

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.

AUGUST, 1927.

No. 8.

An Exegetical Paper on 1 Tim. 2, 11—15.

THE REV. CARL HESSE, Clinton, Iowa.

(By request.)

The Pastoral Letters of St. Paul are addressed to leaders in the Church of Christ, to pastors, as the title implies; and they are not only very interesting, but highly instructive and helpful to every pastor for the proper execution of his office. The more time we devote to the study of these letters, the deeper we dig into these spiritual store- and treasure-houses, the better shall we be able to cope with difficult questions and to advise parishioners what is well-pleasing to God and becoming to such as not only lay claim to the name of Christian, but are Christians in spirit and in truth. The Scripture-passage before us deals with a vital and far-reaching question, which, however, will be decided for us once for all after we have thoroughly grasped St. Paul's statements and the proof thereof as found in 1 Tim. 2, 11—15, a passage which speaks on woman's place in public gatherings of Christians.

In v. 11 St. Paul gives a clear, but general command, which he expresses in v. 12 in the form of a definite prohibition regarding woman's conduct in the assembly of Christians. He says v. 11: "Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection." *Γυνή*, "woman," here used without the article, means any member of the female sex in contrast with the male, married or unmarried, irrespective of descent, race, color, nationality, physical or mental ability. The apostle does not say that a woman is to be excluded from the gatherings of the Christians for public worship; on the contrary, women often formed a very prominent part of the congregations, as we may learn from the frequent remarks about women, and references to them, in the writings of St. Paul. In the verse before us the command of St. Paul clearly presupposes that women are present and pay close attention to the word spoken. Woman is also to reap the benefit of public worship; she is to receive from the instruction given there what is necessary for her

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Case of Rev. Frank Edwin Smith. — The *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council contains the following succinct account of this sad episode:—

“What is termed ‘the first heresy trial in the history of the Lutheran Church in America,’ held at Rochester, Pa., June 16, by the Pittsburgh Synod of the United Lutheran Church resulted in a unanimous vote of ‘Guilty’ for the defendant, Rev. Frank Edwin Smith. On several recent occasions the Rev. Mr. Smith’s utterances from the pulpit of Luther Memorial Church, Pittsburgh, attacked the truth of certain statements of the Apostles’ Creed, the Virgin Birth, the miracles, the blood atonement, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and other basic beliefs of the Church. Shortly after the statements had been made public, seventeen Lutheran pastors in Westmoreland County, Pa., filed formal charges against him with Dr. Ellis B. Burgess, president of the synod.

“An investigating committee appointed by the president, headed by Dr. G. Arthur Fry, Pittsburgh, met an obstacle in the refusal of Pastor Smith to answer a questionnaire which they submitted to him. At a special meeting of the ministerium of the synod, held on June 16, the committee laid its problem before the pastors, who listened for two hours to the presentation of the case, including the reading of all papers and letters bearing on the subject, newspaper clippings, and the testimony of reporters who covered the church services. On poll of the ministers 185 voted ‘Guilty,’ 9 asked to be excused from voting, and no votes were cast for absolving the charges. A few minutes later all of the evidence in the case was presented to the synod. Dr. Fry declared that in the investigation the chances of Pastor Smith’s being misquoted were slight, since he had submitted in advance to a Pittsburgh newspaper a written draft of the sermon in which his alleged heretical remarks were first made public. In closing, Dr. Fry launched an attack on Liberalism, calling it ‘a veritable delirium of inconoclasm’ and ‘a half-way house of atheism’ and ‘ecclesiastical Bolshevism.’ On the question of guilt or innocence the convention voted 233 to 0. On the motion that Pastor Smith be deposed from the ministry as a punishment to him and an example to others the vote was 231 to 0. One pastor argued: ‘Rev. Smith could at any time have withdrawn from the ministry, but he chose to violate the vows he took on bended knee, with his hand on the Holy Bible. We can do nothing now but depose him.’

“Hardly had the delegates taken their seats after deposing Pastor Smith, when Dr. Burgess, visibly affected, stepped down to the floor level and spoke the words that removed his name from the clergy roll: ‘By the authority vested in me by the action of this synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church I hereby depose Frank Edwin Smith from the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.’ Many ministers were in tears as Dr. Burgess spoke. From the floor of the synod Dr. F. H. Knubel, president of the United Lutheran Church, present

as a visitor, spoke, deploring the necessity of the action, but heaping honor upon the delegates for their decisive vote in upholding the faith of the Church, particularly in the face of many personal friendships for the deposed pastor.

