

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IX.

MARCH, 1929.

No. 3.

Perpetual Forgiveness.

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

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

(Continued.)

True, it has been noted that there is a difference between the first forgiveness and perpetual forgiveness. This we admit, just as there is a difference between the first breath of a new-born child and its breathing after that. And furthermore, with justification as it takes place for the first time other things are connected. It is, however, important to see clearly wherein this difference consists and wherein it does not consist, lest the foolish talk gain ground in our midst that a person is justified but once in his life and that after that there is nothing but sanctification. The first and foremost difference concerns the person who is justified. At the time of the first justification he is an enemy of God, who is under the power of darkness and in the bondage of sin; afterwards he is merely a sinner, for also the greatest saints remain sinners to the grave. From this follows the second difference: the first justification translates from the state of wrath into the state of grace, from guilt into favor; perpetual justification keeps one in favor. The third difference is this: the first forgiveness which one obtains coincides with regeneration; perpetual forgiveness does not. On the other hand, the difference does *not* consist in the nature of the divine operation; it is the same act by virtue of which God regards Saul at Damascus and Paul at Philippi righteous. Nor should one say that the first act of God is called justification and the second simply forgiveness; for justification and forgiveness are one and the same thing. For when Paul calls the man blessed "unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works," he, in order to prove this statement, appeals to the word of the psalmist: "Blessed are they whose . . . sins are covered." Rom. 4, 6. 7. So Paul understands what David says of forgiveness as referring to justification. And Acts 13, 38. 39 he declares: "Be it known unto

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Anent the Norwegian "Opgjoer." — After discussing the fact that recently altar- and pulpit-fellowship were declared between the Joint Synod of Ohio and the Norwegian Lutheran Church, Prof. J. Meyer, of Wauwatosa, writing in the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, continues: "Before we close, we append a new testimony to the thoroughly unionistic spirit in which the *Opgjoer* is regarded by its subscribers, as it recently came to our attention. In an address at the last general convention of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, Dr. L. W. Boe used the following words: 'The union was consummated, not because any of the three synods had changed their views on theological questions or had lost respect for the tendencies which they represented, but simply because our common Christian faith and our common blood compelled it.' Add to this the warning note which (according to the testimony of Norman A. Madson in the *Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende and Lutheran Sentinel*) the late Dr. V. Koren in 1910 attempted to sound in his last message to the Synod of which he was president, but which the vice-president, Dr. H. G. Stub, suppressed when he read the message to the convention in the absence of the president: 'Those doctrinal discussions which have been carried on with other Norwegian Lutheran church-bodies have not, in my opinion, led to any trustworthy result. The disagreement which was evidenced in the last point discussed, in which we follow, word for word, the Book of Concord, is based, no doubt, in disagreement on the doctrine of conversion. That a set of theses concerning that doctrine is adopted does not prove thorough agreement. This we have experienced before, when all of our doctrinal theses were subscribed to, while violent objections were raised against the antitheses which we added, in spite of the fact that these were but

unavoidable conclusions of the former. If it were small matters that were at stake, it would not be right to separate. But when it concerns the question whether or not God *alone* is our Savior, then we cannot be too careful.' In our last issue we submitted to our readers the official text of the Chicago-Theses. These should be prayerfully considered on their own merits by every pastor of our synod and discussed in ministerial conferences, irrespective of what course the establishing of pulpit- and altar-fellowship by the Ohio Synod with the Norwegian Church may force us to adopt." This plea of Professor Meyer for an unbiased examination of the Chicago Theses we heartily endorse.

Commission on Evangelization.—The *Lutheran Standard* (December 15, 1928) writes under this heading: "The Norwegian, Augustana, Iowa, United Lutheran, United Danish, Danish, and our Joint Ohio Lutheran synods are cooperating in home mission work in Iowa. At a meeting in Des Moines recently forty-nine representatives from seven of the eight synods operating in Iowa gathered for a day's session, which resulted in the following resolution:—

"1. Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the meeting that a Lutheran commission of consultation and cooperation in matters of home mission work be established, consisting of one pastor and one layman from each synod in the State of Iowa. 2. Be it resolved, That this matter be referred to the presidents of the Districts and conferences with the view of bringing it to the attention of their several bodies.' Another resolution was passed to continue the present chairman and secretary in office, to act as a committee to prepare a program and call another meeting for the fall of 1929.

