

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

---

VOL. XI.

OCTOBER, 1907.

No. 4.

---

---

## CORDATUS' CONTROVERSY WITH MELANCHTHON.

The period of unrest at the university of Wittenberg during the year 1536 and the following years affords material for reflection to the psychologist, the historian, and the dogmatist. We behold men whose names have become household words in the Lutheran Church in a curious disagreement with each other. When righteous men differ, they expose not only their points of difference, but also themselves, their character, to public view. And when the matter at issue between them concerns the common faith of Christians, every believer has reason to take notice of the difference and to try to understand its weight. The study of a theological controversy, when rightly pursued, is very useful. It aids the student materially in fixing in his own mind both the  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  and the  $\pi\tilde{\omega}\zeta$  of a doctrine, the matter proposed for man's belief and the correct manner of proposing it. The personal features of a controversy — and what controversy was ever without such features? — may not be pleasant and delectable. But even from these features the student may draw wholesome lessons for his own conduct.

In the controversy before us we find a close friend of Luther arrayed against another very dear friend of the Reformer. Cordatus, the pastor of Niemeck, is usually represented as a narrow-minded, quarrelsome character, an orthodox verbalist, a self-seeking worshiper of Luther. His frequent changes of pastorate — Koestlin even speaks of his being driven out of Bohemia — seem to indicate a morose temperament. His

## BOOK REVIEW.

---

HANDBOOK FOR THE BEGINNER'S HOME STUDY IN THE WORD OF GOD. By *Carl Manthey-Zorn*, Pastor of Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church, Cleveland, O. Translated by *H. M. Zorn* and *J. A. Rimbach*. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1907. Price, \$1.25.

HANDBUCH FUER DEN ERSTEN SELBSTUNTERRICHT IN GOTTES WORT. By the same author and publisher. Price, \$1.00.

It is a mistake to suppose that the congregations of the Missouri Synod are growing only by natural increase, and that this growth has been so rapid because the Germans are a prolific race and, as a rule, raise large families. Adult accessions to our churches are not at all uncommon. If all have been reported by the respective pastors, there were about 600 such accessions to our churches during the year 1906. Especially in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin our pastors have been busy instructing adults preparatory to baptism, or con-

---

9) See THEOL. QUART. X, 96.

10) This rendering of Prof. Hoppe certainly harmonizes with the context. Walch has translated *et a papistis ferior*: "and I am beaten by the papists."

firmation, or both. Half of the adult accessions during 1906 have been in these three states. Next in order follow the Central, Western, Minnesota and Dakota, Michigan, and Eastern Districts, each of which has furnished a goodly quota of such accessions; in fact, there has not been a district in which no adult applicants for church-membership were instructed. The statistics extant also show that a large percentage of these adults required instruction through the medium of the English language, and were received into the churches by the rite of confirmation. The strict rule of our church in regard to the admission of persons to membership impose on our pastors a good deal of labor. Our congregations hold their pastors responsible for each and every communicant who receives the Lord's Supper at their altars. They demand, in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, that persons shall not be admitted to the Lord's Table who would commune unworthily, because they have not been taught the meaning nor the correct use of the sacrament. Accordingly, our pastors instruct applicants for membership in the doctrines of the Church, and do not admit them until they have given satisfactory evidence, by professing their faith in the presence of witnesses, that they understand the meaning of the chief doctrines of Scripture. In the case of children this work is comparatively easy, because through the work of our parochial schools the indoctrination of the children has been going on for years prior to the child's confirmation. The catechetical instruction, moreover, which is given immediately before confirmation is in most cases imparted to classes of catechumens at a convenient time during the day, and while the catechumens are attending school. But in the case of adults instruction must very often be given to one individual and at odd hours during the day or evening. The course of instruction is frequently interrupted through unavoidable engagements of the pastor, or of the catechumen. In order to advance the pupil speedily, the pastor will be compelled at times to restrict his teaching to the most necessary matters. In short, this part of a pastor's work often proves a grievous crux, and a conscientious pastor is ill at ease during its progress. Now, here comes Pastor Zorn with a very practical aid: a book which can be put into the hands of adults, and by which they can study the leading doctrines of the Lutheran Catechism, and the leading facts of Bible history at home. This book does not supplant the oral teaching of the pastor, but it supplements and intensifies it. It is quite ingeniously constructed. The first part treats the following matters: Natural Knowledge of God; the Bible; Creation; the Fall; Sin; the First Gospel; the Holy Trinity; the Human Race during the First 1500 Years of the World; the Flood; the Tower of

Babel and the Confusion of Languages; Abraham, the Ancestor of God's Elect Nation; Isaac, Jacob, Judah, the Successive Bearers of the Divine Promises; Moses; the Promulgation of the Law on Mount Sinai; the Ten Commandments, in the form and with the explanation which Luther has given them in the Small Catechism; the Forty Years' Sojourn in the Desert and the Conquest of Canaan; Samuel and Saul; King David; King Solomon, the Building of the Temple, the Division of the Empire, and the Babylonian Captivity; the Return from Babylon; the Further Fortunes of the Jewish Nation; the Prophets of Israel and their Prophecies. All this matter is presented in 22 chapters and on 89 pages.—The Second Part discusses, in 19 chapters and on 133 pages, the following subjects: How God Sent His Son, Made of a Woman; How John Discharged, and How Jesus Began His Ministry; the Miracles of Jesus; Jesus Receives Sinners; God Would Have Us Hear Jesus' Word in the Holy Scriptures; the Suffering and Death of Jesus for Our Sake; the Resurrection of Jesus; His Ascension; the Pouring Out of the Holy Spirit; Peter's First Pentecostal Discourse, and the Gathering of the First Christian Congregation at Jerusalem; Faith; the First Article of the Creed; the Person of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; the Office of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; His State of Humiliation; His State of Exaltation; the Holy Spirit and Sanctification; the Church; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting.—The Third Part informs the reader, in 9 chapters and on 58 pages, on Prayer, the Lord's Prayer; the Meaning of the Terms "Means of Grace" and "Sacrament;" the Sacrament of Holy Baptism; Additional Remarks on Baptism; the Office of the Keys; Confession; the Lord's Supper; Concluding Remarks concerning Confirmation.—Pastor Zorn has a peculiar manner of urging and impressing upon the hearer what he has to say. He seizes him, as it were, by force, and makes him listen and understand. There is no getting away from his grasp. And he is very earnest, very persuasive, pleading, direct in his applications even to brusqueness, so that one almost trembles for the pupil to whom the teaching is addressed sometimes with the startling effect of a revelation. This book will prove a very effective teacher by its sound and plain scripturalness and its irresistible address. The original has not suffered perceptibly through the translation; in fact, the translation is scrupulously faithful.—We wish for this book a large sale and suggest that it is also a suitable compend for such as would like to review their Catechism years after their confirmation, but are diffident through want of a guide.

