

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

APRIL, 1928.

No. 4.

## The Imputation.

Translated from Dr. Ed. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part I, chap. 2.

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

"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the *Word of Reconciliation*," 2 Cor. 5, 19. If the king issues an amnesty and does not send his messengers, men or letters, to publish it, it will profit no one. Therefore God has sent His apostles, and the words of St. Paul, spoken at Antioch, "That through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," Acts 13, 38, have for nineteen hundred years continued to ring throughout the nations. The gates of the prison are shattered; God's messengers are standing on the threshold and cry, "Go forth!" Is. 49, 9; 61, 6; Luke 4, 18—21. Is it God's fault if some remain in it because they love their dungeon? Freedom was granted to all the captive Jews in Babylon, but those who desired to remain there did not come into possession of it. He, however, who hears God's message and goes forth is free; him God, for the sake of the perfect satisfaction rendered by Christ, regards as righteous.

This justification does not coincide with the atonement on the cross, but is rather its fruit. God justifies you by not only announcing grace to you, but by truly and actually receiving you into the relation of grace and sonship. The verb *to justify* occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament,<sup>1)</sup> and in all these thirty-eight passages it signifies a forensic act. It means *to regard as righteous, to declare righteous, not to infuse righteousness*. This may be seen most clearly Luke 10, 29. The lawyer, "willing to

1) Matt. 11, 19; 12, 37; Luke 7, 29. 35; 10, 29; 16, 15; 18, 14; Acts 13, 39 (twice); Rom. 2, 13; 3, 4. 20. 24. 26. 28. 30; 4, 2. 5; 5, 1. 9; 6, 7; 8, 30. 33; 1 Cor. 4, 4; 6, 11; Gal. 2, 16 (three times); 2, 17; 3, 8. 11. 24; 5, 4; 1 Tim. 3, 16; Titus 3, 7; Jas. 2, 21. 24. 25.

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

Is the Lutheran Church Responsible for the Divisions in the Visible Church? — This question is discussed by Dr. Elert, professor at Erlangen, in an address given in translation in the *Lutheran*. Dr. Elert said: "To come to a decision in this matter, it would be fundamentally possible to treat the whole subject historically. In this direction we would quickly come to the basic fact that the Lutheran Church as such can be made responsible for but a single division in the Church — the separation from Rome. If we are to-day to do penance for this, we must necessarily first be satisfied to designate the Reformation as sin. If this is what we think, then we ought to say so openly. And we can but be thankful to those spokesmen of ecumenical unity who have actually expressed themselves in this vein (though with a milder judgment concerning the Reformers because of more excusable conditions) for their logic and frankness. But for the separations of the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Friends, Disciples, Winebrennerians, Otterbeiners, and others, the Lutheran Church as such can do no penance, for they have grown upon other ground than that which is ours. With all these and similar groups the Lutheran Church has come into contact only by its selection by them as a profitable field of propaganda." This is very true, and even the separation from Rome ought not to be called a division in the Church caused by Luther and his coworkers; for in its essence it was nothing but a return to the pristine truth as proclaimed by Christ and His apostles. It was a separation from Rome, but not a separation from the Apostolic Church.

Will Lutheran Immigration be Restricted? — In Congress a debate is on over the immigration problem. A committee has submitted a plan which, if enacted into law, would severely limit immigration from Germany and the Scandinavian countries, while that from England and Eastern and Southern Europe would be favored, that from England to an enormous degree. The basis of it all seems to be a computation touching the national origin of the citizens of our country. Going back to the first census taken, namely, that of 1790, the attempt is made to calculate how many persons in the United States are English, Irish, etc., by birth or descent, and the sum total in every case furnishes the percentage of new immigrants which each country in Europe is permitted to send. Dr. Norlie has made a very exhaustive study of the whole subject, the results of which are published in the *Lutheran World Almanac* for 1928. The legal basis for the plan of the committee is a clause in the Immigration Act of 1924, known as the "National Origins Clause." Senator Shipstead of Minnesota has introduced a bill in the Senate which would repeal this mischievous clause. The subject cannot be discussed here in its political aspects, but inasmuch as it has a direct bearing on the number of Lutheran immigrants that can be expected from abroad in the future, the matter is of interest to Lutheran synods and congregations.

**An Editor Complimented.** — *Lutheran*, March 1, 1928: "Not long since, a letter came to the Publication House from a pastor of the Church of Sweden to which we gave honor and acceptance. The writer, schooled in American and German as well as in Swedish institutions, wrote that in his opinion 'the *Lutheran* is the best church-weekly in the world.' We publish his comment for three reasons: First, it is news to us; secondly, it is sure to be news to you; thirdly, it enables us to point out a man with a distinctively individual idea of the quality of a religious periodical. We add our own comment: If his view is not true, we hope it will become so." This item is worth preserving, not primarily because of the compliment, but because of the spirit in which it was received. E.

