

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.

SEPTEMBER, 1926.

No. 9.

---

## The Sesquicentennial of Our Independence.

W. ARNDT, St. Louis, Mo.

The readers of this article, I have no doubt, are agreed that our nation has abundant reason to thank God for the freedom which was achieved through the struggle inaugurated by the famous Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. While the history which began on that day is partly written in blood, some of it the blood of brothers who fought each other in the Civil War; while it is marred here and there by accounts of injustice and corruption; while party strife has dominated our political life frequently instead of true patriotism; while our judiciary at times has failed to function for the protection of the citizens, for instance, at the time of the World War, when innocent men were set upon by fanatical, bloodthirsty mobs; while the American Indian, once the owner of the land we now call ours, has a tale of woe to tell with respect to the treatment he received all too generally; nevertheless, viewed as a whole, that venture undertaken 150 years ago has been markedly successful and has brought in its wake a constitution and a government for which we cannot be too thankful. Dean Inge, a number of years ago, remarked that we cannot escape human limitations and imperfections when setting up a government. If we establish an autocracy, we shall, *ceteris paribus*, have a government that will be honest, just, and efficient, but it will be at the expense of personal and political liberty. (Witness Italy these days under Mussolini.) If we choose a democracy, we shall have freedom, but it will be at the expense of efficiency; there will be corruption, bad, ill-advised legislation, and party rancor. You have to choose between two evils, such was the conclusion the reader had to draw from the remarks of the prominent Anglican scholar, and can you be sure which will be the lesser one? The pessimism of the "gloomy Dean" is shared by few, if any, of my readers, I am sure, even if there is some justification for it. On the contrary, to us the liberty which we enjoy here is a priceless boon, and we

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

**Antilodge Paragraphs.**—The following resolutions, adopted last winter by the Iowa District Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Ev. Lutheran Church of America, will be read with interest and profit:—

“We, the members of the Iowa District Pastoral Conference, assembled in annual meeting at Mason City, Iowa, December 1 and 2, 1925, realizing our great responsibility for the souls entrusted to our care, are deeply concerned because of the soul-destroying influence of the lodges:—

“Because the lodges are religious institutions. ‘Masonry is a religious institution.’ (Mackey, *Lexicon of Freemasonry*, p. 371, cited in Edmond Ronayne, *Master’s Carpet*, p. 45. Also Mackey: *Manual of the Lodge*, p. 40.)

“‘Interwoven with Religion’ (Ronayne, *Handbook of Freemasonry*, p. 142). ‘The lodge is ‘erected to God.’ (Ronayne’s *Handbook*, p. 108.) ‘The lodge has a temple, an altar, a Bible, a chaplain, prayer, a priest, a high priest, a grand high priest. (See *Revised Odd-Fellowship*, illustrated, the complete *Revised Ritual*, 26th ed., pp. 43. 46. 123. 124 [note 69]. 168. 237. 135. 155. 160. 223. 238. 242. 255. Also *Freemason’s Guide*, by D. Sickles, p. 22; Ronayne’s *Master’s Carpet*, pp. 150. 151, and *Handbook*, pp. 25. 26; *Proceedings of the Masonic Congress, Chicago*, 1893, p. 40. See also *The Modern Woodman Ritual* of 1894, prescribed, published, and sold by the Head Company, and the rituals of the Knights of the Maccabees, Knights of Pythias, Improved Order of Redmen, and others.)

“*The American Tyler*, a Masonic official paper, claims editorially that Masonry has regenerative power and the comfort of the true religion and is capable of answering the question, What must I do to be saved? See issue of March 15, 1897.

"Hence the lodge is a religious institution. But the religion of the lodge is non-Christian.

"With the exception of the Good Templar Lodge and a few degrees in another lodge, the lodges systematically exclude the God-man Jesus Christ from their prescribed prayers. Confer their rituals. In spite of the punishment pronounced upon those who add unto, or take away from, God's Word, Rev. 22, 18, 19, the lodges take away from prescribed Bible-passages in their rituals the God-given name Jesus, to which every knee should bow, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father, Phil. 2, 9—11.

"For instance, 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ' is eliminated from 2 Thess. 3, 6.

"In the [by our] Lord Jesus Christ' is eliminated from 2 Thess. 3, 12.

"By [through] Jesus Christ' is eliminated from 1 Pet. 2, 5.

"The passages are taken with slight, but necessary modifications.'

"For proofs see references in Ronayne's *Master's Carpet*, pp. 180—189.

"The second Man is of heaven' is taken out of 1 Cor. 15, 42—49, used as part of the *Modern Woodmen Funeral Rituals*. See p. 73.

"Thus the lodges eliminate from their religion Christ Jesus, who says He is the Way and without whom no one cometh to the Father.

"Still they claim that all their deceased members go to heaven by means of a religion they claim to be a perfect substitute for Christianity.

"There is that latent in Freemasonry which makes it exactly the institution that is most needed in this age.' (*General History, Cyclopedia, and Dictionary of Freemasonry*, by Macoy and Oliver, p. 428. *Master's Carpet*, p. 112.) We Christians know that *Christianity* is the institution most needed in this sinful world in every age. 'If Masonry can't have a man, he cannot be saved.' (*Master's Carpet*, p. 41.) 'If Freemasonry is not the religion or in any manner a substitute for it, then, in Solomon's name, what is it?' (See *American Tyler*, March 15, 1897; also *Modern Woodmen's Handbook*, pp. 314, 315.)

"The lodges are also *antichristian* in their practise:—

"They administer oaths without divine authority. Rom. 13, 1.

