

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V.

DECEMBER, 1925.

No. 12.

## When was Jesus Born?

P. E. KRETZMANN, St. Louis, Mo.

The beginning of the Christian era, and therefore the supposed year of Christ's birth, was first fixed by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk, who lived in Rome at the beginning of the sixth century. He was greatly interested in computations pertaining to the church-year and did much toward establishing a uniform practise with regard to the celebration of Easter. He placed the birth of Christ in the year 754 a. u. c. (after the founding of the city of Rome). Even before his time several of the Popes of Rome had tried to determine the date of Christ's birth. It is said that Pope Julius I (336—352) had the imperial archives of Rome searched for the exact date of the birth of Christ, and it has been established beyond a doubt that Pope Liberius fixed the celebration of Christmas for December 25. By the middle of the sixth century, then, the date of the birth of Jesus was generally accepted to have been December 25, 754 a. u. c.

In an article in *Lehre und Wehre* of December, 1902, the writer shows that the computation of Dionysius Exiguus was undoubtedly erroneous. Using chiefly chronological tags from the Bible, all of which render the year 754 a. u. c. altogether improbable, the essayist finally concludes that the year 750 a. u. c. is the correct year of Christ's birth and that the Christian era should therefore be moved back four years. This idea was held quite generally among orthodox theologians about two decades ago.

But in the mean time, evidence was brought forth which indicated that a further correction in the computations must be made in order to harmonize facts from secular history with the Scriptural account. Work has been done chiefly by Sir William Ramsay, but subsequently also by Robertson, Deissmann, McKinley, and others, and the difficulty may now be said to have been solved with a reasonable amount of certainty. The argument proceeds

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

Rome is just now playing the game of church union with zest. Besides planning for its own World Congress at Rome in 1930, it is looking wistfully towards Russia and watching England. Says the *Commonweal* (October 21): "Out of the welter of confusion in the Russian Church strange gleams break, that are alternately bright with promise and lurid with the threat of further trouble to come. Dispatches last week tell of the virtual failure of the Church Congress held at Moscow to raise any kind of standard around which bishops and clergy might rally to the defense of whatever deposit of religion has survived the laicizing policy of the Soviets. On the contrary, the rift between those who are tiring of strife and those who still believe that essentials of religion forbid any sort of compromise with the civil power seems to be widening. 'At the present moment,' says Mr. Duranty, the very wide-awake correspondent of the *New York Times* in Russia, 'the confusion in the Russian Church is such that, for the first time in a thousand years, there is a possibility of the reunion of the Eastern (Greek) and the Western (Roman Catholic) branches of the Church.' It would be easy for Catholics to exaggerate a prospect that so appeals to their imagination, where the wish is so apt to be father to the thought. Strong Erastian influences are at work to combat the prospect of reunion held out by Bishop Vedenski, the Metropolitan of Moscow. Bishop Makary, of Peterhof, goes so far as to call for public prayer for a government 'now definitely established by the will of the majority of the Russian people,' while the reactionary partisans of the late Archbishop Tikhon, though keeping in the background, for reasons that are not hard to understand, are by no means idle, and their views almost certainly do not include reunion with Rome. Among the many recent incidents which seem to show a growing disposition to seek salvation by a healing of the ancient breach between East and West, perhaps one of the most hopeful is the recent conversion of Dr. Philip Morozow, archimandrite of Wilno, Poland, and rector of the 'orthodox' seminary there. In a dispatch sent by mail and recently published in the Canadian Catholic press, a letter addressed to the faculty and students whom he is leaving is quoted. It gives some idea of how frail is the barrier that stands between the two great branches of the ancient Church, and how natural, in a generation

or two, would seem a gesture that swept it away. 'In taking leave of you,' says Dr. Morozow, 'I beg you to believe that I do not betray anything that should be dear to you — true faith and attachment to our nation. In becoming a son of the Catholic Church, I remain faithful to the orthodoxy which saints and doctors of the one and indivisible Church have confessed. I repudiate no true "dogma" of this orthodoxy. I am not asked to renounce our ancient rite in the tongue of the Slavic apostles, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, a rite and tongue recognized and approved by Rome, side by side with the Latin rite. A recognition of the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff in no way hinders me from considering myself a faithful son of our beloved Russian nation. . . .' In the face of such a declaration a certain hollowness in the much be-paragraphed flirting with Canterbury and Lambeth during the summer inevitably suggests itself." The writer is correct: there has never been any great reason why the Eastern and Western hierarchies should not be one. The schism that divided them was only nominally on doctrinal grounds; it was chiefly caused by political interests. The *Filioque* will not prevent the union, now that Rome's ecclesiastical imperialism considers union desirable and opportune. And even the blasphemous Soviets will be swallowed in order that this union may be achieved.

