

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.

NOVEMBER, 1927.

No. 11.

## Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?\*

W. H. T. DAU, Valparaiso, Ind.

### 1. The Morning after the Great Speech.

Luther's answer "without horns and teeth" at the conclusion of his great speech before the Diet on April 18, 1521, created a fearful dilemma for the Romanists at Worms. That evening, while Luther sat, surrounded by admiring friends, in his room at the hostel of the Knights of St. John and his tense mind relaxed in cheerful conversation, agitated consultations took place elsewhere. His answer, upon close scrutiny, appeared to his adversaries a plain challenge. Luther had to the end withstood the vehement pressure of his examiner Eck for the coveted monosyllabic answer to the question whether he would recant. He had said neither yes nor no, but he had solemnly declared himself ready to say either yes or no after a proper argument. The opposition could not charge Luther with sullenness or contumacy; he had not refused recantation, but had practically paved the way for it by the only process that would have been honorable to himself and his adversaries. They saw clearly the intention which Luther afterwards acknowledged in several letters, to bring on a discussion "with a doctor or fifty who were to overcome the monk in an honest argument."<sup>1</sup>) The intolerable situation which Aleander had always foreseen and pointed out as dreadful to a conscien-

---

\* The substance of this article was read at Union Seminary, New York, December 28, 1925, at the annual meeting of the American Society of Church History.

1) XV, 1936. 1902. 1904. — In this contribution the St. L. edition of Luther's Works is cited by simple Roman and Arabic numerals, for volume and column. RA stands for *Reichstagsakten*; DTC, for Dau, *At the Tribunal of Caesar*; HAL, for Hausrath, *Aleander und Luther*; EE, for Erlangen Edition; BAL, for Brieger, *Aleander und Luther*; EB, for Enders, *Briefwechsel*, in Erlangen edition of Luther's Works; FU, for Foerstemann, *Urkundenbuch*; FNU, for Foerstemann, *Neues Urkundenbuch*.

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

1 Tim. 6, 17, 18. — The possessors of great wealth have rare opportunities to “be rich in good works.” Their wealth enables them to give not only their money, but also their time to the cause of the Church, the spreading of the Gospel, which is the best work of all. And if they are so situated that they can retire from the business of money-making in order to take up the business of soul-saving, not necessarily by entering the ministry, but by exercising their priestly office in the sphere of the many-sided work of the Christian layman, so much the better for the Church, so much the better for them. *The Western Christian Advocate* of September 22 tells of such men.

“Recently we heard of two men who were not only giving a tithe of, but all of their time, to the Church. One of them was a wholesale merchant in one of our large cities. He is a tither and has, through the years, been deeply interested in the Church. He has a religious experience that has made him beloved by all who know him. Recently he retired from business after having accumulated enough to make him independent, and now he is giving himself almost exclusively to the duties which Bishop Henderson may seek to accord him. Another man in a large city in the northern part of the State, a superintendent of schools, was offered a salary of \$10,000 a year. This he refused, stating that the reason for his decision was that he had enough to enable him to be independent, and consequently he did not desire to assume any further responsibilities in the professional field. He has offered himself to Bishop Henderson to do whatever he can in promoting the church and encouraging the religious life and leading others to Christ. If the example of these two men could be followed by others, the Church would profit greatly.”

God has also given our Church men who are able to give, and are giving, their whole time or a greater part or a great part of their time to the Church. If their example could be followed by others, the Church would profit greatly. E.

