

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

AUGUST, 1928.

No. 8.

## The Means of Grace.

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

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

(Concluded.)

But can it be said also of children that Baptism justifies them? They are certainly, it is argued, not yet able to partake of the merits of Christ. That was the reason why the disciples turned them away. Matt. 19, 13; Luke 18, 15. But what did Jesus say? "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 19, 14; Luke 18, 15; Mark 10, 14. These "little children" cannot possibly have been fully grown up, for they were carried in the arms. Matt. 19, 13; Mark 10, 13; Luke 18, 15. And the disciples did not chide the children, but those that bore them. Furthermore, the term which Luke employs to designate the children (*βρέφη*) is used in his writings only of the new-born or of the fruit in the womb. Luke 18, 15. [Note. — *Βρέφη*: of the new-born, Luke 2, 12; Acts 7, 19; of the fruit in the womb, Luke 1, 41. 44.] But the meaning of the "kingdom of heaven" which belongs to the children is shown Rom. 14, 17: "The kingdom of God is not meat or drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." So, then, these three things belong to them: the righteousness of Christ, the peace of God, and the joy in the Holy Ghost. But does not Christ say, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"? Matt. 19, 14. Happy are we that He did say so; otherwise no adult would get into heaven. But did He, with the words "of such," wish to exclude the little children? Surely not; He rather made them the leaders of the procession to Salem. He says: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me"; they will be saved before all others; indeed, only such as they. [Note. — The *Hirschberg Bible* gives a very good explanation of the word "such" in Matt. 19, 18: "The children and those who, by committing themselves without malicious resistance to My arms of grace, become like them." . . . Christ

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

**Dr. F. A. Schmidt Deceased.**—It was a remarkable and varied career that came to its close on May 15, when Dr. Friedrich August Schmidt closed his eyes in death. A review of his life amounts to a survey of the history of a great part of the Lutheran Church in America. No Missourian will read this notice without feelings of melancholy. Born in 1837, Dr. Schmidt received some of his training in the historical log cabin in Perry County, Mo. When Concordia College and Seminary were removed to St. Louis, he joined in the transfer and was graduated in 1857. While in St. Louis, he became interested in the Norwegian language and began that association with Norwegian Lutheranism which was to become the channel in which his life flowed. From 1857 to 1861 he was a member of the Missouri Synod, serving congregations in Eden, N. Y., and in Baltimore. In 1861, Luther College at Decorah, Iowa, had been founded by Norwegian Lutherans, and Rev. Schmidt was called there as one of the professors, serving there till 1872. From 1872 to 1876 he taught at Concordia Seminary; the Norwegian Synod wished to have a man at this school for its students of theology, and Professor Schmidt was called for this purpose. During this period of life he wrote some very strong polemical articles against the doctrinal position of the Iowa Synod. When the Norwegian Synod, in 1876, opened its theological seminary in Madison, he was transferred to that institution and stayed there till 1886. In the mean time the controversy on Conversion and Predestination had broken upon the Church, and Professor Schmidt had become one of the chief opponents of the St. Louis Faculty. In his periodical *Altes und Neues*, founded in January, 1880, he brought the dissension which had been discussed in private for some time before the public, accusing Dr. Walther and his associates of Crypto-Calvinism. To the best of our information he never withdrew this charge. In 1887 he left the Norwegian Synod, the majority of whose members did not share his heterodox views, and with others founded the United Norwegian Lutheran Church. He continued to labor as theological professor, and from 1890 to 1893 he was connected with Augsburg Seminary in Minneapolis. From 1893 to 1912 he taught at the seminary of the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in St. Paul. After his retirement he lived in the last-named city. He was a prolific writer, especially in the rôle of editor. In 1883 the degree of Doctor of Theology had been conferred on him by Capital University. He died at the ripe age of ninety-one.