DAU.

A number of inquiries have come to me regarding the copy of the Augsburg Confession that has been discovered in the museum at Nuremberg and which an Associated Press report represented as the original document given to Emperor Charles V. To all these inquiries I would say that the little piece of news which the press published is insufficient for determining the character of the document said to have been found. Until the document is published or an adequate description is given, I must continue to believe that the original of the Augsburg Confession does not exist, neither the Latin nor the German.

DAU.

Critical reviews of the Ecumenical Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm during August are filling the church-papers. Here are the impressions gathered by one who happened to be in Sweden and Norway at the time (Dr. Kropatschek, of Dresden?): "We had abundant opportunities to hear and read individual opinions and newspaper verdicts on the Conference. Many persons, even such as were well disposed towards the conference, share the view expressed by Professor Reu in his *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*: 'The Conference will soar skyward like a blazing rocket and share its fate in the end.' Again and again faithful Lutherans and Christians from *Gemeinschaft* circles spoke to us about 'the great spectacle,' 'the grand parade,' etc. It is a shocking fact that the people are about to lose confidence in certain leaders who are championing the Stockholm venture. Spite of all their soothing assurances the people fail to understand them. Nothing can characterize the artificial make-up of the Congress better than the fact that throughout the three Nordic countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the *active, believing, self-sacrificing* church people will have nothing to do with the

Congress, or, to say the least, treat it with a great deal of mistrust. In *Norway*, for instance, great excitement was caused by the announcement that Bishop *Gleditsch*, the only liberal bishop, is to represent Norway on the permanent Executive Board of the Congress. The leading devotional paper *For fattigen og rike* ("For Poor and Rich"), which has more than 30,000 subscribers, sharply declined to have anything to do with the Stockholm meeting and violently attacked Archbishop *Soederblom* because he does not accept the Second Article [of the Apostles' Creed]. In *Sweden* there continues to appear sharp criticism of the meeting in *Goeteborgs Stiftszeitung*. In *Denmark* the well-known Pastor *Skovgaard Petersen*, who was in Stockholm, gives vent to his disappointment in *Kristelig Dagblad*. Meanwhile a lively discussion is going on in the Nordic press of a plan of the Pope that has not yet been made known in Germany, *viz.*, to summon a WORLD CONGRESS of all churches to ROME in 1930, that is, in the quadricentenary year of the Augsburg Confession. The Roman Bishop *J. Mueller*, who is making an inspection tour of Sweden, in plain terms confirms the report of this plan and points to it as evidence that the Catholic Church honestly desires unity. But, he says, the *question of unity* is not a burning one for the Roman Church because she already has unity. He regards the question as a more critical one for *Protestants*: they must *first become united among themselves* before Rome can enter into union with them. The *Goeteborg Stiftszeitung* dryly comments: 'We believe the Roman Bishop is right. For a "united" Protestantism the way to Rome is not far!' It is well known that Catholics hold no heresy ought to last longer than four hundred years! Hence their plan for 1930! What may be the reason why in GERMANY there is nobody so far who talks about this plan of the Pope? Has there not been something like shame aroused in Germany over this 'Church Conference' at Stockholm, which so strongly emphasized the fact that the absence of Rome was the only 'dark spot' in the enterprise?—However, the German press has been the more zealous in publishing another fact, regarding which the entire Swedish press and possibly the entire foreign press has observed a significant silence: after the close of the Conference the German delegation through President *Dr. Kapler*, submitted a written statement regarding the question, WHO CAUSED THE WAR? [Understand, not the lie about who caused the war!] While the Conference was in session, this question was kept in abeyance in the interest of unity and peace. After the close of the Conference the Committee on Continuation was to take action upon the question. However, the President of the Conference, Archbishop *Soederblom*, who well knew how to make excellent use of the Swedish press in other respects, *did not give it* this bitter piece of news after the close of the Conference. The doughty *Goeteborg Stiftszeitung* has established this fact. The German delegates seem to have quietly pocketed this affront and are in fulsome terms talking about their achievement of getting into personal touch with, etc., etc. Moreover, when the German delegates made a very tame statement of their attitude towards the League of Nations,

a *Danish* delegate called that a 'tactless act,' and the Germans seem disposed to ignore this affront too. We have reported these facts because they confirm our opinion of the Stockholm Conference. . . . We fear that confusion will be created also in Lutheran circles by very skilfully prepared reports about this Conference." DAU.