**"Has Fundamentalism Accomplished Anything?"** — Under this caption an editorial appeared in the *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist) of December 29, 1927. We quote portions of it: —

"Now, we desire to inquire as to whether Fundamentalism has accomplished anything. The movement has dismally failed as far as allying to itself the rank and file of the conservatives of the denomination. It was desired and expected that these conservatives would be interested and responsive enough to come into the movement, naming it what they would and choosing such leadership as they desired. They have not done so, despite the fact that the Fundamentalists have over and over declared that the movement which they represent is simply a conservative movement, a movement to 'restate and reemphasize' the great fundamental doctrines in which Baptists have always believed. We hope and believe that even yet out of this fundamentals movement will come some kind of union of conservative forces that will stand like a wall in the path of Liberalism.

"In spite of the fact that Fundamentalism has failed in bringing together the conservative forces of our denomination, it has accomplished much. First of all, it has set the whole denomination to thinking about doctrinal questions. Everywhere thoughtful people are considering afresh the doctrines of the virgin birth, the vicarious atonement, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and the promise of His second coming. It is safe to say that in the last five or six years more attention has been given to these doctrines than they had received in the quarter of a century preceding. There is a distinct revival of doctrinal preaching everywhere. Liberal preachers are no longer able to deny the great doctrines of our faith without having their position questioned. In other words, Liberalism no longer is having absolutely its own way. . . . Our seminaries, our colleges, and our academies have been forced to a higher regard for Scriptural teaching. . . . Though individual teachers here and there continue to render themselves obnoxious to devout believers in God's Word, our institutions in general are doing their utmost to assure the people that they are exalting the Bible as never before. Many of them still need cleaning up, and they should not lose sight of the fact that the eyes of the denomination are fixed on them. Our

Baptist people are awaking to the fact that in the distribution of their money and especially in the training of their sons and daughters they have a great responsibility to God. Fundamentalism has gone far beyond our boundaries and is at work in all Christian denominations. Other denominations have needed the movement quite as much as the Baptists have needed it, and in some denominations it has proved more effectual than in our own. . . . The *Watchman-Examiner* is convinced that Fundamentalism, under some name, will exist until Christ comes again. As long as it exists, this paper will continue its advocacy, 'restating and reemphasizing' the great fundamentals of our faith. At the present time it feels that it is by this method that it can best advance the cause that is so dear to our hearts. We are in no sense discouraged, although, as we have said in a foregoing paragraph, we long for the union of all the conservative people of our denomination in some movement to stem the tide of Liberalism."

The very weakness of Fundamentalism and the cause for its failure to bring to action its own forces are its wrong attitude towards the Bible, in which attitude it does not essentially differ from that of the Liberalists. The difference is only one of degree; both the Fundamentalists and the Liberalists hold that not every word of the Bible—as it is written and as words, according to the laws of language, must be understood—must be accepted. While the Fundamentalists, although not agreeing among themselves, still hold fast some of the essential doctrines of the Bible, the Liberalists have gone to the greater extent and greater consistency of casting even these aside. (For our assertion that the Fundamentalists do not agree among themselves we quote this statement from the same editorial: "At another convention a confession of faith, or creed, was presented by the Fundamentalists and rejected by the convention. *But it is widely known that the Fundamentalists were divided on that subject themselves.*") (Italics our own.) The very name Fundamentalism seems to imply, and we think it does, that all that is necessary for unity of faith is to agree on some fundamentals of the inspired Truth. We believe that all inspired Truth is binding upon us, and that we, therefore, for the purpose of "agreeing" with others, dare not single out only some truths of the Bible. The Lutheran position that the Bible is the *verbally inspired Word of God* and that it should be accepted as such is the only correct and consistent and, we may add, even sensible position to hold. And it is the only position which sets up a strong wall over against all the enemies of the Bible and against all false teachers, no matter who they are or what they teach.