**Mission Opportunities in Our Large Cities.** — It has long been recognized that our main mission-fields in this country are the large cities, which are rapidly gaining in population. To the student of home mission work the city of Los Angeles presents some very interesting and startling data. With a total population of 1,350,000, it

has a total church membership of only about 290,000, leaving a remainder of 1,060,000 who are not members of any church organization. These statistics are based upon reports issued by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. The major Protestant denominations report as follows: Methodist Episcopal Church, 67 churches and 24,387 members; the Baptist denominations, 67 and 20,469; the Presbyterians, U. S. A., 47 and 20,184; the Disciples of Christ, 43 and 11,397; the Protestant Episcopal Church, 32 and 8,989; the Congregationalists, 39 and 8,690; the Lutherans, eight different bodies, 43 and 8,322. The Missouri Synod is represented by 26 churches and 2,815 members. In all, there were reported 142,625 Protestants, 131,000 Roman Catholics, and about 17,000 Jews. With regard to the many sects and cults that flourish in this great city, John S. McGroaty, as reported in the *Lutheran Church Herald*, says: "Maybe it is the climate, and maybe it is something else, but whatever it is, the fact remains that Los Angeles is the most celebrated of all incubators of new creeds, codes of ethics, philosophies and near-philosophies, and schools of thought, occult, old and new, and no day passing without the birth of something of this nature never before heard of." In its city directory it enumerates a large number of transient, nondescript sects such as: The Brotherhood of Light, the Church of the First Born of the United Sons of the Almighty, the Chinese Temple, the House of Prayer, the Home of Truth, Invisible Church of the First Born, Spiritualists, Theosophists, Anybody's California Adonijah, American Jerusalem Rapid Bible Mission, the Buddhist Temple, etc. The Christian Science Parent Church of the Transforming Covenant is a variety of the Christian Science movement founded by Mrs. Eddy. The Christadelphian Ecclesia has two assemblies. Unity Center, the Rosicrucians, the Church of Divine Power, the Church of the People, the Institute of Religious Science, and the Modern Church, have their regular place among the church advertisements in the Saturday newspapers.

Let us remember what Paul did at Corinth and in Rome; then we shall know what to do with cities like Los Angeles and others.

MUELLER.

**The Authorized Version Defended and Praised.**—Among the classical scholars of to-day, Prof. John A. Scott, of Northwestern University, ranks very high. What he has to say on the translation of any given Greek text deserves careful consideration. In the *Classical Journal* of October he discusses the translation of Matt. 5, 10, in which passage the Revised Version differs from the Authorized Version. We take pleasure in submitting the remarks of this eminent philologist to our readers.

"The authors of the Revised Version set as their goal the preservation of the readings of the Authorized Version except where change was demanded in order to give the clear meaning of the original Greek. Their first principle as announced in the Introduction was: '1. to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.'

"The Authorized Version translates Matt. 5, 10: 'Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake.' The Revised Version

has instead the words: "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake."

"This change can be due only to the belief that the perfect *οι δεδιωγμένοι* cannot faithfully be represented by a present, but demands the sign of the perfect, the auxiliary *have*.

"In all ages the Greeks made the widest use of the perfect with present meaning, but examples will be given only from writers near the Gospel age. Strabo was of almost the same time, and he lived in Asia not far from the scenes of the Gospels.

"*Strabo*, XII, 10: *ἄκρα μεγάλη πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους τεταμένη.*

XIII, 1: *ἀντιπαράτεταται ἡ Λέσβος.*

XIII, 43: *ἡ Δαρδανική ὑποπέπτοκεν Ἰδη.*

XVI, 26: *τὰ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν κεκλιμένα.*

"Another writer not in Greece proper and not far from the time of Matthew was Diodorus of Sicily, and from him have been selected these two perfectly clear examples: II, 38. 4: *δ' Ἀράβιος κόλπος ἀνεστόμωται εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν.* V. 41: *ἡ Ἀραβία ἡ πρὸς ἀνατολήν κεκλιμένη.*

"Nonnus gives this fine example of the use of the perfect to denote a present condition: XII, 145: *οὐ τέθνηκε, καὶ εἰ θάνεν.* 'He is not dead, even though he died.' Nonnus is, of course, considerably later.

