

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.

AUGUST, 1926.

No. 8.

Renew the Study of Our Lutheran Confessions.*

In the Church the Word of God and its study takes precedence of everything else. Our Lutheran Church, as the Church of the Word of God (in its origin), has emphasized that as its chief principle. No testimony ranks with the Word. In this article that foundation lies as fundamental and changeless,—I deem it supreme.

But—the confession to that Word ranks next both in the teaching of our Church and in her articles of organization. In her creed the Church witnesses of her faith in the Word. So our pastors are pledged on the Word and the Confessions. Members are received as confessors of Scripture and the Confessions. In all disputes we test the teaching by the Word, as the norm, and our creeds as our Church's standard of witness.

Of all teaching, therefore, not directly Scripture-text the Confessions (or creeds) have first rank. No individual teacher's ideas, however prominent, dare cloud the shining testimony of the Confessions. We Lutherans are credal confessors of the Word. In the creeds it is the Church as a totality that has spoken and speaks. "We believe, teach, and confess," is a phrase oft recurring in the last of the Lutheran Confessions, the Formula of Concord.

As a pastor or a professor of theology or a church writer, what I have to say must stand the test of Scripture and the witnesses to Scripture, the Confessions. Such is the position and the manifest publication of our Church in all her documents of an official nature, in her constitutions, in her formulas of installation into sacred offices, and in her liturgies.

It is a sinister fact that this sense has weakened. In the great breaking up of the Reformation Church now going on in the world we see her Confessions brutally violated, torn to shreds, neglected

* This article was written by Dr. Adolf Hult and appeared in the *Lutheran Companion* of March 24, 1924. It is reprinted here as sounding a trumpet blast which is much needed.—ED.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The 1926 Triennial Convention of the Missouri Synod, which assembled in St. Louis, Mo., this year from the 9th to the 18th of June, was a notable gathering, having been attended by more members of Synod than any previous synodical meeting. The outstanding event was the dedication of the new buildings of Concordia Seminary on a beautiful site adjoining and overlooking the city, west of Forest Park. It is estimated that about 50,000 people took part in the simple, but impressive ceremonies. At the synodical sessions, which were presided over by the venerable President of Synod, Dr. F. Pfothenhauer, assisted by the vice-presidents, Dr. F. Pieper, the President of Concordia Seminary, read an essay on "The Christian Religion in Its Relation to All Other Religions," and Dr. W. H. T. Dau, until now managing editor of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, presented a paper on the position we should assign to science in our thinking ("The Pursuit of Sciences which God Approves"). Both papers were gratefully received. Synod gave much attention to its institutions for the education of ministers and teachers, to the training these workers are to receive, and to its Christian day-schools. Nor was Sunday-school work overlooked. Quite important was the adoption of resolutions in which Synod reaffirmed its well-known position over against the lodge evil. It ordered the appointment of a committee which is to deliberate on the attainment of greater uniformity in lodge practise. The Intersynodical Committee was instructed to continue its work. Missions and church extension were discussed at length and with enthusiasm and were voted large appropriations. May God grant wisdom and strength to the members of Synod, so that the important resolutions adopted for the extension of His kingdom can be carried out!—Shortly before Synod convened, in connection with the closing exercises of Concordia Seminary, the degree of Doctor of Divinity, *honoris causa*, was conferred, by the Faculty of the Seminary, on the following brethren: Pastor W. Dallmann, of Milwaukee, and Professors Th. Engelder and L. Wessel, of Springfield.

ARNDT.

American Preaching.—Ozora S. Davis, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, in a lengthy article published in the *Journal of Religion*, sets forth what to him seem the outstanding characteristics of the American Protestant pulpit in the first quarter of this century. Naturally, he is thinking chiefly of preachers belonging to denominations of the Reformed type. As to the length of sermons, he notes that the preacher to-day must "limit himself to half an hour and probably less for the sermon; he must study and achieve compactness and energy; he must 'put it across' quickly and accurately." In respect to the delivery he holds that there is a "remarkable change" from the "oratorical to the conversational style." He finds, furthermore, that the modern sermon shows "freedom from the technical terms of theology" and uses "the vivid and energetic vocabulary of the actual world." This last remark may be true touching sectarian

