

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XVIII

October, 1947

No. 10

CONTENTS

	Page
Lund. W. Arndt	721
Recent Studies in the Chronology of the Period of the Kings. Walter E. Boehrs	738
History as a Weapon in Controversy. L. W. Spitz	747
Outlines on the Nitzsch Gospel Selections	763
Miscellanea	772
Theological Observer	784

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den *Wolffen wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuerehen und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — *1 Cor. 14:8*

Published by the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis 13, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



ARCHIVE

Miscellanea

The Meeting of Prisoners of War Pastors at Valbonne

Very few people in our country know of Valbonne. It is exactly what the name says, a place in a pleasant valley; it is situated forty miles from Avignon in Southern France, celebrated as the residence of the Popes during the so-called "Seventy Years' Captivity" in their history. Here a unique meeting was held in the last week of June of this year. Dr. F. E. Mayer and I had the privilege of attending this meeting, and I believe a short report of it will be of interest to the readers of this journal. We went to Valbonne as representatives of the Missouri Synod, which had furnished a large part of the money required for the conference. It was a gathering of German Protestant pastors who, themselves prisoners of war, were ministering to their countrymen in the numerous prisoners of war camps of France. Most of these pastors were labeled "Lutheran." The French Government had permitted the meeting to be held, and its chief of Protestant chaplains, Pastor Lienhart, had made the necessary external arrangements.

Valbonne is not a town or a village, but an institution taking care of lepers. It was founded early in the thirteenth century as a Carthusian monastery. When, at the beginning of the present century, convents in France were secularized, the institution was sold, and a Protestant gentleman by the name of Delord bought it in order to use it as a hospital for lepers. There are about thirty people afflicted with this dread malady in the institution. They are carefully segregated, have their physician and their nurses, and are cared for in a loving way. The institution, a picturesque complex of buildings of medieval architecture, is so vast in extent that the isolation of the patients creates no serious problem. The founder is still living, but on account of advanced age he has retired from the active management and has turned it over to his son, who, while not an ordained minister, has received extensive theological training and is conducting the hospital on a Christian basis. The kind hospitality which Dr. Mayer and I enjoyed in the Delord home will never be forgotten.

The institution owns a good deal of land which is partly under cultivation, partly forest. Because sufficient space is available, barracks have been erected which young people's societies can use as dormitories when they hold their outings. It was undoubtedly this feature which induced Pastor Lienhart and his associates, when casting about for a suitable place for the conference, to select Valbonne. A touching sight was furnished by an inspection of these huts or barracks, where we saw the primitive straw sacks on which the young theologians slept, one beside the other, no one having more room available than a rectangle six feet long and about four feet wide. There were no bedsteads. The straw sacks were placed directly on the floor. But it seemed that no-

body bemoaned the lack of comfort and conveniences. Lay prisoners of war were on hand to do the cooking; the food was palatable, and for once the pastors had an opportunity for contact with their co-workers. The French Government showed its interest in the meeting by sending three Army officers to pay it an official, friendly visit.

The meeting was by no means insignificant from the point of view of size. It was attended by 180 pastors who themselves were still in French captivity. Besides, several men had come that represented organizations which had befriended these pastors and prisoners of war in general—the Oikumene (World Council of Churches), the Red Cross, and the Y. M. C. A. Our aim, of course, was not to establish church fellowship, but to give the conference an insight into what we conceive true Lutheranism to be, and to encourage those who have placed themselves squarely on the Lutheran Confessions to continue in this course.