J. H. C. F.

### Is Gen. 12, 3b Translated Correctly in the Authorized Version?

This question is discussed in a striking article by Prof. O. T. Allis, published in the *Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. 25, 2). Some modern scholars, like Briggs and McFadyen, adopted the rendering: "In thee shall all nations of the earth bless themselves," giving the verb a reflexive meaning. Robinson, sharing their view, translated this "colloquially": "All the nations of the earth shall regard you as

a type of the prosperous man," of which translation Professor Allis quite properly says that it secularizes this glorious promise and robs it of its richest meaning. The author shows in a remarkably thorough analysis of all the questions involved that the proposed innovation in the explanation of our passage is not tenable. A large part of the lengthy article is a learned philological disquisition on the Hebrew Niphal and Hithpael, showing to what extent these forms express the passive relation. His concluding remarks are heartening in these days, when the Old Testament is so frequently divested of its supernatural character: "Modern philological science supports the New Testament use of the group of Old Testament passages of which Gen. 12, 3 is the first. If the critics reject the New Testament interpretation, they must do so because their rationalistic reconstruction of the Old Testament leaves no room for so striking a prediction and because the pronounced universalism of the blessing is out of harmony with their theory that the ancient Hebrews worshiped a 'tribal god,' whose domain was as restricted as his power was limited. But this god of the rationalistic critic is not the God of the Bible, the God of Christian faith. The God who called Abraham was 'the God of heaven and the God of the earth' (Gen. 24, 3). It was the Creator of the heaven and the earth (Gen. 1, 1), who chose the seed of Abraham to be to Him a peculiar people, that through them all nations might be blessed. The blessing of Abraham assures us that the particularism of the Old Testament religion is not to be explained by the evolutionist's theory of a gradual development of the god-idea in Israel through animism, polytheism, henotheism to the ethical monotheism of the prophets and apostles, but that the universalism of Isaiah and of Paul was clearly present in it from the beginning, not as a mere 'surmise,' but as a sure promise which the eternal and unchanging God had made unto Abraham, His friend, and which He fulfilled in the gift of His Son to be the Savior of the world."

**The Lausanne Adventure.**—The *Presbyterian* reprints an article from *Le Chrétien Evangelique*, an organ of the French evangelicals, from which we quote the following: "In every line [of the reports] there is the triumph of the spirit and method of modern theology. . . . 'The Message to the World' carries in it the affirmation of some of the fundamental verities of authentic Christianity: the divinity of Christ, His preexistence, the expiatory sufficiency of His death, His glorious resurrection, all the orthodoxy of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. How such and such theologians, well known for their horror of dogmatism and for their rationalistic *personnel*, came to subscribe to any such formula or at least recommend it to the attention and study of contemporary Christians, their brethren, these dogmas which they regard as defunct and contrary to simple good sense, — this is quite beyond comprehension. . . . The members of the conference, at least many of them, do not believe that Christ is God, the Son of God, the Word made flesh; they do not believe that He has come 'to give His life a ransom for many'; they do not believe that the Bible is written uniquely, distinct from all other books, clothed with a special, inspired authority; they do not believe all this. Every

time they express their own views freely, they deny these verities; and in this they do well, for they do not believe them." The *Watchman-Examiner* says: "Dr. W. E. Barton, who was very sympathetic with the Lausanne Conference, gives in the *Congregationalist* his view of what was accomplished there. He says: 'I do not think the churches will pay much attention to our findings. I cannot imagine our National Council wasting much time parsing and analyzing our timid and compromising declarations. . . . If we had agreed to recite the multiplication table together as an act of agreement, that would have meant something; and what we said was perhaps not very much more.'" A report formulated by the Continuation Committee after the conference at Lausanne found itself unable to agree on its ultimate form, which was made public February 2. The report states, according to the *Associated Press*: "Unity of the Church implies unity of faith, but it does not mean uniformity. There must be space for divers types of expression, so that nothing of the rich variety which marks Christian experience will be lost and liberty of interpretation within the limits of the accepted faith will be preserved." The *Associated Press* states that the subcommittee which actually drafted this final report included, besides Revs. Peter Ainslie, S. Parkes Cadman, Prof. Edmund D. Soper, and others, M. G. G. Sherer. We hope the *Associated Press* was misinformed. E.

Is the "Presbyterian" Presbyterian?—It says in its issue of December 1, 1927: "These evidences of a religious and moral spirit outside the borders of what we call the Church create a subject of deep, reverent study. Those who believe in the sovereign acts of the Holy Spirit leave the mystery in God's secret counsels. These discoveries of the movements of the winds of God in the field of common grace, even where the great orthodox churches have not scattered the Gospel-seed, are a cause for thanksgiving, though the results so often solemnly reprove us. While waiting with others recently till the hour arrived for a great preacher to appear, the hymnal before us in its earlier pages provided the 'Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith,' where it declares that 'others given by the Father to the Son who are beyond the reach of the outward means of grace are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how He pleases.' It is a happy assurance that God is ever enlarging the number of His subjects from beyond the borders of Tyre and Sidon. We may cherish the hope that saving grace as well as what we call common grace is often operative to produce these fruits."—When the *Presbyterian* insists that men are regenerated and saved without "the outward means of grace," through an immediate working of the Spirit, it speaks for the Presbyterian Church. It is in full agreement with Hodge, *Syst. Theol.*, II, p. 684: "It is only in miracles and in the work of regeneration that all second causes are excluded." But it is not speaking for Paul (Rom. 10, 17) and Christ (John 17, 20). The distinction between common grace and saving grace is also good Presbyterian doctrine. But if we read the article right, it practically eliminates the distinction. It makes "common

