

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. IX.

APRIL, 1929.

No. 4.

---

## Sure Grace.

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

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

Here is sure grace. Is. 55, 3. Not in the doctrine of gradual forgiveness. For what guarantee have I that the little grain of forgiveness which happens to be in my possession at this time is really sufficient for my salvation? Not in the doctrine of a justification through a heavenly voice which comes but once in a lifetime. For the remembrance of the voice heard at that time is effaced by time; and even if time would spare it, what good would that do you? It would no more assure you of your being in a state of grace than the certainty of your birthday gives you the assurance that you are alive now. The assurance of your salvation rather rests on the fact that you are a sinner, but that the blood of Christ which perpetually makes intercession for you is standing between the fierce wrath of Almighty God and you. And as you have the certainty of life in every breath which you take and by means of which you drink the life-sustaining air, so you have sure forgiveness in every grasp of your faith by which you apprehend Christ.

True. But does this also give me the assurance that I will *finally* be saved? Most certainly! For God "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all; how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" Rom. 8, 32. And furthermore, God's Word says: "Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art Mine." Is. 43, 1. And: "For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." Is. 54, 10. "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colors and lay thy foundation with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates and thy gates of carbuncles and all thy borders of pleasant stones." Is. 54, 11. 12.

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

Something about and from Luther's *Table-Talk*. — The following from an article written by T. R. Glover, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, appearing in the *Western Christian Advocate*, January 24, 1929, and entitled "Begin First," will interest our readers: —

"Of Captain Henry Bell I cannot tell you more than he tells us himself. He was 'employed beyond the seas in state affairs divers years together both by King James and also by the late King Charles.' In Germany once on some such errand, he heard great bewailing for the loss of Martin Luther's *Table-Talk* (to use the more historic title), burned, at the instance of the Pope, by edict of Emperor Rudolph II. But in 1626 a hidden copy came to light and was sent to Henry Bell in England for safety and for translation. For six weeks he had little leisure for such a task. Then he had a dream or apparition. There stood by his bed 'an ancient man, arrayed all in white, having a long and broad white beard hanging down to his girdle,' who took him by the right ear and said, 'Sirrah! Will you not take time to translate that book which is sent unto you out of Germanie? I will shortly provide for you both place and time to do it,' and so vanished. Two weeks later, on an order from the council board, he was committed to the Gatehouse, Westminster, and ten years' imprisonment followed. A marginal note says the true cause of the captain's commitment was because he was urgent with the Lord Treasurer for his arrears of pay. So, as he ruefully says, he had both place and time to translate the book; and it was published in folio in 1653, with certain pertinent orders of the House of Commons of some years before. A fine folio it is, well worth finding.

"Luther's *Table-talk* was taken down by various friends in succession, from 1531 onwards, and they recorded all sorts of things, for Luther talked 'in all the freedom of after-dinner expansiveness,' as an American scholar says. Carlyle called the volume 'the most interesting now of all the books proceeding from Luther, with many beautiful unconscious displays of the man and what a nature he had.' Here is a sentence or two worth noting for a moment. . . . This is what he said one day: 'A little child goeth plainly to work and saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, etc.; but this idiot [the mystic Schwenkfeld] will make two Christs, one that hanged on the cross and another that ascended up into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God, His heavenly Father. . . . I have [God be praised] better learned it than he; I know my Christ well.' 'I have said it often and do say it still,' said Luther, 'he that without danger will know God and will speculate of Him, let him look first into the manger; that is, let him begin below and let him first learn to know the Son of the Virgin Marie . . . or let one look upon Him hanging on the cross. Afterwards he will freely learn to know who God is, as then the same knowledge will not affright, but it will be most sweet,

loving, and comfortable. But take good heed, I say, of high-climbing cogitations, to clamber up to heaven without this ladder, namely, the Lord Christ in His humanity.'