"There is no doubt that the Authorized Version contains a true translation of the original Greek and, according to the first principle of the revisers, should not have been changed. The change was due to the fact that they confused the Latin and the Greek perfects. When Virgil said, '*fruit Ilium,*' he meant that Ilium's days were ended, but *Ἰλιος πέφυκε* or *ἔστηκε* would have meant something quite different.

"The early Greek grammarians had the true feeling for the meaning of the perfect when they named the present tense *δ' ἐνεστώσ χρόνος*, that is, the tense of the thing that having come into being still exists. Exactly similar to this *ἐνεστώσ* is the phrase in Matthew *οἱ δεδιωγμένοι*, which does not mean those who, having been persecuted, are no longer persecuted, but those who are now persecuted.

"Any one who studies with appreciation the tenses of the Greek New Testament will be filled with admiration for the unerring instinct and fine discrimination shown therein by the translators of the King James Version."

**Shallowness in American Life.** — In its issue of July 28 the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* has an article by Lewis H. Chrisman, Professor of English Literature, West Virginia Wesleyan College, on "Is Life in America Growing More Shallow?" Among other things, Professor Chrisman says: "The failure of man to use his brains has been a tragedy of the centuries. . . . Real education is nothing more or less than the awakening, the quickening, and the developing of sane, wholesome, and upbuilding interests. A realization of this indubitable truth furnishes the student of modern life with some food for very serious thinking. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in a delightful account of her childhood home in the village of Litchfield, where Lyman Beecher preached his own brand of militant Cal-

vinism and ruled his household wisely and well, spoke of the atmosphere of her father's home as being charged with 'moral dynamite and intellectual electricity.' There are times when we have occasion to wonder whether American education, with all of its intricate machinery and its apparently limitless resources, is succeeding in the development of these qualities. . . . One rather effective way of estimating the intellectual life of a people is by a study of their reading." After admitting that "more books of genuine value are sold now than at any other period in the history of the people" and that "the higher type of magazines and reviews reports an increasing subscription list," the professor nevertheless says: "No one who faces the facts could think of denying that the typical American community is being afflicted with a veritable deluge of literary drivel." Not only is much of the reading done by the American public of a low type, but "in the middle-class American home books and papers play a less important part than they did twenty-five years ago."

The reason for the present shallowness in American life Professor Chrisman attributes in part to the automobile and the radio. He says: "Travel is being substituted for the printed page as a means of knowledge. . . . The significance of the radio lies not so much in that it can be heard as in what is heard. And its best, its chief value is due to its being a fine supplement to reading-matter rather than a substitute for it. We may motor from Dan to Beersheba; we may look at moving pictures evening after evening; we may listen to sound waves until our ears are sore, but without reading there can be no alert, vigorous, dynamic intellectual life." Another reason for our shallowness is given: "Perhaps the chief reason for shallow thinking and shallow living is our inability to use our leisure hours. Fewer working hours and improved household machinery have shortened the working-day of American men and women. But too frequently the free hours are not spent 'nobly or rationally.' In too many lives, amusement has become a vocation rather than an avocation. . . . The expenditure of time, money, and energy in the pursuit of inane amusement means the neglect of the higher interests. No one can spend his hours trivially without becoming trivial. Shallow thinking and shallow living go hand in hand. Strong characters are not developed in an atmosphere of social vapidty."

Mere reading, however, and the devouring of many books and much literature, even though it be good, will not serve its purpose, unless what is read is also mentally received and mentally digested. This Professor Chrisman stresses in the following words: "Reading, however, is not the most important part of the intellectual life. He who reads without thinking can hardly avoid becoming a pedant. But, as a rule, the assiduous reader is the consistent thinker. Generally the man who is too lazy to read is too lazy to think. Yet, if it could be proved that our lethargy in reading is due to our expending so much more mental energy in thinking, there would be no particular reason for pessimism. Unfortunately, though, we have no grounds for being optimistic in this regard. If the intelligence of people is

to be judged by their conversation, there is considerable evidence that American life is not supercharged with intellectual electricity."

