

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

FEBRUARY, 1928.

No. 2.

The Work of Christ.

Translated from Dr. Ed. Preuss's *Die Rechtfertigung des Suenders vor Gott*.
Part I, of which the first chapter is offered here, is superscribed
"On Redemption."

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

The bars of our prison are broken, its gates are shattered. What we could not do another one has done: Jesus Christ, true man and true God. The offense of one man brought condemnation; the righteousness of one Man brings rescue. Rom. 5, 18. True, not the righteousness of a *mere* man, for a *mere* man would have died for his own sins and could not have reconciled the Lord of the earth, just as little as a pot its potter. What gave that insuperable power to the righteousness of this Jesus was the fact that He is the true God and eternal Life. 1 John 5, 20.

This Son of David, who at the same time is the Son of God, Jer. 23, 5. 6, bore our sin. Isaiah prophesies this three times: "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," Is. 53, 6; "He shall bear their iniquities," Is. 53, 11; "He bare the sins of many," Is. 53, 11. John the Baptist testifies to this when he says: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1, 29. If I am groaning under a heavy load and another man comes and takes it on his shoulders, then he takes my place. We were groaning under the load of our sins; then Christ came and took them on His shoulders. Therefore we justly say that He took our place. How earnestly this substitution was meant is shown 1 Pet. 2, 24: He "His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree," that is, on the cross. And there is where they belonged. It is one thing to wear another man's uniform in times of peace and quite another thing to wear it in a battle. He who wears it in a battle is willing and ready to do service in another man's place. But more: Scripture not only teaches that Christ bore our sins, but it directly calls Him, the true God, "sin." 2 Cor. 5, 21. If God made Him to be sin, then He was *sin* indeed. How are we to understand

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A Plea for Controversy.—The *Watchman-Examiner* in a recent issue quotes Charles Hooper, who in a letter to the *Congregationalist* makes a plea for controversy. Here are several of the sentences quoted: "To arrive at what is true and what is right can be attained only by constant interchanges of thought and opinion and by a free play of rebuttal and counter-rebuttal. . . . The Christian Church was founded and built upon controversy. . . . Truth has nothing to fear from error; but if truth never lifts her head, error will stand unabashed and unashamed."

After listening to the many ill-founded pleas "that churches should quit fighting with one another and begin to work together," it is refreshing to hear this frankly expressed desire to have controversy. Of course, it is necessary to heed what the *Formula of Concord* says on this score, namely, "that a distinction should and must by all means be observed between unnecessary and useless wrangling, on the one hand, whereby the Church ought not to be disturbed, since it destroys more than it builds up, and necessary controversy, on the other hand, as when such a controversy occurs as involves the articles of faith or the chief heads of the Christian doctrine, where for the defense of the truth the false, opposite doctrine must be reprov'd." (*Triglot*, p. 857.) If that kind of controversy ceases, the Christian Church is doomed to speedy decay and dissolution.

MUELLER.

Luther and Missions.—Modern missionary zealots are wont to reproach Luther for his failure to mobilize the forces of the Church for the work of foreign mission. The *Western Christian Advocate* of November 17, 1927, even goes so far as to assert that "the Lutheran Reformation never really accomplished the real reformation of the Holy Catholic Church" because of this and several other alleged failures. "Luther worked out some beautiful expositions of the great commission to go into all the world, but they all pointed to the past. Nowhere does he recommend either the going out or the sending out of missionaries. For the coming of those who were not at the time serving the Christ, he depended upon the chance scattering of Christian people, as by persecution." If the statement that Luther nowhere recommends the going out of missionaries means to imply that Luther failed to set before his people the sacred duty of spreading the Gospel among all nations, the writer is not well acquainted with Luther's writings. (He gives as his source, indeed, not Luther's books, but Professor Warneck's *History of Protestant Missions*.) One quotation from Luther will suffice to dispose of the "nowhere." "It is the will of God that Christ be spread more and more. It is not enough that some few know Christ, but we should spread and proclaim it to all, so that many might come to this one assembly, yea, the whole world brought into the kingdom of Christ. . . . We are to keep going on continually and to preach, to go to those, too, unto whom Christ has not yet been preached, to teach those who have not learned