"And again (in a passage that haunts me): 'Dispute not in any case,' said Luther, 'of predestination. But if thou wilt needs dispute touching the same, then I truly advise thee to begin first at the wounds of Christ, as there all that disputation will cease and have an end therewith. . . . When I am in such cogitations, then I altogether forget what God and Christ is; yea, as then I hold him to be a tyrant and a tormentor. . . . Therefore picture thou Christ well in thy heart. . . . But if thou lovest Christ, then all is gone what is in heaven and on earth.' . . . 'Begin first at the wounds of Christ,' says Luther. Few, perhaps, among my readers dispute in any case of predestination. [?] But are fatalism and determinism as remote from our thoughts? Predestination has some advantage over both; for it suggests [?] what a personal God has planned for a personal *you*; while fatalism seems to eliminate at least God's personality, leaving you tangled in the world machine; and determinism cuts away both God's and yours, and you are a cog of the machine yourself. 'Begin first at the wounds of Christ,' then, and say, if you think it sense, that Jesus and Judas are equally moral, neither of them good, neither bad, both irresponsible, both cogs of one great non-moral machine. You can't say it with much conviction. . . . Or take the great mysteries of life. . . . What do you make of sin? You don't count sin a factor in life? Well, once more take Luther's advice. Who nailed Christ to the cross but people like you and me, sound officials who believed in their institutions, civil government, and priesthood — people, not monsters; just people like the rest of us, moved by common motives. And that was what they came to! 'Begin first at the wounds of Christ,' and you may look more closely into motive and conduct, to the great profit of your neighbors.

"The greatest mystery of all is God; and here people go wrong for want of Luther's caution. They start with 'high-climbing cogitations,' abstract propositions, with fine-mixed conceptions from all sorts of sources, primitive tabus, Roman law, Plato, Moses, Dionysius the Areopagite, Justinian, Cyprian, Isaiah, all jumbled up with modern science (in bits) and some sort of loose or rigid omnipotence. No, no! Begin with what you know. Begin with the best you know and work on from that. Half our troubles in theology come from our inverting the natural Christian order — working from God to Jesus instead of from Jesus to God. Lo, I repeat to myself and to you, 'Begin first with the wounds of Christ,' and I am grateful to Luther for saying it."

E.

**Union of Methodist and Presbyterian Churches Considered and in Principle Approved.** — Under this heading the *Presbyterian* (February 14) comments on the proposed union between Methodists and Presbyterians: "We are opposed to the action contemplated because it could not be brought about except at the cost of what is most distinctive of Presbyterianism. We are in full accord with the position maintained so ably by Mr. Floyd E. Hamilton that any union of our

Church with other churches made at the cost of our Reformed faith would be obtained at too great a cost. Just how men like Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, Dr. Robert E. Speer, and Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, who, according to newspaper reports, were particularly active in connection with this conference (between Methodists and Presbyterians on January 30, 1929), can reconcile their interest in the matter with their professed loyalty to the Reformed faith as expressed in the Westminster standards, we do not pretend to understand. Is it maintained that the Methodists have as a body become Calvinists? If not, we do not see how loyal Presbyterians can advocate the proposed merger any more than we can see how Methodists who are loyal to the teachings of John Wesley can favor it. We are even more opposed to the action contemplated because the influences back of this proposed merger seem to be predominantly liberal. It was Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin who proposed the New York Presbytery overture, and it is Bishop McConnell, president of the Federal Council of Churches, who is the chairman of the committee on doctrine and polity appointed at the Pittsburgh Conference. Bad as we would consider a union on a non-Calvinistic basis, we would consider it a thing to be welcomed as compared with a union on a basis that would be acceptable to men like Dr. Coffin and Bishop McConnell." We felicitate the *Presbyterian* on its frank testimony against a union which, if consummated, would no doubt increase and strengthen the liberal element in its denomination.

MUELLER.

**A Good Word for Controversy.** — Controversy is in many circles looked upon as a product of hell and regarded with horror, and the only people against whom controversy is considered permissible are those who will not keep silent when their dearest convictions are trampled upon. There are men left, however, who perceive that controversy is not altogether to be deplored and condemned. The *Watchman-Examiner* recently said: "Dr. James Denny was entirely right when he declared that one of the greatest needs of our age is 'good controversy.' It saves us from stagnation. Somewhere we have read that 'boards have a tendency to become wooden.' The right kind of controversy saves our boards from this tendency. It has the same effect on our colleges, seminaries, and other organizations. It clarifies truth and stabilizes convictions. But 'good controversy' does not mean suspiciousness, bitterness of feeling, and railing. It is to be assumed that all parties to 'good controversy' are conscientious in their views and are jealous of the truth, however mistaken some of them may be. Controversy for controversy's sake is never wise and has not the right spirit behind it. Controversy for the better establishment of the truth is not only a privilege, but a duty. To attack the *status quo* is often as dangerous as to attempt to stop a runaway team of horses. To assume that what is, is right is to forget the pervasive influence and the subtle inroads of compromise and worldly ideals." It is, of course, to be regretted that controversy is unavoidable, inasmuch as false doctrine makes controversy necessary. But since it is necessary, let us engage in it filled with the spirit of a conscientious surgeon, who is cutting, not simply to be cutting, but to

benefit his patient; and let us point out to the calamity howlers that controversy has a good by-product, namely, stimulation of the Christian life and earnest investigation of the Scriptures.