"Pastor Smith was not present during the proceedings, having resigned as pastor of Luther Memorial Church a few days before and having accepted a call as associate pastor of the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh."

By joining the ranks of the Unitarian clergy, Rev. F. E. Smith, of course, dispels all doubts as to his advocacy of false teachings. It is gratifying to learn that the Pittsburgh Synod refused to permit such a heretic to remain one of its members. At the same time it appears that in the minds of the members of that synod considerable confusion reigns as to the terms *synod*, *Church*, *ministry*, and the like. Rev. Smith had been called by a particular congregation. It was the right and the duty of this congregation to depose him. The synod had the right and the duty to oust him from its own membership, but more it could not do. We fail to see that the Lutheran congregation which Rev. Smith served took any action in this affair. The synod ought to have called upon the congregation to depose its pastor, who had become guilty of destructive teachings, unless, indeed, his connection with the congregation had been severed by the time the synod met.

Parish Schools and Fundamentalism.— Meeting in convention at Omaha, the Lutheran Augustana Synod, on June 17, condemned modernism and theological rationalism, reaffirming at the same time its "Fundamentalist position." The synod declared its unalterable conviction that the Bible is "the Word of God," and that it is the only "infallible guide that reveals the way of salvation." The convention also declared the Sacraments to be an indispensable means of grace and warned against regarding infant baptism as "merely an established custom and purposeless ceremony." Members were also warned against worldly frivolity and were urged to pray for a "much-needed spiritual awakening and outpouring of the Holy Spirit." Establishment of parish schools as well as religious instruction in connection with public schools received cordial endorsement. MUELLER.

A Great Sermon.— While some of us are turning away from the substantial sermons of Luther and developing a liking for the frothy preachments of the modern type, others are finding that it is very much worth while to take up the study of Luther's postils—and to profit accordingly. The *Lutheran* brought up the matter thus: "*Luther's Pulpit Method*. Among the great sermons of the world Luther's sermon on Stephen is cited by Dr. Macartney in the *Presbyterian*. He says of it: 'One does not need to read far in this sermon by Luther on Stephen before one comes upon a characteristic Luther utterance. For example: "Is it not a miserable, a deplorable error and delusion to teach innocent people to depend upon their works to the great disparagement of their Christian faith? Better to destroy all the churches and cathedrals in the world, to burn them to ashes,— it is less sinful even when done through malice,— than to allow one soul

to be misled and lost through such error." There is a noble passage, too, on the supernatural, where he answers the objection that it would be impossible for Stephen to see clear into heaven: "When God desires to reveal Himself, heaven and everything else requisite are near. It matters not whether Stephen were beneath a roof or in the open air, heaven was near to him. Abnormal vision was not necessary. God is everywhere; there is no need that He come down from heaven. A vision, at close range, of God actually in heaven is easily possible without the quickening or perverting of the senses." In this sermon Luther affirms that Stephen's prayer was given an answer in the conversion of St. Paul.—It is a model sermon. I hope the reader will not take Dr. Macartney's or my word for it, but will do as I did, take Dr. Macartney's implied advice and devote a few hours to the study of this sermon. He may learn from Luther how to uncover the rich store of saving wisdom presented by the text; how to apply it for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and for comfort; how to apply it to the conditions and persons he is dealing with; how to present the divine truths in the plainest language and to drive them home. He will find that because of Luther's pulpit method every sentence is full of meat.

As to doctrine: There is justification by faith, as Dr. Macartney has pointed out, and the efficacy of prayer, as the *Lutheran* points out. The second quotation presented by Dr. Macartney unfolds the Christology of Scripture: The omnipresence of God and the omnipresence of Christ are identical. The doctrine of good works: "The Holy Spirit is promised to the believer in Christ, and through Christ's grace the Spirit produces in the heart a desire for good. Under its influence the individual voluntarily and without expectation of reward performs his good works for the honor of God." "Luke would say: 'His faith was great; hence his many and mighty works.' For when faith truly exists, its fruits must follow. The greater the faith, the more abundant its fruits. True faith is a strong, active, and efficacious principle. Nothing is impossible to it. It rests not nor hesitates." The doctrine of the universal priesthood of the Christians: "The precedent of Stephen holds good. His example gives all men authority to preach wherever they can find hearers, whether it be in a building or in the market-place. He does not confine the preaching of God's Word to bald pates and long gowns. At the same time he does not interfere with the preaching of the apostles. He attends to the duties of his own office and is readily silent where it is the place of the apostles to preach." As to reproof: "Similar to them, the papists of to-day, when they hear it claimed that works are not effectual and that faith in Christ must precede and must be of sole efficacy, cry out that good works are prohibited and God's commandments blasphemed. Were Stephen a preacher of to-day, he might not, it is true, be stoned, but he would be burned, or dismembered with tongs, by the enraged papists." Denouncing false doctrine: Luther will not mince words: "There" (in "the costly papist churches") "greater sins are committed, more blasphemies uttered, and greater destruction of souls and of churches wrought than take place in