---

POEMS FOR PASTIME. Selected by *C. Abbtmeyer*, Ph. D.  
 St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1907.  
 V and 190 pp. Price, 40 cts.

Ninety classical poems, each one a gem, and many of them favorites of long standing, have here been collected, grouped, and annotated. Byron, Southey, Longfellow, Whittier, Uhland, and Bryant are the authors most favored. Incidentally the compiler introduces our Pastor Meyer of this city as a poet of promise in *The Women of Weinsberg* and in Uhland's *The Inn*. The book affords very delightful reading. Our teachers of English should examine it.

---

THE LORD'S PRAYER. By *William Dallmann*. Pittsburg, Pa.  
 American Lutheran Publication Board. 1907. 271 pp.  
 Price per copy, \$1.00; dozen copies, 80 cts. each; hundred copies, 70 cts. each.

This book represents the latest harvest from a field that has been tilled before by many a husbandman. Within fifteen centuries, from Origen (*περὶ εὐχῆς*) to Tholuck (*Bergpredigt*), there has accumulated a small library of expositions of the Lord's Prayer. The exegete, the dogmatician, the homilist, the hymn-writer, have pored over this prayer, and their lucubrations have served to open the eyes of believers to behold wondrous things out of this prayer and to ponder the height and depth, the length and breadth of these seven words of our Lord. Some of the best books of the most famous theologians of the Church have been written on this subject. And still expositions of the Lord's Prayer are welcome, especially such as are written for popular use. The English Lutheran Church, in particular, has wanted such an exposition; for the work of the most popular writer of our Church, Luther, is not accessible to the majority of Lutheran laymen, being bound up in the Book of Concord with the other confessional writings of the Church. A separate edition of Luther's treatise on the Lord's Prayer in the Larger Catechism would be a grateful addition to the stock of popular literature in our Church.—Pastor Dallmann follows Luther's well-known exposition in the Smaller Catechism, however, according to an arrangement peculiarly his own. The prologue is treated three times over as "a word of faith" (emphasis on "Father"), "a word of charity" (emphasis on "our"), "a word of hope" (emphasis on "heavenly"). The First Petition presents "Our Father's Name:" 1. What is God's name? 2. What is meant by hallowing God's name? 3. How do we hallow

God's name? "Our Father's Kingdom" is the theme of the Second Petition; the exposition introduces 1. the three kingdoms of power, grace, and glory, and shows 2. that it is for the last two that we pray. In the Third Petition the author explains "Our Father's Will:" 1. What is it? 2. How is it done? 3. Examples of doing it. 4. The manner of doing it. "Our Father's Bread" is the theme of the next discourse: 1. What it is: a. "bread;" b. "daily" bread; c. daily bread "this day." 2. How is bread gotten? a. By God's operation; b. by man's cooperation. 3. How to be received? a. With a grateful heart toward God; b. with a charitable hand toward our neighbor. In the Fifth Petition, treating "Our Father's Forgiveness," the author shows 1. why forgiveness is needed; 2. how it is asked; 3. how it is gotten; 4. what it requires. The Sixth Petition explains 1. what is our Father's Temptation; 2. how it is endured; 3. what it requires. "Our Father's Deliverance," the Seventh Petition, is divided as follows: 1. What is the evil from which man needs deliverance? 2. What is its origin? 3. How are we delivered from evil? "Our Father's Doxology" is treated 1. as an argument, 2. as a confession, 3. as a pledge, 4. as a praisegiving. The concluding section, "Our Father's 'Amen,'" explains 1. the meaning of Amen, 2. why am I certain that a true prayer will be answered, 3. why many prayers are not answered. To this is added a eulogy, "In Praise of the Lord's Prayer."

The contents of this book were preached to the congregations which the author has served successively. These sermons have thus been subjected to repeated tests. They are thoroughly Scriptural and practical. The author's style is animated, a wealth of illustrative matter enlivens the discourse, and the diction is adorned with many a choice phrase. Occasionally the author comes dangerously near the point where a preacher sacrifices dignity. We imagine he must be a very earnest speaker and have complete control of his audience who can recite the two silly prayers on p. 8 without provoking mirth and disturbing the devotional frame of mind among his hearers. In a few places, too, we have felt that illustrations, anecdotes, were introduced in too great number and in very rapid succession. The anecdote should be used sparingly in the sermon and with great discretion, lest the audience attaches more importance to the speaker's illustrations than to the matters illustrated. The author's illustrations are often decidedly modern, showing that he lives in the Twentieth Century and is speaking to twentieth-century people. The diamond stud in the shirt front, the Axminster rug, the snapshot photo, the pneumatic rubber tire, etc.,—references

like these to present-day life give a certain directness and freshness to the author's remarks. Altogether we observe that concreteness is one of the merits of these discourses, and we imagine they must have been listened to with rapt attention and gone straight to the hearts of the listeners. There are passages of great power in these sermons, *e. g.*, the apostrophe "Thy kingdom come!" sustained through three pages and a half, and the doxology treated as a praisingiving. As a good Lutheran the author is at his best when he preaches the forgiveness of sin and the subduing of sin. His exposition of the Fifth and Sixth Petitions are among the best portions of the book. This book will be a welcome addition to Lutheran home libraries. For use at home especially we wish to commend this book heartily.

---

THE ELEMENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By *Carl August Blomgren*, Ph. D., Professor of Sacred Theology Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. Augustana Book Concern. IV and 102 pp. Price, 75 cts.

Like Lövgren's Church History, issued from the same press, the present book also excels by its brevity and compactness. To condense the essentials of Biblical Theology in nine chapters (Religion, God, Creation, Man, The Redeemer, The Application of Redemption, The Means of Grace, The Church, The Last Things) and on 100 pages octavo, is certainly a remarkable feat and, if it is well executed, worthy of commendation. It goes without saying that the full elucidation of theological terms, the force of Scripture passages in fixing a certain teaching, and extensive references to standard works of the teachers of the Lutheran Church, had to be sacrificed. Of the older dogmaticians we have found one brief citation each from Luther, Melancthon, Gerhard, Calovius, Dietrich, Hollaz, Bengel. The author's favorite authorities are Jacobs (Summary of Faith), Heinrich Schmidt (Doctrinal Theology of Ev. Luth. Ch.), Schaff (Propaed.), The Lutheran Cyclopedia, and Henry B. Smith. To these he appeals constantly and their writings he cites quite liberally for a book of this size. The book is probably intended as a text-book for use by classes in dogmatics, and the lecturer is supposed to expand its brief paragraphs. — The theological *Richtung* of the author can be gleaned, without great difficulty, from a statement like this: "Theology is the science of the Christian religion, as revealed in the Bible, received by faith, and confessed by believers." This definition (which the