The conference divided itself into sections to make profitable discussion possible. In the morning, Bible study was engaged in; in the afternoon, practical subjects were treated; and in the evening the meetings were given a devotional character. During the days that we were at the conference Phil. 2:1-11 and Eph. 2:11-21 were studied. The essayists had worked out exegetical papers on the basis of the Greek text. Joining in the discussion, we were able to state what we believe the Apostle and the Lutheran Church teach on the points touched on in these passages. An afternoon and evening were turned over to us for a systematic presentation of our message. Dr. Mayer described the Church situation in the United States from the point of view of a loyal Lutheran, and I had the pleasant task of giving the pastors a brief survey of the origin, of the marvelous growth, the ideals, and the controversies of our beloved Synod. Perhaps fully as important as our formal lectures were the private conversations which we were able to carry on with individuals. Some of the Lutheran pastors, I am happy to say, were very positive in their testimony for a strict stand on the Confessions of the Church, declaring that it is our duty to proclaim the truth, whether those about us like it or not. It was a note which was needed in this group as much as elsewhere.

In discussing personal problems the pastors spoke of their contacts with the Roman Catholic Church in France. One of them reported that various Roman Catholic clergymen whom he has met have expressed their regret concerning the formalism into which their Roman Church has fallen and which threatens to stifle all spiritual life. These Catholic theologians, so it was stated, did not hesitate to say that what their Church needed was a genuine spiritual revival. One of the pastors stated that an archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church with whom he had been in contact has issued an order that the churches of his diocese should be available for services of the Protestant pastors ministering to the prisoners of war when not used for Roman

Catholic services — a step which, as far as I know, is unprecedented in the history of Roman Catholicism since the Reformation. It is interesting to note that these men see very clearly the danger which threatens a Church whose services have become purely formal, or in which more attention is given to the outward observance of certain ceremonies than to the spiritual content of the Church's proclamation. It is an idea which was expressed to me in England by members of the Anglican Church who deeply deplore the course of the High Church party, which, at least in many instances, is foisting its formalistic services on the churches even though the people by nonattendance show that they are thoroughly disgusted.

The pastors at Valbonne expected soon to be released and to be sent back home. All those with whom I spoke were hoping to serve as ministers when they have returned to Germany. Some of them were cross-bearers of an extraordinary type. I remember the case of one man whose wife had been residing in the Russian zone and who had gone to visit a sick relative in a different section and who since her return to her former residence had not been heard from, although a number of weeks had elapsed. Another one reported that his wife, from whom he had been separated for several years, had written that the privations and other sufferings were so dreadful that she could bear them no longer and that if he did not come home soon, he would not find her alive on his return. The Christian fortitude of these men, who sought help in the promises of our divine Lord, was admirable. Generally speaking, these young ministers made a good impression. They seemed to be well trained; most of them, as far as I could ascertain, were graduates of German universities. In the discussions they were eager listeners, and there was no reason to complain that absenteeism was undermining the morale. Piety of an ardent kind was distinctly in evidence, aided, of course, by the weight of personal and national sorrows and griefs. May God in His grace lead them more and more to a joyful appreciation of the heritage which we have received through the Lutheran Reformation, so that indifference in doctrine, which is still fostered by many of them and which is the bane of present-day preaching and teaching may be counteracted and overcome.

When we were ready to leave, the pastors formed a circle about us, and as a farewell greeting sang the four stanzas of "Jesu, geh voran auf der Lebensbahn." It was a moving scene, which we shall always gratefully remember. W. ARNDT

Catholics Are Bothered by Admiral's Marriage

Some time ago we editorialized on how easily the Church of Rome relaxes its strict marriage and divorce regulations when it appears expedient so to do. The particular incident we cited was the marriage of Rear Admiral Stone to Countess Santelia in St. Peter's, Rome. Although the Admiral had been twice married

and twice divorced, the third union had the blessing of the Pope, and the rite was carried out with considerable pomp in the presence of high Vatican officials. It was widely publicized that Stone, who was formerly an Episcopalian, had become a "convert" to Rome, but it was kept more or less of a dark secret that the uncle of the "vivacious countess" is a man of considerable influence in Vatican circles.