Christ, in order that they also may be brought into the spiritual kingdom of Christ." (III, 845.) In the light of this passage and similar ones Luther does not appear as looking upon the missionary duty of the Church with apathy. The statement, however, may not mean more than that Luther did not send, nor plan to send, missionaries to India, China, and other foreign countries. And that is a fact. But it is a fact that must be set down to the credit of Luther. Luther had no business to engage in a missionary campaign. The business for which God raised him up was the business of reforming the Church. Before he could aim at Christianizing the heathen, he had to Christianize apostate Christendom. It took every moment of his time, every stroke of his pen, every ounce of his strength. If God had given him the opportunity to prepare, besides the hundreds of missionaries he was instrumental in sending throughout Germany and England and France, other hundreds for India and China, never fear, his great heart would have seized the opportunity as quickly as later generations did, and, no doubt, more energetically. But the one great need was the deliverance of the Church from the rule of Antichrist. Luther would have been woefully derelict in his duty if he had not concentrated all his efforts on this one objective. *He was the Reformer.* As *Lehre und Wehre* says, 65, p. 379: "Luther would not have minded his business if he had made foreign missions his business. He was called to reform the Church. . . . Christendom as led by the papacy believed that the grace of God must be gained by man's own works; it believed exactly what the heathen and the Turk also believe. . . . The Pope would have been much pleased and probably would have subscribed quite liberally to the mission-budget if Luther had gone in for foreign missions instead of showing up Antichrist through the preaching of the Gospel and warning Christendom against him. . . . Through Luther, Christendom also was to be put in a position to bring the Gospel to the heathen." Luther did not fail in his missionary duty. But for Luther our wonderful mission-work would be a sham.—It would be well if the *Advocate* and related circles took a leaf out of Luther's book. Heathen Christians are imploring the home churches to cease sending out missionaries infected with Modernism. Unless the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached, this missionary work is a sham. A good part of the energy of the *Advocate* should be directed towards gaining the Gospel.

E.

Unionism Truly Makes Strange Bedfellows.—A recent enthusiastic article in *Zion's Herald* of Boston, from which an excerpt is given in the September number (1927) of the *Religious Press Digest*, gives a truly amazing picture of the present situation concerning the fellowship of various faiths. The writer of the article, Charles Frederick Weller, calls July 21, 1927, a red-letter day, which will, so he says verbatim, "be remembered as beginning in Europe a spiritual movement that promises to inspire and to unite East and West, America, England, Europe, and the Orient, across the old barriers of race and creed." One is inclined to ask just why the invidious distinction is made between England and Europe, but is prevented

from doing so by the almost unbelievable narration concerning the event which took place on that day. The meeting referred to was held in the city of London, England. It is characteristic in itself that a muezzin of the London Mosque opened the meeting by a call to prayer and that the Rev. Dr. F. W. Norwood of the London City Temple closed the meeting with what people called a Christian benediction. The seven so-called faiths, or religions, of the world were presented and represented. Buddhism's message was presented by Dr. W. A. de Silva. He made a plea "for the elevation of souls by overcoming the selfish desires, which subject us to the ceaseless discord of life." The representative of "Christianity" was Dr. Sherwood Eddy, who said among other things: "When Buddha and Jesus have so long taught brotherhood, why have we achieved so little?... This impressive assembly to-day shows that the world's great faiths can stand together. By so doing, they can save the world from war." Confucianism was represented by Dr. Wei-Chang Che'n, who sent his written message, calling attention to the ethical ideals of his religion, and stating that his belief was a mighty world influence for brotherhood and peace. Hinduism was represented by the ruler of Burdwan. Judaism had as its representative Rabbi Moses Gaster, who likewise stressed "the spirit of the one universal God and the universal brotherhood of all mankind." Mohammedanism was presented by two speakers, Abdul Majid and Maulvi A. R. Dard, the latter of whom stated that his faith includes the teachings of all religions and that the Moslems criticize no man's religion. The last speaker on the program was introduced as Dr. Annie Besant of India, England, and the world at large. She spoke in the name of Theosophy. — All of which causes a person who knows history and the Bible, even superficially, to shake his head in consternation and amazement. Query: Can the Y. M. C. A. defend the position taken by its representative?
K.