grace" effective for regeneration and salvation. And that is no longer good Presbyterian doctrine. It is not in agreement with Hodge: "By common grace is meant that influence of the Spirit which in a greater or less measure is granted to all who hear the truth. . . . By efficacious grace is meant such kind and degree of the Spirit's influence as is sufficient to lead men to repentance, faith, and a holy life" (p. 654). "This call is universal in the sense that it is addressed to all men indiscriminately to whom the Gospel is sent. . . . It has nothing to do with the secret purpose of God to grant His effectual grace to some and not to others" (p. 642 f.). And Hodge, not the *Presbyterian*, is in accord with the *Westminster Confession*: "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased effectually to call. . . . Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ and therefore cannot be saved." If the *Presbyterian* has given up the essential point involved in the distinction between saving grace and common grace, for Scriptural reasons, it should go a step farther and cease making the distinction at all and then go on and accept John 17, 20 and Rom. 10, 17 also. E.

**Videant Consules, etc.** — The *Western Christian Advocate* does well to give publicity to the sinister design of the Roman Catholic organization. Reporting on the election of a new Senate chaplain, it says: "The first candidate announced, and one having the backing of a post of the American Legion, was a Roman Catholic priest, who had given commendable service in the World War. His candidacy was handicapped from the outset by the activity of the leaders of the organization maintained by the hierarchy at the capital to promote Catholic interests in departments of Government, one of whom recently gave publication to this claim of his Church: 'The State should officially recognize the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth; accordingly it should invite the blessing and the ceremonial participation of the Church for certain important public functions, as the opening of legislative sessions, the erection of public buildings,' etc. The terms used by the *Advocate* in characterizing the Roman Catholic design: "This arrogant and sectarian claim of the Roman hierarchy," fit the case. — An Episcopalian "with a Wesleyan background" was elected, and the *Advocate* is much pleased with this result. If we had our way, we would at once, for patriotic and religious reasons, abolish this anomaly, this legislative office with religious functions. The *Advocate* insists on retaining it and filling it with the proper men. Why? The opening remarks of the article are most illuminating: "In the United States, religion and politics are closely related. . . . One of the acts of the founders of this nation, who conceived of politics in the Websterian sense as that which has to do with moral and ethical relations and duties of States or social organizations, was to provide that each House of Congress should be opened with prayer at each day's session by a Christian clergyman. This custom has been followed from the first session of the Continental Congress to the present." The ideal condition, according to

the *Advocate*, is the close relation of religion and politics, with the chaplain's "prayers uplifting this great body of Senators," with "more of the teachings of Christ to motivate and guide," — the teachings of Christ as interpreted, say, by one "who has a Wesleyan background." Religious and political liberty can survive only where Church and State are kept distinctly separate; and "Church" means not only the Roman hierarchy, but also the Reformed brotherhood and any other religious organization.

E.

**The Late Encyclical of the Pope.** — On this subject we submit the following pertinent remarks from the *Watchman-Examiner*: "Sentimental American Protestants who allowed Governor Alfred E. Smith's *Atlantic Monthly* article to sweep them off their feet should give attention to the Pope's Encyclical, which was published recently. The Roman Catholicism described by Governor Smith has never existed in history and does not exist to-day except in his imagination. The Pope's Encyclical shows that Roman Catholicism is as narrow and exclusive as it has ever been. Protestants are charged with hostility against Roman Catholicism. If this hostility exists, the particular ground of it is that Roman Catholics look upon all Protestants as prodigals, heretics, and outcasts. The Pope expresses himself more courteously than some of his predecessors when he says: 'The Church being mystic, the body of Christ is as well joined and solidly bound as a physical body, and it would be stupidity to say that the mystic body can be composed of disjointed and separated members. Whoever is not united with it is not a member, nor communes with the head, who is Christ.' It has become the custom of sentimental religionists to praise the Roman Catholic Church, and public men to-day are bowing and scraping to representatives of the hierarchy. Meanwhile the Pope quotes a Catholic writer who says: 'Only the Catholic Church is considered the true religion. It is the fountain of truth, home of the faith, temple of God, in which, if one does not enter or if one withdraws, he remains far from the hope of life and health.' For our part we resent the Pope's attitude toward the non-Catholic Christians of the world. The hierarchy is now agitating in Italy the question of the Pope's temporal authority; but the Italians, Roman Catholics as they are, know history too well to be stampeded into giving the Pope civil authority again. It will be a sad day for our country if the Pope is ever allowed to set up housekeeping here in the United States. We exhort our readers to beware of such tendencies."

