

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IX.

MAY, 1929.

No. 5.

The Marks of Justification.

From Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Rechtfertigung*, Part VIII.

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

So we have full, perpetual, and sure forgiveness. But that is something within us, and hence no one can know for certain whether his neighbor has it or not. Therefore in order that we may not err in our judgment when trying the spirits, God has given us two marks by which we can know whether a person is in the state of forgiveness or not. These two marks are the confession of the mouth and good works. Not good works alone, otherwise many would be in the state of grace who reject Christ. True, ancient and modern obscurants wish to persuade us that good works alone testify to the presence of justification, and in that way they, like the honorable Sultan Saladin, try to bring themselves into heaven on a bypath. God's house, however, has no small side-entrance; it has only *one door*, and that door is Christ. For beside this name there is none other under heaven given among men whereby they can be saved, even though they do all the good works that can be performed. The first mark, then, of the presence of God's perpetual grace is confession of Christ. Where that is wanting, there forgiveness of sins cannot even be thought of. On the other hand, where it is found, there we may at least assume that faith is present in the heart. And where there is faith, there is also forgiveness. Therefore Christ attaches so much weight to our confessing Him freely and openly before men. He says: "Whosoever shall confess Me ¹⁾ before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10, 32. 33. On the basis of this declaration we say: Where there is a joyous confession of the Lord, there is also forgiveness; otherwise He would not confess in heaven the name of him who confesses His name here on earth. In fact, He caused the pillar among His apostles to make such a confession not only Matt. 16,

1) Ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί. So that his confession abides in Me.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Urban and Rural Lutheran Membership.—From the bulletin *Lutherans, U. S. Census of Religious Bodies, 1926*, the *News Bulletin* presents the following table, which shows the present percentage of urban and rural Lutheran membership:—

	<i>Per Cent. of Total</i>	
	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Rural</i>
United Lutheran Church	67.3	32.7
Joint Ohio Synod	54.9	45.1
Iowa Synod	28.9	71.1
Buffalo Synod	53.4	46.6
Jehovah Conference	28.1	71.9
Augustana Synod	60.6	39.4
Norwegian Lutheran Church	24.6	75.4
Lutheran Free Church	26.5	73.5
Eielsen Synod	31.8	68.2
Lutheran Brethren	56.5	43.5
United Danish	39.8	60.2
Danish Church	41.1	58.9
Icelandic Synod	5.5	94.5
Finnish Suomi	55.5	44.5
Finnish National	42.6	57.4
Finnish Apostolic	23.0	77.0
Missouri Synod (Syn.)	54.6	45.4
Wisconsin Synod (Syn.)	48.0	52.0
Slovak Synod (Syn.)	82.5	17.5
Norwegian Synod (Syn.)	31.2	68.8
Negro Missions (Syn.)	51.7	48.3
Synodical Conference Total	53.6	46.4
Independent Congregations (50)	73.9	26.1
All Lutheran Total	42.64	57.36

The *News Bulletin* comments on this as follows: "A comparison of these two tables will show how nearly the Lutheran Church has met the call of the growing urban population. This is revelation No. 1 concerning the present and future home mission task before the Lutheran Church of the United States." MUELLER.

The Amazing Number of Unchurched in Our Country.—In presenting the opportunity for home mission work, the *News Bulletin* publishes also the following table from the U. S. Census of Religious Bodies, 1926, which shows the present and future home mission needs and responsibilities of the Lutheran Church of the United States. Let our pastors contemplate these figures when they are troubled with the thought that we are burdened with an "overproduction of candidates." The millions of unchurched in our country must fill us with a deep feeling of shame as we think of the opportunities wasted and neglected.