John 17, 21 Once More. — The *Gospel Trumpet*, the organ of the "Church of God," accepts the unionistic misinterpretation of John 17, 21. It says in its issue of November 10, 1927: "Read in John 17, 19—21 how Christ prayed for His people to be one. He knew it would hinder the world from believing on Him with His people divided." It is referring not simply to the offense arising from the divisions, but unfolding the thesis that Jesus is speaking of a visible union as indispensable for the conversion of men. The article states: "God wants His people to be one, so as to be able to perform the great task of saving the world. The world will listen to our message when we 'all speak the same thing.' . . . To convert it is a big task. . . . The power that is needed most to-day is the power that Bible unity can and will give. This will bring the much-talked-of world-wide revival, miracles of healing, and the shaking of the powers of hell and darkness. . . . God can display His power only to the extent of the unity of His people." It is but fair to point out that the "Church of God," while sharing the unionistic disparagement of creeds ("All human names and creeds and traditions and dogmas of men will never enter heaven to divide and scatter God's people"), refuses to declare doc-

trine a matter of indifference: "The world will listen to our message when we 'all speak the same thing,' and this we shall all do when all of us get the right message, which is the truth and nothing but the truth." However, it identifies the revealed truth with the peculiar tenets it holds, and the union which it hopes will convert the world is the visible union of all believers in the "Church of God." "Come out of all man-made churches and abide in the one you were born into or that the Lord added you to when you were saved. You were made a member of the true Church by virtue of salvation. You became a member of the body of Christ, or the family of God, which is the Church of God." So, while the unionists look to an external union for the conversion of the world, these people expect the union in the teachings of a sect to accomplish it. These teachings include "entire sanctification, the Holy Spirit baptism, with or without speaking in tongues, one universal Church, composed of all real Christians, no formal church-joining, a Church where elders and deacons . . . pray for the healing of the sick and exercise in all the gifts of the spirit." As soon as all Christians accept this creed (it seems that the opponents of "creeds" cannot get along without creeds), the world-wide revival will set in. And all this on the basis of John 17, 21!
E.

"Offering Form. — In gratitude to God for His unspeakable Gift to this world, and especially for the fact that the light of the Gospel has reached my heart, I am enclosing herewith \$. as a thank-offering to be used as a Christmas-gift for our missionaries or to supply some special need of the work on the foreign field. Name: —. Address: —." This form is contained in an appeal for missionary offerings sent out by the publishing house of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. This denomination has about 50,000 members, 900 churches, and 1,200 ministers. It employed on December 1, 1925, and supported, wholly or in part, 250 missionaries, men and women, in Africa, China, India, Japan, Persia, Syria, Palestine, and other countries. We quote from the last minutes of this body: "Second: Every assembly ought to have a definite part in sending and maintaining one or more missionaries of its own or sharing the burden of one or more missionaries with one or more other assemblies."
E.

Elementary Christian Education. — Rev. J. N. Andersen of the United Norwegian Church, secretary of the Board of Elementary Christian Education, recently suggested to his synod that a conference be held in the near future, including representatives from the Board of Education, the Board of Elementary Christian Education, the Secondary Schools, Luther Theological Seminary, and the Presidents and Deans of Religion at four colleges of the Church, to discuss with him the "Relation of Education to Elementary Christian Education." In urging the matter, he prepared the following statement: "It is a trite saying that, humanly speaking, the future of the Church is dependent on elementary Christian education. But it is no less also true that higher education in the Church is dependent on the elementary. If the Christian training of the children

is neglected, they will not later want to attend Christian institutions of higher learning. And though they may be compelled to attend, they will not feel at home there nor submit to Christian discipline."

