

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

NOVEMBER, 1928.

No. 11.

Full Forgiveness.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part V.

(Continued.)

The Fifth Petition of the Lord's Prayer has been used as an argument against our doctrine. In this petition, it is said, we ask for forgiveness not only of the sins of the last twenty-four hours, but of all our sins, of all the evil we have done each and every day of our lives. Let this, for the moment, be granted. We merely ask, Is such a prayer heard? I think it is; for "if we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us; and if we know that He hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him." 1 John 5, 14. 15. Now, the Fifth Petition certainly is according to the will of God, "for He Himself has commanded us so to pray and has promised to hear us. Amen, Amen, that is, yea, yea, it shall be so." If we, therefore, in the Fifth Petition ask for the forgiveness of all our sins and if God hears us, as He must, then we have full forgiveness. And that is all we want, absolutely all. For we cheerfully grant that this full forgiveness is no license to sin, on the contrary, that it must be held fast by daily repentance and faith if it is not to slip away from us.

The baptism of John the Baptist has also been mentioned to show the possibility of incomplete forgiveness. It has even been asserted that the baptism of John did not offer as much salvation as the baptism of Christ. That is Romish doctrine.¹⁾ Up to the coming of Rationalism the Evangelical [Lutheran] Church constantly preached the opposite. All her teachers, from Luther to Spener, have confessed that the baptism of John worked regeneration just as well as the baptism of Christ. If the [so-called]

1) Si quis dixerit, baptismum Joannis habuisse eandem vim cum baptismo Christi, anathema sit. (*Concilium Tridentinum*, Sessio VII, *De Baptismo*, Canon I.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Are We Up to Date with Our Christian Day-Schools?— Before me lies a pamphlet entitled, *Attitudes of the Ministry toward the Director of Religious Education*, one of a series of bulletins issued by the Boston University School of Religious Education. It was written by a Presbyterian pastor, Alfred J. Wright, after a careful survey of the churches of Greater Cleveland. This bulletin shows that “thirty-nine ministers in the vicinity of Cleveland are working with directors of religious education,” men and women with special training in religious education working on a full-time basis in teaching the children and young people of the congregations who have engaged them. These ministers, in answering the questionnaire submitted to them, frankly state their opinion that “religion without education cannot survive to-day,” just as education without religion is impossible. Some of the remarks made by the ministers are worth pondering over: “Revivals are *passé*. . . . An educational evangelism should lead to decision. . . . Any evangelism, to be effective, must be educational.”—There is food for thought here. Other denominations are finding the mere Sunday-school education in religion inadequate; they are providing more for the children of their congregations. They are providing educational plants which are amazingly well equipped; they are engaging directors of religious education; they are coming mighty near to the ideal of the Christian day-school. Shall we give up and discard what our Church has found to be the very best?

K.

What's Wrong?—The *Lutheran* of July 19 publishes an open letter, signed by E. V. R., which utters this complaint: “What else are we to expect when such ill-phrased statements are given to the public as were contained in a somewhat striking advertisement in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* of February 4? The advertisement was by the Lutheran (Missouri Synod) Walther League Societies of Western Pennsylvania and was headed: ‘Lutherans still believe that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God, without error, in no need of human interpretation; that man was made by God in an act of direct creation and is not the product of an alleged evolution.’” What's wrong with these statements? Is not the Bible verbally inspired? Is not Gen. 1 true? The complainant adds: “Is not much of the misunderstanding of Lutherans due to the unfortunate phraseology of such statements? Is there not some remedy?” Is wrong found only with the phraseology? How would you change it without

changing the sense? And if the complainant is objecting to the phrase: "Lutherans *still* believe," we fear there is something wrong with him. He must think it is a shame for a Church not to be up to date with modern views. In fact, that is what is troubling him. He is troubled by an article by Ernest Martin Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College, which quotes from a sermon preached by John Robinson in 1620: "I bewail the condition of the Reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion and will go no further than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; for whatever part of God's will has been imparted and revealed to Calvin they will die rather than embrace it, and the Calvinists you see stick where Calvin left them. This is a misery much to be lamented; for though Luther and Calvin were precious shining lights in their time, yet God did not reveal His whole will to them; and were they living now, they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light as that that they had received." The complainant inquires of the *Lutheran*: "Do you regard this as a proper delineation of Lutherans? Why are so many insinuations of this sort made concerning Lutherans? Are we not to blame ourselves for these misunderstandings? What else are we to expect" — and so forth, as given above. We cannot understand how the sturdy phrase "Lutherans *still* believe" could possibly imply that the Lutherans consider themselves bound by Luther. They are bound by the Bible that bound Luther and therefore still believe in verbal inspiration and direct creation. What is wrong with the *Lutheran* in that it did not set its correspondent right? Again, there is something wrong with that member of the Lutheran Church who holds that regarding the doctrines on which Lutheranism and Calvinism differ the Lutheran may be wrong and Calvinism right. If he is not persuaded by Scripture of the truth of the Lutheran doctrine, he should join the Evangelical Church. The *Lutheran* would not blame him for that. For September 22, 1927 it declared: "The Lutheran Church cannot in smug complacency bid the rest of the Christian believers enter its ranks. It is not likely we have learned all the truth since apostolic days under the guidance of the Holy Spirit." E.