pulpits; we hope it does not apply to our Lutheran sermons, but that with us the preacher's aim still is to indoctrinate his hearers, which implies that such terms as justification, regeneration, predestination, etc., are used and explained.—Dr. Davis finds the greatest changes of all in the materials used in the sermons to-day. "Dogmatic fetters have been broken, life is looked at directly." The preacher is no longer concerned with soundness of doctrine, but rather concentrates on "the actual experience of living men and women." Alas! this is true of the circles which Dr. Davis has in mind. Objective, revealed truth is considered almost a nonentity. While our author admits that the chief Bible doctrines are still preached in Fundamentalist circles, he writes: "The following doctrines are in constant evidence: The reality and reasonableness of religion; a Christlike God, not so much the transcendent Sovereign as 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'; the redemptive power of sacrificial love, evident and potent in the death of Christ, a fact which is greater and more vital than any or all explanations of it; the interpretation of the Christian experience in the terms of moral union with Christ; therefore a tendency to renew the meaning of Paul's 'in Christ' and to accent the mystical rather than the dogmatic or institutional phases of the Christian religion; the representation of the Christian religion as 'a way of living according to the principles of Jesus and in fellowship with Him'; therefore a major accent upon the central reality of the living Christ; intense moral passion concerning the practical matters of daily life; yearning for social justice and the realization of the kingdom of God; international sympathy and passion." The author states conditions correctly. In the American pulpit, especially where it is tinged with Modernism, the attempt is manifest to avoid concrete, primary, fundamental doctrines and to go grazing in the field of general moral truth, of ethical axioms, of feeling and social endeavor.—Other points touched on by Dr. Davis are: that the preacher nowadays conceives of his task as teaching, in which connection he makes the interesting statement that "the day-school of religious education seems to be growing in favor"; that there is an "increasing concern for the social applications of the Gospel"; that sermons are being preached to children quite frequently nowadays; that sermons on a book or a piece of literature and on great characters in history, especially Bible history, are gaining in popularity; that world peace is being advocated in the sermons of the American clergy, and that "the transmission of sermons over the radio is an important new factor in this field." Looking at the survey of the situation as given by Dr. Davis, we have to say that lovers of the old Gospel find what they prize most highly is being excluded more and more from the Reformed pulpits in America.

ARNDT.

"The Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ as King."—Under the title "Lutherans Will Not be Caught with the Pope's Bait" the *Lutheran Church Herald* of April 6 presents the recent resolutions of the "National Lutheran Council" in reference to the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI issued December 11, 1925. This letter in-

stitutes a "Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ as King," to be celebrated on the last Sunday of the month of October every year, and "commands also that on that day each year be renewed the dedication of the human race to the most Sacred Heart of Jesus which our predecessor, Pius X, of holy memory, orders to be repeated each year." The resolution of the Lutheran Council states: "It would seem almost a sacrilege to speak any word except in approval of such a feast and such a dedication. All true Christians desire to see Christ honored as King and pray that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. And we would not utter a word of dissent were it not for certain statements in the encyclical which are not true, which are sectarian in the worst sense, and which are uncharitable; and were it not for a fact which is obviously designing and hostile to very large groups of Christians and to widely accepted views of Christian truth. The Pope does not express the truth . . . when he says that 'the Catholic Church'—meaning, of course, the Roman Catholic Church—"is the kingdom of Christ on earth.' . . . There is no institution on earth, no person or order of persons, to whom we may point and say, 'Here behold the kingdom of Christ.' . . . Wheresoever the Spirit of God is and works through the means of grace, leading men to faith in Christ, there is the kingdom of Christ. To accept and celebrate this Feast of Christ as King in the very spirit of the encyclical is at least tacitly to acknowledge all of the pretensions of the Pope to temporal and universal sovereignty as Christ's vicar. . . . The Pope makes himself the head and leader of the most sectarian of all the sects and acts very uncharitably. The designing spirit and hostile purpose of the Pope are unmistakably visible in the choice of the day upon which, every year, the feast is to be celebrated. . . . We may not say that the Pope is not sincere in his expressed desire to see Jesus Christ universally recognized as King over all people and things on earth; but there can be no doubt that he thinks, and perhaps sincerely, that the best way to bring this about is to counteract, as far as possible, the Reformation and the liberating truths of the Gospel which it restored to men. . . . What a master-stroke it would be if His Holiness could set up a festival that would be enthusiastically celebrated with ' manifold ceremonies of veneration,' not only by Catholics, but also by great multitudes of Christians calling themselves Protestants! But we at least will not be caught. . . . May we not commend to the consideration of all Protestants the question whether they will not more certainly honor Christ as their Savior and King by faithfully adhering to the truth of the Gospel and conforming their lives thereto than by joining in the celebration of a mighty festival marked by 'magnificent processions' and outward 'ceremonies'?" MUELLER.