His analysis of the situation in the Synod with which he is affiliated, leads him to the following conclusions: "1) Higher education must therefore do all it can to help awaken the people within the Church to a deeper realization of the importance of elementary Christian education. In our Church, at the present time, higher education seems to be emphasized to a much greater extent than the elementary. And while we should not emphasize higher education less than we do, we must emphasize elementary Christian education a great deal more. 2) The curriculum, especially in the secondary schools, but also in our colleges, must be so arranged that the whole program of Christian education will be unified and progressive from the elementary church school on up through the academy and college. A joint committee on religious education should be appointed by the Board of Education and the Board of Elementary Christian Education to make the necessary recommendations. 3) Higher education must develop trained leadership for elementary Christian education to a much greater extent than it has done hitherto. It is not enough to have instruction in Christianity scattered through the school-years. There should be definite courses in religious education in all our secondary schools as in our colleges.—The Church is in need of trained workers, and our colleges and academies must respond to that need."

The conclusions which have been reached by the above writer confirm the opinion which has always been held in our Church with respect to Christian day-schools and encourage us to continue them. We fully agree with the view expressed that "higher education in the Church is dependent on the elementary." That claim no one can deny.

MUELLER.

Bible Schools. — In one of its recent issues, the *Watchman-Examiner* says: "The value of the daily vacation Bible school has been abundantly proved. It is no longer an experiment, but an established agency of effective influence in our American cities. . . . It is encouraging to learn that this movement is becoming world-wide in its scope." We ask, Why limit the larger religious education of children to the summer months? The problem is much better solved by the week-day religious school operating throughout the school-year.

FRITZ.

Parochial Schools in the Old-School Presbyterian Church 1846 to 1870. — Under this caption the *Presbyterian* of August 25 carries a remarkable article by Professor Sherrill of Louisville, Ky. The writer calls the parochial school episode in the Presbyterian Church "almost dramatic in its interest, yet forgotten now." According to him, the Old-school Presbyterian Church made the effort "to establish a great system of secular education embracing provision for education at every age level, from the youngest child up through the college, all to be entirely under the control and supervision of the Church. . . . A brave start was made all over the Assembly, and

had the movement succeeded, the Presbyterian Church would now doubtless be, as are Lutherans and Roman Catholics, nominally independent of the State in her educational system." The leaders of the Presbyterian Church in the 40's of the last century recognized the danger of an education without religion. "Alas! how many children are common-schooled out of heaven!" one of them exclaimed. The attempt was made to establish elementary schools; then, resting on them, academies and colleges. Dr. Charles Hodge of Princeton was a strong champion of this system. For almost a decade every year about a hundred elementary schools were reported as existing. Gradually they died out again. The causes for this decline mentioned by Professor Sherrill are: "The tide of conviction in American educational affairs was all in another direction; the mass of Presbyterians were in sympathy with public education under state control, although they wished to see religion taught. Here may be listed, too, the outspoken opposition that arose in some quarters of the Presbyterian Church. The matter of expense loomed large; the difficulty of securing teachers was very formidable." Strange to say, the writer says that the parochial schools did not prove satisfactory. To quote him: "The people at large had said that education may not be sectarian. The churches said education may not be wholly secular. The Presbyterian attempt showed that complete education may not be had in a system of church schools. It is for Americans yet to work out in the costly laboratory of experience a satisfactory solution of the problem. Our parochial school experiment showed one solution which is *not* satisfactory." "It is very true that many people oppose the parochial school and apply to it the ugly epithets mentioned by Professor Sherrill in another paragraph, 'sectarian,' 'divisive,' 'narrow,' 'clannish,' 'antirepublican.'" But must we be guided by the views of other people? Can what is called public opinion decide for us issues that have to do with the eternal welfare of our children? Over against the failure of the Presbyterians with respect to parochial schools we can point to heartening success in our own Church.