**Andover Seminary—a Warning Example.**—In connection with the controversy raging about Princeton Seminary at present a writer in the *Presbyterian* draws attention to the history of Andover Seminary, founded as a Congregationalist school in opposition to Harvard, which contains weighty lessons for all who are concerned about the type of doctrine taught in our theological schools. Professor Faulkner of Drew Seminary is quoted as follows: "That historic row of buildings on Andover Hill, that fine campus with its beautiful line

of elms, that magnificent Brechin Hall library building, the gymnasium — all . . . in 1908 went to Cambridge. It became a kind of *protégé* of the Unitarian College, which cast it out in 1805. It was the grimmest piece of irony in history, as one of its graduates said. The inevitable happened. . . . In June, 1922, to save itself from extinction, it merged itself with that school to become the Theological School in Harvard University. Such is the tragic end of a glorious history, an end full of instruction and of warning, so plain that he who runs may read." "For seventy-five years (1807—1882) no school of its kind had a nobler history or lent more glory to its benefactors. It was among the first experiments of a regular theological seminary. . . . Students flocked to Andover from all lands and from all Protestant denominations." "Her professors, for nearly a century, shed immortal light on her, on theological science, and on the whole Church of Christ. Her light went out into all the world. . . . Her graduates, from the very beginning, went forth into heathen lands, Christianized and civilized whole races, and later went also into our whole West and planted academies, colleges, and theological schools, built churches, and evangelized large portions of our land. She became the model of every theological school in America. . . . Yes, she had a glorious history."

How did all this happen? Dr. Faulkner says: "The orthodoxy of no school in the history of the world was ever more sacredly and carefully guarded by human ingenuity than was done in this case by the high-minded, far-seeing, and generous founders of Andover Seminary." There were some strict provisions, which seemed to be adequate to keep the Faculty on the proper foundations. A special Board of Visitors had been provided, whose duty it was to see to it that the professors in the seminary remained loyal to their oath of subscription to the doctrinal standards. Every five years these subscriptions had to be repeated. Certain grave mistakes were made, however, which finally issued in complete disaster. First one, next two, and then more professors were employed who could not sincerely subscribe to the doctrinal standards. The faculty became divided, endless litigation resulted, and finally the property was entirely in the control of the Unitarian liberals. The Board of Trustees, which had the right to appoint teachers, was not careful. After it had placed two heretical professors on the faculty, it took but a short time until the Board of Visitors, which was entrusted with the sacred duty of guarding the orthodoxy of the school, became liberal itself.

Having read the presentation in the *Presbyterian*, we must say that there is no method devised by human ingenuity which can keep a school on the foundations of the Scriptures, — the Spirit of God has to do it. We see, however, that it is a dangerous thing to place control of a school in the hands of a few men, because they so easily take an attitude different from that of the church-body which they are supposed to represent.

**Let Modernists Be Honest.** — It is strange that people should be so slow in perceiving that common honesty demands that they leave their church-body if they no longer agree with its doctrines and

principles. The world sees it, even if the theologian maintains he does not. The *Presbyterian* draws attention to an editorial in the *National Republic*, where this matter is discussed. Says the editor of the *National Republic*: "For a clergyman to remain within the membership and even the ministry of a Church whose doctrines he repudiates is evidence of a lack of stamina which must fall beneath the contempt of all normal-minded men and women. To be willing to take advantage of the opportunity for a hearing afforded by such profession and at the same time to use it for the purpose of subverting or destroying the institution to which he ostensibly yields allegiance, is a violation of the tenets of common honesty. . . . It is about time for the rank and file of the churches of this country to rise up and demand that their disloyalists be required to do what honorable men need not be asked to do — get out under their own flag and fight from the side of the breastworks on which they belong rather than to seek betrayal of the camp from within. Unless such rebellion is raised, vast injury is sure to be done to the cause of religion within the next few years."

