

# Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FÜR EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XIV

October, 1943

No. 10

## CONTENTS

	Page
The Anselmic View of the Atonement. Thomas Coates .....	673
The Spiritual, Not the Social Gospel in the Church John Theodore Mueller .....	682
Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference) .....	694
Miscellanea .....	705
Theological Observer .....	721
Book Review .....	739

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *wei-*  
*den*, also dass er die Schafe unter-  
weise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen  
sein, sondern auch daneben den Woel-  
fen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht  
angreifen und mit falscher Lehre ver-  
fuehren 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 for the

Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



ARCHIVES

---

## Theological Observer

---

**In Memory of Dr. Adolph Hult.** The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, as also other periodicals of our Church, such as the *Lutheraner* and the *Lutheran Witness*, have already taken notice of the departure of Dr. A. Hult, professor of theology at the Theological Seminary, Rock Island (Augustana Synod), which took place on March 6 of this year, in terms praising his conservative stand as a theologian and his constant efforts on behalf of Lutheran orthodoxy in his own synod and others. It may perhaps not be out of place to quote also what the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (July, 1943) has to say of this conservative theologian, who with many others in the American Lutheran Conference fought the good fight for Biblical truth in a most laudable way. The *Theologische Quartalschrift* writes of him, among other things: "He was perhaps better known and more appreciated in our circles than any other theologian of his synod. His name stood for conservative Lutheranism, of which he was an outstanding exponent in his synod." The article then quotes the *Lutheran Companion* of his own synod and the *Lutheran Witness* on the importance of his work as a leading churchman and offers between the two one from the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (A. L. C.) which, we believe, should be given also here. We read: "Dr. Hult was a nobleman of fine culture and devoted Christian spirit, especially at home in secular and in religious music, well acquainted with the hymnological treasures of our church, in the German language as well as in the Scandinavian. He was a thorough theologian. He was better versed in the great German theological works than many theologians whose mother tongue is German. He was a sound Lutheran theologian. They sometimes called him 'the confessional watchdog' of his synod. His was no cold dogmatism. Biblical truth and Lutheran confession permeated with life were his highest treasures. Here he stood firm as a rock."

Conservatives like Dr. Hult account for the fact why many in our Synod, as also in the Synodical Conference as a whole, are not yet willing to break off negotiations with synods which by improper affiliation and other obstacles impeding Lutheran church union render it difficult for some to believe any further in the possibility of achieving a church union which does justice to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. Are there not in these synods many who are willing to serve as "confessional watchdogs" if only they are given proper support? Certainly, reports from intersynodical conferences suggest that in large circles there are indeed many conservatives of the type of Dr. Hult. They may not be as vocal as the liberal group, but they, nevertheless, are active in a quiet way. But could not perhaps even some of the liberals be moved to listen to God's Word if only it were presented to them in a winning, convincing way? Properly interpreted, God's earnest admonition applies also here: "Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die" (Rev. 3:2). We wonder what might

have happened in the 70's, when our Church was dealing with representatives of the General Council on behalf of church union, had not the predestinarian controversy and other factors brought the negotiations to a close? To us at any rate it seems to be a fair principle that as long as we are given opportunity to witness to the truth, that opportunity should be regarded as a challenge and responsibility. J. T. M.

**Articles on Lutheran Church Union.** Persons blessed with many exchanges at present cannot help reading many articles on Lutheran church union—bad, indifferent, and good. Bad, for example, are such articles as transfer the subject from the realm of clear and sober Christian thinking to that of undue emotionalism, trying either to whip recalcitrant nonconformists into line or inciting sentiment against this or that synod by “atrocious stories.” Thus much has been made in recent months of the supposed refusal of two Missouri Synod pastors to admit to Holy Communion certain servicemen of other synods, and much bitterness and anti-Missouri sentiment has been created by this unfriendly and inconsiderate representation, though afterwards on inquiry it was ascertained that there was “another side” to one story, while the other could not at all be verified. Here was regrettable hasty action, doing much to prevent Lutheran church union, and as the *American Lutheran* (August, 1943) says, “not worthy of comment in a sermon or a national monthly.” During the past summer the writer served as guest pastor for his son in West Palm Beach, Fla., where many servicemen from a number of near-by camps and many Spars from the Biltmore Hotel attend the Missouri Synod services. Though acting in agreement with the stipulation of the Army and Navy Commission in general, the pastor refused Holy Communion to two service-women, one who announced for the Lord's Table just before the beginning of the service so that there was not enough time for the discussion of sacramental fellowship, and another who was so unaware of her Lutheran affiliation that she knew the names neither of her pastor nor of her church nor of her synod, so that also she was asked to defer her sacramental communion. The minister's practice was no different when he dealt with members of the Synodical Conference coming to him under similar circumstances, though, almost without exception, these were supplied with “Communion certificates” by their pastors. Now, if these two ladies would have rashly reported their experiences, there might have been some more “Missouri Synod atrocious stories,” and more bitterness against Missouri, especially among laymen not understanding the issue, might have been spread. Perhaps they did not, for the minister, as well as the time allowed, explained to them the problem involved in sacramental communion, and apparently they were satisfied with his pastoral advice.—Again, the Lutheran church movement is not furthered when the real point at issue is circumvented and such things are urged as: “This can be done only [church union can be promoted] when we acknowledge each other as Lutherans, cease our petty bickerings and misunderstandings, call a halt to our destructive competition and duplications, seek mutual forgiveness for our unchristian jealousies and recriminations, and learn to pray, worship, and commune together as brethren in the faith.” Such