But evidently American Catholics have become somewhat disturbed over the incident, and they have found themselves hard pressed to "explain" why such a flagrant violation of canon law has been winked at by the "Holy Father." A Novena publication emanating from Chicago has a special department, known as "The Switchboard," in which a priest seeks to answer the questions of troubled Romanists. A recent issue of that publication contains the following question:

"The press carried articles about Rear Admiral Stone, a recent convert, marrying a Catholic, Countess Santelia, at the Vatican. In view of the fact that he was twice married before and twice divorced, how can the Church recognize this marriage as valid? We Catholics are barraged with insinuating questions on cases of this kind and are often at a loss to defend the stand our Church takes in them."

And here is the answer of "The Operator" of "The Switchboard":

"We, too, have been barraged with similar questions. As for the nasty insinuations about Church marriage discipline being indulgently pliant for prominent people having the 'right connections' at the Vatican, we remain undisturbed. Ignorance, not malice, is the root of most of them.

"Admiral Stone's first marriage was valid. He divorced and 'married' again. This second marriage was invalid in the eyes of the Church because he entered it while his first wife was still alive. Subsequently she died, leaving him free to marry again. He became a Catholic and was wedded to Countess Santelia in Rome. So much for this case."

It's as easy as that!

In other words, the second marriage and the second divorce didn't count at all, because the first wife was living at the time. But meanwhile Wife No.1 had conveniently died, and therefore was no longer a stumbling block in the way of the Admiral's romances. The fact that the Admiral had been separated from her by divorce and not by death could also be ignored. And as for Wife No.2, both his marriage to her and his divorce from her could be completely forgotten, because, in the eyes of the Church, it had never been a legal marriage anyway!

But then "The Operator" goes on to admonish "the faithful" not to be unduly agitated by similar cases. He writes:

"About others, should they arise, Church marriage law is sometimes complicated. Only an expert canonist can know all the ins and outs. The Faithful cannot always answer questions posed

by critics. Unless they're sure of their ground, they shouldn't even try. Simply say that you are sorry, but in this instance you are not aware of the particular details involved. (Neither are the critics.) That's not backing up. That's being prudent.

"Above all, never feel as though you must apologize for the Church's stand. That's entirely unnecessary and betrays a lack of Faith. Church Law rests on Christ's authority. Church matrimonial decisions do likewise."

As an example of rationalization, we doubt if we have read anything that can quite equal the above. But it probably offers the only way out for Romanists who find themselves troubled and distressed by the specious reasoning of their hierarchy. But the pity is that they even seek to invoke the authority of Christ to support their hypocrisy. We wonder what Christ would have to say about these so-called spiritual leaders of our day.

Editorial in *Lutheran Companion*, Aug. 13, 1947

"Vehemence of Luther"

An editorial in the *Christian Beacon* (Feb. 6, 1947) presents a sane, impartial judgment on the so-called "vehemence of Luther." Today when the whole theological world is toying with a sickly ecumenicity and is paying little attention to "Thus saith the Lord," it would be well for all theologians to turn to Luther and again learn from him the meaning of fidelity to the Word of God. The editorial is as follows:

"It would do every Protestant good to read something of the history of the Reformation. In recent weeks the Editor has been looking back over some of the histories that have been written of this movement, which was the turning point in church history.

"One of the most celebrated and recognized histories of the Reformation is that by Fisher. Dr. George P. Fisher was professor of ecclesiastical history in Yale College in the days when Yale was true to the faith. His book, published by Scribner, Armstrong, and Co., in 1875, has a paragraph entitled, 'Vehemence of Luther.' When one reads it, he feels like saying, 'Be of courage, brethren, remember the Reformation, remember Luther.' These days call for a twentieth-century reformation!