U. S. Population (1926)	117,135,817	56,150,322	60,985,495
<i>States</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Churched (1926)</i>	<i>Unchurchd (1926)</i>
Alabama	2,526,001	1,217,170	1,308,831
Arizona	444,708	153,086	291,622
Arkansas	1,903,048	621,307	1,281,741
California	4,316,459	1,567,511	2,748,948
Colorado	1,058,722	352,863	705,859
Connecticut	1,608,491	956,458	652,033
Delaware	237,274	110,142	127,132
District of Columbia	527,880	238,871	289,009
Florida	1,317,160	528,465	788,695
Georgia	3,138,962	1,350,184	1,788,778
Idaho	522,175	162,679	359,496
Illinois	7,202,983	3,357,954	3,845,029
Indiana	3,124,499	1,382,816	1,741,683
Iowa	2,422,915	1,080,152	1,342,763
Kansas	1,820,896	766,578	1,054,318
Kentucky	2,524,210	1,051,504	1,472,706
Louisiana	1,918,591	1,037,008	881,583
Maine	786,053	204,092	581,961
Maryland	1,580,268	758,046	822,222
Massachusetts	4,197,288	2,500,204	1,697,084
Michigan	4,395,651	1,787,023	2,608,628
Minnesota	2,651,306	1,282,183	1,369,123
Mississippi	1,790,618	800,729	989,889
Missouri	3,498,143	1,581,278	1,916,865
Montana	694,965	152,387	542,578
Nebraska	1,384,703	561,423	823,280
Nevada	77,407	19,769	57,638
New Hampshire	453,608	223,674	229,934
New Jersey	3,680,482	1,981,584	1,698,898
New Mexico	388,146	215,547	172,599
New York	11,303,296	6,796,147	4,507,149
North Carolina	2,857,846	1,406,883	1,450,963
North Dakota	641,192	304,963	336,229
Ohio	6,600,146	2,866,496	3,733,650
Oklahoma	2,342,474	581,083	1,761,391
Oregon	877,477	252,731	624,746
Pennsylvania	9,613,570	5,212,050	4,401,520
Rhode Island	692,794	451,395	241,399
South Carolina	1,826,021	872,806	953,215
South Dakota	689,346	294,622	394,724
Tennessee	2,467,679	1,018,071	1,449,608
Texas	5,312,661	2,280,514	3,032,147
Utah	513,711	369,591	144,120
Vermont	352,428	161,123	191,305
Virginia	2,518,589	1,172,363	1,346,226
Washington	1,538,228	384,222	1,154,006
West Virginia	1,669,324	532,106	1,137,218
Wisconsin	2,884,734	1,473,064	1,411,670
Wyoming	235,689	62,975	172,714

MUELLER.

Concordia College in Adelaide.—The *Australian Lutheran*, in its report on this institution, calls attention to the fact that the school-year which began on February 15 and ended on December 12, 1928, was the twenty-fifth since the General Synod had taken over the control and management of the institution and the twenty-fourth since it was transferred to Adelaide. During the past year ninety-seven students were enrolled; of these, seventy-eight were

boys and young men and nineteen girls; forty-nine were from South Australia, thirty-five from Victoria, seven from New South Wales, and six from Queensland. The students were divided as follows: Seminary, 11; Leaving Class (Preparatory), 21; Intermediate Class, 30; Junior Class, 35. Students graduating from the classes must pass the various examinations at the University of Adelaide. The male instructors are all graduates of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. To these faithful men, who by the grace of God did so much to build up the Lutheran Church in Australia, we owe a debt of gratitude. As known, the faculty of our Concordia Seminary bestowed upon the president of the institution in Australia the title of Doctor of Divinity *honoris causa*. The last acquisition to the faculty from our country was Prof. H. Hamann, who served as missionary in India for a number of years. Dr. C. F. Graebner writes of the school in general: "The health of the students, generally speaking, was satisfactory, although the influenza, as usual, caused some trouble. During the third term an outbreak of diphtheria gave us great concern, since it threatened to interfere very much with our work. Three of the students were very ill and had to be removed to the Public Isolation Hospital. Every precaution was taken, and the Lord granted success to our efforts to check the disease and to stamp it out. The patients recovered, and we could close the school-year with praise and thanksgiving to God. The conduct of the students was satisfactory, and no gross breaches of discipline occurred. The Word of God, taught in the class, is applied also in daily life, both publicly and privately, and manifests its divine power. May the Lord graciously continue to bless both teachers and students in order that all our work may redound to the welfare of our Church and to the glory of His name!"