**A Correct Principle Misapplied.** — We read on page 251 of *The Miracles of Our Savior*, by Dr. Wm. A. Taylor: "So, to be saved by Christ, we must touch Him, not, indeed, with the touch of physical contact, for that is now impossible, but with that of the application of our spirit to his. . . . This touch is the means through which the healing energy of Christ passes from Him into our spirits. Let me illustrate. It is a well-understood mechanical principle that if we wish to transmit force from one body to another, we must first establish some kind of union between them. In the cotton-mill you may have the most admirable machinery, and in the basement you may have the most powerful engine careering along at full speed in the very wantonness of its strength; but unless you connect the one with the other, every spindle will be motionless and every loom at rest. If the shaft between the engine and the screw in the steamship be broken, the propeller will immediately stand still. If the wire be snapped asunder, the telegram cannot be dispatched. Now, though we cannot in all respects reason from the mechanical to the spiritual, still we have in this law of material force an outward analogy to the great moral principle that, if influence is to pass from one spirit to another, a union between them must be first established. . . . Now, it is only another application of this principle when we say that the sinner who is to be saved must in some way be brought into spiritual union with the Lord Jesus Christ. The forgiveness of his sins results from Christ's being connected with him and acting in his stead, and the regeneration of his soul results from his being connected with Christ and being animated by His Spirit. Now, what is that link that so connects the sinner and Christ?" A Lutheran will heartily agree with these remarks in their *general* tenor. There must be a means by which the forgiveness of sins gained by Christ is conveyed to us, through which the power of God comes into contact with us; there must be a way "how I obtain Christ and how grace comes to me that I get it, that we meet" (Luther, III, 1693). There must be, besides the merit of Christ, the distribution of the merit (Luther, XX, 925); there must be a means, a way, a bridge, a path, a channel, a conveyance, says Luther, between God's grace and the sinner's need. Now, what is that link that so connects the sinner and Christ? A Lutheran expects the answer: The means of grace, the Gospel and the Sacraments. The illustrations the writer employed point to that answer. But the Reformed writer continues: "It is, as we have indicated by the illustrations which we have employed, the faith or the confidence of the sinner in Christ. The touch, therefore, represents the deliberate and believing application of the soul to him; for that deliverance from the guilt and power of sin which you feel you need. And when you make that application, you will receive pardon and renewal." The means of grace are not so much as mentioned. Faith, indeed, appropriates all the blessings of grace, but where will faith find them? Faith, in the Reformed scheme

of salvation, never gets in touch with the dynamo. "We must touch Christ with the application of our spirit to His,"—but unless it touches Christ in the Gospel and in the Sacraments, it touches nothing. Thus the fine quotation, on page 264, from Trench means nothing: "Faith is the conducting link between man's emptiness and God's fulness; and herein is all the value which it has. It is the bucket let down into the fountain of God's grace without which the man could not draw up out of that fountain; the purse which does not itself make its owner rich, but which yet effectually enriches by the treasure which it contains." True, every word of it. But since the fountain of God's grace flows only in the Gospel and the Sacraments, that "faith" which is told to ignore the Gospel and the Sacraments and to seek God outside of them, by some vague application of our spirit to God's Spirit, is let down into an empty well and draws up nothing. A "faith" which has not a certain definite promise of God for its object and basis is not the Christian faith. It is merely the result of some form of autosuggestion. It is a man-made, self-made feeling and imagination. Dr. Taylor gives utterance to a most solemn truth on page 316: "It is the 'self' in us that is a non-conductor and arrests the current of His might, which else would flow through us in its full energy." Let a man apply himself ever so earnestly to finding Christ outside of the means of grace, apply his spirit ever so strenuously to what he thinks is a revelation of Christ's Spirit, he is applying a non-conductor, a man-made article, touching nothing. Luther had been reading some such article when he wrote: "They confess the death of Christ, Christ who hung on the cross and saved us, that is true; but they deny that by which we obtain Him; that is, they break down the means, the way, the bridge, the path. . . . Therefore the enthusiasts say much of God, of forgiveness of sins, and of the grace of God, so, too, that Christ died; but how I may obtain Christ and how grace comes to me that I get it and we meet, there they say: The Spirit alone must do it; they lead me into the clouds; they say that the external, spoken Word, Baptism and Sacrament, is of no use, and still they preach of grace. That is proclaiming the treasure and using fine words concerning it, but taking away the key and the bridge bringing the treasure to me" (III, 1692). Having the divinely appointed means of grace in mind, one can make very good use of the passages quoted above. One will also put the sentence: "The forgiveness of his sins results from Christ's being connected with him and acting in his stead" into a Lutheran, Scriptural form. E.