In commenting on the editorial statement quoted above, the writer in the *Presbyterian* alludes to one of his own experiences. "In an unguarded moment one of the foremost ministers in our Church reproved the writer sharply in the presence of a brilliant and noted Liberal by saying, in reference to the doubts injected into the minds of students in the seminary by their professors: 'It is perfectly preposterous to put a man into the seminary and then tell him what he is to say. He should be left perfectly free to say what he believes.' This same preacher gave an address before a meeting of known Conservative ministers, in which he noisily affirmed every solemn and difficult phrase of the Apostles' Creed. One audience was Liberal, and so a Liberal pronouncement. The other was Conservative, and so the full Gospel declaration. Paul speaks of not handling the Word of God deceitfully, and it is this utmost honesty and sincerity to which we here recall our own hearts and lips."

**The Catholic Doctrine of Intention.** — Oliver Chase Quick, an Anglo-Catholic, in *The Christian Sacraments*, published 1927, brings up "the difficulties of Catholic theologians" about this doctrine in this wise: "Some doctrine of intention there must be if the Christian Sacraments are to be saved from the absurdities, and worse than absurdities, of magic. But the Augustinian theory of validity seems to make the Sacrament, on its human side, depend upon the *personal* rather than upon the *official* action of the minister, and therefore to require a *private* intention in the minister's own mind to perform the Sacrament and not merely a *publicly expressed* intention, for which the apparent fact that a man is acting in an official capacity is sufficient evidence. In this antithesis we have roughly indicated the point at issue between those theologians who require 'interior intention' in the minister of a Sacrament and those who hold that 'exterior intention' is enough. In the Roman Communion the necessity of interior intention is now generally accepted in spite of the weighty arguments of Salmeron and Catharinus, which have been revived and

restated by Dr. Langford James in his recent monograph *The Doctrine of Intention*. At first sight this is strange; for the difficulties of the now prevalent doctrine are obvious. It necessitates the almost intolerable conclusion that in the last resort the minister can render the Sacrament invalid simply by forming, and adhering in his own mind to, a contrary intention while he outwardly performs the sacramental acts" (p. 157 f.). There are various sorts of difficulties about this doctrine. Those Catholic theologians who hold that the "interior intention" in the minister of a Sacrament is not required will experience great difficulty in reconciling their view with the clear statements of their creed. The *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* declare: "If any one saith that in ministers, when they effect and confer the Sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." (Sess. VII, Can. XI.) "The penitent ought not so to confide in his own personal faith as to think that — even though there be no contribution on his part or no intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously and absolving truly — he is nevertheless truly and in God's sight absolved on account of his faith alone." (Sess. XIV, chap. VI.) "If any one saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses, provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke, . . . let him be anathema." (Sess. XIV, Can. IX.) Unless these theologians can delete these canons from their creed, we shall have to consider them as under the anathema of their Church. The difficulties besetting the other party of Catholic theologians are presented by Cardinal Bellarmine in this cold-blooded manner: "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true Sacrament because the Sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, and no man can see another's intention." (Littledale, p. 22.) It will prove a most difficult task to convince the devout Catholic that he received a true absolution, seeing that the mental attitude of the priest is made an essential factor in the efficacy of the sacrament of penance. Roman writers may minimize as much as possible the likelihood that even a bad priest would act without intention, — it will prove difficult to get the devout Catholic to trust in the goodness of a bad priest. Another difficulty: Do the bulls and encyclicals of the present Pontiff carry any weight? Unless he is a true priest, he cannot act as Pope, the infallible head of the Church. But is he a priest? Who saw the intention of the bishop administering the sacrament of order? Every good Catholic is bound to receive his encyclicals with doubts and misgivings, under pain of being anathematized by his Church. And what about those theologians who, for going against the plain teachings of their Church, have been laboring under the anathema, and now, penitently accepting the teaching, go to the Pope to be absolved from the guilt and punishment of the anathema? The Pope will remove the anathema; but having honestly accepted the Tridentine canons, they are bound to tell him that they cannot receive his absolution "with the certainty