This shallowness in American life is not only to be deplored on its own account, but also because "life was never more of a challenge to the intellectuality and the spirituality of man than it is right now. It is for the individual himself to say whether he is going to spend his days in the futile pursuit of worthless interests or live 'a life of greatness,' knowing that it is worth all that it costs." FRITZ.

**Is the Assumption of Mary a Matter of Dogma, or Do Catholics Merely Believe It?**—The form of the question gives no sense to the Protestant mind. But it is elicited by what the *Ori Flamme*, the St. Louis Cathedral bulletin of August, has to say regarding the Feast of the Assumption, celebrated on the 15th day of August. "In the course of the ecclesiastical year with the Church we celebrate her many feasts of varying degrees of importance. Some commemorate great dogmas like the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity; others are the consequence of some popular devotion as the Feasts of the Holy Rosary, the Holy Family, and the Holy Name. The Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into Heaven comes between these two extremes and partakes of each of them. It is not dealing with a formally defined dogma of our holy religion, and yet it is much more than a mere popular devotion. In explanation of the term 'dogma' we may say a dogma is a truth of religion embodied in the deposit of faith left for safe-keeping by the divine Founder of the Catholic Church to His vicar, St. Peter, and his successors. The doctrines dealing with the Most Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the real presence of our Lord in the blessed Sacrament are among the principal dogmas of our holy faith. . . . Almost within our own times two other important dogmas of our holy faith have gained special prominence [the dogmas of the immaculate conception of Mary and of the infallibility of the Pope]. These two great truths, contrary to the opinion of some enemies of religion, were not created in 1854 and 1870, — no Pope can create a new religious truth, — they existed from the beginning, as attested by the faith of Catholics through all the centuries. The difference is that since their solemn definition by the Holy Father they have become *formal* doctrines of faith. . . . The doctrine dealing with the bodily assumption of Mary into heaven is in much the same state still as were the doctrines of her immaculate conception and papal infallibility before 1854 and 1870, respectively. Catholics have always believed that, though the blessed virgin died, God did not allow her body to become corrupt, but shortly after her death took it to heaven, where, her sinless soul and virginal body being reunited, she is in the glory of the New Jerusalem. But while this is the teaching of theologians and the pious belief and practise of Catholics, officially recognized by our Holy Mother, the Church, in all her liturgies, still, as we have said, we have not yet that formal declaration as in the case of so many truths of our holy faith. Historically we know practically nothing of the death, burial, and bodily assumption of the blessed Virgin. That she died we know; but when, where, or under what circumstances, we cannot say. We have many

charming legends, but few historical facts. And yet, though history fails us, we have another sure way of arriving at the truth in this case, that is, by inference, by deduction, logically, from other defined dogmas. In the XV. Psalm, the tenth verse, we read: 'Thou wilt not give thy holy one to see corruption.' This text is universally applied by Christian writers to the blessed Virgin and her bodily assumption, and with good reason. Genesis tells us that death is to be the punishment for sin. Since the blessed Virgin was conceived without sin, was immaculate in the very first moment of her existence, and remained so ever afterward, she was not subject to the penalty of sin—death. . . . She died, very probably, that she might resemble her divine Son and, like Him, become like to us in all things save sin. . . . What God will do for the just after centuries He has already done for the blessed Virgin. This, then, is the explanation of the doctrine of the assumption of the blessed Virgin. . . . *Holy Mary, pray for us now and at the hour of our death! Amen.*"