**The Pope and Temporal Power.**—The *Watchman-Examiner*, commenting editorially on the pact recently made between the Holy See and Mussolini, writes: "The Pope is about to become a 'temporal prince' again, and of course this means that he will officially take part in the affairs of the nations. For Fifteen hundred years the Popes meddled in temporal affairs, and always they lost spiritual power by so doing. Since 1870 they have sulked in the Vatican because they were shorn of temporal power. Now it seems that Italy will grant to

the Pope a diminutive territory and 1,000,000,000 lire, which amounts to about \$52,000,000. The nations will then, of course, be asked to send diplomatic representatives to this new court. We sincerely hope the day will never come when there will be a United States minister at the Vatican."

MUELLER.

**Catholicism Calls to Council.**—The *Christian Herald* remarks under this caption the following, showing that Protestants are watching with keen interest further developments in Italy: "A gathering, as nearly democratic as official Roman Catholic gatherings are allowed to become, has been called by Pope Pius XI for 1930. To this conference at the Vatican will come all cardinals, all archbishops and bishops, from the ends of the earth, and many lesser clergy. Of lay delegates there will be none. What the gathering does, what it discusses, what it decides, are matters of the Pope's determining. He announces what problems can be discussed. By omission he indicates others which cannot. Actions, in the main, will be no more than perfunctory ratification of papal decisions already made and, because of papal infallibility, irrevocable. The 1930 meeting will be a gesture,—but a most significant gesture. World Catholicism will parade its strength as never before. Temporal power—lost when democratic Italy was established in 1870 and now about to be restored by medieval, autocratic Mussolini—will have elevated the Papacy to something of its former grandeur. Diplomatic representation at the chancellories of most of the world's nations has given the Vatican a new contact with political forces. And the parades of 1930, the debates, the masses that will be said, the greetings sent, the pronouncements made, will all contribute to this waxing power. . . . The Papal Infallibility dogma was officially proclaimed on July 18, 1870. On September 20 the army of Victor Emmanuel battered its way through the walls of Rome, and ten centuries of the Pope's temporal sovereignty were brought to an end. Now that authority seems about to be restored. In the implications of such a development all Protestants are concerned. Will a papal kingdom, however small, give the Pope a place in the council of the League of Nations? Is this first move merely the entering-wedge of political schemes of vaster significance? How, with the Pope the head of a government, sending and receiving diplomatic representatives, can the Roman Catholic Church keep out of politics? If the Church as an autocratic and absolute monarchy more actively enters politics, what will be the result upon the rising tides of nationalism and democracy in the Orient?"

MUELLER.

**News from Other Churches.**—The new year-book of the Disciples of Christ shows a gain of 56,000 members through the entire world. The membership for the United States and Canada is quoted as 1,538,365, as against 1,481,376 in the previous year. The goal throughout the world, to be reached by Pentecost, 1930, is announced as 1,750,000.

A merger between the Christian—not to be confused with the Disciples of Christ—and the Congregational churches is pending and seems to be fast gaining ground. The Congregational churches

number 5,548 congregations, with 928,558 members; the Christian Church numbers 950 congregations, with a membership of 114,136. The joint committee announces that the proposed union is "conditioned upon the acceptance of Christianity as the Christian way of life and not upon any uniformity of theological opinion or any uniform practise and ordinances."

At the World Service Conference, recently held at Evansville, Ill., the Methodist Episcopal Church set for its goal in 1929 "a million a month for missions."