The entire October issue of the "*Christian Union Quarterly*," 130 pages, is devoted to the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. Until the complete protocol of that meeting is published, this number of the *Christian Union Quarterly* offers the best source of information regarding the inwardness of the Conference, its spirit, thought, and aspirations. On one of the first pages the editor has set off by itself and in special print one remark which he calls "the cementing prayer." It was made in an address by Wilfred Monod, of Paris, France, and is as follows: "In order to obtain this important result, there is no necessity of revising our creeds and our symbols. Christianity will never cease to contemplate, in adoration, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' But it should regard with increasing understanding the extent and the eagerness of the battle for the extermination of iniquity. Let, therefore, the Christian world meditate at the foot of the cross upon the prayer taught us by the Savior, the prayer which cements the different parts of the Christian edifice, the prayer which could even unite all the followers of all religions, all those who pray sincerely in the whole world; for it contains not one single formula of Christian theology, but blossoms in its fulness on the religious and social plane of evangelic Messianic faith." The reader will place his own critical marks in the margin alongside this effusion, which subjects the glorious prayer taught by the Redeemer to a new martyrdom. Monod's appeal to the sin-bearing Lamb of God is nothing but a pious gesture, if he wants to unite "all the followers of all religions, all who pray sincerely" before the Atoning Sacrifice. Paul was conscious of the fact that the Gospel of this reconciliation roused the scorn and the fury of the world. Monod has forgotten that the Christ is "the sign that is spoken against," the rock on whom thousands are dashed to pieces.—The issue of the *Christian Union Quarterly* before us contains, besides the editor's notes on the Conference, the opening sermon from Matt. 4, 17, by the Lord Bishop of Winchester; Alfred E. Garvie's paper on "The Church's Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World"; Arvid Runestam's paper on "The Essence of Christian Love"; Sir Willoughby Dickinson's paper on "The Work of International Friendship through the Churches"; Walter Simons's paper on "Christianity and Crime"; Selma Lagerloef's paper on "Unity between All Peoples"; William Adams Brown's paper on "The Church and Christian Education"; the closing sermon by the Archbishop of Uppsala; reports of commissions, and the final "Message" of the Conference. The only thing that becomes plain while one reads and tries to digest these deliverances is that in the opinion of the Conference any one may believe anything he pleases, but he must be considerate enough of the feelings of others to keep his beliefs strictly to himself and come and work with the others,

no matter if they treat his belief with contempt or pity. Although for a different reason, Christianity will have as much reason to remember Stockholm in 1925 as Nicaea in 325.

DAU.

The recent Stockholm Conference had "excluded questions of creed and order and dealt with the duty of the Church toward practical problems of every-day life. Topics included were: 1. The Church's obligation in view of God's purpose for the world; 2. the Church and economic and industrial problems; 3. the Church and social and moral problems; 4. the Church on international relations; 5. the Church and Christian education; 6. methods of cooperative and federative efforts by the Christian communities." In other words, what would have been the distinct, legitimate, and urgent business of churchmen at such a gathering, the establishment of unity in the faith, was declared out of order at the Stockholm Conference. And many things that were not distinctly, nor legitimately, nor urgently the business of churchmen were made the order of the day at this meeting. What was achieved by the Conference in its chosen tasks? On the strength of reports which he has received from correspondents, John Martin Vincent, Professor of European History at Johns Hopkins, says: "As was inevitable in such an assembly, there was little unity of opinion on social and moral questions. If it was intended to formulate a social creed for modern churches, as the Council of Nicaea, 1,600 years ago, formulated a doctrinal creed, that end was not attained; for the divisions of sentiment upon prohibition, divorce, and other problems were acute. The reports of special commissions upon social issues were without impressive significance, hence there was no great treaty placed on record." (*Current History*, for September.) The blessing of the Head of the Church on this showy effort at Stockholm of divided members of the Church so far is not in evidence. The only tangible results of the meeting to date are: greater publicity for the Swedish archbishop — this result was thorough — and giddy heads for some Lutherans from America who attended that meeting.