Is the Expositor's Greek Testament Altogether Reliable?— In the April number of the current volume of the *Review and Expositor* appears a good article on "The Watering of Luke." The writer, Prof. P. W. Crannell, of Kansas City, Kans., takes Dr. Bruce, who furnished the exposition of the Gospel according to St. Luke in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, to task and shows that the hyper-

critical and damaging conclusions of this scholar are untenable. We are accustomed to look upon the *Expositor's Greek Testament* as a conservative commentary, and, relatively speaking, it deserves to be classed as such. But it is surprising to what an extent negative criticism has been permitted to determine and to color the views presented in this far-famed work. Professor Crannell, in speaking of Bruce's treatment of St. Luke, complains of "his too frequent surrenders to the enemy," his "very free handling of the inspired writers," of "his seeming air of conscious superiority toward Luke in particular," and of such ire-stirring phrases as, "Luke has toned this down," "watered this down," and the like. The following paragraphs summarize quite well the objectionable elements in Bruce's comments and the line of thought pursued in Dr. Crannell's critical article:—

"What revolts the Bible student is Bruce's freedom of handling of Luke, his representation of Luke's freedom of handling the Gospel-facts, and the character of the disciples and of Jesus, his insistence on the overstrong influence of the subjective in Luke's writings, his theory of Luke's being enveloped in the magnifying, partly misleading, fog of the second-generation Christian hope and feeling. It is too much like the discrediting of John's gospel on the ground of its representing late views of Christ and not being the original, clear-cut conception of the Master gained in his lifetime by the eye-witness.

"A full treatment of our question should lead us into a thorough-going inquiry, first, as to what foundation there is for supposing that Luke's time of writing was such that he would see Christ through the nimbus of second-generation Christianity; secondly, as to what other writings, indubitably late in the century, do yield in the way of softened treatment and idealization; and thirdly and principally, does an actual study of Luke, in comparison with the others, reveal such a softened and haloed treatment? This article can, of course, do little more than hint at the outlines of such a study."

The purpose of this little notice is mainly to emphasize that as one approaches the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, the warning *cave!* is in place.

ARNDT.

What Is the Baptist Church?—This question has been agitating the Baptist Church as a whole for some time, chiefly because of dissension within the ranks, and the formal statement was to be agreed on at the Northern Baptist Convention, which met in Washington May 25—30. This group was to endeavor to define the Baptist Church as one "accepting the New Testament as its guide and composed only of baptized believers, baptism being by immersion." The difficulty in the whole matter, as stated by Elmer William Powell in the *Christian Century* of April 8, is that "Baptists have no machinery for making definitions, and churches vary in doctrine and practise through the centuries." The local church is regarded as independent and self-governing. Churches are united in conventions as missionary bodies, which at times endeavor to enforce a formulized creed, as the Northern Baptist Convention was to try to do. Mr. Powell states that to define the Baptist Church by the above-mentioned

definition, "as the Fundamentalists now prefer shall be done," "would break faith with the Free Baptists with their open membership churches and lead directly into the courts." The writer quotes Rev. F. M. Goodchild as stating, during attempts to merge Baptists and Free Baptists, in 1907: "We should demonstrate in our union that liberty promotes unity. The basis of union could not be creedal. . . . The Lord Jesus alone must be the object of our united allegiance. His New Testament must be our sole confession of faith." Then Mr. Powell laments the fact that Dr. Goodchild has become president of the Baptist Fundamentalists. "The attempt to define a Baptist church is for the purpose of excluding the Park Avenue Baptist Church, and this simply means Fosdick," is Mr. Powell's criticism, and he defends his disapproval: "The Park Avenue Church is following the line of Baptist faith and in the area of the Northern Baptist Convention there are hundreds of churches which now practise open membership, and hundreds of others will do so. . . . As a matter of fact the younger men in the ministry are moving toward open membership" — Communion or Baptism according to the dictates of the individual conscience — "and carry forward our Baptist genius. They are the true sons who insist on the 'faith of our fathers.'" The picture of a Church which is unable to exclude from its pastorate an out-and-out Modernist of Fosdick's type and which, on the other hand, cannot even defend its muddled confessional standpoint, is indeed a sorry one.

MUELLER.

The Minister and Books.—The *Watchman-Examiner* of April 8 quotes Dr. A. T. Robertson on this subject: "The pulpit has not been dethroned by the press, but the press challenges the pulpit to do its best. A pastor cannot remain indifferent to the reading habits of his people. What they read will help or hinder what he preaches. It is a perilous thing for the young or the unskilled to read only one-sided presentations of new 'isms' and fads before they know enough to answer the follies and fancies of idle dreamers. The pastor's sermon's should bear some relation to the reading of his people. Too often pastor and people live in different intellectual worlds. He does not know what they are reading and what they are thinking about. They do not understand what he is preaching about. The preacher should stimulate people to read good books rather than denounce bad books, which usually simply advertises them. In rural communities in particular a pastor has a great opportunity as a guide of the people. If there is no public library in the community, it will richly pay the church to have one and to fill it with good and great books that will enlarge the horizon and enrich the life of the people."