MUELLER.

Are Ministers' Conferences Worth While?—Under this head the *Watchman-Examiner* writes: "A man went into the ministers' conference of a big city and spent an hour there. We happened to be visiting with this man in Baltimore soon afterwards. He said: 'That ministers' conference was a mighty poor affair. The big men were all absent, and the crowd of little men were discussing an inconsequential subject.' We are candid in saying that we have been in several conferences of which that might be a fair description. It is hardly fair for the so-called 'big men' to stay away except when they have to speak. If they cannot get anything out of the conferences for themselves, they ought at least to be willing to contribute something to these. Great care ought to be taken as to the theme for discussion. Ministers are not called on to run the universe. Subjects ought to be selected that have something to do with a man's recreation or his life or his work. After all, the greatest benefit of these conferences is the social contact which they afford. When as a pastor we were somewhat separated from other ministers, it was our delight to meet them on Monday mornings. Let the conferences be brief, snappy, purposeful, and friendly. Keep the 'faddists' out. In a city such as New York, for instance, there are enough 'societies' and 'causes' to furnish a speaker not only for every Monday, but for

every day in the year. There are multitudes of 'causes' that are eager to interest ministers. But ministers, tired from Sunday and a bit blue, also need some other kind of food than these 'causes' on Monday morning. Yes, we feel that the right kind of conferences are abundantly worth while."

We quote this because there are, no doubt, quite a number of "ministers' conferences" which are "poor affairs" and which, instead of inspiring the "tired" and "a bit blue" ministers, leave them indifferent and cold, if not disgusted. After all, ministers' conferences are what ministers make them. If the "big men" stay away, and "the crowd of little men" discusses "inconsequential subjects"; if ministers' conferences are controlled by "faddists," who believe that they are called on to run the universe; or if, in general, they are not "purposeful and friendly," the result is disastrous. The matter is one of greatest importance and should receive the prayerful meditation of all conscientious ministers. The *raison d'être* of ministers' conferences is given in the words of Paul: "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." 1 Cor. 12, 7. Paul also says: "Give none offense." 1 Cor. 10, 32. MUELLER.

A Resolution which Deserves Commendation.—On November 21, 1928, the Wheaton College Church considered the resolution to withdraw from the Congregational Conference of Illinois. As reported in the *Presbyterian* (December 20, 1928), final action had not yet been taken on this resolution; but the pastor of the church, Dr. Wm. R. Dodd, writes: "The church is of one mind against union with Universalism and is protesting against the resolution passed by the last Congregational Conference of this State favoring organic union with the Universalist denomination; but the final action on immediate withdrawal from the State Congregational Conference has not yet reached a vote in our own church. A few of our members feel that withdrawal should follow unfavorable action on our protest, which will be made against the resolution passed by the last State Conference. More are in favor of immediate withdrawal, but have not felt inclined to force the action hurriedly, out of regard for the feelings of the minority. I think both feel that withdrawal is inevitable. It is merely a question of the best method of procedure. A number of Congregational churches, most of them in the Chicago area, will doubtless join us in our final action, which, I feel sure, will be soon. Wheaton College Church, I am very certain, stands absolutely true to the evangelical Christian faith and has no thought of any compromise in the matter."

Let us hope that this Church will have the courage to carry out its resolution, irrespective of the fact whether the Congregationalists will unite with the Universalists or not. If the Wheaton College Church "stands absolutely true to the evangelical Christian faith," its duty of withdrawing from the Congregational body is clear, for that body is hopelessly polluted by modernistic paganism. Paul, by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, has clearly pointed out the duty of every church that "stands absolutely true to the evangelical Chris-

tian faith," when he writes: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. . . . Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." 2 Cor. 6, 14—18.