**A Well-Deserved Lecture Administered by the Wrong Party.** — *America* has this to say on "The Rejected Prayer-book": "Whatever method the Savior of the world may have chosen for the strengthening of His people in the faith, it is quite inconceivable that He selected as the supreme arbiter in faith and morals a political majority in the British House of Commons. There is no evidence that He did. The assumption is too extraordinary to merit serious consideration. . . . Once more it is affirmed that what the members of the Establishment may or must or must not believe, and how they shall pray, is determined by Parliament acting through a political



majority." That is true, in a way; only the pot should not call the kettle black, particularly when its own color is of the extreme Stygian shade. The human authority which determines what the Roman Catholics must or must not believe and how they shall pray is an absolute authority, acting through a minority, a minority of one. If *America's* horror of human authority in matters of faith and morals is a matter of conscience, it should first of all work for the nullification or repeal of the latest amendment to the constitution of the Church of Rome: "The Roman Pontiff . . . possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves unalterable, and not from the consent of the Church." E.

**Pagan Origins of Rites.**— In its special department "A Survey of Religious Life and Thought" the *Sunday-school Times* publishes the following on the origin of Roman Catholic Rites. It says: "Canon Williams of Christ Church, Oxford, tells us in the *Expository Times* that the reasonable Anglo-Catholic (Episcopalian) is half inclined to wish that Christianity had retained its original *aniconic* character, that is, its abstention from the use of images, and is deeply concerned to avoid the recrudescence of fetish belief in miraculous images that still flourishes in the Mediterranean area. 'He knows of no Scriptural or other evidence for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. His historical conscience cannot tolerate the myths of the Virgin's Presentation in the Temple and corporeal Assumption; and he is convinced that much Continental worship of the Queen of Heaven represents not so much the impression made by Mary of the New Testament upon the earliest disciples as the later transference to her person of ideas and sentiments connected with the pre-Christian Queen of Heaven, whose worship was denounced by Jeremiah in the Old Testament. He cannot forget that the enormous development of the cult of the saints in the fourth and succeeding centuries synchronized with the influx into the Church of vast masses of half-converted heathen under the pressure of civil disabilities imposed upon paganism by the Christian emperors.'

"The antidote to ritualism in its crass forms is unquestionably the study of paganism in such books as Theodor Trede's *Wunderglaube im Heidentum und in der alten Kirche*. Conyers Middleton's *Letters from Rome*, a book largely forgotten, is in the nature of a specific for these religious maladies. It is indeed encouraging that, as Canon Williams tells us, a Jesuit, Père Delahaye, has been showing the resemblance of the cult of the martyrs to the pagan cult of heroes and indicating that much of popular Catholic saint-worship may have to be regarded as the survival of heathen polytheism under a faintly Christian disguise.

"Canon Williams, who is the Lady Margaret Professor in Divinity at Oxford, announces this satisfactory canon: 'No tradition is truly Catholic unless it is also Scriptural; and the existence of an open Bible imposes upon the individual the duty of deciding for himself whether a given tradition actually was promulgated or sanc-

tioned by the Lord and maintained by His immediate followers or not.' Certainly this sentence is an ax laid at the root of a tree, and that tree is not Protestantism."

These statements of Canon Williams teach nothing new; yet they are well in place as an antidote to the present-day mania of Anglican papophiles, who seek union with the Church of Rome at all costs.

MUELLER.

**Unitarianism and Freemasonry.** — "Unitarianism does not prosper, though its opinions are certainly playing havoc with the Christian churches of the present time. The census of 1926 gives a net loss of fifty-eight churches and 22,363 members in the last decade."

With this preamble the *Sunday-school Times* introduces a bit of information which is important enough for us to quote in these columns. It says: "The American Unitarian Association has just put out a pamphlet by Mr. E. A. Coil, called *The Relation of the Liberal Churches to the Fraternal Orders*, in which the suggestion is made of an informal alliance between Unitarianism and the secret orders. They have, he tells us, substantially the same creed. Both teach 'the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, salvation by character, and the soul's immortality. Nearly all the Masonic monitors have as their basis these principles, so familiar to every Unitarian Sunday-school scholar who has been properly taught the fundamentals of the Unitarian faith. It is true', he continues, 'that lodges pledged to this teaching go in bodies to listen to Mr. Sunday, who condemns them as inadequate. In church they, too, often subscribe to the doctrine that we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, by faith, and not by our own works or deservings, while in the lodge the formula states that the All-seeing Eye will reward us according to our merits. This inconsistency, he thinks, is an opportunity for Unitarianism. Those fraternity people whose faith in dogmatic religion is breaking down should be informed that there is a church in which they can find a home, and in whose Sunday-schools their children can be taught principles which they as fraternity people have already enthusiastically approved.'