brothels and in thieves' dens. The keeper of a public brothel is less a sinner than the preacher who does not preach the pure Gospel, and the brothel is not so bad as the false preacher's church. . . . Does this astonish you? Remember, the false preachers' doctrine effects nothing but daily to lead astray and to violate souls newly born in Baptism— young Christians, tender souls, the pure, consecrated virgin brides of Christ." Plain language—and God's truth! As to correction: "Many a man passes by his poor neighbor who has a sick child or wife or is otherwise in need of assistance and makes no effort to minister to him, but, instead, contributes to endow some church." As to instruction in righteousness: "We see in Stephen's conduct love toward God and man. . . . Stephen's love for God constrained him to his act. No one who possesses the same degree of love can be silent and calmly permit the rejection of God's commandments. He cannot dissemble. He must censure and rebuke every opposer of God. Such conduct he cannot permit even if he risks his life to rebuke it. . . . Stephen's conduct is a beautiful example of love for fellow-men in that he entertains no ill will toward even his murderers. However severely he rebukes them in his zeal for the honor of God, such is the kindly feeling he has for them that in the very agonies of death, having made provision for himself by commending his spirit to God, he has no further thought about himself, but is all concern for them. Note also, when praying for himself and commending his spirit to God, he stood, but he knelt to pray for his murderers. How his heart must have burned, his eyes have overflowed, and his entire body have been agitated and moved with compassion as he beheld the wretchedness of his enemies!" As to comfort: "This epistle-lesson, by the example given, strongly inculcates the doctrines of faith and love: and more, it affords comfort and encouragement. Death, the terror of the world, it styles a sleep. Luke says: 'He fell asleep.' Comfort and encouragement are further increased by Stephen's assertion: 'I see the heaven opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God.' Here we see how faithfully and lovingly Christ watches over us. What should not stand open and ready for us when the heavens, the supreme work of Creation, are waiting wide for us and rejoicing at our approach?" Divine thoughts, all of them pulsating with divine strength and invigorating hearer and reader, all of them flowing from the text, all of them serving to carry out the design of the sermon! And we have not exhausted its treasures. Dig them up for yourself. Dr. Macartney must not be the only one to profit by our Luther's sermons. (See Luther, XII, 177; Lenker, *Luther's Epistle Sermons*, I, p. 194.) And the *Christian Advocate* of New York wrote the other day: "The Reformer ought to have twenty-four hours of our time for a few days. One need not be a Lutheran to relish and digest such food." E.

A Fundamentalistic Convention.— Concerning the recent convention of the Northern Baptist denomination, Dr. F. A. Goodchild writes in the *Watchman-Examiner*: "The Chicago convention of 1927 was a thoroughly fundamentalistic convention. From the address of President Brouger in the first session to the sermon of

Dr. Masee in the closing session there was hardly a trace of Modernism in any of the utterances; at any rate, the published reports of the convention have not revealed it to one who is fairly sensitive to the bad odor of Modernism. . . .

"There has been a great change in the convention in ten years, and that change has been brought about by the faithful testimony of Fundamentalists. It would seem from the utterances of the speakers at the convention as though we are at last agreed as to what ought to be done in our schools and on the mission-field. Now let us have some sign that it is being done, and the Fundamentalists will thank God that their work of protest has been to some good purpose. Our Foreign Mission society is saying: 'We will send out as missionaries only men and women who are thoroughly evangelical.' I venture to say that as soon as it is made evident that only such missionaries are in the field, criticism of the board of the Foreign Mission Society will cease, and there will be no opposition ticket presented at the convention. Let the convention rebuke rationalism and check the havoc to the Christian faith of our sons and daughters which it has wrought in our colleges and theological seminaries, and we shall feel that a victory worthy of any reformer that ever lived has been wrought under our very eyes. Let the admirable things that were said in the convention be done, and we shall cry out a fervid 'Thank God! To Him be all the glory!'"