of faith," — and upon that the Pope will at once restore the anathema. It certainly is a difficult affair. And there are other and much more serious difficulties. Says Dr. Dallmann: "For lack of intention on the part of a baptizing priest the boy is never baptized; the boy, when grown, enters the Church, but he never becomes a priest, and every priestly act of his is null and void; those he ordains are no more priests than himself; all their acts are not valid; he becomes Pope, but lacks the infallibility, and so the Church loses her head and becomes a corpse. On his own principles no Romanist can say with certainty that there is a true catholic and apostolic Church on the earth to-day." (*Theol. Quart.*, XIV, p. 94.) — However, the Catholic Church knows how to deal efficiently with the difficulties her teachings present to her thinking sons. It requires them to make the *sacrificium intellectus* — and all difficulties vanish. E.

**Superstition Still Fostered by Rome.** — *Our Sunday Visitor* explains on its "Children's Page" what is meant by the Agnus Dei. On the Wednesday of Holy Week, so we are told, the Pope blesses the Agnus Dei, which is made of wax from the paschal candle of the preceding years. "This wax is made in small molds, and on one side is impressed the figure of a lamb and on the other the image of a saint. They are immersed in water especially blessed by the Holy Father. Then each little piece is enclosed in linen covered with silk or white leather. These are distributed all over the Catholic world and are treasured by those who devoutly recall the Paschal Lamb, Jesus, who suffered for our sins. . . . During the pontificate of St. Pius V the river Tiber overflowed its banks and threatened destruction to several parts of Rome. An Agnus Dei was thrown into the river, and the waters immediately went down." Let no one say that gross superstition is no longer found in the Roman Church.

**The Power of Prejudice.** — The *Biblical Review* for April, 1928, contains a fine article by Dr. A. McCaig, entitled "Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own Death." It deals with the substitutionary and redemptive nature of Christ's death. It insists on taking the words of Scripture as they read. It refuses to depart, for rationalistic considerations, from the plain sense of the words. We transcribe a few paragraphs: "The strong preposition used [in Matt. 20, 28] intensifies the idea of ransom and expiation, even to the point of substitution; *ὕπερ*, 'on behalf of,' is frequently used in connection with the death of Christ, and those who deny the expiatory and substitutionary nature of His sufferings will have it that it is used in a loose, general way, 'for the benefit of.'" (Robertson, by the way, points out that in some passages *ὕπερ* cannot mean anything else than "instead," and "only violence to the text can get rid of it." For instance, Gal. 3, 13. Try to make it mean "for the benefit of" in Philemon 13! Or in 2 Cor. 5, 20! — The article continues:) "But here the preposition is *ἀντί*, and 'instead of' is its proper rendering; and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution, cannot be removed from it. In Num. 3, 45: 'Take the Levites *instead* of the first-born,' the Septuagint uses *ἀντί*, which, like the English 'instead of,' exactly represents

the Hebrew *takhath*, and all three convey most unmistakably the idea of substitution. As the Levites were to be substituted for the first-born, so for the surplus of the first-born, the 'ransom-money' was to be substituted, that idea, however, being clearly enough indicated by the genitive. Indeed, the more appropriate and the simpler way of describing a ransom would be with the genitive — the ransom of many, or, as our version renders, 'a ransom for many'; but just because the ransom here is not a mere money payment, but is the actual sacrifice of the life, the substitution of His soul, He is appropriately said to 'give His soul *instead of many*.' On the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper: "The additional statement that His blood was shed for the remission of sins, makes it still more evident. The blood of the covenant typically and figuratively procures forgiveness for the people through the shedding of Christ's blood; the new covenant is ratified, and perfect forgiveness is actually secured for His people — not for Jews alone, but 'for many.' The words are so plain that only a mind filled with prejudice or preconceived theories could fail to apprehend the meaning, to see that in some way, at least, the death of Christ was to procure forgiveness, that this was indeed His purpose in dying, and not a mere incidental or mysterious and inexplicable effect. Nothing less than atoning, vicarious, redeeming efficacy is thus attributed to the blood of Christ. It is, indeed, very noteworthy that the atoning virtue is not attributed to the teaching, the influence, of Christ, but to His death, His shed blood. It is hard to see how any theory of the Atonement which sets aside the true expiatory character of the death of Christ can be reconciled with these words."