A Nursery for Unionism. — This item appeared in the *Lutheran* of August 23: In Columbus, O., "a community vacation Bible school was conducted by the First Lutheran Church together with three other churches, Lutheran (Joint Synod), Oakwood Methodist Episcopal, and Wilson Avenue Church of Christ. It was demonstrated that the community effort in the field of religious education could be carried on without any infringement upon denominational loyalty. The school was held at Grace Lutheran Church, the Rev. R. E. Golladay, pastor. About two hundred children, ranging from five to fifteen years of age, were enrolled. Two-thirds of the teaching staff was from the First Church." Here are several things which are hard to believe. E.

The Conservatism of Luther. — A valuable article, bearing the heading, "Was Luther Too Conservative?" appeared in the *Lutheran Standard* for July 7, 1928. The writer, Oscar T. F. Tressel, replies.

to Charles Francis Potter, who in the *Woman's Home Companion* had raised the following charges: "From the time of his return from the Wartburg he [Luther] was inclined to be conservative, taking the stand that nothing should be altered in Catholicism save what was contrary to the Bible. He fought in pamphlets and letters against the more liberal Erasmus and Zwingli. The Reformation movement rolled on and left him in an inlet. In many ways the religion of Luther's later days was nearly as conservative as Catholicism itself. It might be said that he simply exchanged one infallibility for another, an infallible Church for an infallible Book. If Luther had believed less in a devil and more in the God of love, not only would Luther's reputation have been brighter, but the Reformation would have been more successful." Pastor Tressel makes this rejoinder: "1. . . . There is absolutely no comparison between the conservatism of Luther's later theology and the conservatism of Rome. Luther's teachings rested upon the absolutely unassailable position that the Word of God is the sole source and rule of Christian faith and life, and no one has shown, or can show, that his teachings or the Confessions of the Church that bears his name contained anything contrary to that Word. . . . Yes, Luther did exchange an infallible Church for an infallible Book, and we, his children, are to be thankful that he did, and in spite of all the misfortunes of a divided Protestantism the largest part of Protestantism still stands where Luther did in this matter." (Here we have to insert a large question-mark. — A.)

"2. Did the Reformation movement roll on and leave Luther in an inlet? Dr. Potter is simply mistaken in his statement. . . . Dr. Luther was a true prophet, who was centuries ahead of his time and will remain so to the end of time. If we had the space, we could show this to be true with regard to all the problems that are now confronting the world, whether these problems be that of government or economics, of the relation between capital and labor or of education. Let us take just one example. America has just during the past few years partially awakened to the fact that an education without religion is a house without a foundation. With Luther that was a burning and moving fact over four centuries ago. It impelled him to write the matchless little book of instruction in religion called the Small Catechism, the four-hundredth anniversary of whose publication we shall celebrate next year. Translated in more languages and sold in more millions of copies than any other book in the world except the Bible, it has been the text-book in religion in our Church for almost four centuries, and our Church has actually taught religion as no other Protestant Church has.

"3. Did the fear of the devil rule the heart of Luther more than the love of God? Again Dr. Potter is mistaken in his statement. It simply is not so. He betrays the fact that he does not know the real Luther. If the fear of the devil had ruled the heart of Luther more than the love of God, he would have been a reed shaken by the wind and could not possibly have been the Reformer of the Church. We care not whether you take him in those great and heroic acts when almost single-handed he defied the might of the most despotic power

the world has ever known, the Church of Rome, and did it knowingly at the peril of his life; or in his relation to princes, professors, students, and fellow-helpers in the work of the Reformation; or in his tender relation to his wife and children; or in his appreciation of nature, music, and art; he could not have been what he was and could not have done what he did without the love of God ruling his heart and life."