MUELLER.

A Happy Inconsistency.—Dr. A. Morse, in a Communion sermon published in the *Watchman-Examiner*, tells why he refuses to believe in baptismal regeneration and the Real Presence. "The ordinance of Baptism is a simple ordinance, and yet it has been invested by some with all manner of absurdities. Whereas it was intended to be administered only by immersion and as a testimony of an inner experience, and therefore to those only who understand it, it has been changed into numerous forms and administered to all manner of people and invested with a regenerating power. . . . The ordinance of the Lord's Supper is a simple observance and is meant simply to keep in remembrance the death of Jesus and to be observed until He Himself shall return. But this ordinance has been greatly abused and elevated into an extravagant place in the worship of some people." After discussing transubstantiation, he proceeds: "The Lutherans hold a slightly different view. They [?] call it consubstantiation, which means that, though the actual substance of the emblems is not changed, in some manner the body and blood of Christ are added thereto. And the Lutherans, we understand, are the second largest body of Christian people in the world. Now, both these things are absurdities to us." He refuses to believe that the Holy Spirit regenerates through the water of Baptism and that the communicant receives with the bread and wine the real body and blood of Christ because of what his reason styles the absurdity of it. However, in speaking of the second coming of Christ, he declares: "A further reason why some people pass this by is because of the difficulties that they think the return of the Lord would involve. I fear I have been halted on this basis myself. I have said to myself: 'How can these things be? And if the Lord should come to one place, he would not be coming to another; and this world as a whole would not see Him; and if He issued His Word in one part of the world, it would not be the same in all others; and if people wanted to see Him, they would have to organize excursions and pilgrimages to go where He is.' But I am changing my thought. In the first place, if the Lord makes a promise, who am I to lay out its details and tell Him? I do not understand how it can be, but in the vital things of Christian experience [??] I am a man of faith. I do not understand how a belief in Him lifts the penalty of sin, but I believe it just the same. The sacred promise lies with Him, and it works. . . . Then I say that this most unlikely promise of the Lord can be fulfilled, and that to the very last letter." If Modernists were arguing with Dr. Morse, they would make this point: Since you reject the plain statements of Scripture or baptismal regeneration and the Real Presence because of the protest of reason, you are bound to deny the second coming and the vicarious satisfaction, for these things are equally unreasonable and "absurd"; you are, unhappily, inconsistent. We are glad of this inconsistency on the part of Dr. Morse and would further

reason with him thus: Since you are a man of faith with regard to the vicarious satisfaction and cling to the promises of the Lord "to the very last letter," be consistent; accept with the same faith the declarations and promises of the Lord on the Sacraments "to the very last letter."

E.

Is the "Crisis Theology" of Europe Historic Calvinism?—Under this heading Prof. F. D. Jenkins in the *Presbyterian* renounces the claim that "Karl Barth is a present-day Calvinist" and offers a very satisfactory analysis of his system. Editorially the *Presbyterian* declares that "Professor Jenkins is qualified as few Americans are to write on the subject" and that, "while the movement represents a conspicuous and significant reaction from Liberalism as represented by scholars like Harnack and popular preachers like Fosdick, yet in its positive teachings it does not represent a manifestation of genuine Christianity."

In the introduction to his analysis, Professor Jenkins writes: "Bearing the name of Reformed theology, but more widely known as the Theology of Crisis, a group of five Swiss and German theologians have originated a new religious philosophy with which they intend to bring a 'crisis' into all modern Christian culture, morality, and religion, on the one hand, and Reformed orthodoxy, on the other. Professors Barth, of Muenster, and Bruenner, of Zurich, Switzerland, are the coryphaei of the movement."