A common believer does not know what to make of all this. 1) The Catholic theory of the dogma is a most complicated matter. A dogma, says the *Catholic Cyclopedia*, is a revealed truth defined by the Church (by the Holy Father, is the more honest definition of the *Orisflamme*), and there are three kinds of revealed truths, the third class being virtually revealed truths (such as the "truth" concerning the Assumption), "virtually revealed" meaning that they are not formally guaranteed by the word of the speaker, but are inferred from something formally revealed, and such a virtually revealed truth becomes a dogma when defined or proposed by the Church. We ask: Since all Catholics believe in the Assumption, though it is not a dogma, how will they believe in it when it does become a dogma? How many kinds of faith are at the disposal of Catholics? 2) Catholics have *not* always believed in it. The Feast of the Assumption was introduced and celebrated about the end of the sixth century. The apocryphal writing telling of Mary's dying in the presence of all living and dead apostles and a host of angels and midst countless miracles in Jerusalem and all the earth, of her burial in Gethsemane, of her empty grave fragrant with precious perfumes, and of her assumption into heaven was condemned by the *Decretum Gelasianum* in 496 with the words: *non solum repudiata, verum etiam ab omni Romana catholica ecclesia eliminata atque cum suis auctoribus auctorumque sequacibus sub anathematis indissolubili vinculo in aeternum damnata.* 3) Catholics do not require a firm foundation for their faith. "We have many charming legends, but few historical facts." And the *Catholic Cyclopedia* says the belief is founded on the apocryphal treatise *De Obitu S. Dominae*. 4) And yet Catholics are required to believe it (not with the dogma faith, but with the virtually-revealed-doctrine faith); for, says the *Catholic Cyclopedia*, "according to Benedict XIV it is a probable opinion which to deny were impious and blasphemous." 5) According to the *Orisflamme* Ps. 15, 10 (16, 10) gives explicit testimony to the Assumption. Why, then, are they speaking of only a "virtually revealed truth"? And by what right does the Pope refuse formally to define it?

Is the Bishop of Fargo Subject to the Pope? — *Our Sunday Visitor*, in order to correct the "queer idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy" harbored by the Protestants, issues a sort of declaration of independence in behalf of the Catholic bishops. But it is a declaration of independence which spells the most abject submission to the Pope. *Our Sunday Visitor*, as quoted above, did not dare to utter the declaration: "The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo." What it is permitted to say is: "The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo relative to the internal affairs of his diocese." The modifying clause turns the brave words of the declaration into an abject acknowledgment of the autocratic powers of the Pope. Of course, the Pope leaves the bishop of Fargo a relatively free hand in the administration of the internal affairs of his diocese. He may locate the diocesan seminary where he pleases. He need not submit the plans for the new cathedral to the authorities at Rome. But if the statement of the *Visitor* means anything, it means that the Pope does dictate to the bishop of Fargo in all other affairs. In matters of doctrine and polity the bishop is bound by the decision of the Pope. The *Visitor* has confirmed us in our "idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy." What would happen if the bishop of Fargo instructed his clergy to preach justification by faith or to discard the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope? The Pope would insist on immediate retraction or worse, and the *Visitor* would insist that, as these matters do not relate to the internal affairs of his diocese, he would have to submit to the dictation of the Pope and offer up the *sacrificium intellectus et conscientiae* at the altar of his lord. What the independence of the Roman Catholic bishops amounts to may be seen from the oath which, for instance, the French bishops are required to take when entering upon their office: "I shall do everything in order to preserve, defend, enlarge, and increase the rights, honor, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of the Pope, our master, and his successors. I shall humbly receive the commands of the Pope and execute them most punctually." (Transl. from *Lehre u. Wehre*, 47, p. 318.) And the *Visitor* will not assert that this does not apply to the bishop of Fargo. The bishop of Fargo is not superior to the archbishop of St. Paul. And Archbishop Ireland's declaration of independence of 1901 runs thus: "I have been in Rome as an obedient administrator of a province of the realm of Christ. I have done homage to him who rules, in the name of Christ, over the whole realm. I have accounted to him for my work." (*L. c.*, p. 88.)

E.