The First Lutheran Missionaries in India. — It may not be superfluous to reprint the greater part of an article which recently appeared in the *Lutheran Companion* on the first Protestant missionaries in India. The article quotes Dr. Rajah B. Mannikam, a graduate of Mount Airy Seminary, as saying: "I have often been amused to hear men and women of considerable learning speak of William Carey as the first Christian missionary of India. Evidently they do not know that the great German Lutheran missionaries Ziegenbalg and Pluetschau arrived at Tranquebar in India nearly a century before Carey sailed from England." The marvelous activities of these first Protestant missionaries in India are vividly and ably described in the *Lutheran Companion* as follows:—

"It was in 1706 that Bartholomew Ziegenbalg and Henry Pluetschau began their labors along the eastern coast of South India. There was a Danish colony at that place, comprising a population of about 30,000, and it was through the personal efforts of the Danish King Christian IV and by means of the support given by the Danish government that the two German missionaries were enabled to begin their pioneer work. The story of the hardships they were compelled to endure is a moving one. The hostility of Europeans proved an even greater obstacle than the ignorance and prejudice of the heathen natives. Ziegenbalg had to stand for a whole day outside the governor's palace under a blazing Indian sun before he was granted an audience. A monument has now been erected to mark the spot.

"Ziegenbalg lived only thirteen years after reaching India, but they were fruitful years. With much patience he and his companions mastered the Tamil language, meanwhile preaching to colonists and traders in Portuguese. A primitive printing-plant was built, by means of which Ziegenbalg's translation of the New Testament into Tamil was printed, as well as a Tamil hymnal, containing forty-eight hymns, Luther's Small Catechism, a Tamil grammar and lexicon, and a great deal of other literature in Tamil and Portuguese. The energetic and zealous missionary had also translated the Old Testament into Tamil, but this had not yet been printed at the time of his death. Ziegenbalg also rebuilt and enlarged the Jerusalem Church at Tranquebar, established several congregations, stations, and schools, and began a seminary for the training of native helpers.

"Two years before Ziegenbalg died, at the early age of thirty-six years, King George I of England addressed a letter to him, commending him for his zeal in promoting the Gospel 'in this our kingdom.' Nevertheless, almost a century passed before the Church of England began to send missionaries to its own colonies.

"A pulpit which Ziegenbalg built of teak-wood is said to be still in use at Tranquebar. It is more than two hundred years old."

When the Church Enters Politics.—The Missouri Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on September 14, passed resolutions dealing with the coming election, which resolutions were introduced by the statement: "The Methodist Episcopal Church has never been, and is not now, in politics as such; yet whereas," etc. We shall not ask the conference to define the qualifying phrase "as such," it being agreed on all sides that the Methodist Church is, in some way or other, very much in politics. But we wonder whether we and the conference can agree on what kind of politics its official organ, the *Western Christian Advocate*, is practising. Its issue of September 13 contained this item: "Again the eminent president of Columbia University has exploded. He is somewhat like a pop-bottle. You can always depend upon him to fizz when he gets air. He is a wet. He married into a very wealthy distillery family of Peoria, Ill., we are informed. Marriage into money has a strange way of dampening intelligent men's convictions. His dissatisfaction over prohibition cannot be explained any other way." In the dark ages this kind of campaigning was in vogue. It was known as mud-slinging. When the preacher turns politician, he will practise the politicians' tricks.

And other things happen. It splits the Church, for instance. We read: "Both the Methodist and Southern Baptist churches have been split wide open by the clerical campaign. . . . Hundreds of Methodist and Baptist ministers [as such or otherwise] are preaching the defeat of . . . from their pulpits every Sunday and electioneering for . . . on week-days." The campaign is being directed by a Baptist minister and a Methodist bishop. And the Senior Bishop of the Southern Methodist Church, Warren A. Candler, has been forced publicly to denounce the political activities of his brother-clergymen. He characterizes their engagement in party politics as "a fatal blunder." It splits the Church, for one thing, and brings on disasters of a more grievous nature. Bishop Candler declares: "The politicalization of the Church of Rome has brought to it immense and irreparable damage in Latin-America and in all the world, even in Italy, and the politicalization of a Protestant Church will injure it in the same way. So our Lord taught when He said: 'They who take the sword shall perish with the sword.' I cannot approve the intrusion of any Church, whether Protestant or Romanish, into the arena of party politics. Such intrusion is a fatal blunder as well as an obvious violation of the truth uttered by our Lord when, in the severe ordeal of His trial before Pontius Pilate, He said with majestic calmness, 'My kingdom is not of this world.'"