A Wrong Explanation. — In an editorial entitled "Always Many Divisions" the *Watchman-Examiner* endeavors to account for the existence of the many divisions within Christendom in a natural way. The writer says among other things: "Do not let us feel that the world is worse off than it ever has been before because there are so many denominations. This multiplication of denominations is unfortunate, to be sure; but, on the other hand, men feel, and have always felt, that religion is so important that a man must follow his highest convictions wherever they will lead him. . . . It is right that we should associate ourselves with those of like mind about the great fundamentals of Christianity. The fact remains, however, that some people are not gregarious. They would rather go alone than flock with others, and these men who start off on a lonely journey soon get to themselves followers, and then we have new denominations. Yes, it is unfortunate, *but perfectly natural.*"

Is this really a fair way of stating the issue? Denominations

have had their origin both in unfaithfulness and in faithfulness toward the Word of God. The Baptist denomination originated when the early Anabaptists, during Reformation days, rejected God's Word respecting the means of grace, infant baptism, the Lord's Supper, and many other doctrines which Luther proclaimed in their full purity. To-day the confessional Lutheran Church exists as an independent body because by its testimony of the truth it desires to be faithful to instructions of God's Word such as we find in Matt. 10, 23—33; 2 Cor. 6, 14—18; Rom. 16, 17, etc. MUELLER.

A Revolt against Schleiermacherism.—The system invented by Schleiermacher which makes the religious experience the source of doctrine and basis of faith holds absolute sway in modern theology. We had hardly expected the *Western Christian Advocate*, an exponent of modern, at times ultramodern, theology, to protest against this pernicious doctrine. But we are glad to note that this periodical is realizing, at least in part, what Schleiermacherism involves. An article in the issue of November 24, 1927, entitled: "The Pulpit without a Message," says: "A messenger without a message is a rebuke to his kind. Especially is this true if that messenger be a Christian minister, standing in a pulpit where God's messenger should speak forth, and with every word demonstrate that he has no commission, no direct deliverance, from the One who sends him to those who expect word from the heavenly Father. . . . If we could agree on what we believe about the Bible, within the Bible, and could consent to a common acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, again our authority would be returned. To-day the place of authority in the Church seems not to rest on the Bible. For this reason we are raising the question repeatedly, 'Where is the place of authority?' If we had not drifted from the Bible so far, we would have it. Verily, we are at sea in our faith. The only anchorage we have upon which we are absolutely trusting to-day is 'a religious experience by faith in Jesus Christ.' Perhaps this is all that is needed, will be argued by some. We will confess it is all that is needed by those who possess it. But how was this experience obtained? By faith in the New Testament. Can we get along without an objective authority? Can we rest our faith wholly in a subjective religious experience? What are those that do not possess it going to do? The means by which the subjective evidence is obtained is through faith in the written Word. Seldom do men come to a subjective religious experience until they have first accepted the authority of the objective evidence as recorded in the New Testament. Seldom, if ever, do men come to the inner acceptance of Jesus Christ independently of faith in the Word of God. Why, then, should we not accept this as one of the essentials of our Christian faith?" The *Advocate* has not succeeded in freeing itself of *all* the shackles of Schleiermacher's delusion. It is willing to admit that the *believer* can get along with the authority of experience, and even that *some* are brought to faith independently of the Word of God. But its revolt against the experience theory is bravely begun. Its war-cry: "Can we rest our faith wholly in a subjective religious experience?" needs only the elimina-

tion of the "wholly" to give it the true Scriptural ring. On May 19, 1927, the *Advocate* was upholding Schleiermacher's theory: "Where does Christianity find its authority? To what or to whom should the Christian turn for authority? E. Stanley Jones tells us that, visiting Harnack one day, he asked this question, 'Where is the center of authority?' The great scholar answered, 'Where the Jesus of history becomes the Christ of experience. There you find your authority.' How true this is!" Let us hope that the *Advocate* will cling to its later position: "Can we get along without an objective authority?" — Nor can it retain this position if it yields verbal inspiration. Only because of its inspiration can the Bible be accepted as the Word of God and therefore as absolutely authoritative. The *Advocate* should not have published, on October 6, 1927, the contribution by Bishop Locke: "Every man will have his own Christ, and if he follows his holy ideal and conforms his life to the truths and spirit of Jesus, he will doubtless share in the salvation which Jesus brought to a dying world, even if he is not sure whether Jesus had one human parent or two or is uncertain regarding the mysteries of the atonement, or whether he thinks everything in the Holy Bible is wholly inspired." E.