MUELLER.

Playing with Sacred Things.—What trifling argumentation is often resorted to when serious questions are to be decided was shown at the Presbyterian convention in Baltimore, when Dr. Macartney, of Chicago, opposed his brother, Dr. Macartney of Philadelphia, the latter of whom is a staunch Fundamentalist. The matter under discussion was that section of a report which dealt with the New York Presbytery and which, in the opinion of the Philadelphia Macartney,

was not satisfactory. The newspapers reported the address of the Chicago Macartney as follows: "Rev. Albert Macartney, addressing the assembly, and 'Brother Clarence' pleaded for peace and conciliation in a brief talk which many assemblymen called the most touching of the convention. 'Brother Clarence is all right,' he said. 'The only trouble with him is that he is not married. If he were, he wouldn't have so much time to worry over other people's theology. After years of ministering to a church, including thirty-five denominations, I am for the report from cover to cover; not so much for what it says as for its purpose and objects.' Recalling his childhood, he said: 'Mother used to sing to us our favorite hymns each night. For me she sang "Rock of Ages," and for Clarence she sang "There Is a Fountain Filled with Blood." We didn't know what that meant then, but it made for us the Christianity we then possessed, and were it possible for mother to return, we'd find our way to our old home in West Pennsylvania, and there'd be room for us to kneel and sing those hymns; and I believe there is room for us to kneel beside our great mother, the Presbyterian Church, in great loyalty to Jesus Christ.' The speech was ended among the most prolonged applause during the assembly."

Is it thus that great issues are met?

ARNDT.

A Preacher's Modern Temptations.—Modern temptations confronting the preacher, according to Elmer E. Conrath, writing in the April 15 issue of the *Watchman-Examiner*, are "akin to that which faced our Lord when the devil took Him up on a high mountain and promised Him the whole world if He would do certain things." The first type of temptation is that on the road to distinction. In former times, according to Mr. Conrath, distinctions came through faithful cure of souls, sound preaching of doctrine, and striving for uprightness in the community. "But in these modern days, in the ministry as elsewhere, there are short cuts, if not to glory, at least to notoriety and certainty of getting in the public eye for a day or two. The preacher who thirsts for fame has two courses open to him. One is to attack the Bible." The writer shows that this procedure effects "a big house—for a few sermons at least." "But it soon fails; it is the path of lesser ability; for 'the sort of ability that could get only an ordinary hearing for a sermon on John 3, 16 and could not even begin to do justice to that piece of Scripture gets a three-column streamer to the effect that 'Dr. Dingus Declares the Bible is Out of Date.'"

The other method of gaining notoriety listed by Mr. Conrath is by proceeding "to deliver a sermon, or issuing a statement, to the effect that prohibition is a failure. . . ." Though Mr. Conrath seems to make quite a point of the fact that the latter proceeding is rather against the practise of the Church than of the ministry, yet he is right in denouncing the pastor who degrades the pulpit into an organ of disreputable sensationalism.

MUELLER.

Religion and Prosperity.—Roger W. Babson, the noted business expert and statistician, recently expressed the opinion that religion is at the foundation of prosperity. Statistics show that all worth-

while things in the world—I include inventions, industries, railroads, public utilities—originate with a very small group of people. Statistics further show that ninety per cent. of this small group owe their vision, faith, and courage to a praying father or a praying mother. . . . The real security for property and legitimate investments rests upon the religion of the nation. The value of our stocks, bonds, deeds, and mortgages lies with the motives of the people. With fifty-one per cent. of the people honest and having at heart the good of the commonwealth, our legitimate property and investments are safe. . . . The real safeguards of your savings are not the banks, but the churches.” As the quoting editorial states: “It is a healthy sign when men who could hardly speak with authority on the subject of religion realize that religion—and especially the Christian religion, whose teachings they cannot but admire—is the need of the hour if business and industry are ever to be rescued from the selfish, mercenary, and inhuman spirit which is making havoc with the Golden Rule.” If Babson and others could realize the true way by which Christianity works for good in the community and state, then their commendation would be even more emphatic. MUELLER.

On “Hearing the Other Side.” — The *Homiletic Review* for June, 1926, contains an editorial on the old Latin maxim, *Audi alteram partem*. The principle is good enough, but the application made of it there is not satisfactory. The reader may judge for himself, as the article is reprinted herewith:—

“The caption of this editorial is a fundamental principle in court procedure, both civil and criminal. But outside the restricted field of jurisprudence, to ‘hear the other side’ is as vital to ascertainment of truth as it is to the spirit of fairness. Indeed, at the moment we cannot conceive a section in the whole area of human action and thought where it should not apply. The researcher in physical science who thinks he has discovered a new chemical element (such as illinium, the latest addition to known elements) is not satisfied with positive evidence in the presence of certain lines in the spectrum; he searches for negative testimony. Is there any other known substance, he asks, which under the conditions may give the same lines? “The other side!” The way to the conquest of yellow fever was discovered in similar fashion. Patients bitten by a certain species of mosquito contracted the fever; those carefully guarded from bites escaped the infection. Again, the other side! And so it is always in such scientific research as permits the acid and impartial test of agreement and difference.