It is strange that a writer who over against the objections of the rationalists so tenaciously clings to the native meaning of the words could pen, in this very connection, these words: "In instituting His memorial feast, He says, 'This is My body,' 'given for you,' 'take, eat,' thus showing the significance of His death. 'Given' tells of surrender unto death, 'for you' proclaims the sacrificial and substitutionary character, while the eating of the symbolical body tells of the nourishment which communion with Him affords." How does it happen that the writer substitutes *symbolical body* for "This is My body," "given for you," so easily, unconcernedly, unhesitatingly? The symbolical body was not given for us. The writer will not suffer himself to become biased by any rationalistic prejudice when studying the Atonement. Why should the Reformed-rationalistic prejudice influence him when studying the words of the Institution? "The words are so plain that only a mind filled with prejudice or preconceived theories could fail to apprehend the meaning." E.

**A National Communist College.** — The *Lutheran Companion*, as quoted by the *Lutheran Standard*, reports that a National Communist College has been formally opened in New York City by the central executive committee of the Workers' Communist Party, with the avowed purpose "to teach the art and science, the tactics and strategy, of militant revolution."

The course can be covered in three months, and during that time the students will be paid a fee of ten dollars a week. The faculty includes Wm. Z. Foster, Ben Gold, Bertram D. Wolfe, and more than twenty others. In his address at the opening of the school, Mr. Foster said that the present leaders of labor organization are "corrupt and in the pay of the capitalist." Evidently this new effort is designed to teach young Communists a morality which money cannot corrupt.

The subjects included in the course of instruction are: Marxism and Leninism, trade-union organization, American political problems, economics, organization methods, labor journalism, statistical methods of research, and the history of American and international labor methods. Students will study during the day and gain practical information by visiting meetings and offices of trade-unions and radical organizations by night. As announced, they come not only from the Eastern States, but also from the Middle West and the Pacific Coast.

"There is no announcement of a course in explosives," says the *Rock Island Argus*, "but doubtless some competent 'professor' will train neophytes in the scientific handling of dynamite bombs. This nest of Communists will send out fledglings from time to time and do what they can to disturb the present social order. It may be that some will take postgraduate courses in penitentiaries."

The *Lutheran Companion* closes the report with the remark: "Who says that the powers of destruction are not active? Who says that all this writing in the press about dethroning God and enthroning license, disorder, riot, and destruction of the powers that be is mere newspaper talk? Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This eternal vigilance must include also the Modernist and the evolutionist, who by their pernicious teachings destroy the morality of the nation; the corrupt politician, who is willing to betray the highest interest of his country for money; and last, but not least, the perverted judge and the lawyer who hold that criminality is only a disease and therefore intercept and prevent the punishment which the ever-increasing multitude of criminals deserves. Communism strikes its root in a people that has forsaken God and His Law. MUELLER.

**Christianity and Woman.** — Christians in our country and the world over recently were horrified when an American woman embraced Hinduism in order to marry a prominent Hindu prince. The *Gospel Herald* offers the following warning with reference to this and other "conversions" to foreign religions: "When God formed Eve and presented her to Adam, He designed that she should be a helpmeet. But every religion and philosophy in the world since, except Christianity, has failed to adhere to this purpose. Even many sects which hold nominal Bible views miserably fail in domestic relationships for the same reason that Christ gave, 'because of the hardness of your hearts.' This God-given place for woman was quickly lost after the expulsion from Eden. It was somewhat restored among the Hebrews and has since reached its highest degree of realization in the various periods of this dispensation when Christianity has enjoyed its greatest purity. For this reason, if for no other, every woman in the world ought to be an enthusiastic, faithful Christian; for apart



from Christ her chances for obtaining her natural rights and privileges are utterly hopeless. . . .