"Their members have promised to do things, not always knowing what they are, thus binding their consciences, like Herod, Matt. 14, 6—8; Jephthah, Judg. 11, 30, 31, 34—39. Examine their oaths. They 'pray' mock prayers, conduct sham funerals, at which they blaspheme God by reading portions of Holy Writ. (Ronayne's *Master's Carpet*, pp. 370—378, and *Handbook*, pp. 200, 218—222. See also rituals.)

"Therefore we consider it our pastoral duty to instruct and warn our people against this pernicious foe of the Christian religion by preaching and shepherding, by instructing the young, and by disseminating antiseoret society literature. We also urge the instructors at our higher institutions of learning to warn the students against

lodges and amply to supply the libraries with antilodge literature. We also urge our presidents to include this subject in their visitation questions and our church-papers to witness against this foe of our faith."

ARNDT.

**Dr. Long and Lodges.**—At the convention of the National Christian Association, on Tuesday afternoon, May 25, Rev. Simon Peter Long, D. D., of the Wicker Park Lutheran Church, introduced the first speaker in the following words: "It was my privilege last Sunday afternoon to help lay a corner-stone in Oak Park, Ill. Some of you have been noticing the last few weeks the great trouble they have been having out there with regard to the dismissal of fifty-one high school students. Now, those fifty-one high school students did just what their fathers had been doing, and it was my privilege to tell the people of that city last Sunday afternoon that if I were a pastor in that church, I would say first of all that the School Board was perfectly right in not wanting a secret society in the school. In the second place, I would say that the School Board was very inconsistent, because I understand that most of them are Masons and belong to different secret orders; and now they are expelling young people from the schools for doing what the members of the School Board have done. I always took the position that if I had a boy and didn't want him to smoke, I would have sense enough to take the pipe out of my mouth and throw my tobacco away. That is the way I would argue with the boy. That is the way we must argue when these questions of membership in secret societies arise. Let us also remember that Jesus said: 'In secret have I said nothing.'"

The argument is absolutely legitimate. If the "A. F. A. M." is something good for older men, there is no reason why the Kappa Delta Phi ought to be kept out of the high school or college. However, in opposing lodgery Lutherans usually stress the element of syncretism, of which lodgery is guilty, rather than that of secrecy. But if unionism is condemned in lodgery, it must be condemned also wherever it occurs. In the report we read also this: "Rev. Dr. Long announced that the devotional service would be conducted by Rev. John Kuite, Gano Reformed Church, Chicago, Ill. Rev. Mr. Kuite then read the First Psalm, which was followed by prayer and the song, 'Take Time to Be Holy.'" Some day the Rev. S. P. Long may take time also to consider how to be consistent. MUELLER.

**Why Are There So Few Candidates for the Ministry in Reformed Churches?**—One of our exchanges reports that the *Modern Church*, a Liberal organ, offers this explanation: "The absurd and fanatical emphasis which the traditionalist clergy and the bitter and obscurantist church press places upon the outworn forms of traditional Christian dogmas and upon interpretations of them which are discredited in the minds of modern men, is doing a tremendous amount to create a feeling of uncertainty, if not of absolute skepticism. No church policy could be more injudicious in this age and country."

Can we not, in reply to this attack on conservative teaching, say that as long as positive truth was taught, there was, relatively speak-

ing, no dearth of theological candidates, but that as soon as liberalistic teaching became the vogue at a number of divinity schools and seminaries, the youth of the Church hesitated to take up the study of theology? It is not a mere "*Tu quoque*" when we raise the countercharge that modern skepticism and unbelief have operated to kill interest in the ministry and in religious work in general. Various other factors have assisted in bringing about this deplorable situation. The writer in the exchange from which we quote thinks that the "engrossment of the present generation in *things*" is largely responsible for this lack of theological students. He says:—

"It is the age of big *things*: big business, big bridges, big railroads, big factories, big structures, big enterprises, big science. The boy of to-day grows up in an atmosphere of things. They press in upon him, they hit him in the face, they shriek at him, they call to him. They offer great opportunities and great incomes, great power and success. The world of the spirit is hard to enter; materialism is the atmosphere we all breathe. Once seniors in college discussed philosophy and poetry, now they discuss industry and inventions. Courses in philosophy are little patronized in our universities. This atmosphere of materialism never breeds ministers. There has never been any shortage of ministers after the great revivals of religion.

"This atmosphere of materialism has got into our homes. Great Sunday newspapers with pages of pictures of big, material things deluge our homes, and the boys who once grew up on *Pilgrim's Progress* now grow up on these supplements. The talk at the table is of airships, radio, automobiles, and inventions. Once church was discussed at the Sunday dinner; now many families never go to church, or if they do, they do not discuss the preacher. They discuss where they shall drive after dinner. Thus the subtle influence of things colors even the home life of the day.

"When the boy goes up to college, he will very likely find that the same subtle material influence has followed him. The scientific and vocational courses are crowding out the cultural and philosophical. In many of our large universities religion is hardly mentioned. One by one the colleges are dropping out church. As I write, a really fierce discussion is going on at Yale about church services for the students, and when the chapel service is dropped as part of the curriculum, it is the same as saying that religious culture is not as necessary as culture in chemistry or political economy. Voluntary church really means that the hundreds or thousands of boys in the universities have no contact with the church for four years. Not only do they lose sight of the ministry as a vocation, they generally forget the church entirely and never return to it even as churchgoers. The universities themselves, while stressing all kinds of studies which have to do with material success and science, except in rare instances pay no attention to religion."

The truth of all this cannot be denied.

ARNDT.

