

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. IX.

NOVEMBER, 1929.

No. 11.

---

## The Means of Grace.

With Special Reference to Modernism.

By PROF. P. E. KRETZMANN, *Ph. D., D. D.*

(Continued.)

### 3.

Closely connected with the doctrine of the essence of the means of grace is that of their outward form and use. The essential difference in the viewpoint will readily appear if we remember that the Word of God (specifically the Gospel), Baptism, and the Lord's Supper are, according to Scriptural testimony, actually the bearers of God's grace; they offer, they convey, they seal, to the believer the benefit of Christ's vicarious atonement.

Some strange notions have appeared from time to time, even where there is no evidence of Modernism in the full sense of the word. Thus a recent writer says of the effect of the Reformation: "With the passage of time and the waning of the first enthusiasm the same thing happened to the Bible which had happened to the Sacrament. It became separated from the life of faith. Protestants came to think of the Bible just as the Roman Catholics had thought of the Sacrament, as something wholly mysterious and exceptional." (Brown, *Beliefs that Matter*, 216.) What he refers to is the same thing that has often been included in the accusation made against Protestants, and particularly Lutherans, that they were making the Bible a "paper pope," looking upon it in a perfectly blind and mechanical manner. It is the same charge which has been brought along similar lines when men have accused the Lutheran Church of teaching a "mechanical theory" of inspiration. But this is not the case, as well they know, and we resent and reject the insinuation as a deliberate misrepresentation. We hold what the Bible teaches, also with regard to the external form of the Bible as a means of grace.

For that reason we defend the validity of *the Gospel as a means of grace* in every form of presentation. It is true of the Gospel proclamation. The Lord tells His disciples: "Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**Neutralia.**—The resolutions adopted by the Lutheran World Convention at Copenhagen declare: "The discovery and furtherance of inner unity in the truth in loyalty to the confessional principle therefore is a primary object." With this object in view "this book [*The Lutheran Churches of the World*] was compiled at the request of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention and must be regarded as a product of that movement." (Foreword.) The president of the executive committee, Dr. John A. Morehead, states in the preface: ". . . the first book endeavoring to give a well-balanced description of the confessional position, organization, worship, numerical strength, missionary activity, and general status of the Lutheran churches throughout the world. It is confidently believed that it will prove to be an important contribution to Lutheran unity." Now, while the gathering of this immense material on the state and the work of the Lutheran Church serves a good purpose and will prove of interest to every Lutheran, it does not serve the purpose for which it was performed. As regards the furtherance of Lutheran unity it is a dealing with *neutralia*. Luther uses this phrase in an opinion given to Chancellor Brueck on the religious concord advocated by Philip of Hesse and Martin Bucer. We are here giving the phrase a somewhat different slant. Luther writes: "My dear Doctor, I am telling you, as in the presence of my gracious lord, that the course of the landgrave and his men is quite vexatious in that they invert the Lord's Prayer by seeking first of all quiet and peace and not studying the first things, God's name, kingdom, and will. What is that saying about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel? If one is seeking concord in religion, let him begin with the fundamentals, such as doctrine and Sacrament; when these things are agreed on, the other things, the externals, which are called *neutralia*, will adjust themselves, as happened in our churches; then God would be in the *concordia* and quiet and peace assured. But where the great matters are passed over and the *neutralia* dealt with, God is being forgotten; a peace without God may ensue, in place of which one should rather suffer all unquietness. For what Christ says Matt. 9 will certainly take place: The piece of new cloth on the old garment will make the rent worse, and the new wine breaks the old bottles. Either make everything new or give over all patching, as we have done, else all labor is useless." (XVII, 667.) The sense in which Luther's words apply is this: the statistics and description of the various Lutheran churches are *neutralia* with respect to the object aimed at, the promotion of Lutheran unity and solidarity; the removal of the doctrinal differences should have been the chief concern. It will never do to give the bare statement of the individual Church that it subscribes to the confessions of the Lutheran Church. The situation demands that the existing differences be honestly discussed, in the upright Lutheran way. The World Convention itself shirked this duty. It preferred to deal with *neutralia*. Resolution IV