author has italicized like the other definitions in his book) is not remarkable for originality. It has been for many years current coin in all divinity schools in which modern theology is dominant. It was made in Germany. It has been constructed out of Luthardt's "science of Christianity." But the definition *is* remarkable for insincerity. That the author desires to have the term "science" understood in its common acceptation is plain from the context, because, both before and after, he speaks of "a system of Christian doctrines," "a system of theology," "a harmonious, self-consistent system of divine truth," and "an organic unity" of the facts and truths of divine truth. In his definition the author claims that this science has been revealed in the Bible, and that faith receives it. Just this is what the author does not believe, and therefore ought not say. For he tells us: "The Bible itself is *not* a system of theology, but it *contains* a harmonious, self-consistent system of divine truth." Accordingly, when he declares in his definition that the science of the Christian religion is revealed in the Bible and received by faith, he is insincere. He has omitted one very important feature from his definition, *viz.*, the mention how the Bible, which is not a system, but merely contains a system, does reveal a science and can hand this revealed science, ready-made, to the believer who receives it. In the paragraph preceding the definition the author has explained how this is possible. "All the faculties of man are quickened into a higher and nobler activity by the divine life planted in the soul, through the powers of the Holy Spirit. Not only his spiritual and moral, but also his intellectual powers are thereby enabled to lay hold of *the realities of true religion*. As these realities are apprehended by faith and enlightened reason, they also tend to resolve themselves into a system of Christian doctrines." And in the paragraph following he says: "Biblical theology sums up these facts and truths into an organic unity." "Biblical theology," of course, in this instance is a gentleman; it is identical with what was called before "faith and enlightened reason." Both terms signify not an abstract idea but a *person*, namely, man whenever a higher and nobler activity has been quickened in him and he begins to lay hold of, to apprehend, to resolve into a system, to sum up into an organic unity, the realities of true religion. We hold therefore that the author's definition, if it is to express his true mind, must read somewhat like this: Theology is the science of the Christian religion, *evolved from the Bible by the intellectual powers, in particular, by the enlightened reason of a believer*, who has been quickened into activity by the Holy Ghost, and who confesses that he has found this science in the Bible, although it was not there at the

start. Definitions are convenient forms into which to comprise every essential feature of the matter to be defined. The author states his *summum genus*, science, and a number of *specific differences*, he leaves out the one essential sp. d., the process by which theology becomes the science of the Christian religion. He would have his readers and pupils believe, and state to others, that the science of which he speaks is extant in Scripture, and all that is necessary is that they appropriate it and confess it. To the extent, therefore, to which the author has omitted from his definition the matter contained in the words italicized in our attempted revision above, we hold him to be insincere. The students who shall have to learn this definition have our sympathy. For even in its revised form and expressing the author's mind fully, the definition defines a non-ens. Where is that enlightened reason which has found the realities of true religion, — whatever that may mean! — resolving themselves into a system of Christian doctrines and into an organic unity? The author recommends Luthardt's *Compendium* to the student for further reading. What evidence can the author produce that the Holy Spirit operated through the faith and enlightened reason of Luthardt any more than through that of Ritschl or Harnack? And why is it that the Holy Spirit produces this scientific theology only in minds which have reached a higher and nobler stage of the divine life? When does a particular mind reach that stage? When is the process of systematizing the realities of true religion completed? Has the Holy Spirit perhaps advanced Harnack to a still higher and nobler plane than was reached by scientific theologians before Harnack? Does our author know Muecke's *Dogmatik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*? It is a fine book to exhibit the process by which "faith and enlightened reason" in the higher and nobler stage of the divine life reached by theologians resolve the realities of true religion into a system of Christian doctrines. The resolving process, when it is fully under way, can be so thorough that there is little left at the end of the realities of true religion, or of any realities. What stands forth ultimately as the product of the resolving process of enlightened reason is neither revealed in the Bible, nor supported by the Bible, nor offered for acceptance by the Bible, but it is the dream and fancy of a religious philosopher who has foisted his theory and forced his system upon God's Book, and has made that Book teach things which it never meant to teach. — The author expresses himself on "the one miraculous attribute" of the Bible, inspiration, thus: "By this is meant: that the Spirit of God dwelt in the Prophets and Apostles and directed them in the progress of meditation and com-

position, yet not depriving them of their freedom and limitations, but guiding them in His divine Providence in the use of their ordinary mental faculties." This statement, too, is in italics. Its teaching is reenforced in the paragraph which follows: "Hence in the diversity of persons, times, and circumstances in the composition of the Bible, there is but *one purpose, one plan, and one pervading unity of divine truth*. The Bible is the most remarkable phenomenon in literature, having a double origin and a double character, yet forming a unit. Its central theme is Christ, and like Him it is *theanthropic* or *divine-human* in its nature. It is divine-human all through, but without *mixture* and without *separation*. Both thoughts and words, contents and forms, are divine and human alike, in which the *Holy Spirit is ever present with His illuminating and regenerating influences*." The reason why the apostle directs his readers to "the more sure word of prophecy" (2 Pet. 1, 19 ff.) is because every prophecy of Scripture is not *ιδίας επιλύσεως*, not of private interpretation, after it has been uttered, just as it came not *θειήματι ανθρώπου*, by the will of man, before it was uttered, but both the old prophets and their later interpreters were carried forward to their work by the Holy Spirit, *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*. And the influence of the Spirit extended to their *speech*; for Peter says: *ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ*, they spake as from God; their words—for *λαλεῖν* signifies *voces distinctas proferre* (Wilke)—came to them from God, and all that was human in those words was that they were uttered by the vocal organs of human beings. Neither the contents nor the form of those words were divine-human, but the contents and the form were divine and only the *λαλεῖν*, the enunciation of the divine contents and the divine form of the words, was a human act. And for this reason the apostle declares the word thus uttered to be *βεβαιότερος λόγος*. The theanthropic feature of Scripture is not greatly in evidence in this passage. In 1 Cor. 2 the apostle assures his former congregation that his speech and his preaching, when he came to them, was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Just to what extent the Spirit guided him he explains in the following words when he says of himself and the other apostles: "We have received . . . the spirit which is of God that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God," v. 12. Here he derives his *knowledge* of the deep things of God from the Spirit. Whatever thoughts he entertained about these matters had been *given* him entirely from on high. He proceeds: "Which things also we speak (*λαλοῦμεν*), not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Here