This, of course, does not mean that the convention was hundred per cent. fundamentalistic or that the advocates of Modernism were either silenced or expelled. This the convention should have done. While touching on Modernism in very guarded terms, President Brouger missed the wonderful opportunity that presented itself to him of ridding the Church of the pestilential plague. Very mildly he said: "No doubt there are a few of us who have gotten so far away that it will be impossible for them to come back and be reconciled to the fundamental truths of our great denomination. But ninety per cent. of us are near enough agreed now to stop fighting one another and unite our forces against a common enemy." This is certainly a pitifully weak arraignment of the error of Liberalism. Dr. Brouger admits that ten per cent. of the Baptist delegates were Liberalists and that a large percentage of the others were not outspoken adherents of the Christian faith. Can Fundamentalists be satisfied with this woeful condition? Is it time to rejoice and thank God when so much of the leaven of the Sadducees still poisons and defiles the Church?

MUELLER.

"Shall the State Take Human Life?" — The *American Review of Reviews*, June, 1927, prints an instructive article on this subject. We regret that we have space for only a few excerpts. "Capital punishment is as old as law itself. 'If any man hate his neighbor and lie in wait for him and rise up against him and smite him mortally that he die, then the elders shall deliver him into the hand of the avenger of blood that he may die. . . . And thine eye shall not pity.' Thus spake Moses to the Israelites. Six [?] thousand years have passed, and the death penalty is still invoked in nearly all the countries of the

civilized world. It is the law in all but eight of our States. The murderer's own life is safe only in Michigan, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Maine, Kansas, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota. . . . There are two principal arguments against capital punishment. One is that it is morally wrong — just as wrong for the state to take life as for an individual. The other is that the death penalty fails to check murder. Both arguments are supported by the conviction widely held that life imprisonment is, after all, the greater punishment. (Any governor will tell you that it is not so considered by the condemned man.) The first of these arguments — that capital punishment is morally wrong — is entirely a matter of opinion. The second argument can be proved and disproved. Let us prove first that capital punishment does check murder. Vermont had the death penalty and four or five murders a year until 1911. Then a kind-hearted legislature passed a law abolishing capital punishment, except when a jury should specifically recommend it. In the year following, twenty murders were committed in Vermont. This may have been mere coincidence, but it may also have been a direct result. Vermonters took the matter seriously. The jury in a famous case ordered the convicted man to be hanged, and the crime wave subsided. In 1924 and 1925 there were two murders each year in Vermont." (A number of similar instances are cited.) "Having thus proved that capital punishment does check murder, let us likewise prove that it does not! — Massachusetts punishes first-degree murder with death, and so does Connecticut. Lying in between is Rhode Island, which abolished capital punishment seventy-five years ago. Presumably the population elements are nearly alike, on the average. Yet Rhode Island, without the death penalty, has by far the lowest homicide rate of the three." (A number of similar instances are cited.) — We have here another illustration of the truth that arguments based on reason and experience are never absolutely conclusive. Arguing along these lines leads to endless disputations. Only those questions settled by Scripture stay settled. And this question has been settled by Scripture. When men argue that capital punishment is morally wrong, we point out to them, not only that that "is entirely a matter of opinion," but also that such an opinion directly militates against Scripture. "The ruler beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Thus spake Paul in the New Testament, Rom. 13, 4. It will not be amiss to state here the teaching of the Lutheran Church: "God and government are not included in this [Fifth] Commandment, nor is the power to kill, which they have, taken away. For God has delegated His authority to punish evil-doers to the government instead of to parents, who aforetime [as we read in Moses] were required to bring their own children to judgment and sentence them to death." (*Trigl.*, p. 631.) To continue: "The opponents of capital punishment are usually the sociologist, the professional reformer, and the sentimentalist; and the female of the species is less deadly-speaking in terms of punishment — than the male. The notorious bandit Chapman, who killed within prison-walls as well as outside, received far more sympathy than did

the families of the victims. . . . Well-meaning persons who work so hard in the interest of murderers might find greater satisfaction in saving the lives of sick babies in their own neighborhoods."