declares: "Since the Lutheran World Convention regards the present unity of faith and confession as the only right ground for the fellowship of the different Lutheran churches and since it regards the living testimony concerning this common faith as the most important and, in fact, the only active means to further the consciousness of this unity, it is recommended that the Executive Committee adopt measures through which the different church-bodies may more intimately learn of the faith, life, and conditions of other Lutheran bodies, that personal testimony may be employed for common instruction and admonition. As such measures have been mentioned: exchange of visits of leaders in the respective churches, an organized activity for information through the Lutheran Press Bureau and through literature, as well as support for Lutheran theological students of minority churches for further theological studies in other Lutheran centers." All of which would be fine, provided the unity of faith first were established; otherwise it is dealing with *neutralia*. And they will continue on this way despite "the common instruction and admonition" advocated as long as they persuade themselves that "the unity of faith is present." Certainly the Lutheran Church possesses, as had been pointed out, a strong bond of unity in the Catechism and in the Augsburg Confession, but why blink the fact that this bond does not unite all? Common instruction and admonition is needed regarding, for instance, the inspiration of Scripture and the *sola gratia*. In which session were these matters *discussed*? Good testimony was given on these points, as far as it went, but why were not the contraveners called to account? How could the sessions close with the declaration on "the present unity in faith"? Dr. Reu's declaration was heard: "In the Small Catechism and in the faith there expressed we are united. Are we united indeed?" What action was taken on this? Dr. Melhorn reports: "It was this conspicuous absence of any startling differences of conviction that made these sessions bare of intensely dramatic periods." In the judgment of *Schrift und Bekenntnis* "the clearest testimony given was that by Dr. Hein, president of the Ohio Synod. He was outspoken in confessing the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture and the 'by grace alone'; the mystery, too, of the *discretio personarum* was recognized and both the Calvinistic and the synergistic 'solution' of the mystery downrightly rejected." The anti-inspiration men and gross synergists there present did not take issue with him. The difference of conviction was there, but its manifestation was conspicuously absent. It caused some "uneasiness," says the *Ev.-Luth. Zeitblatt*, but "why should somebody not also speak for the verbal inspiration, seeing that others uttered convictions which manifestly spring from the new Lutheran spirit?" The World Convention was willing to tolerate such views as Dr. Hein and others expressed as innocuous, thus relegating these fundamental articles to the domain of the *neutralia*, matters of indifference. Dr. Elert had a fine subject: "The Faith and Confessions of the Church in the Light of the Marburg Colloquy and the Diet at Augsburg." If his address is correctly reported, it was beside the mark. Dr. Melhorn reports in the *Lutheran*: "It was

at Marburg in 1529 that an effort was made to unite the Lutheran and Swiss reformation leaders. It was there that Luther traced on the table top: 'You have a spirit other than ours.' The lesion between the German leaders and the Zwingli group was not healed by the Marburg Colloquy, and with the advent of Calvin at Geneva two quite different systems of theology and church government were developed, producing what we now call the Lutheran and Reformed divisions among the evangelical Christians. . . . It was expected, we repeat, that Dr. Elert would discuss the distinctions between the Reformed and the Lutherans as seen at Marburg and between the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans as they appeared at Augsburg." (And we should have expected, we add, that he would have admonished the World Convention to follow Luther's example and refuse to fellowship errorists of any kind. However, he preferred to occupy himself with *neutralia*, as the report shows:) "It was therefore a surprise, a pleasant one also, when his paper took the form of indicating how the personal religious experiences of one man or of a small group of men can become the type and standard for many. . . . His address was one of the great ones delivered."— One cannot help contrasting Luther's attitude at Marburg with that incident at Copenhagen when at the conclusion of an address by Archbishop Soederblom the assembly arose and recited in the various languages represented Luther's explanation of the Second Article. Were they all of one mind when they confessed: "Even as He is risen from the dead"? The archbishop of Abo refused to have Archbishop Soederblom take part in a religious celebration in Finland because of his denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ, and Archbishop Soederblom did not deny that he denies this fundamental. We know how Luther would have dealt with him. Luther would not have fellowshipped him so long as the chief things were not set in order. The Lutheran World Convention and the Reformed World Congress meeting at Boston exchanged greetings. Shall we assume that this was only a polite form? Again, the handbook of the World Convention recognizes churches as Lutheran which are not Lutheran, as *Schrift und Bekenntnis* points out. For instance, the Evangelical Church of Thuringia even disclaims the Lutheran name. The subscription of the clergy of the Church of Hamburg to the Book of Concord is not supposed to be of binding force. See page 137 of the handbook itself. And the conditions in this Church are notorious. Yet they speak of "the present unity of faith." All of which goes beyond the bounds of mere *neutralia* and becomes downright unionism. . . . The *Lutheran Church Herald* cannot refrain from saying: "It is to be regretted that the Synodical Conference is not represented at the free World Conference in Copenhagen. — Are the Lutherans meeting at Copenhagen unworthy and unfit to meet with even in a free conference?" If the next World Conference is ready to discuss the weighty matters separating the Lutheran bodies and to refrain meanwhile from unionistic demonstrations, its invitation will meet with a ready response on the part of the Synodical Conference. As to the *Herald's* question — why waste time on *neutralia*? E.