"Dr. Fisher writes as follows concerning Luther's vehemence:

"From the outset it was evident that Luther must either give up his cause or contend for it against countless adversaries. His polemical writings are therefore quite numerous, and it shows the amplitude of his mind that he did not allow himself to be so far absorbed in this sort of work as to neglect more positive labors, through his Bible, catechisms, sermons, tracts, for the building up of the Church. He had to fight his own friends when they swerved from the truth, as did Carlstadt, and also Agricola, who set up a form of antinomism. But his principal literary battles were with Henry VIII and with Erasmus. The intemperance of Luther's language has been since, as it was then, a subject of frequent

censure. It must be remembered, however, what a tempest of denunciation fell upon him; how he stood for all his life a mark for the pitiless hostility of a great part of the world. It must be remembered, too, that for a time he stood alone, and everything depended on his constancy, determination, and dauntless zeal in the maintenance of his cause. Had he wavered, everything would have been lost. And mildness of language, he said, was not his gift; he could not tread so softly and lightly as Melanchthon. His convictions were too intense to admit of an expression of them in any but the strongest language; in words that were blows. Moreover, he believed it to be a sound and wise policy to fling away reserve and to speak out in the most unsparing manner the sentiments of his soul. It was not a disease to be cured by a palliative. The formidable enemy against which he was waging war, was rendered more arrogant and exacting by every act of deference to him and by every concession. There was no middle course to be pursued. There must be surrender, or open, uncompromising war. Besides, in his study of the Bible, he conceived himself to find warrant for all his hard language, in the course taken by the prophets, by Christ, and by Paul. He felt that he was in conflict with the same pharisaical theology and ethics, which called forth the terrible denunciations recorded in the New Testament. If it was proper to call things by their right names then, it was proper now. He had been hampered at the beginning, he came to think, by a false humility, by a lingering reverence for an authority that deserved no reverence. He regretted that at Worms he had not taken a definite tone, that he had said anything about retracting in case he could be convinced of his error. He would cast all such qualifications and cowardly scruples to the winds; he would stand by what he knew to be truth, without any timid respect for its adversaries' (pp. 125, 126).

"Protestantism today is sick and flabby.

"Oh, that God would give us more men with the spirit of the Reformation in their souls!"

A. W. C. G.

"What About Proselytizing?" *

Inherently the verb *proselytizing* has no disagreeable connotation. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the verb *proselyte* as meaning: "To convert to some religion, opinion, system, or the like; . . . to convert," and so the word does not imply anything reprehensible.

The King James Bible never uses the verb *to proselytize*, but it uses the noun *proselyte* four times, and in no instance does a bad odor emanate from it.

* This paper, read before the Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Greater Detroit (Syn. Conf.) is much indebted to an article by the Rev. R. A. Jesse, former dean of Concordia Seminary, that appeared in *Today* for February, 1947.

1. In Acts 2:10 the word is used in a purely factual manner when it reports that "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes," were in the motley crowd that gathered in Jerusalem on the first New Testament Pentecost.

2. In Acts 6:5 and 13:43 the context in both instances speaks in terms of honor and commendation of proselytes. In the former passage, Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, is chosen to be one of the seven deacons in the church at Jerusalem — "men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom"; and in the latter passage, St. Paul encouraged the religious proselytes who followed Paul and Barnabas, and "persuaded them to continue in the grace of God." The words imply that these proselytes were in the grace of God and were therefore encouraged to continue in the grace of God.

3. In Matt. 23:15 Christ pronounces woes on His antagonists, saying: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." — God, who elsewhere says: "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing" (Gal. 4:18), does not here condemn the display of zeal in proselytizing; He does not anathematize every proselyte. He rather hurls His denunciation at men who were teachers of doctrines of devils and made twofold children of hell of their converts. Their zeal in proselytizing did not seek the glory of God and the salvation of souls; it aimed at selfishly strengthening their party and at advancing their prestige. Their teachings worked their converts up to such a degree of furious bigotry and enmity of Christ and His Gospel that their converts became fit for the most desperate services. Instead of being benefited by their supposed conversion, the proselytes became more openly and outrageously mischievous and blasphemous in opposing the cause of Christ and persecuting believers in Christ than their teachers, the Pharisees. The stigma attaches to the Pharisees, to their teachings, and to the eternal disaster they brought upon their ignorant and blinded converts. It does not attach to the word *proselyte*.