Strenuous efforts are being made to establish scientifically the non-accountability of the criminals as a class and so to prove the Scriptural method of dealing with the murderer immoral. We know *a priori* that these efforts will fail. Scripture assures us that the just Lord does not deal unjustly with the murderer. And we know that honest investigation will establish the accountability of the murderers as a class *a posteriori*. It is doing it now. The *Lutheran* (May 19, 1927) writes on the Heredity Fiasco and quotes the well-known anthropologist Professor Dorsey. "Most of this talk about heredity as the cause of crime he calls 'bunk.'" The *THEOL. MONTHLY* (March, 1927) quotes Dr. James H. Hepbron, director of the Baltimore Criminal Justice Commission: "It even appeared that the mentality rating of the prisoners was about equal to that of their guards and rather higher than the rating of the citizens drafted for military service in the late war"; and Dr. Mabel Seagrave, who "protests against the sweeping statements, much in favor with a certain class of 'Sunday-supplement sociologists,' which attributes crime to any of a thousand causes except the free choice of the individuals." And they that take the sword of their own free choice shall perish with the sword!

E.

Clergywomen. — After the war, women in Germany, hungering for a livelihood, have crowded into every profession, the Christian ministry not excluded. For a long time the authorities of the German Evangelical Church were nonplussed over the question what to do with the ever-growing number of woman graduates of theology. Last month the General Synod, at Berlin, decided to permit women to be ordained, but with restrictions. Women may function only so long as they remain unmarried; they may lead religious services for children and teach Bible classes of girls; they may perform work akin to that of the social workers of this country — welfare work in prisons, almshouses, pesthouses, and refuges for the aged. However, they may not officiate at marriages, funerals, baptisms, and deaths. The pay of clergywomen will be three-fourths that of clergymen. — If the report is true, the field for women's activity in the Church has been properly limited in accordance with 1 Cor. 14, 34, 35, and they are restrained from executing the particular functions of a pastor. Whether the rules will satisfy the ambitious German women, is not hard to tell; no doubt, efforts will be made by them to be granted authority to do the entire work of the Christian minister.

MUELLER.

Machen versus Zwingli and Calvin. — In his book *Christianity and Liberalism* Dr. Machen of Princeton wrote a fine passage dealing with the "cross" in popular hymns, which culminates in strict Lutheran theology. It is worth transcribing verbatim. He says on page 126 ff.: "The Christian doctrine of the atonement, therefore, is altogether rooted in the Christian doctrine of the deity of Christ. The reality of an atonement for sin depends altogether upon the New

Testament presentation of the person of Christ. And even the hymns dealing with the Cross which we sing in church can be placed in an ascending scale according as they are based upon a lower or a higher view of Jesus' person. At the very bottom of the scale is that familiar hymn:—

“Nearer, my God, to Thee,
Nearer to Thee!
E'en though it be a cross
That raiseth me.

That is a perfectly good hymn. It means that our trials may be a discipline to bring us nearer to God. The thought is not opposed to Christianity; it is found in the New Testament. But many persons have the impression, because the word 'cross' is found in the hymn, that there is something specifically Christian about it and that it has something to do with the Gospel. This impression is entirely false. In reality, the cross that is spoken of is not the cross of Christ, but our own cross; the verse simply means that our crosses or trials may be a means to bring us nearer to God. It is a perfectly good thought, but certainly it is not the Gospel. One can only be sorry that the people on the *Titanic* could not find a better hymn to die by than that.

“But there is another hymn in the hymn-book:—

“In the Cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

That is certainly better. It is here not our own crosses, but the Cross of Christ, the actual event that took place on Calvary, that is spoken of, and that event is celebrated as the center of all history. Certainly the Christian man can sing that hymn. But one misses even there the full Christian sense of the meaning of the Cross; the Cross is celebrated, but it is not understood.

“It is well, therefore, that there is another hymn in our hymn-book:—

“When I survey the wondrous cross
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss
And pour contempt on all my pride.

There at length are heard the accents of true Christian feeling—the wondrous cross on which the Prince of Glory died. When we come to see that it was no mere man who suffered on Calvary, but the Lord of Glory, then we shall be willing to say that one drop of the precious blood of Jesus is of more value for our own salvation and for the hope of society, than all the rivers of blood that have flowed upon the battlefield of history.”