"Here is good cause for rejoicing. The history of American Lutheranism has been too replete with 'competitive' rather than with 'cooperative' evangelism. Thank God that out in Iowa seven out of eight Lutheran bodies are going to work together in home mission work. This step ought to eliminate 'overlapping' in many places. What moneys have been wasted through sinful competitive mission-work! What a stumbling-block such mistakes have proved to the non-Christian and to the weak believer! God hasten the day when American Lutheranism can make a concerted attack upon sin!

"The United Lutheran Church in America in convention assembled at Erie, Pa., this year, officially expressed itself as desiring an ever more complete expression of the inner unity of faith of the separated bodies of American Lutheranism. As regards those Lutheran bodies which subscribe to the commonly accepted Lutheran confessions, 'the United Lutheran Church in America recognizes no doctrinal reasons against complete cooperation and organic union with such bodies.' A motion accepted by the convention was referred to the Executive Board for fulfilment. According thereto a commission of not less than four and not more than six members, to be composed equally of laymen and clergymen, was ordered appointed by the board and is to be known as the Commission on Lutheran Church Unity. This convention also agreed on a ten-per-cent. membership increase for 1930 of 1,008,543 communicants."

We, too, pray: "God hasten the day when American Lutheranism can make a concerted attack upon sin!" But that day will not come until there has been attained a real "inner unity of faith." As yet that "inner unity of faith" does not exist, and the seven synods which are now "cooperating in home mission work in Iowa" are plainly ignoring this fact. "Cooperative" evangelism without the "inner unity of faith" is unionism, against which the truest leaders in the Lutheran Church of America have always protested and against which every loyal Lutheran in the name of Christ and of conscience must protest. If there has been "competitive" evangelism in American Lutheranism, there has been also "confessional" evangelism, and in view of this it is unfair and wrong to brand "competitive mission-work" simply as sinful. If the confession of the truth is a "stumbling-block" to the non-Christian and to the weak believer, let us remember that Paul's unqualified preaching of Christ Crucified at Corinth was also a stumbling-block in that non-Christian city. But Paul cared not a whit whether his Gospel was a stumbling-block or not; of himself he writes: "But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness nor handling the Word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." 2 Cor. 4, 2. Yes, "God hasten the day when American Lutheranism can make a concerted attack upon sin"! But let it be an attack also upon the sin of sins so prevalent in sectarian circles of our country, the sin of ignoring the Word of God for reasons of expediency. The action of the seven synods in Des Moines is certainly of far-reaching importance.

MUELLER.

The Fundamental Difference Between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.—On account of this fundamental difference we of the Missouri Synod refuse to entertain fraternal relations with the Reformed bodies, and we are glad to note that the *Lutheran* of December 13, 1928, pronounces this attitude the correct one. In reporting on the sixth quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America the *Lutheran* first states that "the United Lutheran Church has a consultative relationship to the Council through membership in 'commissions'" (with that we are now not concerned) and then proceeds: "The Lutheran Church has consistently held itself aloof from official membership in ecclesiastical organizations with which it is in disagreement in doctrines and in the content of its worship. It holds to the conviction that there is a fundamental difference between us and the group of denominations for which Calvin and Arminius are the sources of interpreting the New Testament and constituting the Church on earth. The 'attitudes' of Calvinism and Lutheranism in relation to God's plan of redemption are not identical. The one emphasizes the righteousness of the Creator as its center, and the other stresses the love of the Father for sinful men seeking to find the good and gracious God." (Why the restriction?) "As a result of seeing salvation from these different points of approach, a clear distinction appears not only in

the definition of the means of grace, that is, in the recognition of the Word and Sacraments as our Lord's instrument to generate and continue His kingdom on earth, but also in a distrust of methods of charging the beliefs and acts of men by pressure from authority, by state-enacted laws and by compulsory efforts to accomplish the realization of ideals of conduct for which a Christian motive has not yet been lodged in the hearts of the people by preaching to them the Gospel." The *Lutheran* is therefore right in refusing to sanction the practise of pulpit-fellowship on the part of U. L. C. ministers with those who teach fundamental errors regarding the universal grace of God in Christ and the means of grace. The subsequent statement: "The present connection of the United Lutheran Church with the Federal Council, as was stated above, is 'consultative' and not organic. This partial membership is not indicative of hostility to an idea of interdenominational cooperation" is expressive of its hostility to anything that goes beyond interdenominational cooperation, such as pulpit-fellowship. However, the tolerance and advocacy of such cooperation with errorists paves the way for unionistic church-fellowship and is a subtle form of it. E.