"'Especially,' he writes, 'should the children be trained. The fraternities cannot do this work, constituted as they are, but the Unitarian Sunday-school offers a place for such indoctrination. Fraternity men, interested in the welfare of their children, should be informed that in the liberal churches their children will be trained in principles that they will not have to repudiate when they, in their turn, become lodge-members. If this plan were worked out, it certainly would transform the Unitarian Sunday-schools, of which there are but 317 in the entire United States. But it never will. It should be added that the present president of the Unitarian Sunday-school Association is President Morgan of Antioch College, who is a disbeliever in the future life and in the existence of God.'"

Let our pastors read this to their congregations! MUELLER.

**Samples of Evangelist Sunday's Revival Talk.** — "If you should ever go to Europe, — and if I ever go, I will never sail on a ship that carries the German flag. You can do just as you please, and I'll tell you what I will do. British jack, tricolor of France, old Italia, they're good enough for your Uncle Fuller — and the Stars and Stripes." The text for the evening was 1 Cor. 1, 18. How many of the 500 that came forward on this occasion were induced by this particular squib to reconsecrate themselves to Christ? A few years ago he preached: "Conscientious objectors are so low down that I couldn't spit on them; in fact, they are so far down below us that it would take an airplane to go to hell." But surely such talk is no longer considered good form. — We cannot discuss here all the unscriptural doctrines Rev. Sunday teaches. But because of the prevalence of millenarianism to-day it will be interesting to note his views on this matter: "Christ will come — all the dead in Christ will rise; all true believers will be translated into the air and away with the Savior. There will arise an antichrist — tribulation and hell on earth. Then another return of Christ — the devil locked in the pit, and Christ with the faithful will reign for a thousand years in Jerusalem, with no evil on earth. Again for a time the devil will be loosed on a pure world, and he will storm Jerusalem and be vanquished. The final resurrection of the evil from the dead — last Judgment." "Nations will be born in a day through the missionary efforts of the Jews." And note what the millennialists are longing for: "Think of how glorious it will be to live a thousand years in this world with our blessed Master and be closely associated with Him; with bodies that will not wear out or grow old, no wrinkles or white hair, perfect health, and with faculties for enjoyment a thousand times greater than we possess now. Poverty, sickness, and war will be unknown." — What attracts five to eight thousand every evening to his meetings? Some come to be entertained; some, because the, let us say, Shovelmakers' Union wants to make a good showing on the evening set aside for it; and some, because they love to be told of the Savior. It is apparent that many appreciate statements like these: "Hung between two thieves, one of them blaspheming and spitting out his dirty oaths, the other asking for forgiveness for his sins in humbleness of heart, our Jesus died." "You may pile up your sins until they rise like a dark mountain in front of you, and then you can multiply by a million all those you can't remember, and after you've tried to recall all that you've ever committed, I will bring one verse of Scripture: 'The blood of Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.'" "The world likes a philanthropic Christ. The world likes a social-service Christ; yes, the world likes a sentimental Christ; the world likes a Sunday morning Christ. Yes, but not a redemptive Christ; not the Christ that died on the cross to save us from our sins and whom we must accept in order to keep out of hell and be saved." Surely these Bible truths find their mark. — And they would find it the more surely if they were not bound up with such a mass of irreverent talk, bound up with so much error. There is nothing said on the means of grace, on the Gospel and the Sacra-