he derives the vocal expression, the utterance in human speech, of those things which had been given him to know, from the same Spirit. Whatever words he employed to declare divine matters were *taught* him from on high. Thoughts and words were both divine, and only the *λαλεῖν* of these divine thoughts and words was a human act, in so far as a man's intellect was employed to conceive and a man's lips and mouth to utter them. And the apostle regards this process as highly appropriate to the sacredness and importance of his and his colleagues' work; for it enabled them to speak *πνευματικὰ πνευματικοῖς συγγρόνοντες*, matching spiritual with spiritual, *viz.*, spiritual thoughts with spiritual words. God adopted this plan of instructing men, says the apostle, "that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," v. 5. God actually wished to remove as much as possible every human element from that foundation on which men's faith was to rest. The theanthropic feature which our author claims for the Bible is thus seen again to be conspicuous chiefly for its absence. For it is not the fact that the inspired writers employed human lips in uttering their messages and human hands in penning them, which caused the author to vindicate for Scripture a composite character. He parallels the Bible with the God-man. The human nature in the incarnate Son of God contributed very materially to the work which He came to perform. The human nature had to contribute *quod suum erat*, as the divine nature contributed *quod suum erat* to the work of redemption. Just so our author would have us believe that in the preparation of Scripture the Holy Spirit and the particular writer each contributed his quota, and thus the Bible has "a double origin and a double character." "Both its thoughts and words, contents and form, are divine and human alike." This view of inspiration, too, is a transatlantic importation and a modern figment. It exhibits a Bible which has no existence except in the minds of theologasters of the rationalistic stripe. Its introduction in a Lutheran school of divinity is a most depressing event. We heartily sympathize with the young men who are made to imbibe this erroneous teaching which attacks the foundation of Christian faith.—In the chapter on Creation the author speaks of "creative epochs." It is an unusual application of the term "epoch" to employ it as equivalent to the Hebrew *יָוֵם*, limited by *עָרָב* and *בֹּקֶר*. But the retention of Biblical terms in their Biblical sense was probably not the aim of the author. He says: "The *creative epochs* unfold to us a gradual progress from lower to higher forms: matter — vegetation — solar systems (!) — animals and man. This accords with reason and science, and shows that each

successive creative act has man as its goal." This language reveals the author's desire to remain on friendly terms with reason and science, and to adjust his findings from Scripture in such a way as to avoid being contradicted by modern astronomers, geologists, etc. His statement regarding "creative epochs" could be endorsed without compunction by any "Christian evolutionist."—In the chapter on the Redeemer the author introduces, strangely enough, the subject of predestination. After dividing the gracious will of God which moved God to send the Redeemer, into universal and special grace, he gives the reason, in Schmid's well-known words, why there is a special grace in God, and wishing to improve the statement of Schmid, he proceeds; "Stated more fully: It is the eternal decree, purpose, or decision of God, according to which, out of pure grace, he determined to save out of the fallen, condemned, and helpless human race each individual, who, from eternity He foresaw, would, by His grace, be in Christ unto the end of life. (Jacobs, p. 554.)" This special grace the author denominates the "mystery of God." What is there mysterious in God's action? Probably the fact that He foresaw what would occur. And what does this "special grace" amount to? God determines to save those who have died believers. Query: Would these believers be saved by ordinary universal grace? Probably the author wishes to lay stress on the fact that it is *by God's grace* that certain people are in Christ unto the end of life. But again we ask: Is the grace of perseverance, is preservation in faith to be reckoned as universal or special grace? Can *any* believer be confident that He who has begun a good work in Him will perform it? If so, the author's special grace is neither special, nor is it grace if it is conditioned by God's foreknowledge, and least of all can we regard the divine purpose of which the author speaks as a "mystery of God." Everything is quite plain, and God's choice is very rational; any one of us would do exactly the same as God is here reported to have done. The only mystery which we can discover in the author's presentation of the case is on man's side, *viz.*, why some men should be in grace unto the end of their life rather than others, and we should propose, accordingly, that the phrase "mystery of God" be recast into "mystery of man." For since it is plainly man who determines God's choice by his conduct, the mystery why God does not choose him must be charged against man.—In the chapter inscribed "The Application of Redemption," the author explains the *ordo salutis* in seven stages: 1. the call, 2. illumination, 3. conversion, contrition, and faith, 4. justification, 5. regeneration, 6. the mystical union, 7. renovation or sanctification. Contrary even to

Luther's Small Catechism the author has introduced the Law into this matter as a means of enlightenment and for applying the redemption of Christ to the sinner. He claims an illumination also by the Law, and he makes conversion the product of the joint operation of Law and Gospel, each effecting one part or bringing about one stage of conversion. On p. 57 the expression "immediate" ("the knowledge of divine mercy may be immediate and extraordinary") is probably used in the sense of instantaneous. According to the author's presentation, faith is wrought in regeneration, which is correct, but we can make no sense out of his statement regarding the time of regeneration, in which he says: "In adults there is a process of illumination that leads up to the 'awakening of conscious Faith.'" Unless there is assumed already in illumination faith in some form, — let us say subconscious faith, — we do not understand why there should be an awakening. And is it correct to speak of a "process of illumination" prior to regeneration? We cannot regard 2 Cor. 4, 6 and Eph. 1, 18, 19 as parallel passages. The illumination spoken of in the former passage is an instantaneous event like the creation of light; that which is mentioned in the latter passage is a continuous act. Altogether we miss in this chapter, one of the most difficult in theology, a statement to the effect that all these terms: calling, enlightening, regenerating, converting, renewing, etc., are employed in Scripture to describe the same event, the quickening of faith, and represent the ensuing change from different points of view; also that these terms admit of a wider and a narrower meaning. In other words, the sinner who has been called effectually is in that same moment an illumined, and a regenerated, and a converted, and a justified, and renewed or sanctified sinner; again, the sinner who has been illumined continues to be illumined, and converted, and renewed. — The author restricts infant baptism to the children of Christian parents, but the Bible proofs which he adduces (Matt. 28, 19; John 3, 5, 6; Matt. 19, 14; Acts 2, 39, etc.) are of such a wide scope that we infer the author would not refuse baptism to a child whose parents are not Christians, if the child were presented for baptism by someone having authority over him. — We forego mention of other defects, such as vagueness of expression, lack of precision, which leaves the reader to guess at the intended meaning. — The book viewed as a whole is not an honor to the Church of God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure, and will not be an aid to secure for us the continuance of these treasures.

---

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL. An American Problem. By *George U. Wenner*, New York. Bonnell, Silver & Co., 48 West Twenty-Second Street, New York. 1907. IX and 163 pp.

The history of this publication is told in the "Foreword," as follows: "At a meeting of the Inter-Church Conference in Carnegie Hall, New York, in November, 1905, at which twenty-nine Protestant Churches of America were represented, one of the papers treated the question of Week-Day Religious Instruction. Its main proposition was favorably received, and the following resolution was adopted by the Conference:

"Resolved, That in the need of more systematic education in religion, we recommend for the favorable consideration of the Public School authorities of the country the proposal to allow the children to absent themselves without detriment from the public schools on Wednesday or on some other afternoon of the school week for the purpose of attending religious instruction in their own churches; and we urge upon the churches the advisability of availing themselves of the opportunity so granted to give such instruction in addition to that given on Sunday.

"The further consideration of the subject was referred to the Executive Committee, and a report may be expected at the meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in December, 1908.