To proselytize is the most engaging duty God has imposed upon us, the highest purpose of every Christian's life. The only reason why God permits this bloody and sin-soaked world to continue yet a little longer is to give us a little longer season in which we are to compass land and sea to make proselytes (Matt. 24:14). The Great Commission (Matt. 28:19-20) and Christ's "marching orders" to His Church (Acts 1:8) command us to evangelize the nations abroad and to make propaganda for Christ at home by showing forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light — and this is to be done for the purpose of proselytizing, of gaining converts to Christ and for Christ. By the power of the Gospel, through which the Holy Spirit operates in the hearts of men, we are to convert men to

Christ and Christianity by turning them from darkness to light and translating them from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. This work is to be prosecuted with a burning zeal, with every ounce of energy at our command, and to the full extent of our financial resources, God-given time and talents—all of which are to be consecrated fully to this great work. That is the clear teaching of the Word; that is the meaning of the word *proselytize*. Webster defines it as meaning "to convert"; and he defines the word *convert* as meaning: "4. To produce the spiritual change called conversion in (anyone); to turn from a bad life to a good one; to change the heart and moral character of (anyone) from the controlling power of sin to that of holiness" (as in James 5:20—"let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins").

However, the verb *to proselytize* takes on a very bad connotation when zeal in prosecuting it is not according to knowledge and contrary to the will of God. The Pharisees are denounced, not because they proselytized most assiduously and with a burning zeal, but because they promulgated *anti-Christian doctrines*, which roused the rabble into murderous hatred of Christ, Christianity, and Christians and brought damnation not only on themselves, but also on their proselytes. The Pharisees are denounced also because *their motives* did not aim at the salvation of souls, but at strengthening their party and at enhancing their own reputation, prestige, and glory.—And in the light of the Savior's language, that in their blind zeal they compassed land and sea to make one convert," as well as in the light of 1 Pet. 4:15, which forbids men to be busybodies in other men's matters, zeal that is not according to knowledge leads to a *transgression of boundaries God fixed* and beyond which we are not to go to proselytize and "convert" those who are not legitimate objects of our endeavors. Transgression of the lines God has drawn brings the offender into the unenviable company of murderers, thieves, and evildoers (1 Pet. 4:15).

Pastor R. A. Jesse in his approach to the subject treats the verb "to proselytize" as a transitive verb. A transitive verb denotes action and at the same time requires a receiver for the action. Therefore, if proselytizing is to be kept within the legitimate and divine channels, we are not only to examine the *doctrine* we promulgate and not only the purity of our *motives*. It is also incumbent upon us to ask: "Is the person into whose life we would penetrate with the Gospel, or whom we would turn from one belief to another, or from one denomination or from one congregation to another—is that person a *legitimate object* for our endeavor"?

Accepting the Gospel, which we preach as the world's *unica spes*, her only hope; taking the purity of motive of the Christian minister for granted, the question that still confronts us in our

every endeavor is: *Who is a legitimate object of lawful efforts at proselytizing?*

In the light of this question a tremendous field for our activity invites us. It is so large that individual effort is utterly helpless. It calls for corporate action by large church bodies—and for a burning, unselfish, and untiring zeal of each member of the body. We are to cross the seven seas to evangelize heathen nations that are sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death. And here at home are the teeming millions of the totally unchurched. There are members of weird cults, of anti-Trinitarian sects, and of individual congregations which have been captured completely by anti-Christian, anti-Trinitarian Modernists and Liberalists. In other words, in all the world, at home and abroad, all who are without the Gospel of Christ and all who are not identified, or have not affiliated themselves, with any denomination in which the Gospel of salvation through faith in the atoning blood of Christ is still heard more or less are legitimate objects for missionary endeavor.