Certainly the Christian doctrine of the atonement is altogether rooted in the Christian doctrine of the deity of Christ, which includes the doctrine of the *genus idiomaticum*. Unless the Prince of Glory, unless God, died on the cross, there was no atonement. If the suffering of the cross be restricted to the man Jesus, as Zwingli and Calvin would have it, the Christian doctrine of the atonement falls. Dr. Machen has done well in warning all Christian congregations

against singing Watts's hymn to the tune of Zwingli's *alloiosis*, in insisting on the Scriptural sense of the wondrous words: "It was no mere man who suffered on Calvary, but the Lord of Glory." E.

Pulpit Prayers without Christ. — A writer in the *Presbyterian* (April 21) protests against the omission of Christ's name from pulpit prayers, which under the influence of Liberalism is rapidly becoming the vogue. (Cp. review on Dr. Stidger's *Pulpit Prayers*.) He writes: "The pulpit prayers are a very important part in the service of worship, and they may be an exceedingly edifying part. In fact, this is so true that many of the people of God are more edified by the pulpit prayer [because of the rottenness of the sermon and the insipidity of the songs — Ed.] than they are by any other part of the service. . . . This is my point: The greater number of pulpit prayers are addressed solely to the Father, especially by those whose entire Gospel is the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, while the Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost are disregarded and dishonored. . . . As a sinful man, what do I need from the Son of God, my Savior? . . . As a Christian, what do I need from the Holy Spirit, my Comforter? As a child of God I need the assurance of the Father's love, the certainty of His care, the surety of His purpose concerning me. I need His forbearance, His sympathy, and the firm conviction of His acceptance of me in and through the merits of His Son. As a sinful man I need the cleansing blood of the Son, I crave the merit of His obedience, I seek His pardoning grace, I plead for His continued mercy, and I long for His presence with me. And as a Christian I need the Holy Spirit to show me the Father and the Son, to enlighten my mind in and by the Word, to inspire me to do what is right, to restrain me from doing what is wrong, to comfort my heart, to guide me in all the transactions of life, to sanctify my heart, and to ennoble my life. I cannot know the Son as my Savior unless the Holy Spirit reveals Him to me; I cannot be acceptable to the Father unless I believe in the Son as my Savior. Thus, out of the depths of the heart the believer appeals to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost in their personal and distinctive offices. . . . How helpful it is when the minister keeps in mind the distinctive offices of the three persons of the Holy Trinity and so directs his prayer in the pulpit!"

While it is not necessary to address by name each person of the Holy Trinity, the deliberate omission of Christ's name from the pulpit prayer is a proof of the infidelity of modern Liberalism. Christ has charged us to pray in His name and has promised the granting of our petitions only when they are so offered. A preacher who deliberately omits Christ's name from his pulpit prayer does not belong in a Christian pulpit.

MUELLER.

Will the Wrath of Atheists in the End Praise God? — Under this heading the *Lutheran* (June 30, p. 14) comments on the decision of the Superior Court of New York, which endorsed the action of the lower court when it declared the practise "of dismissing children from the public schools of White Plains, N. Y., for one half hour a week in order that they might receive religious instruction from the

churches," entirely proper and legal. The Freethinkers' Society had contested this ruling and had appealed to the higher court to have it declared unconstitutional. In its editorial comment the *Lutheran* says: "Whether a half hour's time a week is worth making much ado about and fighting for is a debatable question. It seems so utterly inadequate for the high purpose it is expected to serve as to make its value or worth almost negligible. If it were half an hour per day, it might be worth striving for. But as long as most parents and the public in general exalt the value of a secular education above that of a truly religious education, there is little hope that more than the half-hour pittance can be laid as a poor man's crumb at the Church's table. The importance of training children in the heavenly wisdom does not seem to impress most parents who hold membership in our Christian churches — if we except the Roman Catholic Church. Some day there may be a rude awakening, and even non-Christians, if not freethinkers, may learn that godless parents and godless children are a menace to the welfare of any nation. Godlessness is given a free hand if the absence of religious instruction in the case of probably one-third the children of the United States counts for anything. Unbelief has a voice in many of our public schools; for the number of teachers who sneer at religion is by no means small.

"But the zeal of the Freethinkers' Society may prove to be a blessing in disguise. It may create a counter-zeal in the hearts of many Christian parents who are not taking their religion seriously and give them some concern as to whether they can afford to be satisfied with the half hour of promiscuous instruction in religion which their children are receiving in the Sunday-school, especially when their attendance is exceedingly irregular. It may have the effect, in some cases, of stirring up languid and indifferent parents to depend less upon the Church and the Sunday-school for the religious instruction of their children and to come up a little nearer to Luther's idea of qualifying as teachers themselves. If that should be the result, the wrath of the irreligionists would in the end praise God. We fear that kind of wrath much less than we do the indifference and lethargy of members and parents belonging to the Church."