ments as conveying the grace of God to the anxious sinner, who is thus left to grope his way towards assurance. "Faith is the hand by which my soul touches God. I can't touch God with my hand. I can touch God with my faith." Absolutely true, but never a word that faith finds and touches God only in the Word. What about Baptism? "I am not here to preach Baptism—I never preached a sermon on Baptism in my life! I never expect to." What about Absolution? "There is no man or woman on earth that has power to forgive sins. We can tell people about God, and God can forgive sins, but no man on earth can forgive sins. It is an infamous and damnable slander; nobody on earth can do it." The statements on repentance, conversion, are hazy, contradictory, and misleading. Then this on justification: "God says He will forgive, but it is conditioned upon your doing something to have His forgiveness." "The only sins that God can blot out are those that you are willing to blot out and forsake." If the revivalist knew exactly what justification by faith is, he could not have told the Knights of Columbus: "I know you folks are as proud of your battin' average in the Douay League as I am in the King James League." — His self-complacency is strongly developed. "We've got the devil on the run in St. Louis. I don't think he's ever been so scared before in his life." "An' I know St. Louis is millions and, oh! septillions of miles nearer to heaven than it was seven weeks ago." And the devil said: "Bill isn't going to stay more than seven weeks in the city." "And I will say, 'Jesus, whose house is that?' For there is a 'For Rent' sign in the window. And He will say, 'That is for one of the bankers, but he would not go to the tabernacle.'" Again: "You never had a man come to your city who worked any harder than I work. I do not care who he is. . . . I consume more energy preaching to you in an hour than any other man burns in twelve hours. And it is 1, 2, and 3 o'clock before I go to sleep any night. You say Napoleon could do with four hours' sleep. I have got him backed off the boards." — He is still employing his old methods, his use of choice billingsgate and misplaced jocularity, vaudeville stunts, and pulpit tricks, the daily papers keeping exact tally of the chairs he has broken in his fervor. And that attracts great crowds. Says the daily: "In describing what he termed dangers of the dance-hall, evangelist throws audience into prolonged laughter." "Rev. Sunday asked the devil why there was all this stir about a revival being poison for St. Louis. 'Well, you see, it's this way,' the devil answered through the elocutionary Sunday, 'these here revivals bust up my business.' 'Oh, ho,' cried Billy Sunday, 'you go to hell,' and the crowd roared." And this same Billy complains: "Why, the churches have motion picture screens in the rear of the churches and try to inveigle people to church to see Mary Pickford, Doug Fairbanks, or Bill Hart." E.

**The National Church of the Air.**—From the *Presbyterian* we take the following information on this enterprise: "It owes its existence to the Greater New York Federation of Churches. Its first service was held early in January, and Dr. Fosdick was the speaker. The service was broadcast through five radio stations, and

it is planned to extend this church by adding stations to the chain till the service becomes nation-wide. The service will function exactly the same as in the past and with the same policy as when known as the Radio Vesper Service. But it has been decided to extend the network of stations in connection with the National Broadcasting Company till the service in reality becomes a National Church of the Air." It seems clear that we are here dealing with an attempt of religious liberalism to bring its message to the people of our country. The *Presbyterian* says very properly: "What we fear is that the service will be religious without being Christian." Lutheran pastors and teachers will have to warn those entrusted to them against the theology emanating from this so-called National Church of the Air.

**The Hesperopithecus Haroldcookii Again.** — *Time* reports: "Authorities at the American Museum of Natural History candidly state now that in one particular they had been wrong and the late William Jennings Bryan right. The particular was an old tooth, found years ago by Paleontologist Harold Cook in an ancient Nebraska river bed. President Henry Fairfield Osborn and other specialists at the museum examined the tooth with naked eye, microscope, and X-rays. It belonged, they decided, to a manlike beast and seemed the first indication that such animals had once existed in what is now the United States. They called the specimen *Hesperopithecus*, which means 'Evening Ape,' *Haroldcookii*, to honor the finder. Fundamentalists scoffed at this as at all other evolutionary data.

"Recent diggings in Nebraska revealed a few similar and more perfect teeth. These the museum staff had studied and were delighted [*sic!*] to learn that they had erred in their first deduction. The teeth, they now announce, had served no anthropoidal beast, but an ancient, bristly, snub-nosed pig, a peccary, rooting in Nebraska several millennia ago."

Now, if the scientists will come out with the statement that the rooting was done, not several millennia ago, but several decades ago, the general public will probably have all the facts of the case.

MUELLER.

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

Dr. Frank M. Goodchild, prominent Fundamentalist in the Baptist Church, who was in charge of the Fundamentalist page in the *Watchman-Examiner*, died on February 18.

Bishop Barnes, now prominently before the public through the opposition voiced against him by the conservative Canon Bullock-Webster, appealed in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking that the latter consider steps "to help those of us who are trying to fit the Church to be the spiritual guide of an educated nation." He ignores 1 Cor. 1, where the great apostle points out that men are saved not by the wisdom of this world, but by the foolishness of the message of the Cross.

Our readers will be interested in the information that the works of the late Dr. Benjamin Breckenridge Warfield, who perhaps at the time of his death, as the *Presbyterian* puts it, was the leading Calvinistic theologian in the English-speaking world, will be issued in an edition consisting of a number of volumes. The first volume, which has recently appeared, is of special interest to all Bible Christians because it treats

the great subjects "revelation" and "inspiration." We have not seen the volume, but believe it to be worth the price, \$3.00. The publishers are the Oxford University Press, 35 W. 32d St., New York.

According to Dr. Fry of the U. L. C. Board of American Missions, the mission activities of the U. L. C. in America are quite extensive. Dr. Fry writes: "We proclaim the Gospel in 12 languages. We are contributing to the support of 504 workers. 44 new missions were organized. Church extension loans were granted to 32 missions, and the amount actually paid out in 1927 was \$130,000. . . . All told, our Church Extension loans exceed \$1,300,000 on second and third mortgages."