By the same token, this rules out all who are in affiliation, not nominally but in actual and active fact, with any denomination and congregation in which Christ is still lifted up as the Lamb of Calvary, who loved us and washed us from our sins and in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace. These are not legitimate objects of our endeavors, under penalty of incurring the displeasure of God and provoking Him to relegate us into the company of murderers, thieves, and evildoers (1 Pet. 4:15).

Members of other recognized Christian denominations do not have the Word of God in its full truth and purity nor the unadulterated Sacraments. But we, who, without any merit or worthiness on our part, have been more highly favored—only by the grace of God—must therefore be the more conscientiously obedient to the clearer knowledge we have, lest by false practice we put false doctrine into action.

In our teachings we dare not read all other Christian denominations and their members out of Christ's kingdom and insist—in effect, if not *expressis verbis*—that only Synodical Conference Lutherans can be Christians (or that all Synodical Conference members are Christians) and that all who teach otherwise than the Synodical Conference teacheth are hell-bound. This would be contrary to St. Paul, through whom the Holy Spirit speaks in 1 Cor. 3:11-15: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now, if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; *but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.*"

St. Paul clearly teaches that errorists who adulterate doctrine shall sustain loss in the last burning, but they themselves shall be saved *because*, despite their errors in some or many directions, in the main, *they built on the foundation of Jesus Christ*. Through the blood of the Savior, on whom they built, all sins, also the sin of teaching false doctrine, are forgiven them so long as they continued in their teachings not through stubborn unbelief, but through lack of knowledge and understanding. This is the clear teaching also of so simple a passage as John 3:16: "*Whosoever believeth*" in Christ — even one who in some particulars departed from clearly revealed doctrine through weakness — "shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

To your essayist it is both comforting and inspiring that errorists within the Christian Church on earth, whether those who depart from some truth be inside or outside the Synodical Conference, will still be saved because they still build on the foundation of Jesus Christ. Despite their error or errors and weakness or weaknesses, they are still the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ, just as we are the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ despite our own many weaknesses and sins.

The office of the keys is the peculiar church power which Christ has given to His Church — not exclusively to one congregation, to one denomination, nor only to the congregations of one synod or association of synods. It belongs to all Christians. Therefore, in the words of Dr. A. L. Graebner's *Outlines of Doctrinal Theology* (p. 242, par. 161; p. 243, par. 162), we teach that "The invisible Church of Christ is endowed with certain spiritual rights, privileges, and powers, all of which are vested in every local congregation of believers" and "The rights and powers of the Church of Christ and of every local congregation are those of preaching the Gospel, the administration of the Sacraments, especially the application of the keys of heaven, by loosing and binding in the name of God." — And in the same book, by the same author (p. 252, par. 170), we read: "Since an erring church, or a church contaminated with erroneous doctrine, is still a church as long as it has and sets into operation the essentials of the Gospel, the ministers called by such churches are still ministers of Christ and of the Church of God, and their official acts are valid as far as their performance is an administration of the means of grace." — In other words, the errors they hold through weakness do not deprive them of the rights and privileges which Christ has given to His Church on earth. This we must recognize not only in doctrine, but, lest our practice promulgate false doctrine, our practice must conform to our doctrine. Therefore we must respect their God-given rights and the validity of their official acts. To make inroads upon their memberships is equivalent to the guilt (in the vernacular) of sheepstealing and cattle rustling. Their members are not legitimate objects of proselytism. Their members have no right, ordinarily, to be served by us, because they have ministers of Christ whom they called to serve them and because,

as sheep of the flock, they have no right to follow other shepherds. And, more definitely, we have no call of God to solicit their memberships, no right to estrange, force, or entice them away from their pastors and congregations.