**The Danger of Syncretism.**—In his address at Copenhagen, Dr. Knubel pointed out the danger of syncretism, secularism, and the social gospel. In a striking way he described these three threatening factors, saying: "Syncretism says, 'All religions are true'; secularism says, 'All religions are false,' and also says, 'The State must be lord over the Church'; the social gospel says, 'The Church must be lord over the State.'" The syncretism Dr. Knubel had in mind may be described as an attempt to accomplish a synthesis of the Christian religion with Mohammedanism, Judaism, Confucianism, etc. No doubt such an amalgamation, constituting a union of Christ and Belial, is being sought to-day in many quarters, and a warning against this tendency is altogether justified. But we must not forget that there would hardly be any syncretism of this nature if there were not a similar attempt to weld the creeds of the various Christian denominations into one more or less composite whole—a sort of crazy-quilt, under which all that bear the Christian name can betake themselves for cover. Calixtus, who is often spoken of as the "Father of Syncretism," did not think of forming a common platform with Mohammedans and Jews; he was concerned with erecting a fold that would shelter Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists. The tendency toward syncretism first manifests itself in indifference toward the distinctive doctrines separating Christian denominations; having developed here, it becomes ambitious and wants to take in all religions. *Initiis obsta.* A.

**The Value of Catechetical Instruction.**—The following, taken from an editorial in the *Presbyterian*, makes interesting reading:—

"A Roman Catholic priest in Chicago who has been unusually successful in gaining Protestants for the Catholic Church has been frank to state that those whom he had won into the Roman fold were nearly always from the uninstructed. They were not so irreligious as unreligious. They had never known why they were Protestants, and so were easily convinced as to why they should become Catholics. Can we not return to the ancient custom of teaching the Catechism in the Sabbath-school as well as in a few communicants' classes? All who are familiar with the brief and very defective instruction imparted by too many Sabbath-school teachers know that it is quite imperative that other and more vital information be imparted, something to arouse both mind and heart." A.

**The Right and the Wrong Kind of Tolerance.**—In a sermon which Dr. Machen last spring preached in the chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary, he very correctly and forcibly drew the distinction between right and wrong tolerance. The word is heard so frequently that it behooves us to be informed on the two kinds of tolerance. Dr. Machen's remarks will be read with interest and profit.

"A man may believe what he pleases, provided he does not believe anything strongly enough to risk his life on it and fight for it. 'Tolerance' is the great word. Men even ask for tolerance when they look to God in prayer. But how can any Christian possibly pray such a prayer as that? What a terrible prayer it is, how full of disloyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ! There is a sense, of course, in which tolerance is a virtue. If by it you mean tolerance on the

part of the state, the forbearance of majorities toward minorities, the resolute rejection of any measures of physical compulsion in propagating either what is true or what is false, then, of course, the Christian ought to favor tolerance with all his might and main and ought to lament the wide-spread growth of intolerance in America to-day. Or if you mean by tolerance, forbearance toward personal attacks upon yourself, or courtesy and patience and fairness in dealing with all errors of whatever kind, then again tolerance is a virtue. But to pray for tolerance apart from such qualifications, in particular to pray for tolerance without careful definition of that of which you are to be tolerant, is just to pray for the breakdown of the Christian religion; for the Christian religion is intolerant to the core. There lies the whole offense of the Cross—and also the whole power of it. Always the Gospel would have been received with favor by the world if it had been presented merely as one way of salvation; the offense came because it was presented as the only way and because it made relentless war upon all other ways. God save us, then, from this ‘tolerance’ of which we hear so much; God deliver us from the sin of making common cause with those who deny or ignore the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ! God save us from the deadly guilt of consenting to the presence as our representatives in the Church of those who lead Christ’s little ones astray; God make us, whatever else we are, just faithful messengers, who present, without fear or favor, not our word, but the Word of God!”