"American Protestantism's" Indictment of the Lutheran Church.—It is contained in an article appearing in the *Western Christian Advocate*, entitled "National Checks of Protestantism." It runs thus: "We are informed that on the border-line of Puritanism and Protestantism there are to be found three churches, or Christian communions, which resist the general tendency of the application of Christian principles to the larger field of men's social and industrial activities. First, the prevailing spirit of Protestantism as interpreted, and arrived at, by the larger denominations is confronted by the Lutheran bloc, which follows the thinking of the great Reformer, and largely the original Roman Catholic interpretation of the Church. According to Luther, worldly laws are bad. Nature herself is given over to injustice and evil. The Church is a sanctuary, a means of escape, and God's medium of salvation. Outside of it is the secular, inside of it is the sacred. There should always be maintained a distinct recognition of the difference. In worldly matters the state should operate. The saints must live in the world as best they can, protecting the purity of their spiritual lives through constant watchfulness. The Christian must consider himself able to serve the state, but at the same time must retain the freedom of his soul. This is the position of the Anglo-Saxon Luther. It is one of the religious mysticisms and always manifests itself in cynicism. The Anglo-Saxon of Calvinism and Wesleyanism accepts the duty of the individual to cooperate with the fundamental will of God in the world. When one surrenders all the forces of his life in concentration upon himself, he is involved in wrong-doing. He is under obligation to share with others that which has been a blessing to himself. Out of this have come all efforts on the part of the Church to better mankind in morals, spirituality, in political life, in industrial relations, and in social betterment. Secondly, the Protestant interpre-

tation of the Christian life is held in check by the Anglican Church. . . . Thirdly, the third check on American Protestantism into which it is advancing ideas of social betterment, is the Roman Catholic Church. . . ." Much of this indictment of the Lutheran Church is wrapped in obscurity. One cannot make out the meaning of it. The opening sentences of the article, however, give us an inkling of what the writer is driving at. "There is an effort being made to hold American Protestantism responsible for our national prohibition of the liquor traffic. We do not take exception to this; we are convinced that it is true. The spirit of Protestantism does largely prevail throughout our country." Now we understand the writer's grievance. But he cannot make out a case without grossly misrepresenting the facts. The Lutheran Church, of course, puts forth her best "efforts to better mankind in morals, spirituality, in political life, in industrial relations, and in social betterment." But she does refuse to drag the Church into politics and to set her up as arbiter in industrial disputes in order to reach her aim. She has a better way. And this attitude is stigmatized as "cynicism"! As to the charge that Luther and the Lutherans surrender all the forces of their lives in concentration upon themselves, the writer has evidently not studied that great classic in the field of Christian ethics *On the Liberty of the Christian*: "A Christian is a free lord over all things, subject to no man; a Christian is a bound servant of all things, subject to every man."—In view of the charge that we are opponents of American Protestantism, we should know what American Protestantism stands for. We do not intend to oppose any good cause. If a cause be good, it shall have our whole-hearted support. Here is its platform as given in the article: "What does American Protestantism stand for? It believes in nationalism. It believes in the practical application of religion. It believes in the evangelistic impulse. It believes in religion as comprehending the whole life of man. It believes that the Church is a means to an end, even that of establishing the kingdom of heaven among men. It believes that worldly success is providential, coming as merit to those who walk upright. It believes that financial means should be held in the spirit of stewardship. It believes that great moral solicitude should be encouraged. It believes that great moral vitality comes from God, through the channel of faith, and by the current of the spirit of Jesus Christ." Most of these planks are fine. But we Lutherans certainly refuse to stand on this platform. It has no solid support. The chief thing is missing. Lutherans believe, first and foremost, in the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. E.

The Possible Union of Presbyterians.—The *Presbyterian* (December 20, 1928) writes editorially: "In one of the leading presbyteries of the United Presbyterian Church quite recently a vote was taken which has proved of much interest to the public and to the press. The vote was on the desirability of a union with the Southern Church because that Church is openly committed to the historic faith of the Protestant Reformation. The reason assigned

for their aloofness from us is that both themselves and the Church, South, are reasonably suspicious of the soundness of our faith as a body. The fact is that the very men who shout the loudest in the interest of church union are the very men who by their shouting so loud against the narrowness of the Presbyterian creed close the very door that they hoped to open. Why do they not see it?