**Internal Trouble at Princeton.**—In our last issue mention was made of the opposition which the appointment of Dr. Machen, a great leader of the conservative forces in the Presbyterian Church,

to a full professorship at Princeton Seminary, met with on the floor of the recent Presbyterian convention. The root of the difficulty is that the Seminary Faculty presents the sad spectacle of a house divided against itself, and that not on some petty point of pedagogy, but on the evaluation of present-day Liberalism. The *Presbyterian* gives this account of the controversy and of the outcome in the Assembly:—

“There can be no question as to the great significance that attaches to the argument employed by President Stevenson before the Assembly against the confirmation of Dr. Machen. And that because it makes clear what the question at issue between President Stevenson and the majority of the Faculty and the majority of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary really is. There has been much confusion of mind at this point. Henceforth the matter should be clear to all. President Stevenson’s main argument against the minority report was that Dr. Machen is actively hostile to his aims and purposes for the Seminary, as expressed in the following words: ‘We are the agency of the combined old school and new school, and my ambition as president is that the Seminary shall represent and be amenable to the whole Presbyterian Church and not to any particular faction in the church.’ This means, if it means anything, that President Stevenson wants to make Princeton Seminary an ‘inclusive’ seminary—a seminary whose faculty would include, and to whose platforms would be invited, not only Fundamentalists, but Modernists of the sort who signed the Affirmation of 1924. Against this avowed aim of President Stevenson, the majority of the Board of Directors as well as the majority of the Faculty are unalterably opposed. In their judgment the differences between the conservatives and liberals—or if one prefers between the Fundamentalists and Modernists—in the Presbyterian Church are not to be compared with the differences between the old and new school Presbyterians. For while the differences between the old and new schools were differences within the bounds of Calvinism, the differences between Fundamentalism and Modernism—when expressed in any consistent form—are differences between Christianity and what is something other than Christianity. President Stevenson may be perfectly right when he affirms that there is not a doctrinal difference in the faculty of Princeton Seminary, but there is a real and important difference between President Stevenson and most of his faculty and directors as to the attitude that should be taken toward that sort of liberalism that finds expression, for instance, in the Affirmation of 1924—practically the only kind to be found in the Presbyterian Church. President Stevenson evidently does not judge that such liberalism disqualifies a man to occupy a chair or to lecture at Princeton Seminary. Not only Dr. Machen, but a majority of his colleagues judge differently. The question at issue is a larger question than the future of Dr. Machen. It has to do with the future policy of Princeton Seminary—whether Princeton Theological Seminary, in the future as in the past, is to stand *uncompromisingly* for the complete trustworthiness of the Bible as the record of the supernatural revelation,

in deed and word, that God in His love and mercy has given us; and so for the historicity of the events recorded in the Scriptures as facts and for the explanation of those facts given in the Scriptures themselves as the only true and Christian explanation of those facts.

"The majority report, which recommended no action be taken on Dr. Machen's election, was read by the chairman of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, Dr. George N. Luccock, of Wooster, O., and was supported on the floor of the Assembly by Drs. J. Ross Stevenson and Charles R. Erdman. The minority report, which recommended the confirmation of Dr. Machen, was read by the Rev. Thomas S. Dickson, of New Kensington, Pa., and supported by Dr. John B. Laird, of Philadelphia, vice-president of the Board of Directors, in the absence of its president, Dr. Maitland Alexander of Pittsburgh, and by Dr. Oswald T. Allis, who, like Drs. Stevenson and Erdman, is a member of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary. The majority report was adopted by a distinct majority of the Assembly."

A later issue of the same paper states that the appointment of Dr. Machen will stand in spite of the failure of the Assembly to confirm it, since the Assembly merely has the right of veto concerning professorships at Princeton and did not exercise this right, its resolution being merely to the effect that action on the appointment of Dr. Machen should be postponed. As matters stand, it is impossible to say whether the majority of the Presbyterian Assembly wishes to see Dr. Machen appointed to the professorship in question or not.

ARNDT.

**The Southern Baptist Convention.**—At this convention, which was held at Houston, Tex., beginning May 12, the presiding chairman, Dr. Geo. W. McDaniel, said in his presidential address, among other things: "I do not need to record my faith, for all who read know that I have written it in words that cannot be misunderstood, and I am happy to believe that this convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God and rejects every theory, evolution or other, which teaches that man originated in, or came by way of, a lower animal ancestry."

Immediately Dr. M. E. Dodd, of Shreveport, La., was on his feet. "I move," he said, "that the convention make the last sentence of this declaration the sentiment of this body and from this moment we go ahead on the great Kingdom enterprises." There was not a dissenting voice, and the vote was vigorous and unanimous.

The budget of the Church for general and state activities was fixed at \$9,000,000. It was decided: That under the direction of the Cooperative Program Commission there be inaugurated this year the most intensive effort that has ever been conducted among Southern Baptists for the full enlistment of the churches in systematic and proportionate giving, through a regular budget that shall give due recognition to the claims of the general work of the denomination as well as the local work of the churches. To this end it is recommended that an effort be made immediately to enroll at least 500,000 tithers among Southern Baptists.

Concerning foreign missions there were reported 13,269 baptisms this year, almost a thousand gain over the record last year. Southern Baptists now have on the foreign fields 1,213 churches and 3,247 out-stations, with a membership of 140,488. To-day 528 American missionaries are in the employ of the board and 2,544 native workers.

MUELLER.