"This action of the Conference placed the question on the docket, as it were, for the consideration of the churches.

"On the 30th of January, 1906, in connection with the 10th Annual Meeting of the Federation of Churches of New York, the subject was debated, and after an animated discussion, a committee was appointed to make arrangements for further consideration of the question at a subsequent meeting. At this second meeting, held on the 30th of April, addresses in favor of the movement were delivered by Rabbi Mendes, Father McMillan, Bishop Greer, Dr. Henry M. Sanders, Dr. Frank Mason North, and Dr. Henry A. Stimson, representing respectively the Jewish, Roman Catholic, Protestant Episcopal, Baptist, Methodist Episcopal, and Congregational communions. A letter from the Hon. Charles A. Schieren, of the Lutheran Church, also endorsed the proposed plan.

"To meet objections, and remove misapprehensions, the substance of the paper read before the Inter-Church Conference, is presented in the following pages, together with such additions as may help to illustrate its purpose."

Regarding his object the author says: "The object of this little book is to bring before American Christians a question that must

sooner or later be decided. The more thoroughly the question is discussed, the more likely shall we be to reach a reasonable conclusion. Doubtless there are difficulties. But they are *not to be compared with the difficulties in which we shall continue to be involved so long as we do not make adequate preparation for the systematic religious education of our children.*" (p. 45. Italics ours.) The author essays to achieve his object by presenting, first, "The Problem:" "Two questions are settled in the minds of American Christians. One is, that there can be no true education without religion. The other is, that we must have a public school, open to all children without regard to creed. These two propositions appear to contradict one another. The problem is how to reconcile them."

Before proceeding with our account we would here interpose a remark bearing on the second point in the "Problem," which we would like to amend by inserting, after the words "all children," the words "not otherwise cared for," or words to that effect. As it reads, the clause in question seems to say that educating children is primarily a function of the State. We do not claim that the author means to express this idea; on the contrary, Dr. Wenner is very outspoken on the duty of *parents* to provide for the education of their children. In fact, Dr. Wenner holds that the State, due to the neglect and indifference of parents and of the Church, came into possession of an educational system and educational facilities which the Church had erected, and he pleads with the authorities of the public school to "restore to the Church a portion of the time which has been surrendered." (p. 112.) Accordingly, we are inclined to believe that Dr. Wenner will endorse the proposed amendment. To us it is essential. It erects a proper limit to the *raison d' être* of the public school. We also believe the public school to be a necessity, however, in the same way as we acknowledge the right and duty of the State to act as guardian for minors and derelicts. Let the responsibility of providing for the education of the child be placed at the outset where it emphatically belongs.

Next follows a "Historical Review" of child-training from the days of Timothy to the Nineteenth Century (pp. 4—21); a statement of the present status of religious instruction in the schools of Germany, England, France, and Sweden (pp. 22—25); an ardent presentation of "The Church's Responsibility" in this matter (pp. 26—38); the proposal of the solution for the existing difficulties, "A Week-Day Sunday School" (p. 39—45). Each church is to give religious instruction to her own children in her own building for two hours on Wednesday afternoon, or on some other afternoon during the week. "A Course of Study" is outlined pp. 79—81. In chap. VI,

"Lions in the Way," the author meets objections to this plan. "The Child Catechumenate" (partly historical) is discussed pp. 56—78. In the ninth and tenth chapters (pp. 82—105) the author explains his views of the manner in which the Bible Story and the Catechism should be taught. Chap. XI fixes "The Goal" for this educational effort, *viz.*, membership in the church universal and, ultimately, life everlasting. (p. 110.) On p. 38 the author had indicated this aim "the systematic preparation of all the children for the duties of church membership." The concluding chapter once more urges—*The Examiner* calls it an "impassioned plea"—the solution proposed: "Give us Wednesday afternoon." Pages 119—163 are an appendix in which the author offers "Views and Comments" that have been expressed regarding his plan by *The New York Daily Tribune*, *The New York Times*, *The Examiner*, *The Christian Advocate*, *The Christian Intelligencer*, *The Lutheran Observer*, *The Churchman*. The greater portion of the views expressed is unfavorable to the adoption of Dr. Wenner's plan. A few advocate that the plan be given a trial.

The publication of this book and the keen interest which it has aroused throughout the country is an event of the first order. It is, as *The Examiner* has said, "a sign of the times." The two institutions which have been the pride of the average American Protestant, the public school and the Sunday school, are on trial in this book. The witnesses summoned, the jury, and the judge are friends—have been for years—of both institutions. Herein lies the significance of the book. It is not foreigners, who might be suspected of un-American or unpatriotic tendencies, nor people who have no practical knowledge of these institutions, but native Americans of high intelligence who have tested the merits of both, who rise to express their sober judgment regarding them, and their judgment is: They are both insufficient as instruments for educating a generation of Christians. We of the Missouri Synod have been so often branded as inferior American citizens because of our supposed disloyalty to American educational institutions that the temptation becomes very strong, in view of the acknowledgment referred to above, to indulge the spirit of retribution and to say to our fellow-citizens: We told you so, but you would not believe us. We shall forbear, because the matter is too sad and serious to admit of mirth and banter. We should rather express our sympathy with those who have tried the public school and the Sunday school, and have found them wanting. On the negative side of the question there is agreement between them and ourselves, and it is superfluous to go into details and exhibit to our readers the specific complaints which are raised in

Dr. Wenner's book against the public school and the Sunday school. To us these complaints are an old tale, and interesting only because of the source from which they emanate.

Now, as to the positive side, religious instruction of the children of church-members at their churches on Wednesday afternoon, there is no doubt that the plan is well meant. An increase of religious instruction would come to children whose religious training has been sadly neglected, and who would grudge a child this boon? But the plan is not feasible. Many children, especially in rural districts, but also in cities, live at a considerable distance from their churches. Prof. Singmaster's suggestion for obviating this difficulty, and others, cannot be entertained because it is unionistic. He says: "In small communities a single religious school might do the required work. The pastors or competent day-school teachers could do the teaching. In larger towns the children of the same or allied denominations might be gathered into one school." (p. 142.) In order to make the plan operative, not only the children would have to be released, but also a sufficient number of men or women to teach them. And these teachers must, indeed, be competent. In many cases, probably, the pastor could do all the work alone, but in very many cases he would have to be given assistants. If these assistants are to be obtained in the same way as Sunday school teachers, we doubt whether they can be had on Wednesday afternoon. And the brief employment for two hours a week would not justify a person in making this sort of teaching his life-calling. Still more serious, from a pedagogical point of view, is the disproportionateness in this plan between the religious studies of the child and his other studies. All religious teaching which he is to receive during an entire week is crowded into two consecutive hours of an afternoon, not distributed evenly, like the child's other studies, especially the important studies, over five days of the week. Every pedagogue knows that this is a most unsatisfactory arrangement and promises very poor results. The more one tries to picture to himself the practical working of the plan the more skeptical one becomes. It is a half-hearted, timid attempt at doing a duty so as not to offend anybody.