DAU.

Does the Fourth Gospel contain any reference to the virgin birth of our Lord? This question has induced Prof. A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Seminary at Louisville, to examine once more the evidence for reading, in John 1, 13: *ὁς ἐγεννήθη* for *οἱ ἐγεννήθησαν*. If the former reading is adopted, v. 13 connects with v. 14, not with v. 12: it describes the manner of the incarnation of the Logos, not the manner of the spiritual rebirth of believers. The textual evidence is altogether against the former reading: all Greek manuscripts have the plural instead of the singular variant. Nevertheless, liberal theologians like Harnack and Loisy, who do not themselves believe the virgin birth, argue for the singular in John 1, 13 because they hold that John certainly did believe it. Frederick Blass, the author of the *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, the great Zahn in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, and A. E. Brooke, in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, argue for the singular. The last-named writer says: "The singular well leads up to v. 14, and the connection with what precedes is good; the

sonship of Christians rests on His sonship. In particular the very emphatic threefold negative statement of v. 13 seems to be directed against some who affirmed the contrary, and such a denial was far more likely to be of Christ's supernatural conception than of the divine begetting of Christians in the spiritual sense." Hort, in his edition of the New Testament, has deemed the variant with the singular important enough by marking it "Western" in a special note. It is a fact that Irenaeus and Tertullian quote John 1, 13 in the singular reading: Irenaeus, in speaking of the incarnation, and Tertullian in arguments against the Valentinians and the Ebionites, who denied the virgin birth. Furthermore, Justin Martyr and Augustine apparently knew John 1, 13 in the singular reading. The earliest quotations of this verse give the singular, and this date is a hundred and fifty years earlier than *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, the two oldest Greek uncials. The last Old Latin *Codex Veronensis* (b) has "*qui natus est*," while the Curatonian Syriac has the relative pronoun in the plural, but the verb in the singular. Robertson also calls attention to the fact that Hort holds "that there are some sixty-five cases in the New Testament where all the Greek manuscripts are wrong and where we have a primitive error," and that this is possibly the case in John 1, 13. He sums up the evidence thus: "With the light before us, we cannot insist that the singular is clearly, or even probably, the correct text. It is possibly correct. That is all one can say,"—especially when one takes into consideration the picture of God in the flesh which John and Paul in their writings and in the oldest known document about Christ, the Logia, have drawn.

DAU.

**Professor Robertson** has embodied some excellent personal testimonies in his article, which corroborate time-honored Christological truths. They will be valued by Lutherans all the more because of the source from which they have emanated. Here are some of them as published in the *Biblical Review* for October: "Both in John and in Paul the main problem is the incarnation of Christ, the Son of God. The Virgin Birth is a detail of the Incarnation. The real battle is over the Incarnation. Paul and John do not mean that God entered by spiritual impression into the heart and life of Jesus so that He became a God-filled man and was lifted into fellowship and communion with God. The rather, they both give us the picture of One who was already in existence before the Incarnation as the Son of God, who voluntarily came to earth to do His redemptive work for men. It is plain, without any reference to the Virgin Birth, that Paul and John set before us the conception of One who is more than a man, who lived as God's Son before He became the Son of Man, who remained God's Son while the Son of Man, and who to-day is both Son of God and Son of Man. He took back to heaven His humanity as He brought to earth His deity. He was both God and man on earth as He is now in heaven Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of Man." (p. 572f.) "The New Testament will be left a torso if the statements about the deity and the incarnation of Jesus Christ are all taken out. There is no getting rid of the