Methodist Evolutionists, Take Notice! — One of your official organs, the *Western Christian Advocate*, has come out against evolutionism. Its arguments are unanswerable. "You cannot make moral beings by an evolutionary process. . . . All the enlightenment of a universe would not exalt the intelligence of a mule, neither would it disturb the conscience of a baboon. Man progresses because he has within him the capacity for progress. Man is a subject for enlightenment because he has within him the possibility of enlightenment. Jesus was not a product of evolutionary processes." An unbridgeable gulf separates man and brute. — From the rest of the article it is not clear whether the writer is stressing the deity of Jesus Christ. Let us stress it. And the Methodist Christian who believes in the miracle of the incarnation will not balk at the miracle of creation. E.

Rom. 16, 17 and Modern Ideas of Proselytism. — In an article which recently appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, as reported in the *Reader's Digest* for December, 1927, R. C. Hutchison presents some views which are in thorough accord with the very modern syncretistic ideas of our age. He says that Christianity should become more conscious of its non-proselyting objectives. And he uses strong arguments to support his views. We read, for example: "When Christ healed the lepers, He knew that they would not thank Him, much less follow Him; yet He healed them. When He taught the Beatitudes to the multitude, He knew that His hearers would not become disciples; yet He taught them." Upon such uncertain premises the author builds his appeal to ignore religious differences and to regard all men as brethren in the faith. He says: "Christianity proposes to make certain contributions to the world, and these proposals are not based in any way on proselytism. They are based simply on the words and life of Christ. To receive the direct benefits of these con-

tributions, no theological or doctrinal faith in Christ is necessary. The recipients may be Moslems, Hindus, Shintoists, or devil worshippers. Christianity proposes to make these contributions even though not a single person surrenders his indifference or deserts his own faith to become a Christian." If the man were simply speaking of the charitable duty which rests upon all Christians, this might be accepted without much hesitation, although even here we speak of the benefits derived from contact with Christianity as mere by-products of the preaching of the Gospel. But the author insists upon ignoring all doctrinal and religious differences. He states: "Christ struggled to eliminate every obstacle to direct communion and taught that *every man* — not only His disciples — had direct access to the Father in heaven, that within the chamber of each man's house was an entrance to the Holy of Holies, and that within the Holy of Holies was a God, not vengeful, but loving, tender, fatherly." If we could take away about half the New Testament, including all of the Gospel of John, there might be a show of correctness in the arguments advanced by this writer. But as it is, he is judged by just one statement of Christ, namely: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." K.

The Work of the Baptists in Russia. — Concerning the new evangelical movement in Russia the *Presbyterian* writes: "Alongside the gracious news from different missionary centers in China of that moving of the Spirit as the wind that crosses the fields of grain, bending the harvest before its gentle breeze, there comes also a report of an even more radical move among the Russians, that is vigorous and forceful and yet so clearly a new reformation within the borders of the great Soviet lands. In Siberia it is stated that in one country there were 3,000 baptized in one day. The report indicates that these leaders are largely Baptists; for during all these later years the Baptists have been the foremost evangelists in Russia and seem specially fitted to work with the Slav races. Both believe in immersion as the mode of baptism, and the deep religious nature of the Russian is peculiarly moved by the definite teaching of the necessity of the clear knowledge of an indwelling Christ. Through this revival there has sprung up along the Siberian railway the surprising number of 1,500 churches. Many Mohammedans and Tartars are among the converts. It is reported that the Greek Catholic priests are not at all opposed to the movement, but that some are in deep sympathy with it. Revivals come when the storms are most severe." MUELLER.

Young People and the Christian Home. — Concerning the present-day situation among young people with regard to their interest in religion, Dr. J. W. Stevenson, an Englishman now residing in Quebec, says: "In Canada the young people's problem is causing grave concern. While we are managing to hold many of them in the Church, the great majority are not interested in the Church and, judging from their lives, are not much concerned with religion. There is undoubtedly a good deal of genuinely Christian activity in our country that is showing itself in various service clubs and other organizations. While I believe the inspiration of these activities is

Christian, yet the claims of Christianity are seldom given any prominence by those engaged in such work. If we can *train the children in service*, we shall have done much to ensure a vigorous Church for the future. But without the cooperation of the home our work cannot become very effective. To make the home Christian is no less the duty of the Church than to train the child in Christian ways of living."