Presuming that our readers are interested in this matter, we transfer to these pages a sample of the discussion which the plan has aroused. The disputants are the editor of the leading church-paper of the Episcopal Church and two correspondents.

#### THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOLS.

A proposal is being seriously considered by representatives of many Churches, not all of them Christian, to secure the cooperation of the state and city educational authorities with the churches in a plan for the reli-

gious education of school children. At a meeting, in New York, of which an account will be found in our news columns, representatives of our own church, of the Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Jews, joined in more or less qualified commendation of the proposal of a committee appointed some months ago to consider the matter. The proposal was that public school children, who might desire it, or whose parents desired it for them, should be excused from the Wednesday afternoon session of the public schools that they might receive instruction in their respective churches. Of this plan Bishop Greer said: "If it does not succeed, it will not be the fault of the schools—it will be the fault of the churches. At all events it is an experiment that is well worth trying."

We are not so sure of that. It seems to us an experiment of very doubtful expediency; one that we would much rather leave untried. With all that Bishop Greer said in commendation of the great patriotic work of the public schools, with his indignant repudiation of the aspersion that they are "godless," we are in hearty accord. We agree with him entirely, too, that it is not the business of the public schools to give religious instruction. But neither is it their business to see that it is given. "It is for the churches to give religious training," said Bishop Greer, "that is what the churches are for." "What they ask," he continued, "is that they have the opportunity of doing what they exist to do." This "opportunity" of which Bishop Greer speaks would amount under this proposal to the opportunity to compel attendance at religious instruction by the use of the same system that the state has devised to ensure attendance at public schools. The churches apparently, to ensure their "opportunity," propose to invoke the aid of the truant officer. Moreover, they propose that one-tenth of the time which the state considers necessary for the child's instruction and for the full employment of which the tax-payers are paying, shall be taken for use by instructors of whose pedagogical competence the state has no knowledge, and over whom it can exercise no control. The public schools need all the time they can get for their work. They have not an hour too much. The supposition that one session out of the ten in each week can be given to "relatively unimportant" studies shows a strange ignorance of the conditions under which the school curriculum is devised, and of the anxious care with which the various elements in education are balanced against one another, that every minute may be used to the utmost. We want no interference of the state in education by the church and no interference by the church in education by the state. The plan seems to us bad in itself, even if it were found practicable. It would prove even worse in the results to which it would inevitably lead. For surely the benefit of religious instruction would be a questionable quantity if children found it so uninteresting or their parents were so indifferent to its value that they must be dragged to the church to receive it. The church must win her children; she cannot force them into allegiance.

We do not wish to create in this country conditions that are distracting the English Church and Parliament and injuring the efficiency of both. We cannot forget that the plan has the support of the traditional enemies of public education. To opponents of the American system we would say in challenge and to its friends in warning: Hands off the public schools! — *The Churchman*, May 12, 1906.

#### RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the *Churchman*:

As secretary of the Missionary Thank-Offering Committee I am enjoying an unusual opportunity to confer with laymen and clergymen all over the country, respecting the points of strength and weakness in the work of our church. I find a large number of intelligent people who share the opinion which I have ventured to form upon this subject. That opinion is that we are bringing annually into vital relation with Christ a number

of men, pitifully small, when regard is had to our great scheme of church organization and to the power of the message with which we are entrusted. In the great majority of parishes there is little vital religion among men. In the relatively small missionary work of the church the men have hitherto taken an insignificant part. I state what I believe to be facts, not at all in a spirit of hopelessness and depression, but as one who is awestricken in the presence of so great an opportunity for the work of Christian education. I believe it was Horace Bushnell who, in reply to the question, "Has not Christianity been a failure?" replied, "How can it have failed? It has never been tried." This was an exaggeration; but only an exaggeration; not a statement wholly false. In searching for the causes of weakness in the church, would it not be wise to consider whether this is not one of them — that we are not giving Christianity a fair trial?

I venture to affirm that what we need is more direct and positive teaching, in the pulpit, at missionary conferences and in the columns of the church papers, respecting the essence of Christianity, which I take to be this — that it is absolute devotion to Jesus Christ as not only our Lord but our Friend. We have a simple message; but, if properly delivered, it will find a lodgment in every soul. As our Gospel is the good news of the redeeming love of our Friend, so our message is the proclamation of our duty to Him. That duty is twofold; first, to make ourselves fit to associate with Him and hold communion with Him; second, to cooperate with Him in bringing all men everywhere into the personal relation of friendship with Him. But "how shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

It is not enough that we have a message. It is not even enough that we utter it ourselves and send others to do likewise. We must devise means to bring within range of the message those for whom it is intended. I am not speaking at the moment of the heathen, but of two classes of people who sustain a geographical or family relationship to our parish churches — the men and the children.

To reach the *men and the older boys*, the M. T. O. movement has been inaugurated, and already God has blessed its progress. I do not refer to the money-raising aspect of the movement. Money giving, except as an expression of devotion, is of little or no subjective value. I speak of the anointing of blind eyes to see the vision of a world to be won for Christ and the unstopping of deaf ears to hear the cry of souls that must be saved. The working of these miracles is the primary purpose of the M. T. O.

But what about the *children*? It is plain that they cannot "believe in Him of whom they have not heard." The lack of insight into the heart of Christianity upon the part of this generation of adults shows that they have been defectively taught. What about the rising generation? Here is a great opportunity and a solemn responsibility. Of course normal children do not want to be taught and will not come voluntarily. By the time we have trained the parents to compel them to hear our message the children will be parents themselves — and we shall have the work to do over again. As a matter of course, we compel children to receive secular instruction. We know that interest and even zeal will come with the recognition of ignorance and the vision of knowledge. Accordingly it is proposed in New York, as you explain in your issue of May 12, to allow Christian instruction in a child's own church on Wednesday afternoons to count in lieu of an afternoon's attendance upon public school. Christianity must be imparted to the children of the church, not by preaching but by careful and systematic teaching. What place more appropriate than the parish church? What thought more important to the child than the thought that to learn to know Christ — not to know *about* Him — is an

essential part of education? Yet in your editorial you say: "Surely the benefit of religious instruction would be a questionable quantity if children found it so uninteresting or their parents were so indifferent to its value that they must be dragged to the church to receive it. The church must win her children; she cannot force them into allegiance." Am I manifesting an unchristian spirit if I ask whether these are the words of one who believes that the future of our nation and of our church depends upon bringing young children to Christ?

But you say: "The public schools need all the time they can get for their work. They have not an hour too much. The supposition that one session out of the ten in each week can be given to 'relatively unimportant' studies, shows a strange ignorance of the conditions under which the school curriculum is devised, and of the anxious care with which the various elements in education are balanced against one another, that every minute may be used to the utmost." Not at all in a controversial spirit, may I ask the writer of these words this question: "What is the relative importance of secular education and of the knowledge of Christ?" Of course school hours are all too short for learning. Art is long and time is fleeting. But the real question is: Shall the little time for learning be devoted exclusively to other subjects than learning to know Christ?