And other things happen. The churches which enter politics, as such or otherwise, because they do not believe in the separation of Church and State, also believe in, and advocate, the intrusion of the State into the affairs of the Church. If the political preachers had their way, we would soon see a state church of some kind established in the United States. The *Advocate* of September 13 thus comes out into the open: "There are those who think that the government should not be interested in the country's morals, that religion should have nothing to do with it, and that it should have nothing to do with

religion. It may concern itself about everything else, but when it approaches the field where men say their prayers and think about God and seek to love each other as human beings, it must take off its shoes if it enters, or it must stop at the gate. . . . If the government is going to take an interest in humanity and in its citizenship in general, why, then, should it not take in the whole field of man's life? Well, there are reasons. Yes, various reasons. We think them to be largely trumped up. Many of them are false, selfish, and, at the last analysis, irrational. While the Church is committed to look after the religious and moral life of the people, nevertheless the Government should be an instrument in the hands of the moral consciousness of the people for the accomplishment of good to the whole life of the nation." The Government would be asked to send out paid agents to report those families which omit family prayer. And as to the Government's being directed and used as an instrument by "the moral consciousness of the people," in what concrete form would this moral consciousness function? Through the Roman Catholic Church or the Methodist Church? That would call for a referendum. And then the churches would be in politics with a vengeance. E.

Will Dr. Lang Be the Next Archbishop of Canterbury?—It will be recalled that Dr. Davidson, the eighty-year-old Archbishop of Canterbury, announced his resignation when the lower House of Parliament had refused to accept the second revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Some of the Evangelicals in the Anglican Church are fearing that Dr. Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of York, will be appointed the successor of Dr. Davidson. According to the *Lutheran Church Herald* the following protest against the appointment of Dr. Lang has been sent to the authorities: "Dr. Lang is generally known as the real head of that party which has so recently tried without success to subvert the Protestant religion under the cloak of the revision of the *Prayer-book*. A full report of the Malines conversations will be published, wherein it is stated that an unofficial representative of the Vatican had promised the English primate special privileges and rank in the Roman hierarchy if he would accept the Roman Catholic faith. The Archbishop of Canterbury would have special precedence 'equal to, and perhaps above, the cardinals' and would be allowed the use of a special liturgy and jurisdiction over the whole patriarchate." From the points advanced it would seem that the evangelical branch of the Anglican Church has good grounds for opposing the appointment of Dr. Lang to the highest position in their Church.

Some Roman Catholic Fallacies.—Writing in the *Atlantic Monthly*, T. F. MacManus said: "There are only two systems of religious thought in the Western world to-day—the authoritarian, or Catholic, and the sectarian, which is Protestant. The Catholic principle is, of course, the principle of truth conveyed by Christ through His Church; the Protestant theory, the theory of truth conveyed to the individual by interior illumination, of whose authority he, and he alone, shall be the judge."

Dr. E. Y. Mullins states the arguments which Mr. MacManus advances against the Protestant principle of private judgment in religion thus: "1. It is a negative and not a positive principle; it is the mother of all the 'isms' and 'ologies' of modern times. 2. It is a 'dissolvent and a separative principle — automatically and irresistibly and invincibly so.' 3. The sects anathematize all authority and say, 'Full steam ahead,' to the intellect. The individual is assured that he is his own judge, jury, people, and God. 4. You can sum up Protestantism in statements like these, 'It makes no difference what a man believes,' and, 'One man's guess is as good as another's.' 5. Sectarian congregations have left sectarian churches because there was nothing left to hold them. Their churches are empty because their creeds are empty. 6. Protestant individualism is bearing fruit in philanthropism, eugenics, etc."

In making his rejoinder, Dr. Mullins points out that the Catholic writer fails to distinguish rights from belief. "We have ever stood for the rights, civic, intellectual, political, and religious, of the rationalist as well as the Christian, but that is a far cry from accepting the belief of the rationalist." "Individualism is a dangerous principle, but so is every other great principle of enlightenment and progress.... Our Catholic friend omits from his description of Protestantism the authoritative Scriptures, the regenerating and illuminating Spirit of God, the transforming experience of God's redeeming grace in the soul, and the supreme Lordship and Saviorhood of Jesus Christ. For the authoritative New Testament he substitutes the Church; for the Holy Spirit he substitutes the Sacraments; for the transforming inner experience he substitutes an outward conformity to ritualistic observances; and for the Lordship of Christ he substitutes the earthly vicegerent, the Pope." When Dr. Mullins places the Holy Spirit in opposition to the Sacraments he, of course, reveals his Baptist bias, according to which the Holy Spirit and the Sacraments are two separate principles. On the whole, however, his answer to Mr. MacManus is irrefutable.