**A Baptist on the Sola Gratia and the Gratia Universalis.**— We found a remarkable article in the *Watchman-Examiner* of this year. In reprinting it here, we shall, for good and sufficient reasons, omit portions of it and call attention to several unscriptural expressions. But in the main it is charged with sound theology. When we find similar statements in our publications, we take that as a matter of course. Finding them in a Baptist paper we take notice.

“God’s Long Purpose. (Rom. 8, 28, 29.) By Rev. William G. Coltman. — There are but two religions in the world. The one declares that salvation is of man; the other that ‘salvation is of the Lord.’ The one postulates the freedom of the human will, the other the freedom of the divine will. The one springs out of the earth, the other descends out of heaven. One is born in the heart and mind of man, the other in the heart and mind of God. One is natural, the other supernatural. One says, ‘Work out your own salvation’ [not quoting, of course, Phil. 2, 12], the other sings, ‘Jesus paid it all.’ The one puts the responsibility for redemption [meaning conversion and salvation] in the hands of man; the other places the responsibility with God.

“The Bible knows but one religion. Its great affirmation is: ‘Salvation is of the Lord.’ It represents true religion [?] as being conceived in the mind of God, provided by the Son of God, communicated by the Spirit of God, and finally perfected by the Lord Himself. Redemption [meaning salvation] has its origination, continuation, and consummation in God. This is its sublime declaration, and it is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture as a whole. . . .

"The second word is 'foreordained.' . . . The will of God enters, and God determines to rescue those whom He foreknew. [The author did not quite grasp the meaning of *foreknew*.] In other words, He predetermined that they should be His. Foreordination has therefore been defined as 'that active exercise of the will of God by which certain results are brought to pass.' In the realm of redemption God not only foresaw, but He foreordained. There are many confirmations of this. In Acts 2, 23 it is stated that the crucifixion of our Lord was predetermined in the counsel of God. According to 1 Cor. 2, 7 [?] we see that it was God's eternal plan to give us the written Word. But still more wonderful is the fact that in His eternal purpose He should determine to call, to justify, and to glorify such an one as I. 'Oh, the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!' If I were to ask you the question, 'How did you become a Christian?' you would probably reply, 'Because I chose Christ.' But let me say with strong emphasis that you are not a Christian to-day because you chose Christ, but because Christ chose you, and chose you 'before the foundation of the world.' John 15, 16. In John 6, 44 Christ made a startling statement to His critics, 'No man can come to Me except the Father that sent Me draw him.' When Simon Peter made his great confession at Caesarea Philippi, the Master said, 'Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father who is in heaven.' Flesh and blood alone [why the "alone" ?] can never bring men and women into an experience [?] of Christ's Saviorhood. This is the result of the divine work on the heart." In discussing foreordination, account must be taken of Eph. 1, 4: "According as He hath chosen us *in Him*." — But mark the following: —

"Right here some one will say, 'Do you mean to affirm that God foreordains some to destruction?' My answer is that such is not the teaching of the text nor of any other portion of Scripture. Foreordination or predestination, according to the Word, has to do only with the redeemed." Redeemed again means those who are converted and finally saved. And now mark well the following: —

"God's attitude towards the world is clear from such passages as John 3, 16; 1 John 2, 1; 2 Pet. 3, 9. Here are two great truths running through the Bible — one that Christ died for the whole world and is 'not willing that any should perish,' and the other that 'whom He foreknew, them He did foreordain to be conformed to the image of His Son.' God has not seen fit to harmonize these two facts. And what He has thought best to leave unrevealed, it is wise for us to let rest. Godly William Jay once said: 'Two grand truths have always seemed to me to pervade the whole Bible and not to be confined to a few phrases, namely, that, if we are saved, it is entirely of God's grace and, if we are lost, it will be entirely from ourselves.'