"The catchy book philosophy of the Hindu poets and pundits traps the unspiritual minds even of English and Americans, who see nothing but the ethical ideals and none of the vile degradation which is universally prevalent in Hindu life and worship. . . .

"The American bride . . . will discover that her husband may have a quartet of wives according to his religion and that he will quickly give her the lowest place and the least attention if she does not come up to his ideals. If she disappoints him in any one of five ways, he can simply say, 'Thou art divorced,' and her meteoric honeymoon will suddenly end without redress or alimony. Her new religion will teach her that a man may lie in three cases, 'to woman, to reconcile friends, and in war'; and lying to women was placed first, while, on the other hand, he may divorce her if she lies to him. She will face the lack of home love such as she knew in America; her liberties will be seriously cut off; she will be torn with jealousy and crushed by the ignorance of the women with whom she must associate. . . .

"The fad for marriage romance which has captured many in these latter days has caused untold soul anguish, moral turpitude, and spiritual bankruptcy. The idea that all religions can give soul peace to their followers has been accepted by some as a mark of tolerance and has led not a few into breaking off their interest in Christ and taking up religious teachings which have engulfed whole continents and made nations grovel in immoral gutters for thousands of years.

"If the non-Christian religions of the world had been able to do what Christianity has done, why did they not do it before Christ came? He knew their powerlessness and said to His disciples: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. . . . He that believeth not shall be damned.' Mark 16, 15, 16. This last statement puts Christ's seal of disapproval upon them all and marks them as beliefs to be avoided. His correctness in this attitude is clearly demonstrated and proved by the home life under the different religions. Christianity is the only religion that establishes and maintains the atmosphere of divine love, peace, and equality. This is simply because it came from God and not from the imaginative human mind.

"The woman who forsakes Christianity for any non-Christian religion will very soon find that she has sold her soul and body for a mess of sour pottage. She may imagine at first that she is going to find some new light, but she will quickly discover that Christ spoke a great warning truth when He said: 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!'"

MUELLER.

**Pacifism, Just Wars, and War Lust.**—The report of a committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, published February 17, enunciates principles which our statesmen—and our people—would do well to study. It rejects the proposition that "all employment of force among nations is immoral." Only a sovereign power possesses the right to make a just war, it declared, and it added,

"equally obvious is a just intention." "Even though engaged in justifiable warfare," the report continues, "a state should not include wrongful ends among its objectives. A state may make war to safeguard its rights, actually violated or in certain or imminent danger. Hence a war is not morally justified which aims at extending national territory, enhancing national power and prestige, promoting an international 'balance of power,' or forestalling some hypothetical or merely probable menace. — Utterly inadequate are the formulations, 'the good of the community,' 'public peace,' 'necessity,' and similar general terms which can be, and have been, used as pretexts for unnecessary wars. Moreover, legitimate defense of rights implies that the aggrieved state is not simultaneously violating the right of the state against which it contemplates war. — The violation of national rights must appear to the aggrieved state as morally certain. No degree of probability, not even a great preponderance of probability, is sufficient. A declaration of war is equivalent to a sentence of death; to pronounce the latter with a doubtful conscience is murder. — Neither actual violation of national rights nor moral certainty about it, nor both combined, are sufficient to make war lawfully moral. War, particularly in modern times, inflicts so many, so various, and such enormous injuries upon innocent and guilty alike that it cannot be justified except by very grave reasons, by the gravest known to human society. — Even though all three of the foregoing conditions are fulfilled, a declaration of war is not justified. Recourse to war is not justified until all peaceful methods have been tried and found inadequate. The principal pacific means are: direct negotiation, diplomatic pressure of various kinds, boycotts and rupture of normal international intercourse, and mediation, and arbitration. — If all these fail, the calm, deliberate judgment of the people rather than the aims of the ambitious few should decide whether war is the only solution. — A government should have solid reasons, proportionate to the evil alternative of defeat, for expecting victory. — It is the duty of a government to promote peace both as an obligation of justice to its citizens and as an obligation of charity to other peoples," etc. As to the degree of preparedness which the government is justified in maintaining (also discussed in the report), the writer and perhaps all other laymen are hardly in a position to form a right judgment. There also may be a question as to specific applications of the principles, as set down in the report, but the principles themselves should be earnestly studied by our statesmen — and the press and the people. The Catholic Association is, on this matter, in substantial agreement with Luther: "Since the sword is given by God to punish the evil-doers, to shield the good, and to maintain peace, Rom. 13, 1 ff.; 1 Pet. 2, 13 ff., that establishes invincibly that warring and killing is sanctioned by God and everything that war and the laws of war imply. For what is war other than punishing injustice and evil?" "This I will say first of all: he that begins war is in the wrong, and it is right that he be vanquished or, at any rate, be finally punished who first draws the knife. — Government is not ordained by God for the purpose that it should break peace and begin