Incarnation without also getting rid of Christianity. Now, incarnation is absolutely supernatural. There is no possible way to explain it by any sort of ratiocination. If one is willing to admit and to believe in the fact of the Incarnation, he has no logical ground to stand on in any objection to the fact of the Virgin Birth. There is absolutely nothing in the New Testament that contradicts the Virgin Birth." (p. 573.) "If one does not believe in the Incarnation, it is probably useless to talk with him about the Virgin Birth. But it will be profitable for one who accepts the incarnation of Christ as a fact, to visualize to himself any process by which the Son of God, who already existed in heaven, came to earth. He will, I believe, have very great difficulty in formulating any theory that is more credible than the Virgin Birth narratives of Matthew and Luke." (p. 574.) "The author pointedly asserts that the preexistent Logos *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. Note *ἐγένετο*, not *ἦν*, as in v. 1. Something happened to one already existing. John comes right up to the point of giving us the Virgin Birth. Is his language inconsistent with it? Absolutely not. It is in perfect harmony with it. In fact, one will have difficulty in giving full force to the language of v. 14 without the idea of the Virgin Birth. If Jesus already existed with the Father, as in 1, 1, how could He become (*ἐγένετο*) a man already begotten in the ordinary fashion, who was a complete personality? John's language, 'became flesh,' means clearly that somehow this Logos, who was God, was united with human nature." (p. 575.) "This idea of the peculiar origin of Jesus pervades the Gospel of John from beginning to end. It makes it practically certain that, when he wrote the words, 'The Logos became flesh,' he was referring to the virgin birth of Jesus, who then, as the Son of God, came into our human nature as the Son of Man. That being true, it is not a matter of great importance what the real text of John 1, 13 is. If the singular, *ὁς ἐγεννήθη*, should ever prove to be genuine, it would be discounted by those who reject the Virgin Birth as of no more value than John 1, 1. 14. 18. There the Incarnation stands out clearly." (p. 578f.)

DAU.

**The Stockholm World Conference**, called by Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden on the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea to be a convention of world-wide Lutheranism, has left nothing but an aftertaste of weakness and confusion. Dr. Ernest Gordon writes in the *Sunday-school Times*: "A congress convened on the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea should proudly reaffirm the Nicæan faith. It should not welcome to its membership those who openly or tacitly disavow the faith. It is for this reason that Bishop Ihmels of Saxony declares that he has serious doubts about it, looks for little or nothing to come out of it, and takes part in it under mental protest. . . . Of evangelical conviction and missionary fire and Puritan determination there is blessed little in these August days in Stockholm." One of the chief objects of the meeting was to promote international peace; but any advantage in this direction was counterbalanced by the mixing of Church and State, and a general confusing of confessional lines. The editor of the



*Lutheran Church Herald* writes (October 27): "The continued repetition of 'understanding,' 'cooperation,' and that it is not necessary to agree in confession, will have its effect among the Lutherans. It will increase the indifference, so prevalent in our day, regarding the Word of God, lead to a denial of salvation by faith alone, and emphasize salvation by good works." Typical of the confessional laxity and gross unionism prevalent at the Conference was the spectacle—witnessed by Rev. J. C. K. Preus of the Norwegian Synod, who attended the Conference unofficially—of a Greek-Catholic requiem celebrated in the Lutheran Gustav Vasa Church on a Sunday evening. Lutherans in black gowns participated with English lord bishops in silver and white, patriarchs of the East, and the archbishop and metropolitan of Bukowina. The service was conducted in Russian, with magnificent chanting and a solemn ritual for the peace of soul of Patriarch Tikhon of Constantinople, whose death prevented his appearance at the Conference. In the above-mentioned issue Rev. Preus is quoted as saying: "All this took place in a Lutheran church, arranged for by a Lutheran archbishop. Such things will happen at an ecumenical church meeting where the fundamental principle is to *forget confessions* and to unite for practical purposes those *divided in spirit*." MUELLER.

The **Juvenile Literature Board** of Synod has not been organized or done its work because of a whim, but in view of a real need. It is interesting to note how this need has been felt also in other circles. The *Sunday-school Times* of October 24, 1925, devotes an entire issue to children's books. One of the leading articles is written by the librarian in the public library of a large city, whose observations are illuminating. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that just those books which are recommended for juvenile reading often "ably supplement the efforts of the evolutionists and modernists in grounding the generation of the future in their false teachings." F. A. Kummer's *First Days of Man* admits in its preface that it "takes many liberties" to give "a story of the development of civilization which rests upon a *foundation of fact*." The second volume, *First Days of Knowledge*, states that the idea of God has grown out of sun, moon, and animal worship; that "thinking men and women of to-day do not believe in the God of the Israelites because we cannot believe He would choose and defend one people nor be appeased by burnt offerings." *St. Nicholas' Magazine* is publishing Hillyer's *A Child's History of the World* as an "accurate outline of the progress of mankind from the barbaric caveman of thousands of years ago to the airman of to-day." Interesting is the criticism of "Boy Scout-approved" books on the ground of evolutionary teachings behind the mask of nature study and woodcraft. Elementary biographies of scientists are fostering evolutionary ideals. Of Louis Agassiz, F. Darrow writes: "It is difficult to understand how a man of his intelligence and extensive knowledge of the geological life of the past should have failed to recognize that evolution is simply the Creator's method of working." With the writer of the criticism we