The Greatest Danger Threatening from Rome. — Writing in the *Lutheran*, Dr. John C. Mattes discusses "The Real Roman Peril." The subject is timely because these days we naturally think of the opposition which Rome has always manifested to religious liberty. Dr. Mattes points out, however, that the greatest peril threatening us from Rome lies in its false teaching concerning the way of salvation. Quoting from the Encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, which was issued on May 8 of this year, he points to the heart of Rome's teachings, namely, the doctrine of salvation by good works. In that encyclical the following words are addressed to Jesus: "We are now resolved to expiate each and every deplorable outrage committed against Thee; we are determined to make amends for the manifold offenses against Christian modesty in unbecoming dress and behavior," etc.

Commenting on this and other parts of the encyclical, Dr. Mattes writes: "Strange as is this catalog of sins that omits some of the greatest offenses of the Decalog, it is no stranger than the proposal

that we offer in reparation of the honor of Christ the satisfaction He once offered Himself, and that we do it in union with — we almost hesitate to repeat the blasphemy — ‘in union with the acts of atonement of Thy virgin mother and all the saints and of the pious faithful on earth.’ What is this prayer itself but a shocking blasphemy and an unspeakable insult to the honor of that Redeemer who alone can make atonement for us?”

The false doctrine persists to the end. The final petition asks the Lord to receive this act of reparation through the intercession of “the blessed Virgin Mary,” “our model in reparation.” Thank God our model in reparation is still Jesus Christ, who has made perfect reparation for all sin and who ever liveth to make intercession for us. We will not take away from His glory nor interfere with His office to delegate either to any creature, not even to His blessed mother.

This is the real Roman peril — the ignorance of the completeness of the mercies of Christ, which does not understand His “overflowing charity for men” and fails to comprehend the divine fulness of the love that wells from the sacred heart of Jesus, because it will not understand the heart of His Gospel.

Anticlericalism in Mexico. — An informing discussion of the situation in Mexico is found in the *Watchman-Examiner*, written by Rev. Charles S. Detweiler, superintendent of Latin America for the Home Mission Society. The following quotation will be welcome: “The third movement is the spread of anticlericalism. This is in evidence everywhere in Latin countries, but is especially prominent in Mexico. Its first emergence was in the middle of the last century, and it then issued in the separation of Church and State and in the failure of French intervention to sustain the empire of Maximilian. For thirty years this movement was quiescent. Then it broke forth in the revolution of 1910, which lasted nearly ten years. The prime motive of the uprising was the land hunger of Mexico’s dispossessed masses. But the leaders also hated the Roman Catholic Church because they believed it to be the principal property of the landed aristocracy. Consequently, when the new constitution was issued, stringent provisions were made to curb the political power of the Catholic Church. No Church can hold real estate or mortgages on real estate. No religion may be taught in primary schools, public or private. Only native-born Mexicans can exercise a religious ministry, and all ministers must register with the government. It is this last regulation that has been most strongly protested by the Church of Rome. Refusing to be limited to a priesthood of Mexicans only, the Roman Catholic Church has not allowed its ministers to register with the government and has thus occasioned the deadlock between Church and State. These restrictions are imposed upon evangelical as well as upon Roman Catholic churches. The particular law that hinders our ministry is the one which prescribes that religious services must be held only in recognized church-buildings. Most of our churches had their origin in services held in homes. If a group of people cannot function as a church until it has a building, its life is smothered at the start. The religious laws of Mexico are extreme and limit

freedom of worship. But let us remember that the provocation that occasioned them was also extreme. The success of the Mexican government in maintaining its position will undoubtedly encourage similar movements in other Latin-American nations."