"If it were evident to these sister churches that our Church, which so largely outnumbers them, would hold steady when the world assails our dogmatic stand, the blessed union so devoutly longed for by the various members of the family would be speedily realized. We are happy in the assurance that both the United Presbyterian and the Presbyterian Church in the United States are true to the ancient faith. Further, we wish them to know that we have a great majority in our beloved Church who would not remove the ancient landmarks for any price offered."

If the last statement is true, why, for the sake of the truth, does not that majority expel the Modernists from their midst? or, if that is impossible, why do not those who are loyal to the "ancient landmarks" withdraw themselves from these who would remove them? Fundamentalism will always remain weak if it refuses to confess, not only by word, but also by deed. Or is it perhaps the spirit of religious unionism, which inheres also in Fundamentalism, that accounts for the toleration of such intolerable conditions? This is certainly an issue which bears inspection. MUELLER.

The Status of the Czechoslovakian Lutheran Church.—The bishop of this church, Dr. George Janoska, recently gave the following account of the Lutheran Church in his country, according to the *N. L. C. B.*:—

"After the World War, when the Czechoslovakian Republic was formed, the Lutheran Church in Czechoslovakia separated from the Lutheran Church of the Augsburg Confession in the former territory of Hungary and became geographically independent. It is, in comparison with the Roman Catholic Church, a minority Church in that land, with about 380,000 members. Of this number about 40,000 are Germans, 15,000 Magyars, and 325,000 Slovaks. This group is now united with the sister Church of the Czechs.

"The Church now maintains its own confessional public schools in over 800 localities. In Bratislava a theological academy is maintained for the training of teachers, pastors, and catechetical instructors. Of the seven chairs at the academy one is designated for the training of German theologians and one for the training of Magyar theologians.

"In moral life and inner religious life the country is still suffering from the devastating consequences of the war. There is, however, a loyalty to the faith which reveals itself in the willingness of the people to make sacrifices in order to build the institutions of the Church. During the ten years since the war 16 churches, more than 200 school-buildings, and many parish-houses have been erected, and — an interesting fact — more than 200 bells have been purchased

to replace those which were confiscated during the war and melted down for military purposes. The Church maintains four evangelical Lutheran orphanages and one deaconess motherhouse, and in the literary field its interests are taken care of by 6 Slovak, 2 German, and 2 Magyar church-papers."

The item does not dwell on the question whether this Church is adhering to the vital matters of our faith so much in dispute these days, especially the teaching of the vicarious atonement of our Lord.

Rome and the Separation of Church and State. — On account of the assertion heard frequently of late that Rome no longer is the foe of religious liberty that it used to be centuries ago, it will be well to have at hand for ready reference the following facts pointed out by the *Lutheran Church Herald*:—

"Pius IX condemned the principles of religious freedom and the separation of Church and State. Leo XIII pronounced it unlawful for states to place the various forms of religion on the same footing and in his encyclical of January 6, 1895, addressed to the American bishops, pronounced it an error to believe that the example set by America is to the best interests of the Church and that it would always be right and expedient that civil and sacred matters be disassociated as they are by the American plan. In 1911 Pius X declared the Portuguese law separating Church and State to be void. In the conflict going on in Mexico between Church and State, Pius XI supported the priests in their opposition to the Mexican Constitution, which by a previous Pope had been declared 'null, void, and without value.'" Rome is true to her boast that she is *semper eadem*.

The Newly Elected President of the Federal Council of Churches. — Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Episcopal Church is the successor of Dr. Cadman, who is now holding a position as radio preacher. The infidelity of Dr. Cadman is well known; in his hatred of Biblical Christianity he out-Ritschled Ritschl, the father of Modernism, and made the name of the Federal Council of Churches a symbol of the rankest rationalism. Of this enemy of the Christian truth Bishop McConnell, the newly elected president of the Federal Council of Churches, is a worthy successor. As John Horsch points out in the *Presbyterian* (January 10, 1929), the new head of the Federal Council of Churches identifies faith in the deity of Christ with paganism. For in his book *The Christlike God*, published by the Methodist Book Concern, he declares (p. 15): "Is not this tendency to deify Jesus more heathen than Christian? Are we not more truly Christian when we cut loose from a heathen propensity and take Jesus simply for the character that he was and for the ideal that he is?"