“In view of this habit, this inflexible rule, or method, in science, is it not a bit strange that in matters religious, theological, or political many not only do not seek to know ‘the other side,’ but even grow angry at the mere expression of an opinion not their own? They seem never to have prayed the prayer: Lord, make it possible for me to apprehend that I can be mistaken. The indirect suggestion of such a possibility discovered in the statement of a position other than their own acts as incitement to passion and challenge to combat.

They do not so much want to be right as to be left in the comfort of self-assurance undisturbed by suggestion of doubt of the correctness of their conclusions. Hence, on the one hand, they read what they like, believe, and hold, and, on the other, eschew all else. A Republican paper or (not *and*) one Democratic, a Fundamentalist magazine or (not *and*) one that is Modernist, is all-sufficient. And so, unconsciously, but inevitably, they become intellectually asymmetrical, dwarfed, gnarled, misshapen, intolerant, and often intolerable. They know not the serenity of mental poise, the equability of a mind established in the truth by seeing it from all angles.

"Among the worst of the sequelae of this habit of mind is the weakening of moral fiber resulting from the absence of that best of disciplines, self-discipline. When a minister says (as one has said), 'I can't read on evolution because it would 'upset my theory of Old Testament symbolism,' or (as another said), 'I dare not read Biblical Introduction because I might have to reconstruct my theory of the Bible,' both display a laxity of moral resolve and a fearfulness of fact which are fatal to leadership. The timid never 'lead' either a forlorn hope or a victorious assault.

"Facts are God's finger-posts. Who ignores them may wander far in the slough of the unverified."

To hear the other side is fair. But no one ought to demand that after you have heard the other side and have acquainted yourself with the arguments produced and have recognized them as false, you should continue listening to that side just as though you had not taken a stand in the controversy. Such an attitude would befit skepticism, but would not be in keeping with that joyous faith which has found in Christ the realization of its highest hopes and wishes. Some people are always doubting. They seem intensely interested in digging up difficulties. It has been well said that they are like the man who, having climbed up a tree, is trying to saw off the branch on which he is sitting. In such a case it is no longer the *Audi alteram partem* principle which is dictating the action, but unbelief.

ARNDT.

The Bible in the Public Schools.—Another expression on this topic, brought forth by the proposed bill in Virginia compelling the reading of the Bible in the public schools, is quoted by the *Baptist* of April 10, from the *Religious Herald* of the Virginia Baptists: "We would encourage the reading of the Bible in every way open to us—in the home, in the church, by the way, everywhere and in all possible and suitable conditions. But Baptists will never consent to have the state exercise authority in matters of religion. They are bound to protest when any such effort is made. They know what their forefathers suffered and endured. They know that they have entered into their heritage of religious liberty in this State through the toil and suffering of others. Hence the day is probably far distant when Virginia Baptists will acquiesce in any proposal to turn over to the Commonwealth any authority in the realm of religion."

MUELLER.

The True Nature of Modernism Becoming Known. — The *Watchman-Examiner* carries a Fundamentalist's page, in which the following interesting item recently appeared: —

"A few years ago the Fundamentalists were kicked and scoffed at, and the Modernists were hailed as the prophets of a new age. Things have changed a bit. The newspapers do not sneer at Fundamentalists as they did. In denominational councils their opinions are asked. The Modernists are having their turn in being bally-whacked. Even their one-time friends are turning against them. We remember that after the Buffalo convention the *Christian Register*, the organ of the Unitarians, issued an 'All hail' to the 'Unitarians' of the Northern Baptist convention. It has no kind words to say now of the Modernists among us, whom it greeted fraternally then. It does not honor them by the name Modernists. It calls them Institutionalists, following the lead of Prof. Kirsopp Lake. It approves Prof. W. T. Waugh's words that for Unitarians to make terms with them is 'treating with the enemy.' It says with Herbert Croly in the *New Republic* that their influence is 'chiefly on the reactionary side.' It declares that, 'although many of them pride themselves on being liberal, their Liberalism consists largely in applying to religion the compromising technique of opportunist politics.' Then it proceeds to castigate the whole group by saying: 'The Modernist is the man in the credal orthodox churches who wants peace and not division. He says that theology is unnecessary and that unity is everything. He does not plead for truth, but only for fellowship. He says that Fundamentalist and Modernist can live and work together, and if they cannot seek the truth and think together, why should they think anyhow? It is not necessary. Religion is not a matter of thought, of doctrine. Religion is a way of life.' And then the *Register* pronounces the judgment: 'The Institutional (Modernist) is a compromiser, as the Fundamentalist is not.' All this is not a Fundamentalist's description of a Modernist. But apter, truer words could not be chosen. As the Modernist reads them, he will feel the truth of Dean Brown's words: 'It is just as easy to be opinionated and disagreeable on the liberal side of the fence as it is on the conservative side.'"