**Church History According to Rome.** — It deals chiefly with fables and proposes to gain credence for them by coolly and persistently presenting them as facts. Its chapters on the Roman episcopate of Peter, on the *Donatio Constantini*, etc., are familiar instances. *Our Sunday Visitor* lives up to the best traditions of the Roman Catholic school of church historians. For the purpose of refuting the true statement that the Church in Britain was originally independent of Rome it repeats, in the issue of August 28, these fables: "Suppose the first missionaries in Britain did come from other quarters than



Rome. This will not help the rector's case. All of the churches of Asia Minor and France, in the fourth century, acknowledged the primacy of the Roman See. The papal legate, Hosius of Cordova, presided over the Council of Nicaea and signed the canons, which was necessary to give them validity. St. Augustine did not try to dictate to the Church in Britain. This Episcopalian rector seems to have a queer idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy. The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo relative to the internal affairs of his diocese; yet the bishop of Fargo acknowledges the primacy of the Pope and his jurisdiction over the universal Church. So also with the Catholic Church in Britain. It acknowledged the primacy of the Roman Pontiff." In all of this there is but one statement that agrees with the facts of history, and that is that Hosius of Cordova was a member and an influential member of the first ecumenical synod. All the rest is purely a Roman fabrication. Hosius was not the legate of Sylvester I. The Pope's legates were Vitus and Vincentius. But they did not preside. The names of the presidents are unknown. Some historians, of a very late date, mention bishops Eustathius of Antioch and Alexander of Alexandria; others, Hosius. The canons were not signed by any papal legate. Nor did any man at that time advance the claim that the "papal" signature was necessary to give them validity. The principal description of the synod is given by Eusebius of Caesarea and by Athanasius, and they know nothing of the presidency of the Roman legates. No contemporary writer tells of it. None of the older historians speaks of it. It is a Romish fabrication of a later date. More than that, the canons of the synod disprove the claim that at that time the Roman bishop exercised authority over the universal Church. The sixth canon denies that his authority extended even over the entire Western Church. And this canon was signed, according to the Roman historians, by the papal legate and thus became valid! This sixth canon prescribes that the bishop of Alexandria, "in accordance with the old customs, shall have jurisdiction over Egypt, in Libya and in Pentapolis, since it is also according to old custom for the bishop of Rome to have such jurisdiction, as also the churches in Antioch and in the other provinces." This canon, "signed by the papal legate," acknowledges that the Roman chair has a supremacy, but not over the Eastern dioceses and divisions, not over all the West, but only over the ten *suburbicarian* provinces belonging to the diocese of Rome. — At first glance one might admit the truth of a second statement. "The Catholic Church in Britain acknowledged the primacy of the Roman Pontiff." It did indeed. But the context creates the impression that the Church in Britain acknowledged the primacy of the Pope as a matter of course. As a matter of fact it was the result of the unholy machinations of the Romish emissaries. Augustine, the missionary sent by Gregory I, "did not try to dictate to the Church in Britain." Well, the times were not opportune for that. But the Pope himself indulged in more or less dictation — he bestowed upon Augustine archiepiscopal rights over the whole Saxon and British Church. And Augustine demanded that the Britons submit to his

authority. That looks like dictation; also his refusal to stand up, at a conference with the British chiefs, on their arrival. Whether he dictated or not, the Britons at that time, in 605, refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome. They submitted in 664, owing to the eloquence and skill in intrigue of Abbot Wilfred. E.

**Universalists are Unitarians.**—In the *Christian Leader*, the organ of the Universalists, John Murray Atwood, president of the Universalist General Convention, who ought to be able to speak with authority, says: "Ever since Hosea Ballou became a Unitarian in 1795 and led the way, the Universalist Church has been overwhelmingly Unitarian. I would say that you could count the professed Trinitarians on the fingers of one hand. To be sure, there is nothing in our principles of faith or polity that forbids one to be a Trinitarian. But as a matter of fact, the case is as stated."

This answers the question which the *Watchman-Examiner* puts: "Are Universalists Unitarians?" Moved by the large number of Modernists, whom the Baptists tolerate in their denomination and who are on the increase, this periodical might propound to its own denomination the query, "Are Baptists Unitarians?" If not, why tolerate men of professed unbelief and practise fellowship with them?