While the author asserts "there exists a feeling in Europe that the high-water mark has been passed," he at the same time points out that the movement has exercised a tremendous influence upon theological thought both in Europe and America. Barth has been hailed by Professor Lange, of Halle, as the "greatest theologian since Schleiermacher." Count Keyserling declared him to be the "one hope" of Protestantism. A prominent liberal writer asserted that Barth has "saved" Protestantism in Europe. Professor Jenkins writes: "Lovers of speculation and rejecters of predestination, plenary inspiration, the substitutionary atonement, theological system, and pure historic Calvinism alike choose to worship at this altar of such strange fire." Of course, there have been opponents. Dr. W. P. Paterson, formerly head of the Edinburgh University Divinity School, described the phenomenon as a pronounced "agnosticism" in its theism, something like that of the heathen upanishads of India. Professor Adolph von Harnack stamped Barth's theology as a "revival of ancient Gnosticism," and the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* repudiated the system as "unbiblical," "unphilosophical," "destructive," "pessimistic," and "comparable in certain aspects with Buddhism and early Christian Gnosticism."

The agnosticism of the Barthian system is clearly evinced in its "grim God-idea." "God remains, in Barth's writings, the 'Totally Other One,' an eternal 'Question,' a 'Possibility,' but at the same time a strictly 'Impossible Possibility,' a 'Presupposition,' a dark and concealed 'Background.'" Furthermore: "Behind the subtle simulations of Biblical and theological terms there is no Jesus of Nazareth at all in the commonly accepted historic sense. We cannot find His

divinity in His person, moral character, or in His teachings and example. As Barth puts it: 'Jesus has simply nothing to do with religion.' The significance of the Mediator lies in the fact that He revealed that God cannot and must not be known by any mortal." Again: "Faith is an abject 'not-knowing,' as it has been styled, a 'vacuum,' and one in which there is no possibility of normal religious respiration. It is the supreme otherworldly act of throwing the soul upon the 'will' (unknown will) of the quality-less 'hidden background,' a resort in which there can be no confident feeling or thinking reduced to its ultimate analysis. The supreme event in the Christian life is the moment of 'crisis,' or of 'decision,' when through this act of faith a divine despair descends upon the inquiring soul and lays low its human pride, reason, 'will to live.'" Barth's doctrine of the atonement is described as follows: "It does not make satisfaction to justice for human guilt. It marks the death and *finale* of all human morals, history, and religion. From it we learn the abstract symbolic truth that man must die to self in order to live." The resurrection of Christ is treated by Barth in the same symbolic, mystical way. It is "no historical event." While it is "*in* history, it is not *of* it." "Resurrection is eternity!" "It is the inbreaking of the 'new world'"; but what the "new world" is "we are never given by Barth to thoroughly understand. The conception is purposely left incomplete."

The consequence of the "Crisis Theology," Professor Jenkins summarizes as follows: "1. Man is thoroughly determined by this transcendent Unknown God, to whom personality, attributes, and even being cannot be safely ascribed. God can know and act upon man, but the reverse of this is never true. 2. This type of thought can be called with much force pagan. Dr. Bruenner's idea of God is capable of coming out of the very heart of Africa or, as Dr. W. P. Paterson says, from the heathen upanishads of India. 3. There is only one question which is wholly a serious one: the question of God. It follows with inevitable consequence that the whole system of theological ideas and Biblical truths and sacred historical events constitutes a train of illusionism. 4. Preaching is futile; for according to Barth two truths confront us: a. that we should speak of God; b. that we cannot. We should know both the necessity and the impossibility of our task. 5. Christian ethics is very difficult to maintain. Conduct is reduced to the task of escaping from this world and human endeavor by means of this very unbiblical doctrine of 'crisis,' whereby we yield ourselves in an abject otherworldly fashion and with heads bowed into the hands of the unknown 'origin' of all things. 6. Similarly the Church's great task of education is clearly unjustifiable. All definite knowledge except the knowledge that we cannot know is 'insolence' to God. 7. Creeds, confessions, and doctrines are hardly longer tenable. Though paradoxically maintaining that we should not discard our present creeds with their content, the Crisis Theology summarily empties them of their traditional meaning. 8. The Gospel is simple and directed to the plainest man. The Crisis Theology can be directed only to religious philosophers, to the in-

telligentsia, and even to such the learned philosophemes and theologoumena are hardly within reach."