**The Document "Q."** — The *Hibbert Journal* of April of this year brings a conjectural restoration of the mythical document "Q." In their endeavor to explain the origin of our gospels in a naturalistic fashion, critics have hit on the supposition that Matthew and Luke had two main sources for their narratives, namely, Mark and a document which contained chiefly sayings (*logia*) of Jesus and which they designate as "Q" (*Quelle*). This document, they admit, was lost very early in the history of Christianity, and no convincing proof can be submitted that it is alluded to in the early history of the Church. The famous statement of Papias, reported by Eusebius in his *Church History* (III, 39): "So then Matthew composed the oracles (*ta logia*) in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could," certainly does not furnish us sufficient ground for assuming that Matthew wrote a book which was distinct from his gospel and contained chiefly utterances of Christ; what Papias had in mind may well have been our present Gospel according to St. Matthew, in which the discourses of Christ are so prominent. Even Dr. Streeter of Oxford, who is one of the champions of the theory that there was such a document as "Q" is supposed to have been, is fair enough to say: "We are justified, then, in assuming the existence of 'Q' so long as we remember that the assumption is one which, though highly probable, falls just short of certainty." Various attempts have been made to reconstruct this suppositional document, the best-known probably being that of Harnack. The writer in the *Hibbert Journal*, who is so audacious as to engage in such an effort is Rev. J. M. Crum, M. A., Rector of Farnham, England. He submits (in English) what he believes to have been the text of "Q." The highly hypothetical nature of his work is indicated by these opening remarks of his: "The restoration is conjectured on the following suppositions: 1. That Dr. Streeter is right in his suggestion that a first edition of St. Luke can be disengaged from our present third gospel. 2. St. Luke had already, in his first edition, broken up and distributed his 'Q' material without much regard to its original order. 3. He has omitted or altered such 'Q' passages as were too Jerusalem-centered or Judaistic for his purpose. 4. 'Q' was a Jerusalem-centered and Judaistic version of the Gospel tradition. It represents the A. D. 40—50 version of a tradition which was taken to Rome and, in A. D. 60—70, appears as St. Mark's gospel. 5. In many cases the original 'Q' order is lost. In such cases, I have used the Marcan order, as being the only one available." To see what flimsy arguments are employed by critics when they have a theory to support, let the reader glance at the following sentences of Rev. Crum with respect to Luke 10. He says: "Luke has discarded Matt. 10, 5, 'Enter not into any city of the Samaritans.' He has betrayed his omission by inserting before

the mission [of the seventy] 9, 51—56, the story of the Samaritan village, and after the return, 10, 30—37, the story of the Good Samaritan." That is grand reasoning! In the charge to the seventy no mention is made of the prohibition telling the disciples not to go to the Samaritans. That prohibition ought to have been there, argues Rev. Crum, because it is found in Matt. 10, which is taken from "Q," and Luke had "Q" before him when he wrote. Luke omitted this prohibition. Of that we can be sure. The context shows it, says our author. The preceding context relates how Jesus would not have a Samaritan village destroyed, and the subsequent context contains a story in which a Samaritan is commended. Therefore it was impossible for Luke to report that Jesus said to his seventy disciples they should confine their labors to the Jews and not go to the Samaritans. Is that not manifesting remarkable acumen? Just as though a merciful attitude toward the Samaritans would have been incompatible with the order that the disciples, as long as Jesus was with them, should go to the Jews with the Gospel, not to Samaritans or Gentiles! This is one of the points where the ultra-arbitrary character of many of the foundations for the theory in question evinces itself. Thus the divine Word is measured with the yardstick of human reason, dissected, and a microscopic search is made to discover its origin. While the individual trees are minutely examined, the woods are not seen. We can safely leave the critics to worry about the vexing problems which their own fancy has created. *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum.*

ARNDT.

**Slop.**—For some time the *American Mercury* has been publishing articles on various churches in our country. Relative to these articles the *Biblical Review* (July, 1926) writes: "It is inevitable in our age that particular feelings and ideas, good or bad, which sway large numbers of people should find expression in periodical literature. The unruly spirit of the times, so contemptuous of God, the home, the Church, moral restrictions, and even those conventions that have derived from ages of human experience, has naturally found expression in the printed page. The *American Mercury*, a radical magazine found often in the hands of a rabidly intellectual class, has been giving a series of articles on the denominations. Their character and value may be judged when the *Christian Register*, Unitarian, was moved to say this concerning the article about the Baptists:—

"An article in the *American Mercury* entitled 'The Baptists' is the first of a series on the denominations announced in that magazine for early publication. The writer is utterly out of his sphere. He has no background of knowledge of religion, no historic sense in any field whatever, and as for facts, he has hunted a scavenger's scent in a study which requires, first and foremost, spiritual discernment. God help the other churches to come if they are heaped up in such a garbage can! It is a caricature of a great communion whose works are known for their light and healing and quickening around the planet. We know somewhat of the ecclesiastical shortcomings of every denomination, including our own. If they were as bad among

the Baptists as this article presents, with no compensatory virtue and achievement, that great people would perish. Such writing fits the worst of our flippant and degraded newspapers." The foregoing criticism applies also to the article on the Lutheran Church, which appeared in the *American Mercury*. Fortunately the majority of people do not judge the Churches by the standards of this erratic periodical.

MUELLER.

**The Bible in Other Lands.**—The *Sunday-school Times* (July 25) reports the following concerning the reading of the Bible in other countries: "Cardinal O'Donnell in a recent pastoral has called on Irish Catholics to read the Scriptures daily. It is not so long ago that such reading was forbidden to the Irish. There is consequently a new opportunity for Bible colportage, and last year 6,165 more Scriptures were sold in Ireland than in 1924. The total sale of religious books by colporteurs in that country was 85,407, of which nearly a third were Scriptures." It must not be forgotten, however, that Catholics may read the Holy Scriptures only in versions and editions sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church, and that the insidious notes in the Catholic Bibles, which are added to the text, must be accepted by them as the true interpretation of God's Word. If the Irish Catholics discard these notes and cling to the text in simple faith, they may find Christ, their Savior, even in a translation prepared from the Vulgate.