It is proposed, you say, "that one-tenth of the time which the state considers necessary for the child's instruction and for the full employment of which the taxpayers are paying, shall be taken for use by instructors of whose pedagogical competence the state has no knowledge, and over whom it can exercise no control." "The state" means you and the rest of us. As far as we churchmen and our children are concerned, it is proposed that the teaching shall be done in our own churches and under the direction of our own clergy. Whose fault is it if we have no knowledge of their "pedagogical competency," and if we exercise no control over them?

Finally you observe: "We want no interference of the state in education by the church, and no interference by the church in education by the state," and you close by a reference to the conditions that are distracting the English Church and Parliament. Is it your opinion that the separation of church and state should be so complete that our people as a whole are to be indifferent whether or not the children receive religious instruction from the church of their parents' choice? If you do not mean this, what do you mean? In England they are at least distracted over the effort to solve this difficult problem. Because of its difficulty shall we give it up in advance? The plan proposed in New York avoids the chief difficulties which have caused trouble in England, yet your language seems to imply that we proposed to try an experiment which has failed. May those of us who believe that Christian education alone can appease the hunger of the age call upon you for some constructive suggestion? If you have a better plan than this, we solemnly adjure you to make it public. Do not tell us: "The churches are open; the children ought to go voluntarily and be taught there." We have tried this experiment and it has failed. Do not say: "This matter of Christian instruction is the business of the parents." Perhaps so; but the parents are not attending to their business. Do not point to voluntary attendance upon Sunday school as the solution of the difficulty. The Sunday school is a blessed institution, but it reaches only a corner of the field. *The point is, Mr. Editor, that multitudes of the children of the Church are dying or growing up without being brought to the knowledge of Christ.* This is your fault and mine. What are we going to do about it? Your only reply so far is, "Hands off the public schools!" Nobody has suggested laying hands on the public schools. The proposition is to lay hands upon your children and mine, and to bring them within reach of the voice of Jesus Christ. Instead of opposing, will you not help?

Philadelphia.

G. W. PEPPER.

(*The Churchman*, May 26, 1906.)

## RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the *Churchman*:

Your editorial of May 12th concerning the proposition to have the public school authorities excuse the children of such parents as desire it from attendance at school on Wednesday afternoons, in order that they may be instructed elsewhere in religious subjects, has not been replied to in your issue of to-day. Failing a more competent person to answer your objections, may I make several suggestions in this connection?

(1) There is no complete and fully formulated proposition before us as yet, other than what is roughly stated above. At the same meeting where one speaker said that he would consider it beneficial to have truant officers compel attendance, another said that there would be nothing to prevent some parents — though he thought that there would be very few of such — from taking advantage of this to keep their children at home for other reasons than to have them taught religion. Certainly many of us agree with you “that it is not the business of the public schools to give religious instruction,” and “neither is it their business to see that it is given.” So also your statement that this is a demand for “10 per cent” of the work hours of the school week depends upon the hour when the children shall be excused, and this is not yet determined. Evidently while discussion of details is quite to the point, condemnation of the scheme for such reasons is quite premature.

(2) Your next objection is that “The public schools need all the time that they can get for work. They have not an hour too much.” Comparing our educational system with that of other Christian nations, we are alone, so far as I know, in not providing for religious instruction within the school week. As a people, we have decided, and most of us think very wisely decided, that we shall not have religion taught by the state. But having surrendered these hours which other nations use for religious training, to purely secular training, does our secular training for that reason outstrip all others — the Germans, for instance? Yet they invariably have religion among their set tasks of the week. Or is it true again, as you claim, that there are no “relatively unimportant” studies which might be put on the Wednesday afternoon public school schedule? Here are certain subjects taught in the public schools to children of fourteen years and under, which do not all appear to be of first importance:

Carpentry, sewing, cooking, drawing, hygiene, singing, construction work (fancy boxes, etc.).

But now suppose it be asked if we have not our Sunday schools to teach religious subjects on Sunday? The best answer to that would seem to be that, barring rare exceptions, the Sunday school simply does not do the work — and this in a day when there is little or no religious instruction at home, and therefore children must be taught outside. Two things, certainly, are accomplished in our Sunday schools: in the person of the teacher the child comes into contact with a maturer Christian and often a highly consecrated character, and furthermore it is brought to public worship. These are splendid results, the value of which cannot be over-estimated. But still crowds of children slip away forever from Sunday school, never becoming church members, owing to the fact that religion soon ceases to interest and appeal to them — perhaps it never did — and those who do pass on into church are inadequately taught.

Among the causes for this failure we may note that, first, there is not time enough. Could you teach a child to read if you had him as one of an often disorderly class, for a lesson of from twenty to thirty-five minutes once a week, or could you teach him arithmetic, or religious truths, or anything, except in a most superficial manner? As a matter of fact,

you cannot and you do not, even if you are a clever teacher. And as a second cause of failure the teaching staff is not adequate for the work, often as to training and generally as to numbers. Leaving aside that class of teachers who stay at home because it rains or a friend calls, what the teacher accomplishes is commonly more in the line of character building than instructing, and if anything of real value is done by a good teacher, be sure that the pupils are met outside the regular Sunday school session, and that brings us back to this question of weekday work.

It is necessary here that we should recognize that the standard of religious instruction which Christian people in America are contented with is shamefully low — there is nothing like it certainly among the Northern nations of Europe. To say nothing of the average, your *good* Sunday school pupil can glibly recite the catechism, but, even if in an advanced grade, what can he tell of the doctrine of the Atonement or the evidences of the Resurrection of our Lord? He knows the graphic stories of the Old Testament, but the profounder things concerning the struggles of the ancient Hebrew church are beyond him, while the beauty and majesty of the Hebrew prophets is a closed book even to many an older churchman who never had his eyes opened in his youth. The life of our Lord is learned in outline — fortunately the church year prevents our getting far from that — but how much thorough knowledge is there of this greatest of subjects? Think also of the life of St. Paul, the early church, church history, including the Reformation and our American church, the story of Christian Missions and the formation of our Prayer Book — no wonder that the men who are interested in seeing some real and thorough work done among our children and young people are discouraged. Nor does it lessen the discouragement to be told to go back and be content with one-half hour on Sunday! There is simply one way to meet the problem. We must have opportunity to teach the children on a weekday, and we must have them taught by persons who have been trained to the work, and this not to supplant, but rather to supplement the Sunday school.

But here one may perhaps say, Take the children during the week if you will, but take them after school hours. Does such an objector know children after school hours? Still some of us will take them — some of us are already taking them — tired little bodies though they are, and going home to study their evening lessons later on, too. But we dare not neglect them while we are waiting for their elders to provide a fair and proper time for this important part of their work.

