything in the New Testament which seems to support the argument, and ignoring everything that does not. . . . The simple fact is that, as Mrs. Eddy writes, on page 256 of *Science and Health*, “The theory of three persons in one God (that is, a personal Trinity or Triunity) suggests polytheism rather than the one ever-present I AM. “Hear, O Israel: the Lord, our God, is one Lord.”. . . . The primitive Christian, it is quite clear, was untroubled by the Trinity. He knew it simply as a pagan dogma. The doctrine was reached later through a process of deduction by the Fathers.”

A religion which so thinks and speaks of the doctrine of the Trinity surely cannot be the Bible religion. It is well that we should remember that the so-called Christian Science religion does not believe in the Triune God, and, therefore, also, of course, does not believe that Christ is the God-man and the Savior. Denying the fact of sin, so-called Christian Science does not believe that it needs a Savior

from sin. Any one who believes what so-called Christian Science teaches thereby says that he no longer believes the very fundamentals of the Christian religion which are necessary for salvation. Both words, "Christian" and "Science," ought to be stricken from the official name of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy's religion. FRITZ.

The Sun-Phoners.

This branch of the New Thought movement was briefly characterized in our article in the March issue of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. The *Living Church* (Protestant Episcopal) recently contained this breezy write-up of the cult's leading publication, the *Scientific Christian*:—

"From Denver comes an amusing monthly paper called *Scientific Christian*, which appears to be the organ of a combined Eddyism (without Mrs. Eddy), new thought (without much thought), and sun-worship. It has been published for twenty-seven years; and the members of its cult are 'Sun-phoners.' I have heard of 'Sun-downers,' but own that this other barbarism is new to me. Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Shelton edit it; and, as Mrs. Shelton publishes the statement from an admiring friend that 'she is the greatest woman in the world,' it ought to be worth reading. Somehow, I didn't find it so; but there are juicy bits; *e. g.*, this from the Correspondence Department:

"I am teaching a Sunday-school class, and I don't teach Baptist doctrine either, although I am supposed to do so; but they are all grown-ups, and if they can't tell what they want, I feel I should give them what they need. And they tell me that I am a good teacher."

"This is the way all good Scientists are conducting themselves in the objective universe where they have to associate with orthodox people. Go right on teaching the Truth without antagonizing others; you don't have to offend, and you can be orthodox for that matter, for the fundamental teaching of all sects is the Truth when rightly interpreted. You know how to interpret it!"

"Perhaps this explains why there are clergy who teach the errors they have long before pledged themselves to repudiate!"

"Treatments are given to the fellowship by either of us for one dollar a month; by both of us for two dollars a month. Direct personal and special treatments are given by either of us for five dollars a month; by both of us for ten dollars a month."

"One bit of advice is worth handing on:

"Give name and address in every letter.

"You can get more from one month of Sun-phone treatments than from a thousand years of books. You enter into the consciousness of your own divinity."

"The modest editors declare that 'their office is in the sun'; but currency must be sent to 1657 Clarkson St., Denver—postal connections with the sun being a trifle uncertain, I suppose.

"There are four dimensions—earth, water, air, and fire. You are the fourth dimension.' This is worse than Einstein.

"The testimonials published are fully equal to those in a patent

medicine almanac. But here is a scheme for bewitching motor cars which is perhaps worth testing, if you believe in witchcraft!

"How are you going to protect children from automobiles? By passing a law prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and use of automobiles? Baby Blanche is an expert driver, but, like her dad, she wants to turn things loose. After being in four accidents in nearly as many months, and smashing her mother's car without receiving a scratch or hurt to herself, except to hurt her feelings, we concluded to protect the car as well as the girl. So when the new car came (it is a blue one this time), we spoke the word for protection of the girl and the car; accidents ceased suddenly. The girl still drives the blue car like a blue streak, not only in Denver, but to Colorado Springs, Idaho Springs, and various mountain-park trips, and everywhere she wants to drive it.'