The writer concludes his article with the words: "Despite Barth's repudiation of the charge we confront here an outstanding expression of the post-war pessimism. A human despair and a sighing of tragic sadness, which jealously seek refuge in Christian ideas, lie at the root of this theological disaffection. The *Literarischer Jahresbericht* of Germany not ineptly called this mooted 'Calvinism' a 'desperado theology.' What European theology needs is not a 'crisis,' but a Biblical rebirth through the overturning operations of the almighty Spirit of God."

MUELLER.

The New Exegetics.—The old exegetics is bound by the plain meaning of the text. The old exegetes hold that the words which the sacred writers wrote, the words which Jesus spoke, express exactly what was in their minds. They hold, over against the allegorizers, for instance, that the words of Scripture cannot be made to mean anything beyond the plain sense of the words. Allegorizing has long ago gone out of fashion. Oliver Chase Quick, who is a keen thinker, would not for a moment think of advocating the allegorizing method. But thinking deeply along philosophical and psychological lines, he has discovered a new method of investing the words of Scripture with a sense that was not in the minds of the authors. He offers it in his book *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 188 ff.: "Both in ancient and modern times controversies concerning the Eucharistic offering [?!] and the doctrine of the Real Presence have often turned upon the precise exegesis of the words attributed to our Lord at the Last Supper. . . . It is true that all we need for sound doctrine is to draw out the full implications of our Lord's words and acts. But these implications cannot be drawn out or appreciated if we refuse the help which the subsequent reflection and experience of Christians alone can provide. Narrow pedantry and imaginative literalism in exegesis have ever been chief obstacles to the understanding of the mind of Jesus. . . . This fact is a salutary warning that the construction of Eucharistic doctrine demands something other than a meticulous adherence to the letter of our Lord's speech. . . . Granted that St. Paul's and St. Mark's account [of the institution of the Lord's Supper] is substantially correct, we still have no materials for determining what was the full reality of our Lord's meaning if we are to insist upon limiting our vision, as it were, by the four walls of the upper room. We may attribute to our Lord's consciousness, as He uttered the words of institution, an altogether supernatural knowledge of future events. If we do, it is evident that the consideration of those events as we now know them can alone give us the key to the meaning of the words." (Then, what did the disciples make of the Lord's Supper?) "But if, on the other hand, we suppose that our Lord's conscious knowledge in the days of His flesh was limited by a psychological mechanism similar to that of which we have become aware in ourselves, the impossibility of determining His full meaning by reference to His immediate consciousness is really no less indisputable. It is an elementary fact in psychology that the field of attention can never