"Permission to place Bibles in the hotels of Stockholm has been given by nearly all the important hotels of that city. The innovation, however, displeases some. Thus a student summoned the maid and asked her to put him in another chamber, as he did not care to sleep in the same room with a Bible. 'You must have a bad conscience,' was the answer, 'to fear to be in the same room with the Bible.'"

"*L'Officiel*, the organ of the French government, has this regarding the Bible in secondary education: 'Pupils must not be left in ignorance of the principal traditions and the great men of the people of Israel, nor of the books of the Bible. This because it is a part of the intellectual and moral patrimony of humanity and then because, if we are not acquainted with them, we cannot understand either Protestantism, Puritanism, the art of the Middle Ages, or that of the Renaissance.'" We pity all who study the Bible merely for these reasons!

MUELLER.

**Circulating the Scriptures.**—The *Sunday-school Times*, a periodical which has frequently warned the Churches of our country against sending Modernistic missionaries to the foreign fields, urges in one of its recent numbers that all Christians should do their utmost in circulating the Scriptures, since "every Testament is a missionary that can never become a Modernist." The editorial reads: "When we send missionaries to the foreign field, it is important to make sure that they really stand for the faith. For many missionaries do not; and even some who have been sound when they went to the field have been turned aside from the truth after reaching there and are not bearing a true testimony to-day. On the other hand, it

is a matter for thanksgiving that there is a vast body of true missionaries in the field. But there is one particular missionary in whose sending we can all have a share, and for whose testimony we need never have any fear. That missionary is the Word of God. As the Director of the Great Commission Prayer League has said in connection with The Million Testaments for the China Campaign, every Testament is 'a missionary that can never become a Modernist.' Let us praise God that He is flooding the inhabited world to-day with printed copies of His Word as never before in the history of the world. And if we would share in the most effective way in the evangelization of the world before the Lord's return, let us do our uttermost in circulating the Scriptures, rejoicing that no copy of the Word will ever turn aside from that to which God has sent it." Sad to say even some Testaments have been changed into "Modernists" by translations that deliberately misinterpret the original, as, for instance, Moffatt's, which seems to be used extensively even in the foreign fields.

MUELLER.

**New Translations of the Old Testament.**—Dr. J. M. P. Smith of the Semitic Department of Chicago University has been selected by Dr. Laing, former Dean of the Faculty of Arts of McGill University, to write a translation of the Old Testament corresponding to Goodspeed's translation of the New. Dr. Smith chose as his assistants Prof. T. J. Meek, of Toronto, Le Roy Waterman, of the University of Michigan, and Dr. A. R. Gordon, of Montreal. According to the *Presbyterian Banner* of April 15, Prof. Smith is working on the Psalms, Job, and the minor prophets; Profs. Meek and Waterman, on the historical works; Dr. Gordon on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Proverbs. Each was given three years in which to complete the work, and the completed translation will be published within a year of next November. The book will be published in modern form, with alternative readings about disputed passages.

MUELLER.

**The Trade in Bibles.**—The American Bible Society closed its one hundred and tenth year with a record of 9,069,120 Bibles published. The China agency reported 4,075,853 volumes, breaking all records. The Japanese and Philippine agencies doubled their 1924 issue. New versions to the number of thirty-eight languages and dialects were attended to. The Soviet Government in Russia has permitted Christians in Russia to print Russian Bibles on government presses; the American Bible society is furnishing close to \$15,000 for the purpose of making the electrotype plates to print these Bibles, which are much needed after years of opposition to the publication of Bibles in Russia.

MUELLER.

**Monsignor Caruana, Protestant and Professor.**—Some time ago Monsignor Caruana, Papal Delegate and Bishop of Porto Rico, Italian by birth and Spanish by long connection as bishop of Porto Rico, filled in the "Cuestionario Para Inmigrantes y Repatriados" at the Mexican Immigrant Station. He was admitted. Soon afterwards he left, expelled by the Mexican government. At Washington, D. C., he threatened to denounce the Mexican government on account of its

cruelty in obliging him to leave that country. However, he was silent. In the mean while President Calles instructed the Consulado General de Mexico at Washington to send out a certain letter to the various publications, asking them to publish the matter therein contained in order "to help create a good feeling between the peoples of Mexico and the United States." Attached to the letter, which explained why the Mexican government decided to live without Monsignor Caruana, was the "Cuestionaria," or rather a photostatic copy, which showed how Bishop Caruana, the Papal Delegate, a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church and the personal representative of Pope Pius XI, had lied to the Mexican authorities. The following are a few examples: "Profession, office, or occupation?" "*Professor.*" "What is your nationality?" "*English.*" "What religion do you profess?" "*Protestant.*" "Do you come on business or as a tourist?" "*Tourist.*" "What other languages do you speak?" "*None.*" No wonder "Professor Caruana," "Protestant tourist," "speaking no other language than English," was expelled! MUELLER.