"I gather that the senior editor was once a Protestant minister of an evangelical denomination. *Heu, quantum mutatus!*"

The incident of the motor car protected by New Thought is not at all exceptional. *Unity*, another publication of the cult, in its September, 1921, issue, p. 268, reports the cure of a case of tonsillitis. The patient, a boy of ten, in the absence of his mother, "placed a copy of *Unity Magazine* around his throat" and was immediately cured. And in the Motherhood Department, p. 251, a prospective mother writes: "I would hardly know that I am pregnant, and I am very grateful to God and to *Unity*." So little removed from fetishism is the latest religious fad of blasé lounge-lizards. GRAEBNER.

Managing a Convention.

The tendency towards manipulation as a substitute for deliberation is ever present in large organizations, also ecclesiastical. In the conventions of interchurch bodies, but also of synodical organizations, the suppression of deliberation and debate and substitution for it of machine government has gone pretty far, if the observations of the *Presbyterian* (Philadelphia) are to be relied upon. The editor, Dr. Kennedy, had been called upon to attend many conventions, conferences, and councils, and in every case was impressed with the tendency to yield enlarged powers to groups and committees, with the consequent elimination of the freedom of debate. He describes the process as follows:—

"Some committee or other company of men make out a plan and map a program; a council, conference, or convention is called, which may be representative in its make-up, or it may be composed of those invited specially by the committee or the company which desires effectual endorsement of the scheme presented.

"The plan and project is then read to the convention. After it is thus read as a whole, it is taken up seriatim for debate and tentative adoption. During the debate, no member of the assemblage is allowed to propose an amendment. All such propositions must be written out and passed over to 'the business committee.' If this committee approves the idea of the proposed amendment, they incorporate it into

the plan in such a way as not to alter or seriously disturb the original proposition. If the proposed amendment is not acceptable to the business committee, they simply ignore it or recommend no action. When the final vote on the article is read, not only is deliberation thus cut off, but in debating the original proposition, which has been moved and seconded, there is a steering committee which watches every movement and utterance opposed to the motion to approve. In some cases one of these steerers stands on the platform beside the presiding officer and keeps up a stiff line of defense of the proposition. Another appears on the floor in front of the moderator's desk, and is prompt to speak from the floor in the defense of the motion to adopt. This is kept up through the entire debate, with the frequent declaration that the suggestion would change the whole plan and defeat it, or the statement is frequently made that the committee in charge has gone over and through this whole matter, and they are persuaded that any serious change in it would destroy its value and defeat its purpose. If a speaker has independence and insists on his motion, then he is informed he must write it out and send it to the business committee. We also noticed that if the committee which prepared the plan had been too cautious and had put some point more timidly than they wished, any effort to push the matter to a bolder measure always succeeded in getting through, although many were shocked and disturbed by its final form and meaning."

This is pretty bad, but worse follows: —

"In one recent convention a speaker was not allowed to present a matter before the meeting or to make an address of any kind without giving from one to two days' [!] notice to the business committee of his purpose and subject. If the business committee believed that such address would in any way interfere with carrying out the program they proposed, then the privilege of presenting the subject was refused."

The *Presbyterian* concludes that the object of many of these conferences and sessions is to "present their scheme" and "put it over" on the Church, securing its endorsement, and charging it with the obligation of carrying the plan out. As instances of larger movements that employed this method, the editor mentions the "Men and Religion Movement," which "cost the Church nearly a million dollars and accomplished little or nothing," the Laymen's Missionary Movement, which "virtually exhausted itself after great expense," and the Y. M. C. A. canteen work, which, says Dr. Kennedy, "has been confessed a blunder and an ambition by some of its most ardent supporters and workers." Where all this will end, no one can tell. "There seems to be a fascination about this kind of thing which no measure of failure can restrain. The very men who were leaders in the earlier movement which failed are doubly eager to be leaders in the most recent movements. Indeed, the movements are growing so rapidly in measure and number that the one-time fellow-leaders are become rivals in contest." Of one thing only the *Presbyterian* is sure: Such practises are "neither democratic in form nor Christian in their

suggestions." Very true. The system described suggests, however, that churches which have not taught their people to recognize and employ their congregational rights need not be surprised when self-appointed bosses, who are out for easy pickings, rule the conventions and the denominational boards and, through them, the clergy and laity.

GRAEBNER.