MUELLER.

**The Religion of Dr. Jacks.**—When, recently, the *Hibbert Journal* observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding, the editor, Dr. Jacks, who has been in charge of it from the very beginning, spoke as follows: "Labor is a thing to love with all our mind and heart and soul; to be clothed with all the excellence and beauty it admits of. That, I think, is the religion of the future. For my part, if they ask me on the Day of Judgment what denomination I belong to, I shall tell them, I hope with due modesty, that I was baptized into the sect of the laborers. And I shall hold out my worn-out pen and my old blotting pad, and I shall say: 'These are the only passports I have into the kingdom of heaven.'" This is the speech of a man who does not know the meaning of sin and grace. But when we hear that Dr. Jacks is principal of Manchester College, the theological school affiliated with Oxford University for the training of Unitarian ministers, we shall not marvel at the self-righteousness on which he stakes his hopes for salvation. The *Hibbert Journal*, by the way, is a sort of open forum, where all sorts of opinions find expression.

#### Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

From the U. L. C., information reaches us that the Rev. Ezra K. Bell, D. D., who for 10 years was president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America, died at his home in Baltimore on September 13.

Rev. Oscar N. Olsen, who for a little over a year has held the position of editor of the *Lutheran Companion*, of Rock Island, Ill., has resigned that position to fill the chair of English Bible, Biblical Literature, and Ethics at Augustana Theological Seminary, located in the same city. (N. L. C. B.)

The *National Lutheran Council Bulletin* informs us that plans are on foot to merge the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and the Susquehanna Synod of Central Pennsylvania. This would

mean that the oldest Lutheran Synod of America (Pennsylvania Ministerium) would lose its identity. The three synods mentioned are constituent district synods of the U. L. C.

The University at Dorpat has observed the three-hundredth anniversary of its founding. It was established by Gustavus Adolphus in 1627, when he was encamped at Nuremberg.

The *Christian Century* takes note of the fact that during the year ending June 1 Chicago Lutherans led in numerical gain. It says that the Lutheran Church reported three times more accessions than its nearest competitor, the Presbyterian Church. The Lutherans added 15,186 members; the Presbyterians, 4,947. To what extent Synodical Conference congregations figure in these gains is not indicated in the item.

When Jean Henri Fabre, world-famous entomologist, was asked whether he believed in God, he replied, according to the *Presbyterian*: "I cannot say I believe in God; I see Him. Without Him I understand nothing; without Him all is darkness. Not only have I retained this conviction, I have aggravated or ameliorated it, whichever you please. Every period has its mania. I regard atheism as a mania. It is the malady of the age. You could take my skin from me more easily than my faith in God."

Another good item from the *Presbyterian* deserves being quoted: "Under God, the Protestant Reformation was the work of one man, Martin Luther. Luther did nothing but preach, teach, write. When certain turbulent spirits of the Reformation thought they had to 'do' something and were demolishing papist churches and breaking images, Luther came from his seclusion in the Wartburg and preached a series of sermons that put a stop to this iconoclasm. He told the people to let the Word do the work and said that, while he and Philip [Melanchthon] were doing nothing, his words were spreading like a fire throughout the length and breadth of Germany and bringing in the Reformation." This little paragraph describes the nature of the Reformation more accurately than many a large book.

117 bishops of the Orthodox (Greek) Church are either imprisoned in Russia or living in exile in Siberia. A glorious era of liberty which the Soviets have inaugurated!

We are told that there are 20,000 Jesuits, 4,000 of whom are engaged in mission-work. In point of numbers they seem to be the strongest order in the Roman Church. That they hold this rank in point of influence is, of course, well known.

Recent investigations as to the character of the small pyramids which are found in the neighborhood of the large royal pyramids and until now were considered mausoleums in honor of the queens, seem to show that these piles were not erected for sepulchral purposes, but for religious uses connected with the worship of the sun carried on in Heliopolis.