war.—Of such the Lord declares, Ps. 68, 31: ‘Scatter Thou the people that delight in war.’” “You must distinguish between two kinds of war; the first, a war undertaken freely and wilfully, before one is attacked; the other, a war forced upon one by the attack of the other. The first may be called war lust; the second, a war of necessity. The first is the devil’s; let God not bless it; the second, a misfortune; God be with it.” “Therefore mark well, dear sirs, keep away from war, unless it becomes your duty to guard and protect and your office forces you to go to war. In that case do not hesitate, smite with might; be men and use your armor.” (X, 492. 513. 515.) “It is well and needful to have fortified cities and castles, good armor and munition, against the foe. But it is also well that a prince should build a peace castle, that is, that he should desire peace and maintain peace at home. For the Romans themselves, the greatest warriors of all times, say that to undertake a needless war is like fishing with a golden hook, which, if lost, could not be paid for by the business; and if it resulted in a catch, the cost would be larger than the gain. You must not begin and plan war; it will come unbidden, and all too soon. Preserve peace as long as you can. Victory will in no case restore what is lost through war.” (Erl. Ed., 39, 244.) “A good, worth-while soldier is so minded that he would rather preserve one citizen and friend than destroy a thousand enemies. So said Scipio, the heathen, Rome’s foremost general. No true soldier will begin a war lightly and without grave reason.” (22, 1452.) “What a fearful delusion it is that men should rejoice over the carnage, butchery, blood, murder, and the whole mass of disaster that is bound up with war, to praise and celebrate it, when it behooves us to shed bloody tears over it all, especially when the war is not waged by God’s will, but from an insane lust after dominion and possessions, as the heathen have done and are still doing, and to-day, alas! the Christians, the men of peace, the children of God, are doing more barbarously than the heathen.” (4, 894.) E.

**A Waste of Precious Time.**—There are no doubt many Christians who sympathize with the editor of the *Watchman-Examiner* when he complains of the waste of precious time at church services. He writes: “Recently we attended a church service at which the pastor introduced every hymn, every Scripture-reading, every anthem, and every other part of the service with ‘appropriate’ remarks. The consequence was that an hour was used up, and the people, too, before he reached his sermon. Evidently that pastor thinks that he is paid for his much speaking. We are certain that his people would let him off with less. The truth is that he spoiled a beautiful service with his little sermonettes. He spoiled the effect of his sermon also because everybody was fidgety to get home to dinner by the time the sermon was begun. What a pity it is that that man cannot understand the value of time and learn not to fritter it away! We are making no plea for short services or short sermons, although we might make a plea for both of them. We are simply pleading that pastors will conduct the service of worship in a dignified and straightforward

way without interpolating too many of their own side-remarks. When these side-remarks are unusual, they are sometimes very delightful. When they are continuous, they are nerve-racking." MUELLER.