Baptists are this year observing the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Balthasar Huebmaier, whom they consider their protagonist at the time of the Reformation. He had to suffer many indignities and tortures and finally was burned at the stake in Vienna on March 10, 1528, for his opposition to the teachings of the Church of Rome. His brave wife was put to death by drowning three days later. How sad that among the things he so courageously contended for was the rejection of the Biblical doctrine of the Sacraments!

In Eastern Europe there is said to be a mass movement of Jews away from their religion toward Christianity. The president of the International Hebrew-Christian Alliance, so the *Sunday-school Times* says, is authority for the statement that in Hungary alone 90,000 Jews left the synagogue in a body. In Vienna 17,000 Jews have become Christians. In Poland the Christian Jews are said to number 35,000; in Russia, 60,000. It is thus that Rom. 11 is being fulfilled: the elect of God in Israel are brought into the Church.

Dr. Leonard, of the School of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, is one of our educators who sees clearly the injustice of the policy pursued by the present accrediting agencies for secondary schools and colleges in our country. His advice, as given in the *N. L. C. B.*, is: "Scrap accrediting agencies. They have served a useful purpose during the past thirty years, but now they are fastening all attention upon mechanical or physical facilities rather than upon educational considerations. They should be replaced by two agencies; one a commission to apprise the public at large of institutions which exploit their students, and the second one committees to foster experimentation and curriculum research."

A revolt seems imminent in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. Eighty-five prominent laymen have joined hands and, together with twenty women, have signed a petition addressed to the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies urging that at the next convention of these bodies, which will take place in October, "steps be taken so that Protestant Episcopal churches can no longer have mass, reservation, and adoration of the Sacraments, prayers to the Virgin Mary, invocation of saints, worship of images and relics, auricular confession, the practise of penance, use of the rosary, holy water, and other ceremonies peculiar to the Church of Rome." The revolt certainly is long overdue. These people, in addition, ought to urge a complete return to the religion of the New Testament.

"Distance lends enchantment to the view." Does not this old saying explain why America ranks first in contributions for the maintenance of the so-called Holy See at Rome?

The power of the Roman Church in Bavaria can be gaged by its successful effort to have the Martin Luther film prohibited in that German state. The press reports that the Catholic Bishops' Organization is attempting to have the film barred elsewhere too. We need not be surprised at this attitude of the Romanists. But how, in spite of such occurrences, many Protestants can fail to see the dangers lurking in Roman power and aspirations and aggressiveness is a mystery.

The *Presbyterian* calls attention to the remarkable fact that within recent years a great change has come about in the attitude of people toward the Bible. There used to be learned men who contended that the Bible does not teach the Trinity, the two natures in Christ, the vicariousness of the death of our Lord, the monergism of divine grace, etc. Now that is changed. It is quite generally admitted among scholars that the Bible does teach these doctrines; but the tragedy is that many scholars making the admission no longer believe what, according to their own view, the Bible teaches. Formerly the learned errorist tried to take his stand on the Bible. Now he boldly brushes it aside as a human, fallible book, which is without authority for him. The question nowadays is not, What does the Bible teach? but rather, Is the Bible to be followed at all? It is open and avowed rebellion against the Scriptures which we have to face. A wise strategist will take note of the change of tactics on the part of the enemy.

If proof were needed that Mohammedanism is still a power, we might point to an item circulating in the press to the effect that last year 200,000 pilgrims visited Mecca to offer up their prayers at the tomb of the false prophet. Just before the close of the period when pilgrims are received, 30,000 worshipers came from British India. Let the reader contemplate what a trip from India to Mecca in Arabia and return means, what expenses and inconveniences it entails, and he will have to marvel at the devotion exhibited by these pilgrims to a false religion. What of the neither-hot-nor-cold policy of so many Christians by way of comparison?

According to the *Pastoralblaetter* there were 14,338 cases of suicide in Germany in 1926. The unsatisfactory financial and social conditions that set in after the war are mentioned as factors responsible for this alarmingly high figure. But the chief reason, so the writer very properly states, is the rejection of the Gospel of the Savior. We can, however, not endorse his plan, which seeks to provide a burial conducted by Christian ministers for all suicides whose families desire such a ceremony.

According to the *Watchman-Examiner* the Ku Klux Klan decided to discard masks after February 22. Three reasons are mentioned why masks should not be used: 1) Men ought not to take refuge behind a mask in performing any deed. 2) The mask gave immunity in performing deeds of lawlessness and violence. 3) Probably some evil deeds perpetrated by other masked people were charged against the Klan. Agreed, we say. But now let our contemporary be consistent and inveigh against the secrecy of the lodge-meeting as well.

---