Our Church has long ago seen the necessity of training the children and for this purpose has established Christian schools. The result has been not only that the children themselves have been reared in the fear and admonition of the Lord, but that in many cases also the home was drawn nearer to Christ.

MUELLER.

A Sample of Modern Wisdom. — Dr. Knight Dunlap holds the chair of psychology at Johns Hopkins University. He recently wrote an article for the *Journal of General Psychology*, in which he offers conclusions which almost cause a person to despair of any results of modern science. Speaking of the reason why human beings wear clothes, he states that there have been four theories of the origin of clothing. These are: First, the modesty theory (covering up the body); secondly, the immodesty theory (making the body mysterious and alluring); thirdly, the adornment theory; and fourthly, the utility or protection theory. The last form is that which would account for hanging strings, leaves, strips of hide, the tails of animals, and similar articles so that they will flap with the movements of the wearer. In other words, this theory, which Professor Dunlap has accepted, would simply mean that people put on clothes as we place mosquito bars over horses, or as horses use their manes and their tails to drive away annoying insects. One of the last conclusions in this strange article is given as follows: "Clothing itself is not modest or immodest. Any degree of clothing, including complete nudity, is perfectly modest as soon as we become thoroughly accustomed to it." To such degrees of babbling will men descend if they set aside the truth of Scriptures. Gen. 3 gives the reason why men wear clothes, and two hours spent in observing and thinking will enable any person with common sense to answer arguments such as those advanced by this "psychologist." The fact that people become callous to indecent exposure has no more strength of argument than the fact that some criminals regard their work as a noble craft and even have their patron saints.

K.

Difficulties Connected with the Translation of the Bible into the Tongue of Primitive Peoples. — In a pamphlet issued by the American Bible Society the following interesting account is given of the difficulties which confronted the missionaries translating the Scriptures for an African people: —

"The Bulus had no word for *God*. They had a word *Zambe*, signifying an immortal spirit that created man and the gorilla, then went far off and left them to shift for themselves. So this name was used for *God* in the translation. The wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, truth, and mercy of the Supreme Being as revealed in the Bible gave to *Zambe* a new and larger personality,

'and the Bulu soon came to recognize and appropriate a new spiritual entity under the old name.' Thus was the four-inch pipe enlarged to take the full stream of the Word.

"Since the Bulus had no equivalent for *saints*, the translators simply said *bot ya Zambe*, people of God, and these common words began to acquire an enlarged meaning.

"They had no term for *conscience*. They did have a quaint expression, *mone mot ya nlem*, 'little man of the heart.' So these pointed words are used in the Bible translation, and the Bible gives the little man of the heart an authority over daily conduct that he never before possessed.

"Think of the difficulties of translation when the native language contains no word for *book*, no word for *bread*, none for *church*, or *wolf* or *moth*, since these things themselves are unknown. The words, 'Their hearts are as wolves' would mean nothing to the Bulu, but he immediately understands when you say, 'Their hearts are as leopards.' He is not troubled by moths, and it would be beside the point to warn him not to lay up treasures where moth and rust corrupt. But the *bibiam*, hard little insects equipped with tweezers, do destroy his property, and the lesson immediately goes home when it reads, 'Do not lay away goods where *bibiam* and rust eat.' Thus extreme literalness, while strictly adhered to in most cases, must sometimes be sacrificed in the interest of fidelity to the real significance of the text.

"A curious example of how misleading a literal translation can be occurs with reference to the word *serpent*. 'When a son asks for a fish, will his father give him a serpent?' inquires Jesus. Our mental answer is a horrified *No!* The translators knew, however, that the Bulus eat snakes and regard them as a great delicacy. 'A Bulu boy,' says Dr. Fraser, 'would be more pleased at receiving a snake from his father than at receiving a fish; for thus he would not be bothered by bones and scales, would get more meat from a snake than from a fish of the same size, and would enjoy the meat and skin fully as well as those of a fish. The point and force of the illustration obviously require that the earthly father shall be represented as giving his son something good—not only good, but better than some other thing which he avoids giving, else God's willingness to give the Holy Spirit to those who ask would not be set forth. A fish, as we have seen, is not better than a snake to the Bulu; but it is better than a centipede. Accordingly, *nsanelete*, 'centipede,' instead of *nyo*, 'serpent,' is used in the translated text, and the Bulu at once understands, reading or hearing thus, that as a father gives his loved son a fish, not a centipede, so, and much more than so, God is willing to give His Holy Spirit to those who ask."