**Concerning the Ancient Hittites.**—Regarding this interesting people mentioned in the Bible we find the following interesting item in the *Australian Lutheran*: "Children of the Hittite race who went to school in Asia Minor about 1000 B. C. had to learn dead languages just as the modern schoolboy learns Latin. Baked clay tablets found in the capital city of the ancient Hittite empire have been deciphered by scholars, who say that eight languages are represented on them, written in the neat, wedge-shaped characters known as cuneiform writing.

"The Sumerian language was then long dead, but the Hittites learned it and taught it to their children because they believed that charms sung in the old language were peculiarly effective. In some of the tablets the Sumerian text is followed by columns containing the same text translated into the official Hittite language and into Babylonian, and also a column pronouncing the Sumerian words. Babylonian was apparently the language of diplomacy among the Hittites.

"Several thousand tablets were discovered in a palace, and in a temple used as a record office, by German archeologists some years ago; but early attempts at reading them were hampered because the different languages were not sorted out. Writers of long records on the baked tablets were careful to indicate the sequence from one tablet to the next, and usually at the end of the document the author wrote his name, his profession, and place of residence in modern fashion."

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

According to the *Australian Lutheran* the rector of Willcannia, New South Wales, who has a parish as large as England, will use an aeroplane to visit the various points of his far-flung parish. A Moth machine will be used.

In 1925 the Eastern Theological Seminary was organized, the intention of the founders being to make and keep it a conservative school of theology. It belongs to the Baptists. During its second year it had an enrolment of 137; the third year, 153. The school is located in the heart of Philadelphia, on Rittenhouse Square.

Speaking of the clash between the Pope and Mussolini, the Catholic paper *America* remarks: "The Premier is probably a busy man at the present moment. A storm is on the horizon; but whatever duties claim him, he will do well to retire to some secluded retreat and there meditate on the phrase, so old that men cannot trace its authorship: '*Qui mange du Pape meurt*' (He who 'swallows' the Pope dies)." We believe it.

According to the statement of Dr. C. F. Graebner, Concordia College in Australia is attended by 98 students. The school has more than 300 alumni, and the venerable president says that only a very small percentage of them have left the Church. Since 1913 fifty-six pastors were graduated, and fifty-three of them are still in the ministry. This is a remarkable record.

Christianity is making some headway among the Moslems of Galilee. At Shefamer there has been a little group of native Christians for some time. Recently, so one of our exchanges says, representatives from perhaps forty Moslem families have been attending the services, and half a year ago, one Sunday morning, there waited outside the church a group of thirty men who said to the deacon that they wished to become Christians.

*America* quotes the *Rutland* (Vt.) *Herald* as an opponent of the Curtis-Reed Federal Education Bill. This paper, in spite of being Republican in its politics, considers this bill as approving dangerous encroachments on the rights of the States. It says: "The time to make a stand against Federal aggression is on this obnoxious and pestilential bill for a Federal Department of Education."

Why a decline of ministerial candidates? The *Presbyterian* says: "Commercialism and materialism are depriving the Church of the ablest brains and energies of the land." It adds: "The greatest influence to-day that is at work among the thoughtful young men is the agnosticism that is so prevalent, the spirit of uncertainty, and the whole history of destructive criticism. When men feel the great realities, they will answer the call."

It is reported that Dr. John Timothy Stone of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, has accepted the presidency of McCormick Theological Seminary in that city. McCormick is a Presbyterian school.

Judge W. H. S. Thomson, of Pittsburgh, when asked for an injunction in favor of the Klan, declared: "This unlawful organization, so destructive of the rights and liberties of the people, has come in vain asking this court of equity for injunctive or other relief. They come with filthy hands and can get no assistance here."

The following item found in *America* deserves to be passed on. Speaking of the efforts which certain bishops in the Protestant Episcopal Church are making to reunite all Christianity, a layman asked the question, "Why do these gentlemen work so hard to secure world unity and do nothing apparently to secure unity in their own dioceses?"

---