Modernists, as Mr. Horsch shows, while disowning the supernatural birth and deity of Christ, look upon Jesus as the revealer of God; but they think that Jesus was mistaken in His teaching concerning His own person, His second coming, and the end of the world. If that is true, Mr. Horsch rightly contends, "if the testimony of Jesus concerning His divinity, lordship, Saviorhood, and other points were false, He would stand discredited before all the world,

and it would be impossible to regard Him even as a great man. Clearly, only a mentally deranged person or a wilful deceiver could make the claims which He made concerning Himself unless they were true. How, then, could such a person be recognized as the revealer of God?"

The great trouble with Modernism is that it, after all, "does not believe all that Jesus taught." Of this Prof. G. B. Smith, in his recent volume *Current Christian Teaching* (p. 124), himself furnishes proof. As Mr. Horsch shows, this prominent leader of the Modernists "points out that they reject such points in His teaching as do not meet with their approval, asserting that these points are not essential to His message." This policy characterizes Modernists as superficial and unfair and their rationalistic philosophy as a disreputable falsehood from beginning to end.

Bishop McConnell is president of the Foreign Mission Board of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North). With reference to Bishop McConnell's work as a missionary leader, Mr. Horsch says: "The question forcibly suggests itself, Is mission-work worth while if Jesus Christ is not recognized as the divine Savior from sin? Do not the Socialists of the Continent of Europe on the whole and many Socialists of England and America hold antireligious, atheistic views and yet accept Jesus as a character and an ideal? . . . Are there not at the present time many pagans, particularly in India, who accept Jesus as a character and an ideal? What difference does this make in their personal relationship to God? Did not the one who sentenced Jesus to death accept and admire Him as a character? The question is certainly pertinent, To what a pass has the Church come when her bishops and mission boards deny the Gospel of salvation through the blood of Christ and hold that belief in His deity is heathenism? Can the fact be ignored that spreading such teaching is all to the interest of the kingdom of darkness? If there is joy in heaven before the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, what of the joy of the demons of hell when the world is led astray in such a way as this by the Church that bears the Christian name?"

MUELLER.

Do the So-Called Christian Colleges Function Properly?—When the U. L. C. recently met at Erie, Pa., for its biennial convention, one of the most important subjects before it for consideration was the report of a committee of experts on its colleges. The committee was composed of Drs. Leonard Evenden and O'Rear of the department of college management in Columbia University, New York. What they say about the colleges of the U. L. C. is applicable to the Christian colleges of the United States in general, and it is on this account that we are quoting from their report. It should be added that the schools they are speaking of are not institutions whose sole aim is the education of Christian ministers. The committee says in part:—

"The problems confronting your institutions are approximately the same as those of all other Christian colleges. Regardless of the approach you may make, you are soon driven to the central issue:

Why does the Church in this day attempt to maintain its own institutions, and how should these institutions differ from others? . . . For twenty years or more the church colleges have occupied a competitive position, somewhat of a defensive character. By the process of upgrading they have tried to hold their own and become as well regarded academically as the state universities or the endowed colleges. Perforce the standard of the state universities has been copied, and each year the church college has become more like them in educational program, athletics and sports, social life, and general objectives. To retain their place in the educational world, they have tended to sacrifice the very thing for which they were established and the only reason for their claim upon church support. . . . The problem is not only to make and keep the colleges of high grade as to scholarship, but to bring to the front conspicuously the one purpose which differentiates them from state and private institutions."

This is well expressed and should be heeded by all who have to do with the directing and superintending of Christian colleges. Why should the Church expend vast sums, contributed by its members, on the maintenance of colleges if these do not differ at all from the great institutions maintained by the State? The Church's mission is not to teach algebra and astronomy, but to preach the Gospel.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

From Japan comes the almost unbelievable news that a German scholar hailing from Berlin and now sojourning in Tokyo, Prof. Bruno Petzold, has been consecrated as a Buddhist priest. Turning from Christ to Buddha! The proper comment here is the word of St. Paul, 2 Thess. 2, 10, 11: "They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie."

In the *Lutherischer Herold* we find a reference to the Jewish population in New York City which is interesting. The Census Bureau informs us that there are more than four million Jews in America. Almost one half of these are found in the State of New York. In New York city itself the number of Jewish inhabitants is 1,643,021. No wonder New York has been called the Jewish paradise. But how shall we explain that the writer in the *Herold* continues: "And in this city there is not a single Lutheran Jewish mission"? Has he never heard of the work of Rev. N. Friedmann, who has been preaching the Gospel to New York Jews for a number of years and now is issuing a religious paper in Yiddish, *The Remainer of Israel*?