A gift of \$150,000 to the Board of Christian Service of the Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Lutheran Synod was recently received from Prof. and Mrs. Alexander P. Anderson. Professor Anderson is known in the scientific world for his invention of "food shot from guns," a process used in the manufacture of breakfast cereals. The gift is offered as a maintenance fund for a children's home and follows other gifts for the same purpose, already totaling about \$100,000 in cash value.

Seven years ago the number of mission-workers on the foreign fields of the Southern Presbyterian Church was 463. In 1925 this number had risen to 517, but now the number has dwindled to 464, and the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions announces that, unless receipts show a decided increase before March 31, further curtailment in the Foreign Mission force may become necessary. Also the United Presbyterian Church is compelled to make further retrenchment in its Foreign Mission work. The Board of Foreign Missions had decided that it must make a cut of \$100,000 in its appropriations for the coming year. This retrenchment involves the retirement from service of twenty missionaries, who are now at home on furlough.

The Episcopal diocese of Delaware has recently been the recipient of a gift of a million dollars from A. Felix Du Pont, Episcopal layman, to be used for building and endowing a church boarding-school for boys, formed primarily for the purpose of training boys for greater efficiency in Christian service. — *Ev. Herald*. MUELLER.

**Christian Teaching in Chinese Colleges.** — Under this caption the *Watchman-Examiner* comments on the action of the Baptist missionaries in China relative to their schools and colleges, since the demand was made by the Chinese authorities "that all our mission-schools should register and comply with restrictions on the teaching of Christianity." The consensus of opinion is that the demand should be complied with, and with reference to this the article says: "It will be seen from the foregoing statements that the Chinese government has called for the registration of our schools under certain restrictive rules and that our school leaders have signified their willingness to comply with these demands if they are insisted on. Some of our schools have already given up compulsory chapel attendance and actually report large attendances and a deeper interest in worship than was the case in compulsory chapel. The same is seen in optional Bible study and other Christian meetings. We are, therefore, positive in declaring that what seemed at first to



be an almost fatal demand will work out for better results than those that were obtained under the old system. Of course, we are not fully out of this storm which our missions in China have been facing during these last fearful years, but we feel that we have weathered the worst of it and that we emerge stronger in many ways than when the storm first broke." MUELLER.

**The Domain of Science.** — The definition of the domain of sane science as given by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, president (in 1928) of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, does not present anything new, but as coming from such an authority is worthy of a place in these columns. It was called forth by a deliverance of a professor of sociology, H. E. Barnes, before a regional meeting of the Association in December, 1928, declaring that "this newer view of God must be formulated in the light of contemporary astrophysics, which completely repudiates the theological and cosmological outlook of the Holy Scriptures." Dr. Osborn later took occasion to make this statement: "This is a scientific meeting and covers the whole realm of what can be estimated by its scientific membership. It has to do with weighing, measuring, and analyzing the universe and covers the whole realm of what can be estimated and understood, and it stops there. Mr. Barnes took an unwarranted liberty in intruding a metaphysical, philosophical, and religious subject. He took advantage of this great, solid platform of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to give expression to his own opinions on a subject totally unrelated to the subjects under discussion. . . . There is no antagonism between science and religion, and there can be none. Some of the greatest men of science have been very religious men. . . ." The following from an editorial in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* is also worth preserving, as coming from a secular paper: "The realm of science is the material universe. It does not, and cannot, go beyond that. It stops there. The realm of the spiritual is outside of its jurisdiction. . . . And when scientists come together for the exclusive purposes of science, these matters [the discussion of theology] are not only irrelevant, but impertinent. . . . Dr. Robert Andrews Millikan, who succeeds Osborn as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is another one of a host of scientists of the first rank whose faith is not only unclouded by science, but is advanced [?] by it. . . . The more we know of nature, the more we know of the universe, the more deeply we must be impressed with the power and wisdom of the Creator. . . . The business of science is with the tangibles; the spiritual belongs to another realm, in which scales and measures and crucibles are useless." So those theologians who are ever ready to remodel their theology in order to remain abreast with science are in accord neither with the Bible nor with science. The *Western Christian Advocate*, for instance, has lately repeatedly stated: "New discoveries require a re-statement of our religious faith." Dr. E. H. Delk, of the U. L. C., demands that our doctrine of creation be altered to agree with the teaching of "science." Dr. Osborn, in calling Professor Barnes to