subscribe to the one means of counteracting this poison: "Thorough instruction in the fundamentals of our faith through a knowledge and love of the Scriptures."

MUELLER.

"Home and Family Life" was the subject of investigation of a special committee of the recent New Orleans convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the group was forced to report: "Allowing for notable and beautiful exceptions, it is generally true that in America the home has ceased to function. This accounts for the increase in lawlessness, immodesty, and juvenile depravity." This is also the gist of the recent report of the Federation of Churches on Prohibition. P. L. Blakely writes in *America* of October 31: "The boys and girls of to-day, allowing for notable and beautiful exceptions, are growing into maturity, fearing neither God, man, nor the devil. Evil is in the magazines they read, the theaters they visit, the amusements in which they engage, the clothes they wear, or, rather, dispense with, the company they keep, and the resorts, sometimes referred to as 'home,' in which they live. Foolish, weak, and criminally negligent parents either impose no check whatever upon them or themselves set a bad example." The Jesuit writer, in proposing a remedy, quotes the above committee: "Let all Christian churches enter upon a vigorous campaign to check the existing evils by preaching and instruction," and commends the work of Catholic preaching and other agencies in carrying out the suggestion. We demur to Catholic preaching, but encouragement to the Church which still fosters the pure Word, the only remedy for the situation, is certainly not amiss.

MUELLER.

**Is Family Prayer Practicable?**—On this subject an exchange paper has the following to say: "Whether we practise it or not, all of our convictions are on the side of family prayer. Where it is neglected or given up on account of our busy lives, we are ashamed. The difficulty in most homes is to find the right hour. In wide travel and in the conditions of many Christian homes we have found the breakfast table the most satisfactory place and time for family worship. Families are so scattered during the day and evening that convenient hours are difficult to settle upon. Dr. John Timothy Stone writes in the *Continent* concerning the family altar: 'First of all, it evidences orderliness and regularity in home duties. It binds the family in the genuine and lasting bonds of devotion and piety. It stamps the householder a God-fearing one. It teaches parents as well as children to pray. It acts as a poise and adjuster in all difficulties and problems and relates them rightly to God in their settlement. It is a pacifying as well as harmonizing force always. It weaves itself into the very fabric of domestic life, and time and use never wear out its sacred and blessed figures.'" MUELLER.

The Triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America was held at New Orleans October 12—November 2. One of the outstanding acts of the assembly was the approval of the election by the House of Bishops of the Rt. Rev. John Gardner Murray, seventh Bishop of Maryland, to be the first elected Presiding

Bishop of the Church. Other results of the convention are of more general significance. Despite the argument of Bishop Brent of Western New York, with a following of half of the convention, the motion to enter the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America failed of the necessary two-thirds vote. Against the insinuation that this is a victory for the Anglo-Catholic party, which prides itself on the ecclesiastical tradition of the Episcopal Church in contrast with the ecclesiastically doubtful parentage of the Puritan and other Reformation-born sects, the conservative element pointed out that the Roman Catholic Church "recognizes no cousins," and that it is not antagonistic to the Federal Council. Bishop Johnson called the Federal Council a "visionary experiment." Bishop Brent, in opposition, chiefly argued that Christian churches should unite against the impending tide of Eastern paganism, which argument was met by Bishop Gailor with the rejoinder that some churches in the Council were "hindering the cause of Christ." — It was decided to continue to refuse Christian burial to suicides, excommunicates, and unbaptized infants. The proposal to introduce into the *Book of Common Prayer* 54 saints, to be printed in black type in distinction from the red of the "undisputed saints," was rejected. It was decided not to drop the common chalice in the administration of the Communion. A motion to strike out the word "Protestant" before the name of "Episcopal Church" on the title-page of the *Book of Common Prayer* was tabled. The prayer-book received other corrections, however: The 39 Articles of Faith adopted in 1562 to distinguish the Church from the Roman Catholic and other Protestant churches were stricken out, likewise "obey" and "with all my worldly goods I thee endow" in the marriage service, also such "medieval" expressions as "the vengeance of God," "the wrath of God," and "miserable sinners." The Litany was amended to petition for those "who travel by land and water or *by air*." — A memorial was adopted calling for the adhesion of our Government to the World Court. — The Pastoral Letter read at the conclusion of the convention, in the words of *Time* (November 2, 1925), "avoided controversial creedal questions," but contained this veiled thrust at Fosdickism: "We would especially warn our people against the superficial and false antithesis, just now often dwelt upon, between the religion of Christ and the religion about Christ. No such differentiation can be made by those who believe in Jesus Christ as God. There is no such antithesis in the New Testament. We need both the religion about Christ and the religion of Christ, and the Church and the Scriptures give us both." MUELLER.