ARNDT.

A Nut for the Evolutionists to Crack. — The *Presbyterian* some time ago printed the following facetious little article, which originally appeared in a Kansas paper and which has not lost any of its attractiveness by doing extensive traveling: —

"Scientists have discovered that the humble, but very much despised cockroach ranks first in antiquity among all the creatures of the earth. And in making this discovery, the same scientists have been 'hoist by their own petard,' as the old-time country editor would say, for the reason that the present-day cockroach shows no change whatever from his ancestors of two hundred thousand years ago. If there is anything in this talk of evolutionists that creatures are ever changing, such, for instance, as ape into man, why is it that the cockroach has not changed? When confronted with this question,

Tom McNeal, editor of the *Kansas Farmer* and an evolutionist of the first water, dismissed it, as most scientists do, with the query: 'Who would want to evolve from the cockroach anyway?' Another scientist replied that the cockroach attained millions of years ago so perfect an adjustment to nature that no alteration was necessary. But this explanation is rather far-fetched because the cockroach had no cupboards, pantries, or ice-boxes to get into millions of years ago. Certainly there is just as much reason for a cockroach to change its form and habits to overcome the modern barriers to its food supply as for an ape to quit hanging by his tail when the cocoanuts ran out and begin working in a garden for his food supply. It will be hard for the evolutionists to convince all the people that man descended from the monkey until they clear up this cockroach business."

ARNDT.

Is Modern Geology Reliable?—Dr. Bartoli, who is considered one of the eminent scientific men of Italy to-day, has written a book entitled, *The Biblical Story of Creation*, in which, according to the *Sunday-school Times*, the following appraisal of present-day geology is found:—

"Geology is hardly a science at all. It tries empirically to say something about the formation of the earth's crust, but sound reasoning and the certain data from experiments forbid us to lay down any theory as certain and definite. Geology is a science in the making, a science of the future, not certainly a science to-day. Its three principal theories as to the origin of rocks, plutonism, neptunism, and vulcanism, have ended in skepticism. Theories follow one another in quick succession and satisfy no one. Not a day passes that does not see new hypotheses, new schemes, new plans, new tabulated results, as to the formation of the earth; in reality there is a babel of tongues and nothing more. If any reader doubts this assertion, let him consult books on geology, and he will undeceive himself.

"Must we wonder at all this? By no means. Geologists have undertaken an impossible task. Looking upon an immense globe of ruins and broken fragments, they want to tell us how the first fabric of the earth rose and came into being. A vain labor, a useless effort! They will never succeed in their endeavors. If, however, laying aside their preconceived ideas of evolution, they accept the Bible's account of the reconstruction [?] of the earth, they will have light in the darkness by which they are surrounded. The internal structure of the earth will not appear, then, as mysterious as now." ARNDT.

The Bross Prize.—The late William Bross left to the trustees of Lake Forest University a sum of \$40,000, from the proceeds of which every ten years a prize of \$6,000 is awarded for the best book fulfilling the conditions of the deed of trust, the objects of which are "to call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world, to illustrate from science or any department of knowledge, and to demonstrate the divine origin and authority of