Again another objector may say that, if clergy and parish staff, commonly hard worked enough, are to do this work, what is to become a regular parochial routine? The reply is that parochial duties must always be taken up in the order of their importance, and the older parishioners must be educated up to seeing that this may demand a sacrifice on their part. . . . It can be done and it will be done if we realize that the place for the children is in the front ranks. We elders must look over their heads.

Other objectors doubtless will also raise other points — everything can be criticised — but this question is up now, and be sure it is with us to stay until we solve it. Whether or not we get Wednesday afternoon or any portion of it, whether one favors or objects to any particular scheme, the fact remains that the children are knocking at the door of the church, and I venture to say that as the church answers this appeal which is now beginning to sound in her ears, so she determines her own future. That future is to be built up out of these very children, by the aid of the Spirit of God, and He surely will not lavish His grace upon any church or any religious body which neglects them.

New York.

THORNTON FLOYD TURNER.  
(*The Churchman*, June 9, 1906.)

What solution of the "problem" do we propose? None other than the one we have adopted long ago—the church-school, or parochial school. The advocates of the Week-Day Sunday school will find, in a short time, that their plan is a failure just as much as the Sunday school has proven a failure. If you are in earnest, we would say to our friends on the other side, if you really consider it your duty to teach religion to your children, you will have to do that just as thoroughly, regularly, systematically, as you teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, that is, you will have to teach them religion every day. True, this course entails a vast amount of labor and a very heavy expense. The Missouri Synod counted on her roster during 1906 the following teaching force: 1085 pastors who were teaching school in connection with their other parochial duties, 933 teachers specially trained for this work as their life-calling, and 215 female teachers, altogether 2233 persons who were constantly engaged in teaching the children of the church the Bible and the Catechism just as systematically as the secular branches of a common school education. It seems a misappropriation of the pastor's time to confine him in a schoolroom for the greater part of the week; yet the growth of the synod has not suffered. And it looks like a waste of money to spend,—in a rough estimate!—half a million dollars annually for teachers' salaries, not counting the erection, equipment, and maintenance of special school buildings, yet the work of the Synod has not been retarded in other directions through this great outlay of money. For many years half the pastors and nearly all the congregations have borne uncomplainingly the physical and financial burden which the parochial school entails. The money alone which the Missouri Synod during its existence through 60 years has invested in this work amounts to many millions of dollars. There is not now, nor has there ever been a Protestant church-body anywhere in the world that has voluntarily and unaidedly undertaken this task. This feature will forever remain one of the distinctive features of the Missouri Synod, and no small part of her glory and her strength. The Missouri Synod is not a wealthy body, by any means. Out of their limited resources her hard-working people have been able to maintain a system of church-schools that is without parallel in the history of free churches anywhere. What could the wealthy Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, have accomplished, if they had earnestly taken the religious training of their children in hand! And what the Missouri Synod has done in this respect she claims to have done not for the Church alone, not for her own enlargement, but for the State as well. The parochial school has issued

god-fearing, law-abiding, industrious citizens as well as intelligent and well-informed church-members. It is a mischievous notion and a biased opinion to view the parochial school as an institution that is hostile and harmful to the best interests of the American nation. In the light of the present agitation the advocates of the parochial school may reasonably claim that they have given better evidence of their patriotism than their opponents. Results on either side should pass for sufficient evidence.

Naturally, in this connection, the question arises: Will the parochial school be adopted generally as the only proper solution of the educational problem in our country? We have no hopes in that direction. The present agitation will die out in a few years. Protestant America is too indifferent in religious affairs, and the public school and the Sunday school are too strongly entrenched in the hearts of the people. Thinking men will continue to offer their criticism of both institutions, and plans like that of Dr. Wenner will be advocated again, but we expect sooner to witness the rise of a state-religion and a state-church in this country than the rise of church-schools. It behooves the friends of the parochial school to review again and again the grounds on which rests their conviction that the parochial school is the only school for a Christian child, and to fortify their position against criticism that will continue to be directed against it. Foolish, utterly foolish, however, would those Lutherans be who have the parochial school and plan its abolition, or fail to aid in its propagation. What can they offer us as equivalent if this school is rejected? We venture to say that no Protestant church body in our country, if it were in possession of an educational system like that which has been built up in the comparatively small Missouri Synod, would think of abandoning it, but would cherish and improve it, according as it came to command larger means. It is, of course, a very difficult matter now, after years of neglect, criminal neglect, to provide the remedy which the disease calls for. And it is human for men to speak lightly of what they cannot have, and to manufacture all sorts of reasons why they do not want it. Those who have tried the parochial school system are as keenly aware of its defects and drawbacks as others; they know that perfection is not attained in church-schools either, but the positive good which these schools accomplish is so great and so evident and so plainly unattainable by a different method, that the parochial school even with its deficiencies is very dear to them, and will so remain. We rejoice to record the fact that among us — although there have been defections — as a general matter the parochial school is constantly growing in

favor. At the end of 1905 our statistician reported 475,029 communicant members, 96,723 school children and 33,687 baptized persons (presumably mostly children). At the end of 1906 under the same heads 481,242, 96,964, and 33,264 respectively were reported. We would point out that despite a very perceptible decrease of the birth-rate—an unpleasant phenomenon that has been observed for years!—the attendance at the parochial schools not only remained the same, but was increased by about half the number by which the births recorded decreased.

From a review of Dr. Wenner's book we have passed over to a review of our parochial school system. The digression, we trust, will be regarded as natural and will be pardoned.

---

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

---

ROTCIL, REVISION OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG'S HEAVEN AND HELL, Swedenborg Printing Bureau. Boston.

EVANGELIUMS LIEDER 1' und 2 (Gospel Hymns) mit deutschen Kernliedern. Ausgewählt u. herausgegeben von *Walter Rauschenbusch* und *Ira D. Sankey*. The Biglow & Main Co. New York.

LESSONS PREPARED FOR THE USE OF SUNDAY AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, by *Theo. Graebner*. First Series. Part III. Third Grade. Decorah, Iowa. Lutheran Publishing House. 1907. Price, 20 cts.

This series was reviewed in THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY X, 118.

THE COMMON SERVICE WITH MUSIC (see THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY XI, 109) has been issued in convenient form, printed on strong cardboard, and in three separate editions, containing, respectively, The Morning Service, The Communion Service, and The Evening Service.

MARTIN LUTHER BY THOMAS CARLYLE. Introduced and edited by *William Dallmann*. Erie, Pa. Church Publication Society. 1907.

A neat and tasteful reprint of that part of Carlyle's essay in *Heroes and Hero Worship* which deals with Luther. Rev. Dallmann has written a brief introduction, eulogistic of Luther and Carlyle's essay on Luther.