"Them He also called.' This is the first act of God in time. We are no longer dealing with the past, but with the present. We have come out of the eternities into the years. Foreknowledge and foreordination took place outside my experience. But now something happens that affects me. His call marks the beginning of the realiza-

tion of His eternal choice. God calls men to Himself—He calls them through His Word and by His Spirit. [We say: by His Spirit through the Word.] And that call carries with it the power of response. It has been referred to as 'the effectual call.'" [We think the author is using this term without the Calvinistic implication.] God called Abraham while in Ur of the Chaldees, and Abraham went out not knowing whither he went. Saul of Tarsus, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the servants of the Lord, heard the call on the highway, and soon he is found in the synagogs preaching Christ. The history of true and divine religion in the earth is the history of God's call to human hearts and their response to His approach. Apart from the divine call, none would be saved. It is only because God took the initiative and called us that we stand before Him justified at this moment.

"'Whom He called, them He also justified.' Note carefully that the justification spoken of in the text is a divine matter. And there is no mistaking the context, 'it is God that justifieth.' It is because Christ 'was made sin for us' that we are 'made the righteousness of God in Him.' This glorious Gospel of ours reveals the provision of a righteousness of God for unrighteous men. Justification is therefore an act of God and not an achievement of man. 'It is God that justifieth.'

"'Whom He justified, them He also glorified.' Now we step back out of time into the eternities again. We discover that glorification is as much God's purpose as justification and that the same will that has determined our salvation has also determined our glorification. The justified are the glorified. The tense dealing with glorification is remarkable, being the same as that dealing with justification. . . . In fact, our glorification is an accomplished thing in the mind and purpose of God. . . . 'Foreknown, foreordained, called, justified, glorified,' and all these are ours in Christ Jesus. Not a link in this golden chain will be broken."

That is certainly taking Scripture at its face value—and thus being enriched in the saving knowledge. We wonder how the Rev. Coltman took the editorial appearing in the same number which carried his article. This editorial says: "As our Lord instituted it, the Lord's Supper was a simple memorial of His death, the bread standing for His broken body and the wine standing for His shed blood. Its blessing lies in its holy suggestiveness. It is not a work of merit. It is not even a means of grace unless the consciousness of the cost of our salvation moves us to a profounder appreciation of it and to a deeper consecration because of it." One would think that a man who takes Rom. 8, 28, 29 as the words read, despite the protest of reason, would refuse to have the words of the institution discounted on account of the protest of reason and thus lose the wealth the doctrine of the means of grace bears. It would be well if he and the editor applied the same principle that dictated the article to the editorial.

E.

**Drifting to Sanity and Common Sense.**—The *Sunday-school Times* reports the following interesting bit of news: "The Christian Science Parent Church departs from the 'Mother Church,' 'in en-



deavoring to bring a new spirit of sanity and common sense into the practise of mental healing. It recognizes the unselfish humanitarian labors of the medical profession in alleviating human suffering.' In this position it supports itself on the alleged authority of Mrs. Eddy, 'in whose personal experience there came a time when neither her own nor her followers' unaided faith was sufficient to relieve her of serious suffering. On various occasions she gratefully availed herself of the services of reputable physicians. She also authorized a practitioner, when he had a patient whom he did not heal, *to consult with an M. D. in the anatomy involved.*'

"This is indeed a new note. The editors of the *Christian Science Watchman*, organ of the Parent Church (from which we make these quotations), describe the standpatters of the 'Mother Church' as a vast army of practitioners almost all of whom are dependent for their livelihood upon their practise. Unless they are loyal to the policies of the board of directors in Boston and renounce medical cooperation, they cannot be officially advertised as authorized practitioners. Disloyalty to the board of directors is punishable by excommunication. Those suspected are out for financial and social disaster. Hence the fervent appeals frequently heard at testimony meetings for support of the Boston directors. . . .

"The five directors are described as a self-perpetuating body, controlling millions of dollars of trust funds and many other millions of income-bearing property. There is an enormous increase of mortality within the organization, according to this report. The public seldom hears of the patient to whom after months of suffering a doctor is hurriedly called in order that there may be no legal complications in securing a death certificate. The facts in such cases are usually suppressed through the elaborate system of espionage and press supervision maintained to protect the 'Mother Church.'