**Advertising One's Religion.** — Several weeks ago there appeared daily for a week, in the *New York Times*, a little advertisement, four inches wide and two and one half inches deep, at a cost to the advertiser of \$84 daily, with the notice: "These advertisements inserted daily, and paid for, by a native Pittsburgh Catholic business man who believes in his religion," giving paragraphs on Catholic customs, famous Catholics in the world of history and achievement, and Catholic doctrine and apologetics. Interesting among the latter

is: "*Scandal*.— Christ never guaranteed that His Church would be free of scandals; but He did guarantee that it would not teach error. There were grave scandals in the Church in the time of Christ. Judas was a thief, as well as a traitor and a suicide. Peter was a perjurer, James and John quarreled, and so did Peter and Paul. All Catholics readily admit the Catholic Church needed house-cleaning in the sixteenth century; but the Reformers set about, not to clean the house, but to dynamite it. If a child has a dirty face, you do not kill it; you wash its face. But in spite of the unholy lives of many Catholics in the sixteenth and other centuries, the Catholic Church never has taught, does not now, and never will, teach error. Consult your Bible, Matt. 28, 20: 'And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'" The point of this type of advertising is well put by *Time* (October 26): "It is a commonplace of advertising that to be successful one must be sincere. The Pittsburgher's institutional advertising argues sincerity at least."

MUELLER.

**Glimpses from the Observer's Window.**— It may do us all good to read William Johnston's "If I Were a Clergyman" in *Collier's Weekly* for October 10. *Fas est ab hoste doceri*.

When you dip into *Social Progress: A Handbook of the Liberal Movement*, just out, you will find that what we used to call "novel" is now called "progressive."

The *Nation* (October 28) claims that Solomon wrote: "Spare the rod and spoil the child," and discredits the maxim by lampooning its supposed author thus: "Solomon had so many wives that he probably did not know his own offspring by name, nor which were his and which the neighbor's; it is not surprising that he found the rod desirable, or at least easy; but it is a pity that his ignorant maxim is applied in the single small family to-day as if it were eternal wisdom." It makes no difference whether Solomon or some one else wrote Prov. 13, 24, the sentiment there expressed is "eternal wisdom," and the better part of mankind has been, and is being, raised on it. For the other part we have to have jails, gallows, and a hell.

Suicide is coming more and more to be regarded as the legitimate ending of life and is so proclaimed in modern literature. When the twentieth century *roué*, after "taking each night a new love to his bed," has had "each day to check the failure of a trial to find an hour's forgetfulness," he turns the knife against himself. Llewelyn Powyo, in *Ebony and Ivory*, two years ago, even called any person a fool for not committing suicide; for he wrote: "If our days in the garden of the earth are in reality so uncertain, so brief; if there is indeed so little time for any of us to play under the blackthorn; if, indeed, as was made clear to me then, death cannot be gainsaid, then surely the secret of so sorry and insecure an existence must lie in detachment; for he who would lose his heart to a life so beset with tragedy had best have a care for his wits."

If you are still interested in the question who caused the late World War, read the memoirs of Viscount Grey (*Twenty-Five Years, 1892—1916*), just published by the Frederick A. Stokes Company. His name is Grey.