the Christian Scriptures; and, further, to show how both science and revelation coincide and to prove the existence, the providence, or any or all of the attributes of the one living and true God, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." The latest award is made to Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University, for his book *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. The *Presbyterian* (Jan. 7, 1926) bluntly states: "A candid examination of it will convince any intelligent reader that it would have been more accurately named if he had called it 'The Unreasonableness of Christianity,' provided the word Christianity be taken in its historical meaning as designating the religion established by Jesus Christ and His apostles and believed on by the Church of all ages." One of the author's keynotes is: "All that has been said of the reasonableness and truth of Christianity is demonstrably valid whether we have any Christology or not and whatever we may or may not believe about the historic Jesus. It would still be valid if it should turn out that Jesus was essentially different from what has been commonly believed, or even that He was not truly historical at all." The *Presbyterian* comments: "In extracting from historical Christianity what he calls the essence of Christianity, Professor Macintosh proceeds on the assumption that nothing that is irrational or immoral can belong to the essence of Christianity. The significance of this procedure appears when it is perceived that, in his judgment, everything of the nature of the miraculous is irrational and that the thought of salvation through the expiatory death of another is immoral. . . . He is able to write thus concerning that which the Christians of all ages have regarded, and rightly, as the very heart of Christianity: 'Much less is it reasonable to suppose that the divine justice was satisfied by Jesus' vicarious suffering on the cross, viewed as a substitutionary punishment of the sinner's sin. Any such notion is not only not a part of the essence of Christianity; it is essential to the well-being of Christianity that it be eliminated from the Christian's belief.' Surely we need say no more to make clear that the Bross Prize volume of 1925 is definitely and polemically antichristian." The judges who awarded the prize were Drs. Kerr and MacIntosh, of a Presbyterian church in Pittsburgh and McCormick Theological Seminary, respectively, and Dean Shailer Mathews of the Chicago University Divinity School. The quoted issue of the *Presbyterian* laments the judgment of at least the Presbyterian ministers.

MUELLER.

American Illiteracy.—One of the motives which prompts more school and compulsory education laws is seen in the results of the 1920 census, which revealed that there were at that time 4,931,905 people in the United States who could neither read nor write; and of the army tests, which proved that there was a practical illiteracy of 24.9 per cent. The question remains whether compulsory school legislation, and especially the pernicious type prohibiting parochial schools, is the answer to the problem.

MUELLER.

"The Movies for Morons."—The editorial comment of the February issue of the *Catholic World* brings some interesting thoughts on the movies: "Every one criticizes the 'movies.' Yet every one seems to continue to go to them. I hear of no one who resolves—and keeps his resolution—not to go. The truth is that the moving pictures have become indispensable. At their best they are wonderful; at their worst they are unspeakable. That is to say, they are like books and paintings and music and people. There is the point—they are like the people. Critics, especially critics who have intelligence, are apt to forget what the people are like. The intellectuals object to the moving pictures as an insult to the intelligence of the public. They forget that it is difficult, indeed, practically impossible, to insult the intelligence of the public. Of course, we have had public schools and parochial schools for many generations. And we have hundreds of colleges, annually flooding the country with presumably intelligent graduates. But the dismal fact remains that the 'public' as such is almost inconceivably dull-witted. One proof of that fact is that the public does not rise up and hoot most of the pictures off the screen. . . . The truth is the public doesn't recognize the insipidity and the asininity of most of the pictures. That is to say, the public is moronesque, if not exactly moron. . . . Moron . . . means simply one whose mental level is that of a normal child of eight or twelve years."

MUELLER.

A Reformation Day in India.—Missionary Blaess, of Ambur, India, reports a combined service of the native congregations in Ambur and vicinity in the *Australian Lutheran* of January 20, 1926. Preliminary work was the distribution of about 800 programs, containing an order of the services to be held and a translation of *What the Lutheran Church Stands For* by Prof. Th. Graebner, the posting of placards with sentence sermons in Tamil and English, with Bible-passages, in prominent places of the town, and information given by the Christians when questioned regarding the material. The festival was celebrated on November 1. It opened with a service in the morning, attended by 500 people from Ambur and some 25 villages surrounding. After the service the visitors were shown the mission-work at Ambur: the hospital, the girls' boarding-school, the high school, Cheri School, and other features. A meal of native dishes was served at 1 o'clock by the Ambur congregation. At 3.30 p. m., the boys of the boarding-school staged a parade, carrying a banner and singing songs, returning with a number of Hindus and Mohammedans in their wake. The evening service was marked by the substitution of the recitation in Tamil of the story of Luther's life in place of the sermon. After the service another meal was served, hymns and lyrics were sung, and fireworks displayed. The report also presents some interesting information concerning the Gospel Training-station at Ambur, which is designed to train men for the position of teachers and Gospel-workers. The first class finished April, 1925; six members of this class are in active work, and the

seventh is studying in Nagerecoil Seminary. The second class, consisting of eight men, will finish April, 1926. Due to accidents and illness among the members of the faculty of this school, the work at the time of writing was in the hands of Missionaries Blaess and Noffke—an arduous task alongside of mission-work. The missionaries are filled with zeal for the work, but complain of the shortage of men in the field and plead for reinforcements. Their call deserves an answer.

MUELLER.