order, has also called the *Advocate* and its colleagues to order. — "There is no antagonism between science and religion, and there can be none." That does not mean — at least it should not mean — that there is no antagonism between science and the Bible in as far as the statements of the Bible can, in emergencies, be twisted to agree with some accepted teachings of certain scientists, but it means that, when certain scientists contradict any Bible truth, their scientific investigations have not proceeded far enough, — in certain cases *cannot* proceed far enough. — By the way, this same Professor Barnes has also been reading sin out of existence, also on scientific grounds. This time it is Prof. Ellsworth Faris, head of the department of Sociology of the University of Chicago, who calls him to order, declaring that "Professor Barnes is mixing up religion and science when he says there is no such thing as sin." E.

**The Wave of So-Called Atheism.** — Under this title the *Watchman-Examiner* comments editorially as follows: "It is our belief that our zeal for the truth leads us to exaggerate greatly the wave of unbelief that seems to be sweeping over the country. We doubt exceedingly whether there is much of real atheism abroad in the land. Atheism happens to be a popular cult in our day. Men and women in their eagerness to be up to date and different from their fathers are attacking all sacred and traditional beliefs. Let sickness, sorrow, failure, trouble, come, and these very people will instinctively call on God for His help. Recall the story of the man sitting on the rail of a bridge arguing that there was no God. The rail suddenly broke, and the man was precipitated into the water. He began at once calling lustily on God for His help. The bystanders rescued him from danger and then reminded him of his change of mind about God. He answered, 'Well, if there isn't any God, there ought to be one to help a man who was in my fix.' It is profoundly true that men instinctively believe in God. It will take only a little trouble and sorrow to smash all these atheistic clubs."

Paul says: "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them." Rom. 1, 19. MUELLER.

**Wilful Desertion as Reason for Divorce.** — A writer in the *Presbyterian Herald* very clearly sees that according to the New Testament it is not adultery or fornication alone which constitutes a valid reason for divorce. The occasion for a declaration on this subject is furnished by an overture which is at present considered by Presbyterian churches and which is to the effect that adultery alone is to be regarded as lawful ground for divorce. The *Presbyterian Herald* writes: "Adultery as a ground of divorce is given by Christ in discussing 'easy divorce' at the whim of the husband when he said in Matt. 19, 9: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery,' etc. His discussion was evidently not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of the matter, as He spoke only of the woman's rights and did not teach the subject of the man's rights at all. 'Wilful desertion' is mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. 7, 15, where he says: 'But if the unbelieving depart, let him

depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.' This 'departing' is a 'wilful desertion' primarily on account of 'religious incompatibility.' If we accept the Scriptures as being inspired, we must accept this statement of Paul's as being either in harmony with the original teaching of Jesus or intended as an inspired amendment to it. In either case it becomes a guide for us. Desertion violates completely the principle that Jesus laid down for marriage, namely, that the 'twain become one flesh.' To deny divorce to those who have been 'wilfully deserted' would in many instances work hardships on innocent sufferers, contrary to the spirit of Christianity." This is a good presentation of New Testament teaching on the reasons for which a divorce may be sought.

**A Correct Appraisal.**—Some time ago Dr. Meiklejohn caused a big stir in educational circles by his ultramodern ideas. The *Commonweal* of August 8, it seems to us, is not judging him too harshly when it submits the following estimate of his recent work: "A year ago no experiment in higher education seemed more promising than the college then being organized under the direction of Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn at the University of Wisconsin. Here a number of favored students were to be permitted to 'grow' in a new way, while a selected faculty stood by to water these interesting young flowers at the psychological moment. Now that the new method of intellectual horticulture has been in effect one year, the chief impression left with the spectator is the surmised that—material has been gathered for a new book about education! Dr. Meiklejohn evidently has a dream, but neither he nor any one else seems able to recall the details when daylight comes round. In saying during one of his addresses that the young man or woman ought to have adopted no intellectual tenets or rules of conduct until he or she had reached eighteen years, he shocked many good Wisconsin parents, who were sorely tried by the task of wondering what the family household would have been like under such conditions. The Doctor appears to have been expressing his yearning for the 'plasticity' of mind which every teacher desires, but obviously forgot (as so many of his kind do) that clay needs the faculty of hardening as well as the quality of malleability." Pedagogues who, first and foremost, are interested in the well-being and progress of their pupils are *aves raræ* these days. A new book from the pen of Dr. Meiklejohn—that seems likely, far more so than real and lasting good achieved in the classroom where he teaches.