**The Faith of Luther.**—It is strange to see theologians who are scientifically trained and might be expected to know better define the faith of Luther in Ritschlian fashion. Writing of the theology of Eugene Menegoz, a French theologian of Lutheran antecedents, W. M. Horton, of the Berlin Graduate School of Theology, makes these statements: "What we need, he [Menegoz] says, is not absolute knowledge of the truth, which our limited intelligences are not fit to reach, but absolute certitude of salvation; not intellectual certitude, but religious certitude. All of us are in error in one way or another, for we see through a glass, darkly. But in spite of our errors we are saved by faith and made certain of our salvation. In this combination of intellectual agnosticism with religious certitude of salvation, Menegoz shows himself a true Lutheran. Did not Luther himself maintain that it is not what God is in Himself, but what He is to us, that matters?" This is the same anti-intellectualism which characterized the Ritschlians and which by Ritschl himself was labeled real, genuine Lutheranism, while the Lutheranism of the dogmatists of the seventeenth century was, in his opinion, altogether degenerate and no longer worthy of the name.—In the words quoted above we find a remarkable perversion of historical fact. It is very true that Luther distinguished between the hidden God and the revealed God and that he admonished all Christians to let the latter, not the former, be their concern. But it is evident to every one who carefully studies the writings of Luther that by taking such a position, Luther did not affirm that God cannot be known at all, but that he merely maintains that the "hidden" God is past our finding out. In other words, our knowledge of the great God extends as far as His revelation of Himself extends. Where that ceases, there we are ignorant concerning that almighty, ever-blessed Being and His ways and plans. There are many things in God which He has not revealed to us, which hence we do not understand. About these hidden things we should not speculate. If we do it, we shall quite likely come to grief. But God has revealed Himself. He has

revealed Himself in Christ, such is Luther's position, and that revelation is given us in the infallible Scriptures. Modern theologians fasten on Luther's warning not to speculate about the unrevealed God and have interpreted this to mean that the great Reformer was opposed to insistence on the Bible-teachings about God. They overlook the fact that for Luther it is simply unthinkable that a person can accept God without accepting Christ, and accept Christ without accepting what the Word of God has revealed about Him. We grant that Luther combated the idea that a merely intellectual certitude is true faith; but we say that he likewise combated the opinion that true faith can exist without accepting the divine revelation about God and Christ. A few sayings of Luther may be submitted here. He says, for instance: "Our life is altogether enclosed in the Word. For it is true that we have Christ, we have eternal life, eternal righteousness, help and consolation; but where? We do not see it. We have it not in a chest or in our hands, but exclusively in the Word. In such a way has God enclosed His gift in what might be termed nothing (*also gar hat Gott sein Ding in das Nichts gefasst*)."

And again he says: "We cannot have God in any other form than that in which He presents Himself in His Word." Luther proclaims on the one hand: "I have often admonished young theologians, and am admonishing them still to-day, to study the Scripture in such a way as not to explore the divine majesty and the dread works of God. God does not desire to be known by us in such a fashion; on the contrary, Christ is the Way to God." On the other hand, he says: "I believe that God has so ordered matters that no one can describe Christ, the Scripture only excepted. If people disregard this Book, it is impossible for them to know Christ." (These quotations are taken and translated from a little book by Dr. George Buchwald, entitled, *Neues zur Charakteristik Luthers*.) Unbiased students ought to be able to see that the effort to make Luther the precursor of Ritschl and Menegoz amounts almost to a historical monstrosity.

ARNDT.

Several journalists lately burst out in denunciation over a clergyman because he would not marry an unbaptized person in his church. The journalists were so irrational, and so innocently irrational, that they actually supposed it was the clergyman who was guilty of irrationality. It never seemed to strike them that the man who would not be christened in a church and could not bear to be married outside of a church was guilty of some irrationality. If it is right to be unbaptized, why is it wrong to be married at a registrar's? Whether the Church of England is Catholic or Protestant, divine or human, dependent or independent, it obviously has the same rights as are possessed by any Two-penny Bank Club, and any man would be thought a fool who said: "It is a great shame that I am not allowed the privileges of the Old Poorman's Club merely because I refuse to go through the superstitious ceremony of being put up for election." Nobody would be allowed to be a Freemason, a Forester, an Odd-Fellow, or anything else upon the extraordinary terms on which the extraordinary bridegroom apparently wishes to be a churchman, and

nowhere in the human world but in this strange area of irrationality, by this time amounting almost to insanity, would any one have achieved such a topsyturvy contradiction as this version of first and last things. . . . What would a reasonable age think of a man who really wanted to be inside of a building without ever having entered it?

C. H. CHESTERTON,

in *Illustrated London News*, November 11, 1925.

**The Case of Sir Oliver Lodge.**— That the pursuit of scientific studies does not make a person immune against error is evidenced all too clearly by the adherence of many scientists to the theory of evolution. We are reminded of the same truth when we think of the infatuation for spiritualism possessing Sir Oliver Lodge, the famous British scientist. The *Christian Century* remarks interestingly:—

“According to Sir Oliver Lodge, the Royal Society, through Professor Armstrong, has virtually asked him to resign, ‘because,’ he explains in a letter to *Nature*, ‘I have gradually reached a conviction on a subject of age-long debate and uncertainty and have said so.’ In other words, Sir Oliver believes that we do receive authentic communications from the spirits of the dead. Sir Oliver appears to be incorrigibly credulous. Not many months ago Houdini and some of the American investigators of spiritualism proved that part of the pictures which Sir Oliver and Conan Doyle took to be proofs of spirit photography were simply more or less disguised copies of bits from great paintings or other known pictures. The eminent believer in spiritualism answered in effect that an element of fraud in some of the negatives did not vitiate the integrity of the rest. For ourselves we confess that when a man has sold us one glass diamond we take very little stock in the rest of his assortment. If Margery, the Boston medium, accomplishes something by fraud to-day, even though we cannot detect the fraud in what she does to-morrow, we strongly suspect it is there. The man with the fraud complex on March 26 has it on March 28, too. We sympathize with the Royal Society. Sir Oliver may be a very good scientist. But when it comes to his yearning affection for his dear lost son, he will accept a very far-fetched explanation of phenomena susceptible of many other explanations and much simpler ones. Darkness and the Royal Society do not mix.”