"Under the caption of 'A Ghastly Record' an account is given of the 'appalling death record of the Christian Science Sanatorium in Brookline, Mass., and how this has been covered up by recording the deaths, not from the institution, but from the street number of the institution. This gives the impression that a death at that institution has been a very rare event. The contrary is true.'

"Literature on the subject can be obtained gratis by application to 20 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C." MUELLER.

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

Dr. H. Ernst, for many years theological professor at the seminary of the Ohio Synod in St. Paul, Minn., died on August 9, eighty-seven years old. He was a graduate of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and at first a pastor in the Missouri Synod, but withdrew when the controversy on election arose.

Prof. Emmanuel Hirsch of the University of Goettingen and Prof. Hans Rueckert of the University of Leipzig have arranged to publish for the first time a lecture of Luther on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This lecture in manuscript form has been known to research workers for about a generation, while it was held in the possession of the Vatican. It is said to be one of the most important documents throwing light upon Luther's development in the decisive years of 1517 and 1518. — *Luth. Ch. Her.*

In Marburg the celebrated debate between Luther and Zwingli will be commemorated this fall with special festivities. The intention, to judge by the invitation, is not to convince the world that Luther's position was right, but to show how much the Lutheran and the Reformed churches have in common. It will be a case of shouting peace when there is no peace.

In Tuebingen, where F. C. Baur did his faith-destroying work, the old radical Liberalism is gasping for air and to-day can boast but few adherents. We are informed that only ten students still subscribe to it. It is largely Karl Barth's theology, fanciful and unscriptural as it is in a number of points, which is the avalanche crushing the proud structure of the Tuebingen masters. How little terror-stricken souls can find shelter in these man-made hovels is now becoming evident even on the spot where they were first erected.

Writing in the *Pastoralblaetter*, Dr. Erich Stange, the editor, thinks that the present ecumenical movement, endeavoring to bring about cooperation between all the churches, has probably arrived at the crossroads, and that particular dangers threatening it are, in his opinion, the ill-considered rapidity with which some leaders have endeavored to push the ball ahead, the confusion resulting from the many diversified aims that are observable in the movement, the lack of big things attempted at the meetings, the overemphasis placed on official pronouncements of religious congresses, and the insufficient recognition of the necessity of having the guidance of the Spirit of God. This diagnosis of Dr. Stange is not entirely incorrect, but it does not point out to the patient where the trouble chiefly lies, namely, in the rejection of the *sola gratia* and the *sola Scriptura* by at least the great majority of the propagandists of this movement.

When G. K. Chesterton leaves theology alone and discusses philosophy or literature, he often says things that are worth while. The *Literary Digest* reports him as quoting this ancient definition of metaphysics: "It is seeking in a dark room for a black hat that is not there," which is not far from the truth concerning much that is labeled philosophy.

Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, a world-figure in missionary matters, has been called to be Professor of Missions at Princeton Seminary. From 1891 to 1905 Dr. Zwemer served as missionary in Arabia. He is considered a great authority in everything pertaining to Moslem missions.

Soviet writers are advocating abolition of the venerable week of seven days as it has existed since the creation of the world, and the introduction of a week of six days, five work-days and one day of rest. It reminds one of the French revolutionists, who likewise tried to do away with the Sunday and with church festivals. At this writing the daily press carries the news item that the Soviet government, on September 5, abolished Sunday as a regular day of rest.

In the *Hibbert Journal*, attention is drawn to an utterance of T. H. Huxley, which is interesting as setting forth the view at which an unbelieving scientist who closely observes events has to arrive. Huxley, we are told, was "driven to the statement that that which is ethically best involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence." It was the logic of facts as known to him which dictated to Huxley this remarkable statement: "The good man must lose in the struggle for existence." This is sounding the very depths of pessimism. Compare with that the triumphant statement of the believer that "all things work together for good to them that love God," and that those whom God has justified He has also glorified.

Utah has 544 Mormon churches, with an aggregate membership of 327,000; Idaho, 270, with 85,000 members; Arizona, 58 churches; California, 48; Wyoming, 45; Colorado, 24; Nevada, 22; Montana, 21.—*Watchman-Examiner*.