**Does This Fit Us?**—"We ask the question, 'What is the matter with Protestantism?' We give ten answers. First, the time element of worship in Protestantism is too short and passed through in too much of a hurry. We do not give God His day without counting the hours. We have a program for the period of worship to which we strictly adhere and resent any effort to lengthen and find ourselves happy when it is reduced. When a man appears before God in the spirit of worship, he cannot afford to be in a hurry."—*Western Christian Advocate*, December 27, 1928.

E.

## Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

Prof. H. C. Leupold, of the Buffalo Synod theological seminary, has been elected to the chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis at the theological seminary of the Ohio Synod at Columbus, O.

Rev. William Huebener, of Dresden, Germany, recently celebrated his eightieth birthday. The *Ev.-Luth. Freikirche* of December 23, 1928, contains a long and interesting biographical article on the life and labors of this venerable pastor emeritus. What made him a determined Missourian was the perusal of Dr. Walther's article in *Lehre und Wehre*, 1872, on the question, "*Ist es wirklich lutherische Lehre, dass die Seligkeit im letzten Grunde auf des Menschen freier, eigener Entscheidung beruht?*"

The *Australian Lutheran* recently contained an interesting article written by one of our brethren in Australia on the doctrine of the real presence, setting forth that the Lutheran teaching was not invented by Dr. Luther, but, in addition to being Scriptural, was held almost universally in the Christian Church from the beginning to the twelfth century. Among the Church Fathers quoted are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine.

Theodore Maynard, writing in the *Commonweal*, submits this diagnosis of the condition Protestantism is in: "I am far from denying that genuine religion is still even to be found among Protestants. But the general test is simple enough: The religious books and the sermons of the Protestant leaders have every succeeding year less to do with doctrine. If it is difficult to gage this as between two consecutive years, go back twenty years and note the difference; then go back twenty more, and so on. You would be surprised. . . Religion as such is being pushed off the sidewalk by a false system of ethics." This is only too true of Protestants in general. Let us be forewarned!

Dean Inge, among many erroneous things, at times utters a truth. For instance, the following one: "Many changes have come over religious and theological teaching within living memory; but none seems to me so momentous as the acute secularizing of Christianity as shown by practical disappearance of the other world from the sermons and the writings of those who are most in touch with the thoughts and aspirations of our contemporaries." Alas, that this is true!

A much-advertised commentary is that announced under the title *A New Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Including the Apocrypha*. The general editor is Charles Gore, formerly bishop of Oxford. The *Presbyterian* warns its readers against this work, stating that as regards the Old Testament the critical point of view is that of the destructive Graf-Wellhausen school, while with respect to the New Testament a more conservative attitude is taken (the Virgin Birth and the resurrection of Christ are considered historical); nevertheless, the views advocated there are not those held generally by evangelical scholars.

Word comes from the Philippines that the Pope has issued an ultimatum that the progress of Protestantism on the islands must be stopped and that the ground lost to Rome in the last thirty years must be recovered at all cost. To do this, the orders are spending immense sums on magnificent educational institutions.—*W.-E.*

Speaking of the beginning of Christian missions in China, a writer in the *Commonweal* makes this interesting remark: "Arnobius, the African rhetorician of Sicea Veneria, numbers the Seres (the Greco-Roman name for the people of North China) among the Oriental nations already reached by the Gospel of Christ. The work of Arnobius is entitled *Adversus Nationes* and was written during the period of the persecution of Diocletian (303—305)." This agrees well with the statement of the *Concordia Cyclopaedia* that Christian influence in China can be traced back at least to the third century A. D. Col. I, 23 ("the Gospel . . . was preached to every creature which is under heaven") may well be more than a figure of speech.

According to Dr. Slotemaker de Bruine, the so-called missionary consul, the following territories in the Dutch East Indies are still untouched by Christian missionary endeavors: the entire east coast of Borneo; the west coast of Borneo; the Boegines people on the east coast of Celebes and the wild races of the interior of Celebes; the whole southwestern coast of Sumatra; a large number of smaller islands in the East Indies.

From the *N. L. O. B.*

---