The *Presbyterian* draws attention to the fact that the Macmillan Company is announcing a series of books for laymen called *Philosophy for the Laymen Series*, which, to judge by the two volumes that have appeared, will be atheistic in their outlook and tendency. Dr. Roy Wood Sellars of the University of Michigan is the general editor of the series and author of the first volume, *Religion Coming of Age*. The second volume is by Durant Drake and has the title *The New Morality*. These are books against which we have to warn our people.

A Lutheran bishop writing in the *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* expresses the fervent wish that the air in the Church might be purified. What is it that he desires? The excommunication of all who deny the deity of Christ and the atonement through His blood? Far from it! The *Elsaessische Lutheraner*, quoting from the article in the paper mentioned, points out that this bishop is inveighing against those Lutherans who still believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible; he would like to see the belief in the inerrancy of the Scriptures exploded. This dignitary is indeed chopping away the branch on which he is sitting.

In Abyssinia, so the *N. L. C. B.* informs us, people maintain that they are in possession of the original Ark of the Covenant. They say this was stolen from the Jews by certain of their people who had gone to Jerusalem with Queen Candace (?) to visit Solomon. The fable is said to be given full credence in Abyssinia.

Would to God that the following words of the *Sunday-school Times* would be read and pondered widely: "That denominations are 'getting together' increasingly there is no doubt. The regrettable fact is that the cooperation or union is usually at the expense of the purity of the Christian faith. Sound doctrine almost always suffers in such a united movement, just as God predicted it would. Union colleges and schools in the Foreign Mission fields, for example, have invariably gotten farther and farther away from evangelical New Testament truth, as have such union movements in the homeland."

When the World's Fair will be held in Chicago, 1933, a great Parliament of Religions will be convened, so Mr. George W. Dixon, of the Board of the Chicago Temple, First Methodist Episcopal Church, announces. Mr. Dixon is chairman of the commission which is to have charge of this undertaking. It will certainly be a strange spectacle when idolaters and disciples of Jesus will join hands and Christ will be said to have concord with Belial and the temple of God with idols. "Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord."

Some of the intolerable conditions in the Anglican Church can be visualized when one reads that Dean Inge advocates the exchange of bishoprics on the part of the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Gloucester. The former is no longer in sympathy with the clergy under his supervision. Recently, when he proposed introduction of the revised *Book of Common Prayer* in his diocese, his motion was voted down by the pastors or priests entrusted to his guidance. The Anglican system seems to be about ready to topple over.

St. Michael's Lutheran Church of Germantown, Pa., recently celebrated its two-hundredth anniversary. According to the *Lutheran* this church came into existence some time before 1728, as the Rev. Anthony Jacob Henkel, the first known pastor, died in August of 1728. . . . There was already a church-building before the coming of Rev. Henry Melchior Muehlenberg, which had been completed under the direction of the Rev. John Dysander, of Gloria Dei Church, who served St. Michael's for several years. In 1743 Muehlenberg became the pastor of the church. Twenty-six pastors have served the congregation in these two hundred years.

The daily press informs us that the State Baptist Convention of South Carolina opposes the teaching of the Bible as a text-book in any school or institution of the State and will present a resolution to the State Legislature which will prohibit such use of the Scriptures in the State of South Carolina. The resolution says that it is the business of the State to protect, and not to promote, religion; that religious training belongs to the homes, the churches, and the denominational schools.

In view of the exactions made on the time and strength of the average minister of to-day, it is well to remember what Dr. William M. Taylor, of New York, once said in a talk to preachers: "As soon as the devil sees a young minister likely to be of use in the kingdom of God, he gets on his back and begins to ride him to death with engagements."

Watchman-Examiner.

For the benefit of all who are interested in American church history we quote a few sentences from the *Lutheran*: "Prior to the organization, in 1918, of the United Lutheran Church in America the United Synod of the South was composed of eight district synods. Since that time three of the synods — Tennessee, Holston, and Southwestern Virginia — have been 'benevolently assimilated' by other synods, so that to-day there are in this southeastern region but five synods." These bodies are the synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Mississippi, and Georgia. The formation of a Florida Synod is in prospect.