ARNDT.

**Religious Conditions in Russia.**— Reports from Russia are very conflicting. Some picture conditions as very dark, others furnish a more favorable description of the situation. What of the state of religion? A writer in the *Hibbert Journal*, who is himself a Russian and writes from Russia, but whose name is not given (for obvious reasons, as the editor says), makes us believe that religious conditions are no longer so bad as they were several years ago. Some of his remarks will be read with interest. He writes: “The outward régime through which the Church is now passing may be called the period of an expiring persecution. It, like everything else in Russia, is a passing period through which we must go. The moral atmosphere of a country recovering after a revolutionary cyclone is unendurably dif-

ficult to bear. Passionate class hatred has somewhat abated, and an acute, but equally passionate longing for enjoyment, not restricted by religious or social claims, has come to the fore. We see plunder and pilfering of private and state revenue among those in authority, numerous cases of renegeation among the intellectuals; depravity among the young generation, the coarsest materialism in the masses, the negation of the Church, of God, of the very idea of religion — such are the characteristics of the present society, a society perfectly heathen in its new way. And, withstanding it, we see the Church, restricted in numbers, but strengthened by the fires of persecution. . . . Antireligious authority has evidently given up the intention of breaking down the Church by coarse material violence. There is no doubt that in this struggle the state has sustained a painful moral defeat. The churches have not been empty, the communities of the faithful have only closed their ranks in a spirit of true unity around their pastors. Many martyrs and confessors among the clergy have consolidated the unity of the Church with their own blood and by martyrdom. The Church has proved itself stronger than its persecutors. The latter are obliged to make concessions to the masses, which still value the Church and do not want to give it up; otherwise they would be in danger of losing their political authority. At the present moment the priests are no longer executed, and the practising of a cult is subjected to few restrictions. . . . The Communist authorities still continue to think that the struggle against God is one of their chief aims; but they prefer to kill the spirit, not the body. They do this in the schools, in literature, through a special publishing firm, 'The Atheist,' in the journal the *Godless*, in the theater. . . . The 'regenerated' reformation of the Church [the form of religion which had the sanction of the Soviet government] is no longer an acutely painful subject for the Church. The leaders among the 'regenerated' have not found it possible to enlist either the masses or the idealistic adherents of reforms. . . . Are there still many faithful left in Russia? Yes, very many. But it is difficult to say whether they form the minority or the majority of the country. It is wise to avoid mistakes in one or the other direction. It is impossible to get at any correct figures; we can only judge from the attendance at church. The churches are full, but not overflowing. If we take into consideration the fact that many churches which have been given to the 'regenerated' are empty, it becomes evident that the general attendance is smaller than before the revolution. . . . Among the city poor, the Baptists and all kinds of 'brethren' find many adherents. The simplicity of their moral preaching and often the severity of their personal life attract many to them. This is in direct opposition to the cultured lawyers of society. Among them the former infatuation for Tolstoy, for theosophy, and even for Catholicism has completely disappeared. The Orthodox Church has attracted to itself all the vitally religious and faithful Christian souls. . . . But, speaking of such villages as we have been able to observe, the first thing that we notice is the emptiness of the churches.

Generally speaking, only women and old men attend divine service. The youth have imbibed the lessons of atheism. The middle-aged, who have returned from the war, after having traveled far and wide over the whole of Russia, often having become acquainted with foreign countries during their imprisonment, have brought home a large dose of skepticism, or at best great religious indifference. It is only now that the village is going through the 'Age of Enlightenment,' and this without much enthusiasm. . . . The average village clergy have not passed through the vitalizing epoch of persecution. They have remained timid and downtrodden. They stand not much above the surrounding population and make but few efforts to influence it or to unite together the remaining faithful. . . . During the imprisonment of the patriarch, the exile of many bishops, and the seeming triumph of the 'Living Church,' the hierarchic principle sustained a severe blow, all the more so as many priests had shown signs of vacillation. . . . We have been the witnesses of a quite remarkable outward perfection of divine service. There is now a severe beauty that formerly could not have been found. Never before was divine service performed in so solemn and spiritual a manner. . . . But it is clear to all that the most vital moment of church worship is centered in the Holy Sacrament, in the Lord's Supper. The inner hidden meaning of the liturgy has again grown to be for many a deep mystery. Never is the holy cup brought out in vain; many approach, all join in their joy. Many speak about a 'Eucharistic Movement' in the Russian Church, and say that it is the work of Father John, of Kronstadt, which is bearing fruit. . . . It is well known with what profane ribaldry the venerated sanctuaries and monasteries have been destroyed. But probably all do not know that these destructions were neither systematic nor universal. As in former times, a stream of pilgrims goes every summer to the shrine of St. Seraphim or to Kiev on the day of the Assumption. . . . The monastic idea, which yet a short time ago seemed to belong to the past ages, is again growing very popular. I have already mentioned that not all monasteries are closed. Here and there they still exist under the name of 'laboring communities.' Even in the capitals they are still to be found. Of course, the number of ikons has been very much reduced. . . . Side by side with this there exist active practical Christians of different shades and tendencies. Sometimes their activity takes the shape of an Orthodox 'Evangelism.' These look upon a life of active love founded on the precepts of Holy Scripture as their ideal. The present conditions of life make it inevitable that evangelical love should be closely connected with the apostolic ideal — with preaching. We can meet many touchingly disinterested people who have dedicated their whole lives to the salvation of their brethren. They go along sowing the Word of Life without taking care of the morrow. . . . Christian thought suffers from severe oppression more than Christian life. The Word is in fetters, intercourse between individuals very limited. We know that many work, many write without any hope that they will ever see their books

published. This gives an exclusive importance to oral teaching. The pulpit, also bound by official fetters, cannot satisfy the great demand, though it has given birth to many remarkable preachers." The writer evidently is a member of the so-called Orthodox Church. His description shows that the persecution which the Russian Church had to pass through redounded to its benefit, even though it is fairly infested with errors.