"These few examples may slightly suggest the immense labor that is necessary—wise, patient, loving labor—before millions of homes are opened to the Bible."

A "Vulgar" Hymn.—William Henry Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, recently gave decisive publication to his wrath against certain English hymns which Roman Catholics have unwarily

allowed into their funeral services. *Time* reports this as follows: "The specific hymn which His Eminence denounced was 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere.' It goes:—

"Somewhere the sun is shining,
Somewhere the song-birds dwell;
Hush, then, thy sad repining;
God lives, and all is well.
Somewhere, somewhere,
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere!
Land of the true, where we live anew,
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere!

"Of 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere' Cardinal O'Connell commanded last week: 'I have noticed lately that on several occasions, at the funerals held in our churches, vulgar and profane English hymns, composed evidently by people who have no faith, but plenty of maudlin sentiment, have been sung at the end of the ritual. One of these hymns, 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere,' a flagrant outrage to faith and the ritual, seems to be the favorite sob-producer. The Catholic ritual is so noble, so sublime, and so divine that only a vulgar mind could be guilty of insulting it with such trash. I call this to the attention of the pastors and the people of the archdiocese in order that this revolting experience will not be repeated. Any organist or choir director allowing such a stupid performance in the future will be immediately suspended or discharged."

Regarding the origin of the hymn *Time* enlightens its readers thus: "Everybody knows the melody. Jessie Brown Pounds and John S. Pearis composed it in 1897, when Cardinal O'Connell was in Rome, domestic prelate to Pope Leo XIII. Voices welling with young love sang it from stoops to hollyhocks and sunflowers nodding in moonlight; voices welling with grief sang it at funeral services. It still draws applause at burlesque shows, and it still can soften the memory of clods plumping down on coffins. It is an accepted hymn in many a Christian church."

No doubt, Cardinal O'Connell is right in denouncing "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere." It is not a hymn that should be sung in a Christian service. It contains no Christian theology, no comfort, no hope, no thought of the Cross of Christ. Its mushy sentiment is indeed "a flagrant outrage to faith," that is, Christian faith. But so is also the Romish ritual, which outrages the *sola gratia!*

MUELLER.

Ape-Bones and the Cradle of Civilization.—The *Western Christian Advocate* of September 22 tells of the sad case of an archeologist who, from studying the customs, the religion, etc., of the Maya Indians, is personally convinced that Yucatan is the real cradle of mankind, but is prevented from absolutely establishing his theory by the absence of an all-important factor. This archeologist declares: "If we could accurately trace the record of the Mayan civilization, we might be able to prove that the so-called 'new world' is the cradle of civili-

zation. There are to-day evidences of agricultural knowledge and the existence of highly developed food plants in that territory which date back thousands of years. The only difficulty in the way of a general acceptance of the theory that America is the original seat of mankind is the absence of apes, or the bones of apes, in South America. If the bones of anthropoid apes can be discovered, then the last obstacle to the acceptance of this theory is removed." All good and true evolutionists ought to come to the assistance of this patient investigator. They might advise him to go on and discover these missing bones. That should be easy as the discovery of the *pithecanthropus erectus* proved to be. Or they could advise him to locate that famous island which harbored the apelike ancestor of man and was unaccountably submerged, along the coast of South America. The rest of us would in the mean while point out to him that the difficulty he is finding does not really exist. What was to prevent these beings, after their transformation into men, from leaving the bones of their ancestors in Java and migrating to Yucatan? The distance is exactly the same as their children would have had to cover to go, according to this theory, from Yucatan to Asia, etc. — The comment of the *Advocate* is this: "If a man continues to make his investigations with preconceived ideas, it will take him a long time to find the real truth." — Or can it be that this archeologist is only poking fun at his fellow-scientists?

E.