When excepting the Roman Catholic Church from the charge of indifference with regard to Christian education, the *Lutheran* should have mentioned also the Missouri Synod and those denominations which maintain Christian day-schools. Its failure to call attention to this great institution of Christian education shows how little this is appreciated in the circles which the *Lutheran* represents. Negative criticism is not sufficient in this great crisis; the Church must lead its members to the fulfilment of their duty by offering constructive programs. To-day the need of Christian day-schools is much greater than it ever has been.

MUELLER.

"The Fine Art of Saying Nothing. — The *New York Sun* has reprinted a trick speech written by a professor in Princeton which should cause earnest searching of heart to every public speaker, particularly to those who are gifted with that mysterious endowment

known as the 'oratorical' temperament. For this speech is a demonstration of how eloquently words may be put together so as to mean absolutely nothing at all!" After giving a part of the speech, an editorial writer in the *Western Christian Advocate* of May 12 comments further: "There is a seductiveness about mouthing of grandiloquent nothings against which every minister must set himself like steel. . . . There is unquestionably a glory of the highfalutin oratory which raises a Newfoundland fog about every subject it discusses. But a much higher glory is that of the concrete positive word. *P. S.* We have just compared this speech with our last Sunday's sermon and are wearing a new suit of sackcloth and ashes."

If this article (we are passing over the flippant form of the last remark) expressed the sentiments of the editors of the *Advocate*, they suffered a relapse within the week. The opening article of the issue of May 19 has the heading: "The Hour of Great Hunger," and we are wondering what it is aiming at. "This is a time of great hunger. Deep calleth unto deep, while the souls of men cry out in the wilderness. The day has been long, a great weariness has set in. The cry of the soul carries the despair of the ages. In the midst of luxury men starve. Within the shadow of overflowing granaries children cry for bread. . . . In the day of faith's mightiest proclamation, doubt and agnosticism shadow the pilgrims of eternity, prey upon their resources, and beset the way of the righteous with the terror of an endless tragedy. . . . Mankind lives on the level of the low register in the presence of the highways that lead to eternal light. There is no urge to be up and doing. The call of the mountain, the challenge of the altitudes, falls like the water of a cataract. The spirit that devours and consumes has destroyed all safety zones, and the traffic of the universal planetary system rushes on without check or signal. . . . It is the day of approaching Pentecost. What waiting! What prayers! What expectation! . . . Quick, quick, ye thinkers, ye preachers, ye ministers of grace, break these shackles of bondage, open the windows, open them wide for all spirits that they may breathe the air; open them wide, yes, wider still, that the intellects of men may find relief, that the human spirit may enjoy release and leap forth, bounding on its way to the ineffable heights where God and His people meet in the eternal pavilions of uncreated excellence. . . . On the left is the tree and the dangling rope. Judas went that way. On the right is Calvary, a cross, and immortality. Jesus went that way. . . . Oh, Church of Christ, rise, stand on thy feet! It is time to be going. Why linger by shaded waters? Move forward! Take the direction of Pentecost. Only that way leads to full fruition."

If the *Advocate* is referring to Modernism, which is throttling the Methodist Church, it does not say it; if to the vicarious satisfaction made by Jesus Christ, it does not say it; if to Scripture as the sole source of faith, it does not say it.

E.

Is the Eighteenth Amendment Based on the Moral Law?—The *American Review of Reviews* found space in the June issue for this slur: "I could only wonder whether these continual raids on disorderly houses would start some objectors to the formation of an