ARNDT.

**Loisy as a Critic.** — As is known to the readers of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, Loisy is a French Modernist of deepest dye, having been excommunicated by the Roman Catholic Church on account of his radical views. Dr. Jacks, editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, complained some time ago that this great French scholar was so little known and studied in England. An able reply is published now in the same journal by Dr. Vincent Taylor, in which the work and methods of Loisy are examined. While Dr. Taylor himself is not free from the virus of Modernism, his critical objections to the views and the work of Loisy are so important that we cannot refrain from giving the gist of them. Loisy's position concerning Luke's gospel is stated thus: "The gospel is held to be a composite work. It is a second-century Christian expansion (A. D. 120—130) of a genuine writing of Luke, the companion of Paul, the latter having been written about A. D. 80 from materials supplied by Mark and the collection of sayings of Jesus commonly known as 'Q.' The final redactor, whose aim throughout is apologetic, is identical with the writer to whom we owe the Acts in its present form." Loisy has been endeavoring to reconstruct the original St. Luke, omitting especially the infancy narratives and the resurrection account. Now, Dr. Taylor points out:

1. That there is a total lack of external evidence for Loisy's view. He says very correctly, "It is past belief that so extensive an editorial process can have left no ripple."
2. In the second place, he mentions that Loisy has failed to explain how the style of Luke can possess the uniformity it admittedly has, if the Gospel is a composite work.
3. Next, the assumption that a redactor gave final form to the work faces unexplainable difficulties; the point of view in the gospel, as far as doctrine is concerned, is that of the first and not that of the second century.
4. The redactor as conceived by Loisy strikes one as a mythical character. "Certainly it requires a greater faith to accept him [the redactor] as a creature of flesh and blood than it does to treat Martha and Mary, Zacchaeus and the penitent thief as historical personages." — In conclusion, Dr. Taylor avers that Loisy has written so voluminously that his work cannot be first-rate. "It may seriously be doubted if scientific works can be produced like Waverly novels. Commentaries, if they are to be of any worth, demand hours of research." However, "the strongest point in the indictment is Loisy's failure to discuss his own critical principles. Loisy reiterates emphatically, but does not produce arguments. For all these reasons English scholars are not sympathetic in their attitude toward Loisy." Why should they consider too seriously a scholar whose main claim for consideration is "a felicitous style and an ability to tell what he thinks"?

ARNDT.

**Glimpses from the Observer's Window.**—Concerning William Robertson Nicoll, known to us as editor-in-chief of the *Expositor's Greek New Testament*, and as editor of the *British Weekly*, whose *Life and Letters* have appeared, a reviewer says: "We are told that he succeeded 'in humanizing the religious journalism.' It is true, but the final cost was the journalizing of his religion and personality. This is not to say that the sacrifice was wasted and the work not worth while. It is to remind those whom his journalism served and helped of the great cost to himself, that they may be humble and realize the tragedy involved in the success by which they profited." The explanation is found in Nicoll's remark: "From the day I began to think about these things up till now, I have always held that the pastorate is the highest office open to a minister." He was a pastor for a short time. When his health gave way and he was forced to leave his first love, he became a journalist. This is one aspect of the tragedy referred to by the reviewer.

Lovers of Ancient Philosophy will be glad to learn that the Loeb Classical Library has been enlarged by two volumes containing the valuable work of Diogenes Laertius, entitled *The Lives and Opinions of the Philosophers*. A revised text and a translation are offered here, the author being R. D. Hicks, of Cambridge, England.

The following words of President Butler of Columbia University were quoted recently in an exchange and deserve being passed on: "Too early specialization is the parent of information and of a certain kind of skill, but it is the foe of knowledge and the mortal enemy of wisdom. Not narrow men, however keen, but broad men sharpened to a point are the ideal product of a sound system of school and college education."

A news item states that Rev. J. H. Geelkerken, of Amsterdam, Holland, has been found guilty of heresy by the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church of Holland. "As a punishment," so the statement continues, "Mr. Geelkerken was prohibited from exercising his ministerial functions for three months. The church, however, which is one of the largest in Holland, has refused to recognize the decree and has insisted that he continue preaching. Reports from the Dutch city indicate that the heretical church is being filled to overflow at every service." Shall we wonder more at the folly of the church authorities who thought that they could suppress a heretic by forbidding him to preach for three months, or at the love of error on the part of the populace?

The *Christian Century* reports: The synod of the Russian Church meeting in Moscow has issued a decree abolishing monasticism. A similar decree was made public three years ago, but was ignored. The synod issuing the present order, however, has the tacit recognition of the Soviet government, and its orders are likely to be carried into effect.

A friend has sent an interesting clipping, which speaks of the attempt of two Hebrew scholars, Dr. Buber, leader of the Zionist Youth Movement in Germany, and Dr. Rosenzweig, founder of the Jewish Seminary at Frankfurt, to translate the Bible into modern up-to-date German. They have had many precursors and quite likely will not be more successful than these. The clipping says, "An interesting criticism of the result as shown so far by the book of Genesis appears from a Jewish pen in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*. This writer complains that the improvement on Luther's language is the German of the Wagner opera, a cultivated medievalism, but whether it will supersede the less cultivated work of Luther in the hearts of the people appears very doubtful." It is safe to say that every effort will be made in this translation to keep Jesus Christ out of the Old Testament.