Benjamin Franklin and Promiscuous Prayer. — The following item we cull from the *Watchman-Examiner*: "Benjamin Franklin made the following speech in the Constitutional Convention of 1787: 'I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writing that, "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded; and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest. I, therefore, beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.'" No one of us will find fault with Benjamin Franklin for his belief in the efficacy of prayer. But he forgot, 1) that prayer does not have to be public or joint in order to be efficacious, 2) that the Bible expressly forbids joint religious exercises with errorists.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

In certain sections of the Lutheran Church of America bicentennials can be observed. The *N. L. C. N. B.* reports the bicentennial of St. Luke's Lutheran Church, Williams Township, Northampton County, Pa., which was celebrated September 9, 1928. According to the old records the first pastor was Rev. John Carfer Stover [should this not read: John Caspar Stoecker?], who served from 1728 to 1737, followed by Rev. John J. J. Birckenstock, who served from 1740 to 1750.

An item in the *Watchman-Examiner* points out that the denomination called "Christians" must be distinguished from that body which is called "Disciples of Christ." The latter body is the larger one. The editor of the *Watchman-Examiner* says: "The Disciples of Christ hold to the baptism of believers by immersion only, while the Christians receive members by any form of baptism, though immersion is commonly practised. It is a fact — and it seems to us an unfortunate fact — that the Disciples of Christ are also frequently and widely known by the name of Christians."

America says that Bishop Valdespino, an exile from Mexico, who died recently, might have departed with the last words of Gregory VII on his lips: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." Students of history will remember that Gregory VII died in exile because he was not content with the rôle of a humble pastor, but wished to lord it over the world.

Our exchanges report that in Turkey the separation of Church and State has come about. Kemal Pasha, called the Turkish Dictator, has been

an important factor in this matter. Article II of the Turkish constitution originally read: "Islam is the state religion of Turkey." To change this paragraph, a two-thirds majority of the members of Parliament was necessary. It is reported that Parliament unanimously voted to let the paragraph read: "Islam is no longer the state religion of Turkey." It would be premature, however, to conclude from this that public opinion in Turkey is friendly toward the Christian religion.

Hinduism is exerting itself to repel the attacks of Christianity and is even assuming the offensive. According to the *Freikirche*, the *Modern Review*, published in India, appeals to Hindus for large sums of money for the purpose of inaugurating an effective campaign against the Christian Church. The claim is made that 45,000 persons who had embraced the Gospel have been won back to Hinduism. The *Freikirche* aptly points to Rev. 20, 8. 9.

The *Lutheran Church Herald* points to the dangers lurking in the literature our children have to read in the schools. It says: "Thomas Carlyle was a pantheistic evolutionist, and so was Emerson. . . . Matthew Arnold did not believe in a personal God and held that the miracles of the Bible are mere fairy-tales for weak-minded people." Concerning Robert Browning it states that his teachings are evolutionary to the core and that he helps to destroy the Christian view of sin and to obscure the meaning of the cross. "Clough was a Gnostic, Rossetti never believed, and Morris had no regard for Christianity. The great majority of the English novelists laid aside the fundamental teachings of the Bible and taught a progressive humanity." Watch and pray, we have to tell all parents whose children are studying English literature.

This year attention was again focused on Voltaire and Rousseau, who died one hundred and fifty years ago. According to the *Commonweal*, Dr. Otto Hachtmann declares that the enlightenment sponsored by Voltaire is to-day ignored in Germany as something dry, flat, and stale. Of Rousseau he says that his conception of democratic government, his advocacy of living close to nature, and his ideas of pedagogy are being restated from a thousand platforms. Undoubtedly this Rousseau cult will have its day and then disappear just like that of Voltaire.

Even sectarian church-papers find it necessary to sound a note of warning concerning entertainments arranged by the churches. The *Watchman-Examiner* lately carried an article containing the following: "The social side of church-life should not be neglected; but there is a limit. A church can be very 'active,' yet spiritually superficial, because the meetings have been more social than religious. Church-members will tire of entertainments and drop out because their social needs have been more than satisfied. To many the church is merely a club; one can on that level do better elsewhere. We cannot compete successfully with moving-picture houses, but we have a monopoly in our line and 'look on the fields white already to harvest.'"

In England the question of enlarging Westminster Abbey is occupying many minds and is regarded as a topic for most serious debate. The Abbey grows too small as a national Valhalla, says an exchange. Some people are frightened at the thought of change in the appearance of that historic landmark. The doctrine preached there seems to be a matter of minor or no importance.

One of our exchanges remarks on the different brands of Catholicism found in North and South America. While in South America church funds are largely raised by gambling devices, in North America this is not permitted, says the writer. He ascribes the difference to the presence and influence of Protestantism here in North America. Whether his description of Roman Catholicism as found in our country is correct seems to us highly debatable. Gambling may be prohibited by the bishops on paper, but it appears to be practised widely.