Association against the Seventh (Sixth) Commandment, including many of the same general groups who have formed an Association against the Prohibition Amendment!" If the writer had been dealing with an Association against the Fourth (Fifth) Commandment, that is, if those advocating the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment refused to be bound by it as long as it is in lawful force, his parallel would be justified. Again, if the Decalog contained an Eleventh Commandment enjoining total abstinence, the Association against the Prohibition Amendment would have to be put on a plane with an Association against the Seventh (Sixth) Commandment. The Prohibition fanatics, indeed, insist that there is such a commandment in the Moral Law and that it is the greatest commandment ("Prohibition continues the greatest moral and political issue of the country"; *Western Christian Advocate*, June 2, 1927). However, if the Methodists would turn their Sunday-schools into Associations for the Better Study of the Ten Commandments, they would find that the Moral Law inculcates temperance, but not total abstinence, and they would, in the main, agree with President Harding and the conference of governors, which declared that Prohibition is "not a question of morals or ethics, but purely an economic and financial question and as such should be treated by the state." And if the writer became an active member of such an association, he might learn that there is quite a difference between advocating and practising what is inherently immoral and calling into question the wisdom of enacting the views of the prohibitionists into laws. Finally, the persistent spreading of the insinuation that the denial of the wisdom of the Eighteenth Amendment reveals a depraved moral sense seems to point to the existence of an Association against the Eighth (Ninth) Commandment of which our writer would be an honorary member. E.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

Several months ago the Royal Society and the Royal College of Surgeons in Great Britain celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph (Lord) Lister, the father of antiseptic surgery. The *Watchman-Examiner* says: "Lord Lister was not only the most eminent surgeon of his day in England and the discoverer of antiseptic surgery, but a humble Christian believer and a man of amazing tenderness and kindness."

While Mr. Thomas Edison, at eighty, avers that the Word of God has no meaning for him, former Senator Chauncey M. Depew, at ninety-three, has this to say: "From my experience of ninety-three years I am more firmly anchored to the Bible than ever before and believe implicitly in its teachings and the God it portrays. I have always felt a real dependence upon God. My idea of God is personal rather than one of force."

The Methodist Church has enjoyed remarkable growth in China. There are 92,000 Chinese members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, says the *Christian Advocate*. It further states that 95 missionaries are in the field and 489 ordained Chinese pastors, 457 local preachers, and 100 unordained local preachers and exhorters.

A rather remarkable use of the Book of Genesis was reported in the press some time ago. There was a dispute between the British government and Mohammedan authorities with respect to a piece of ground. The Mohammedans laid claim to the land near the sepulcher of Rachel. They based their claim partly on Gen. 35, 16, which refers to the location of Bethel. We are told in the *Australian Lutheran* that the British government admitted the evidence and settled the case on that basis.

The *Watchman-Examiner* recently carried on its front page this fervent declaration concerning the Bible: "Other books are of the earth. This is from heaven. Do not think and do not say that this Book only contains the words of God! It is the Word of God. Think not of it only as a good book or even as a better book, but hold it in your heart and faith, not as the word of man, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God; nay, more, as the living Word of the living God: supernatural in origin; inexpressible in value; infinite in scope; divine in authorship, though human in penmanship; regenerative in power; infallible in authority; personal in application; inspired in totality."

The Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the United Free Presbyterian Church are endeavoring to unite. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland is state-supported, in other words, it is the established Church, and it wishes to retain the state support which it now enjoys. It will be interesting to observe whether the United Free Presbyterian Church, which has always opposed unscriptural alliance of Church and State, will yield or not.

Another union of churches spoken of is that of the Congregationalists and Universalists. That the Universalists deny the fundamental truths of the Gospel is well known. The question is, Do they now lay aside their soul-destroying heresies and accept the beliefs formerly espoused by the Congregationalists, or have the latter changed their faith and adopted the Universalist platform? We fear that error is about to triumph in the proposed union, especially since the main principle on which the two churches wish to unite is the following: "The basis of vital Christian unity is a common acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life." Christianity is reduced to a system of morals. Enough said!

The Anglican Church is discussing revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. The proposed changes that have provoked most debates are those which strike out the word "obey" in the marriage service and permit the so-called reservation of the consecrated bread and wine for the communion of the sick. We are told that among the additions that are advocated are prayers for the dead, for peace and industry, for the League of Nations, and for the king's air forces. Before the new version is fully authorized, it will have to be accepted, not only by the Anglican Church, but by Parliament. Church and State are still strongly mixed in England, and Romanism, to use a figure, is considering the Anglican pond good fishing.

Dr. A. C. Diefenbach has not much respect for his fellow-Liberals who still pose as Gospel-preachers. He says about them: "This group presents, as we Liberals know, the most ugly and the most inconsistent position. They are half forward-looking, half backward-looking. That is why they have largely lost their power. In the nature of their divided minds they straddle, equivocate, and muddle all vital religious questions. If they are driven to a hard corner by the persistent reasoning of a serious inquirer, they turn sentimental and utter vague, elusive abstractions on goodness and such like." Not very complimentary!