hold more than a fraction of the content of the mind. All a man's sayings are the products of a mental content immensely larger than that which is explicitly within his consciousness as he utters them. Yet their meaning can only be fully defined by reference to the whole mental content as it is gradually, by subsequent reflexion and through the course of subsequent events, brought into the light of conscious knowledge. A man never knows exactly 'what he meant when he said' a thing, until he has afterwards pondered over the circumstances and conditions of his original utterance. And when he has thus in subsequent reflexion defined his meaning with full sincerity and truth, his account of it must always contain far more than what was actually occupying his attention at the moment when he spoke the words. . . . The work of the true commentator is often to unfold more of the real content of Platonic or Shakespearian wisdom than was already unfolded in Plato's or Shakespeare's consciousness as he wrote. All this has a considerable bearing upon the true interpretation of our Lord's words and acts at the Last Supper. It leads us to expect that we shall find the truth by regarding them in a broad context as the product of a mind and life, the unique value of which the history of Christian thinking and living has enabled us to recognize. And if we thus find in them a meaning which goes beyond what many conceive to have been the limitations of our Lord's conscious knowledge before His crucifixion, we can still maintain that this meaning nevertheless was in a true sense in the Lord's mind and that one great purpose of the sending of the Holy Spirit was to enable us to exhibit ever freshly the riches of meaning which were latent in what our Lord said and did upon earth." It would seem, then, that we shall not know what the Lord's Supper is until, on the Last Day, the reflexion and experience of the last Christians have been brought to an end and the common result of these reflexions and experiences has been summarized. Meanwhile the preliminary findings of the Anglo-Catholic Quick are these: "The central meaning of the Christian Sacrament is not to affirm any nice distinction between substance and accident, but to assure us that the substance of the life of Christ, being divine and eternal love and therefore distinct from all outward and perishable things, is nevertheless through outward things communicated to us. In so far as the doctrine of transubstantiation was or is the best available means of making clear that truth, it is itself to be accounted true." However, Quick does not accept transubstantiation. He teaches virtualism, in this form: "Christ's action, then, reaches its first stage of externalization in His body, the Church, which at a given place and time in the person of its priest solemnly offers the bread and wine in memorial of His Passion. The action is thus further externalized and extended into the consecrated bread and wine themselves as representing the offered body of Christ's manhood. . . . At every point of the Eucharistic action the whole Christ is present in that through which He acts; and that through which He acts is at every point His body as the instrument and expression of His will." The words of the institution certainly do not say this. Hence the need of a new exegetics. E.

“Christian General Feng, Backslider.”—This was the caption of an editorial which recently appeared in the *Globe-Democrat* of St. Louis, Mo. After dwelling on the strict discipline which characterized John Feng’s “Christian army” in former years, a discipline reminding one of the sternness of military law in the camp of Gustavus Adolphus, the writer says: “Most remarkable stories are told of this Christian army under its Christian general. Its like was never seen even in the West and certainly nothing approximating it in the East. Its soldiers did not drink, smoke, swear, and did not even loot in years when looting was the chief recreation of the Chinese soldiery. It was a stern Cromwellian army, which, while it had its reverses, often came to the rescue in the nick of time and turned defeat into victory for the Nationalist cause, and its example did much to increase Christian prestige among the Chinese. A sensation was therefore caused in foreign settlements in China a few months ago when it was reported that General Feng had become a backslider after coming under the influence of communistic atheism in Russia, where he was obliged to go to obtain arms and military assistance. The report, being denied, was reaffirmed, and obscurity shrouded his sentiments until cleared up by Mrs. Feng the other day. After the general’s first wife died, he had been attracted to a Chinese girl of extremely poor family who was working as Y. W. C. A. secretary to educate her younger brothers, and he was married to her in a Christian ceremony. That both have become greatly troubled over the factionalism among different sects and particularly by the notorious anomaly that the greatest Christian nations are the most warlike, an anomaly that has long been a great barrier to the spread of New Testament doctrines among the Chinese, is now explained by Mrs. Feng. The couple still have a great admiration for Christian civilization and the beauty of the religion, but no longer maintain their former devout attitude toward the essentials of salvation. The fact seems to be that both have ceased to be Fundamentalists and have become Modernists.” The genuineness of General Feng’s Christianity has been under suspicion for some time. But if he has become a Modernist, we have a sufficient explanation for his vacillating course in recent years. A.

The Modernist’s Millennium has Dawned.—Thus one is tempted to exclaim when reading the following item in the March issue of the *International Journal of Religious Education* (p. 39): “Inter-religious Camp for Boys,” so reads the title of an article in the *Christian Patriot of India*, which describes a recent camp held in Mandapam. It was held for three days and was attended by 123 delegates. Nine were Mohammedan boys, 36 were Hindus, 68 were Christians, and there were other non-student leaders making up the total. The morning sessions were devoted to religious study groups upon topics that were intimate discussions of Hindu, Moslem, and Christian interest, showing the practical ways in which each of these three religions could be lived out in daily life and conduct. *The leaders urged upon the students closer fellowship with one another in the spirit of brotherhood, believing that under heaven they were all one family.* Questions

such as these, "What do you think contributes most to character in the life of your school?" and, "What are the moral problems which you think the boys of your school find to be most difficult?" were discussed with much profit. At the closing session, Moslems, Hindus, and Christians came to the platform and testified to the value of the conference." (Italics ours.)