Bruno Pinkney, of New York, is wondering in the *Nation* (October 28) why the banking house of Otto H. Kahn and other banking houses of Wall Street, which were frenzied declaimers on the love of liberty and against Emperor Bill, who had to be canned to give everybody a decent chance to love liberty, — why these banking houses are now so silent about Abdel Krim and the Riffs, who surely love liberty. Bruno Pinkney is even so abandoned as to suspect that the late transactions at Washington with representatives of foreign governments regarding their debts to the United States are really the work of our superpatriotic big war profiteers, who are

now doing their well-known salient work toward reduction of the Allied war debts in order to enhance the value of Allied securities held by our big financial interests.

We all remember, among the great variety of "German atrocities" during the World War, this particularly shocking one, *viz.*, that the Germans were utilizing the bodies of their dead in order to obtain fats and other things needed for fertilizing and for the making of ammunition; moreover, that this fact had been revealed by a German soldier who was employed in the factory where the dead bodies were being boiled down and who suddenly discovered that the body of his own brother was among those to be boiled down. Well, now here comes General James E. Charteris, Chief of Intelligence of the British Army during the war, and declares at a dinner at the National Arts Club in New York City that he invented this lie and forged the diary of the German soldier that was used for propping up the lie all over England. He said he had to resort to this strategy "to get the Americans into the war."

Both state and privately organized universities are receiving huge bequests, more or less conditioned, from capitalists. A movement has begun to prevent state universities at least from accepting such bequests. The reason is patent: capitalism wants to obtain a controlling influence on educational establishments because of their immense power for influencing the public mind and shaping the future. Mammonized educational facilities would be about the worst blight that could fall upon us. But what a compliment to education these bequests represent!

The Connecticut Conference of the Lutheran New York Ministerium adopted a resolution on evolution that meets all requirements: "As a scientific working hypothesis, evolution does not necessarily conflict with the Christian's faith in his God. But the philosophy of atheistic, pantheistic, and also theistic evolutionists is decidedly antichristian. It ascribes everything which faith knows as the working of God — creation, redemption, as well as the perfection of man — to evolution. It denies even the truth of the Gospel. It is not science, but pure unbelief."

"If throngs of eager children can be assembled for the purpose of deepening their knowledge of the providential civilization saved for them beyond the wreckage of nations and of philosophies, then let us reverence the glory of their youth and nurture it with a fine fervor, with no misunderstandings amongst ourselves, but *conscious always of the society we hope — as did the heroic among our forefathers — to create in America. For the arts and sciences, all of them, are the levers with which the future will be controlled.*" (Italics ours. *The Commonweal*, October 21.) This shows that the program voiced at the First Catholic Missionary Congress at Chicago in 1910, *viz.*, to "make America Catholic," has not been forgotten and never will be. Moreover, it is sure of success because it works by the method of educating its youth — the infallible road to success. And because Protestants do not educate, their cause is doomed.

"Cafeteria education" is what Bishop Irving Johnson of the Episcopal Church recently called the picking and pecking at this or that study which the dilettante pursues at our great institutions and for which the institution must serve ever so many electives. The addicts to this sort of education may be munching educational tidbits for six years without eating a single square meal.

In a commendatory notice of Dr. Zorn's *Last Apostolic Word* in the *Lutheran* (October 29) J. A. S. speaks of the author's "somewhat extreme attitude on lodges and unionism" and remarks: "If these are as godless as the author assumes, they should be opposed as a matter of course." *O sancta, etc.!*

Referring to the recent world series of baseball the *Lutheran's* Washington correspondent remarked: "When the game is played on Sunday, all Christians regret it, though otherwise it is a desirable game." It would be interesting to learn the exact cause of the regret. There are reasons for regret when some people attend a game on Monday or Tuesday, etc.

The Universal Knowledge Foundation, New York, has in five volumes of 2,622 pages attempted the impossible, *viz.*, to establish the thesis that "Roderic de Borgia, Pope Alexander VI, has been a man of good moral character and an excellent Pope." The author is Peter de Roo, and the title of his book, *Material for a History of Pope Alexander VI, His Relatives, and His Time*. All who differ from the author's findings are "arch-slanderers" and "discordant revilers." Sympathy with the author is in place. Ten times five such volumes as he has produced will not accomplish his end.

DAU.

---