Truth never changes. What did the great men of God of the past teach? What was their practice? St. Paul tells us in Rom. 15:20 that in all his proselytizing and missionary endeavor he worked only where the Gospel was not yet known or accepted. "So have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." In other words, so long as men built on the foundation of Christ's saving work, even if they built some hay and stubble of false doctrine on it — so long as they built on the foundation of Christ, it was not for Paul to make inroads upon their work. So says he to the Romans. And in 2 Cor. 10 he is careful to point out that God had appointed him a missionary in Corinth, that he did not arrogate to himself a field that belonged to another, and that he did not try to entice anybody's members from him so that he, Paul, might boast in other men's labors. St. Peter sounds the same warning when he says: "Let none of you suffer as a busybody [a meddler] in other men's matters." And Luther, when the Dunkards were trying to make inroads on the Lutherans, wrote a blistering letter of "Warning Against Sneaks and Hedge Preachers," saying in part: "If such sneaks had no other blemish . . . this one single thing (that they come sneaking without a command and uncalled), powerfully proves they are the messengers and teachers of the devil. For the Holy Ghost does not sneak, but He flies down from heaven publicly. The snakes sneak, but the doves fly."

The above serves to make us wise as to the value of the work of those who sneak into Christian homes, sometimes under the guise of "nonsectarianism," to introduce into our Christian homes their books to bespatter the unwary with their poison; wise to the work of those who use sound Lutheran practice, e. g., the correct lodge practice, for a target to estrange the unwary, and unstable from us. It teaches us with emphasis not to stoop to tactics so low ourselves.

And if making inroads on other Christian denominations is forbidden, we need not mention how reprehensible it is to offend against a sister congregation and a brother of our own, that one may have to boast of another's labor. What saith the Law — the Seventh, Ninth, and Tenth Commandments? Paraphrased, they say: "We should fear and love God that we may not take our neighbor's money, goods, or church members"; "that we may not craftily seek to get our neighbor's inheritance or house or church members"; and "that we may not estrange, force, or entice away from our neighbor his wife, servants, cattle, or church members."

To give the discussion a timely turn, the essayist would remark that James C. Fernald's book *English Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions* furnishes us with the finer shade of meaning of synon-

ymous words. On p. 119 (tenth edition) he mentions as synonyms for the noun *convert* the nouns *disciple*, *neophyte*, *proselyte*. Then he points out that "a *convert* is a person who has come to one faith from a different belief or from unbelief. A *proselyte* is one who has been led to accept a religious system, whether with or without faith."

Last year the stirring "Each One Reach One" endeavor was launched with emphasis. Evangelistic work among the unchurched adults in the past was so feeble that our "Missouri" *Statistical Yearbook* had no column for recording adult confirmations until 1918 and no column for adult baptisms until 1919. Even a year ago the figures submitted failed to inspire. This seemingly has changed. But there are disturbing rumors afloat that we are lengthening our cords without properly strengthening our stakes, i. e., that through instruction periods reduced to an unreasonable minimum, the endeavor may develop into a race for numbers instead of a gain of souls, or, in keeping with Fernald's definition, a gathering in of proselytes rather than of converts who have been indoctrinated and are grounded in their faith and knowledge.

Again, as long as we live in our sinful flesh, the temptation to build on other men's labors will assert itself. Covetousness and the desire for self-aggrandizement have infected every human breast; and for the flesh it is much easier to gather in well-indoctrinated Lutherans who were added to the church by the labors of some other brother than it is to teach and instruct thoroughly and to wrestle with the problems, very vexing at times, of prospects who must be won and whose feet must be turned into the way of righteousness.

In all of our work the motives must aim at the glory of God and the salvation of blood-bought souls by making propaganda for Christ and adding converts to the Church—over and above the work of feeding all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made us overseers. To win the sheep from another fold by design is not only sinful in itself, but may prove detrimental to souls. Mission work must not develop into transmission work. And not all plants can stand replanting. It is good to have many churches through the length and breadth of the land into which our people may be gathered when under God's providence they must move; but it also is, in the average case, better for the individual to hold to the services of Christ's undershepherd who knows the peculiar problems, traits, etc., of the souls he won and which he served possibly through many a weary year. Transmission work at best does not build the Kingdom. It merely transplants individuals and may do irreparable harm to their souls.

Detroit, Mich.

R. JESSE