E. Stanley Jones has effectively paved the way to put Jesus on the same level with the religionists of the East in his books *The Christ of the Indian Road* and *Christ at the Round Table*. What he propounds for adults the Directors of Religious Education, no doubt, wish to pass on to the boys. "Get the boys!" is a well-known necessity in the teaching of religion. The millennium of the evolutionistic Modernist does not look for the time when the Son of Man shall come in all His glory. No; for him the millennium has dawned when the exclusive claims of the Christian religion are denied and so-called Christians join in strewing incense before the image of Vishnu and in extolling the shallow moralizing of Mohammed.

Will those who have been flirting with those who espouse the cause of unionism in their community take a warning from this item? The community training-school for Sunday-school teachers and other church-workers is highly praised. "Away with doctrinal distinctions! Christ before denominations!" These are the slogans. Give heed to these, and an "interreligious camp for boys," which would place the disciples of Jesus on the same level with the deluded followers of Mohammed, will be a consistent sequel. W. H. L.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

From Valparaiso comes the good news that Valparaiso University, which is being operated by Lutherans of the Synodical Conference, has been accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, one of the chief accrediting agencies in the United States. It will mean very much to this university that it is now permitted to take its place beside the great universities and colleges of our country. May God prosper the school and make it an efficient means for the spreading of true Lutheranism in the United States!

Whoever still enjoys reading a journal which not only is printed and illustrated with exquisite taste, but contains poetic gems and much wholesome reading-matter, should order, if he understands German, the Easter number of the *Abendschule*, sold for 25 cents by the publishers, the Louis Lange Publishing Co., St. Louis, Mo.

On June 29 and 30, that is, on the Saturday and Sunday following the close of Synod, a second Lutheran Exposition will be presented by the Chicago Lutherans at the Sherman Hotel of their city. Six programs will be arranged in connection with the exposition. Three years ago, when the first exposition took place, the crowds attending it were estimated at 25,000. Much favorable comment was voiced at that time. The exposition planned for the coming June is to be on a still larger scale than the first one.

"The General Synod," as the delegate body of the Synod of Iowa and Other States is called, will convene in June of this year. Plans for this meeting were recently made at a joint session of the Executive Committee and the Committee on Finance. The consolidation of the Iowa Synod's schools at Clinton and Waverly, Iowa, and plans for the merger will be the important matters occupying the attention of the delegates. The

Lutheran Herald states that this will be the last meeting of the Iowa Synod and will practically coincide with the organization's seventy-fifth birthday. — *Lutheran Standard*.

According to recent news, Dr. R. T. Glover, professor in the University of Cambridge, England, has accepted the chair of New Testament at Yale Divinity School. Dr. Glover will succeed Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon. He is the author of the *Jesus of History* and *Paul of Tarsus*.

According to a report of Rev. James M. Gray, D. D., president of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, the school-year which ended August 31, 1928, saw 2,296 students at the school, and 205 male and female teachers finish various courses during the year.

The theological faculty of the University of Berlin will, in July, offer a two weeks' course to theologians from other countries, especially to those using the English tongue. The above item is taken from *Christentum und Wissenschaft*, February number. The same journal reports that Dr. Hans Windisch, of Leyden, a well-known modernistic theologian, has been called to Kiel and that Dr. Rudolph Otto, of Marburg, renowned as the author of *Das Heilige*, has retired.

The *Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche*, organ of our brethren in Germany, has begun a series of articles on "Apparent Errors and Contradictions in the Bible" which promises to be interesting and helpful. The first so-called error which is discussed deals with the charge that Gen. 2 contains a second report of creation seriously diverging from that of Gen. 1. The untenableness of the charge is strikingly brought out. A.