Denominationalism in the Foreign Field.—Is there any one that has at any time bestowed a modicum of thought on the extension of Christianity in heathen countries to whom the division of the Church into many opposing denominations has not appeared a very formidable hindrance? Modernistic mission boards are endeavoring to evolve a Christianity which will not be hampered by distinctive beliefs and form the basis for one great national Christian Church in China, in India, etc. That a Christianity having a basis so broad that the Unitarians, the Methodists, and the Lutherans can stand on it is no longer real Christianity is, of course, a truth hidden from such promoters. Dr. W. O. Carver, Professor of Missions in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, writes touching this matter in the *Review and Expositor* (April, 1926): “However much and however honestly we deplore Western denominationalism, is it, after all, quite so serious a hindrance to the acceptance of Christianity in missionary countries as we sometimes imagine? One recalls having heard the late Bishop Thoburn say that he had never known an Indian to raise this objection unless it had been suggested to him by some foreigner. With more than forty denominations of Buddhism in Japan, with a considerable number of them in China, with various local cults in every community, is the human mind in China so desperately confused by various interpretations of a new faith? It is not at all argued that our Western denominations should be perpetuated in China; it is suggested that doctrinaire theories, proposed and promoted by foreigners, may be much more largely responsible for the hindrance in the Chinese mind than has properly been taken account of. Until we are ready and able to transcend our denominationalism in the West, we cannot hope to conceal it from the non-Christian world or from the newer churches in China, and the effort to do so might suggest something of insincerity rather than afford a winning appeal in the missionary lands. It is hardly to be hoped that we shall be able to overcome a past built up through many centuries by piously saying: ‘Go to, let us build a simple, undivided, unhampered Christianity in China.’ We shall probably have to solve our homeland and our foreign-land problem of Christian unity *pari passu*.” While a divided Church is certainly not in keeping with the will of God, there is something infinitely worse, be it at home or abroad, namely, the modern apostasy, which calls itself Christian, but has robbed Jesus of His divine glory and teaches salvation by works.

ARNDT.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — According to the reports of the newspapers, the Fundamentalists did not win their battles at the recent conventions of the large Reformed church-bodies. The outcome seems to have been a draw. In civic life we applaud the man who says with Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death." When it comes to religion, people exhibit a strange readiness to be tyrannized or to have their sweetest convictions trampled on. The peace-at-any-price atmosphere seems to have prevailed at these gatherings.

The daily press informed us that the recent Presbyterian convention refused to confirm the appointment of the well-known Fundamentalist leader, Rev. Dr. Gresham Machen, to the Chair of Ethics at Princeton Theological Seminary. On one day we were told that this unfavorable action was "on the ground that Dr. Machen voted against a resolution offered in the New Brunswick Presbytery endorsing the Eighteenth Amendment and pledging the support of the Presbytery to the Volstead Act." On another day the public was informed that Dr. Machen was a man who cannot get along with people. Those who have met Dr. Machen personally will agree that he is a man of charming personality. The charge that he cannot get along with people seems to have no other foundation than his refusal to sanction anticonfessional teachings in his Church.

A newspaper advertisement paid for by a Catholic business man says: "Catholics believe the ordinary method of propagating Christianity is by preaching, not by writing or circulating the Bible. See Mark 16, 16: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.' Printing was not invented until the fifteenth century." Are we not here reminded of the opposition found in some quarters to the singing of the words of institution when the elements are consecrated in the Lord's Supper, an opposition based on this, that the Bible reports, "Christ said," and not, "Christ sang"? It is surprising that the author of the above Roman Catholic advertisement connives at the printing of any Bibles at all, since the prophets and apostles were told to "write" and not to "print." Enough said!

A St. Louis paper contained the following item: "The Young People's Department of St. Peter's Evangelical Church will hold its annual banquet and circus to-morrow night, with an address by Mayor Miller, at the church, St. Louis and Warne Avenues." We have been wondering what brand of "high jinks" was exhibited at that "circus." The very term in connection with church-work is utterly obnoxious.

Die Allgem. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung reports that at an intersynodical Lutheran conference in India representatives of the Ohio Synod refused to join the other Lutherans (for instance, the Leipzig people, the Swedes, and Merger representatives) in a Communion service because the common doctrinal basis was lacking. May God strengthen these men in opposing unscriptural unionism!

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin has been chosen President of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and has accepted the call. Dr. Coffin, before this, was pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, which he served for twenty years. His predecessor, as head of Union Seminary, was the well-known church historian Dr. Arthur C. McGiffert, who relinquished the presidency on account of ill health. Both men mentioned are thorough-going Modernists.

The *Sunday-school Times*, several months ago, contained this interesting item on the origin of the American Indian: "The American Indian came from China. The Chinese came from the West and can easily be traced from the direction of Afghanistan, and from there the lines are still not altogether obliterated; we connect the language with that of the Euphrates Valley." In similar manner the lines of migration in the West all lead back toward the Euphrates Valley in Mesopotamia. As far as we know anything on this subject, the statement of Paul that "God made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" is absolutely scientific.

ARNDT.