a representation ignores the fact that there still exist obstacles, serious enough to separate the various synods, such as, for example, the lodge question, pulpit and altar fellowship with sectarian denominations, the denial of Biblical inspiration, and perhaps others. The matter, impeding church union, is not at all one of "petty bickerings and misunderstandings," but one of Christian doctrine and practice, about which not only Missouri, but also many Lutherans in other synods are vitally concerned.—Nor does it help the movement if such things are said as: "I think it [a certain article] is timely and perhaps will help some of the rest of us to 'be patient with Missouri' until the trends that are in evidence today within that body can work themselves out in the direction of greater friendliness toward other Lutherans." If the matter were one merely of "greater friendliness," Missouri (as an organization) would not hesitate a moment to consummate and declare altar and pulpit fellowship with all non-Synodical Conference Lutherans. The fact of "greater friendliness" is very much beside the point. There are definite principles at stake, which Missouri finds herself conscience-bound to hold, and these principles are evidently shared also by many members of non-Missouri synods.—Again, the matter of Lutheran church union may be impeded by too much writing on the subject. We believe that the various synods did well to entrust the matter of church union to commissions, consisting of sober and fair-minded men, instructing them to arrive at an understanding not by way of public controversy, but by discussing the various issues in restricted group conferences. Too much writing on the matter certainly causes confusion and may produce endless strife and debate. This does not mean that there should be no non-official writing on the score, but let all who do write, remember their grave responsibility before God and the Church and write only after much clear and objective thinking and with much sincere charity, and, above all, with their minds fixed upon God's Word as the only norm and guide, and not on transitory earthly values.—But despite all the travail connected with the present union movement, there is much at which one may rejoice. For one thing, there is for the most part that right and godly kind of controversy which brings into focus the Word of God and impresses the Church with its central duty of proclaiming the Law and the Gospel in their Scriptural purity. The result has been greater clarity in viewing important questions. The timely Graebner-Kretzmann contribution *Toward Lutheran Union*, numerous articles in the *Lutheran Witness*, the *Lutheraner*, the *American Lutheran*, not to speak of such as appeared in non-Synodical Conference periodicals (we are just thinking of what Dr. Reu has written in the interest of truth and fairness), in periodicals of other synods of the Synodical Conference, and last, but not least, those that came to us through the *Australasian Review*, have shed much new light on the difficult problem and done much rightly to orient the movement. After all, the basic questions underlying the whole movement are few and simple: "What really is it about?" "What does God's Word say or not say on this point or that?" "Are we willing to accept God's Word?" These questions, rightly considered, will suggest Luther's charitable and objective controversial methodology: "On this point we may yield. On that point

we may bear for a while. On these points we cannot yield an inch." Luther did not settle all controversies that arose at his time. Nor are we able by our reason or strength to bring about a church union pleasing to God. That after all is the Lord's own special and gracious gift. But we may witness to the truth as it is set forth in clear words in Holy Scripture, and if through the omnipotent divine Word the Lutherans in our land will be moved to see eye to eye in matters of faith and life, the problem facing them is gloriously solved. And we do believe that on the whole through the study of God's Word we are slowly moving toward a better understanding and a deeper appreciation of the issues at stake.—And one more point. After Luther's death the controversies that troubled Lutheranism were settled neither by the too ardent orthodoxists, nor by the yielding liberalists, but by the moderate, rather nonvocal but extremely loyal central party, represented by men like Martin Chemnitz, who were deeply grounded in Lutheran theology and firm in their Lutheran convictions, yet ready to yield in all matters of adiaphora, while keeping in mind that it is the glory of the Christian Church to hold the Word and preach the Word. Much emphasis is now being placed on prayer fellowship. Certainly, true unity in teaching and practice will not be granted to Lutheranism in America unless with prayerful meditation of the divine Word we make Christ's sublime intercession our own: "Sanctify them (us) through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth" (John 17:17).—And last, but not least. As has been said time and again, there must be more contacts, not contacts of unionism and indifferentism, but contacts of brotherly charity and Christian helpfulness to attain the goal: "That ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10).

J. T. M.

**From St. Louis via Mendota and Louisville — Whither?** One of our most welcome exchanges is the *Australasian Theological Review*, edited by the Rev. Dr. H. Hamann, president of Concordia College, Unley, S. A., who is noted for his brilliant style, keen analysis, and good judgment. In the January-March, 1943, number he presents to his readers a bird's-eye view of the Lutheran church union movement in the United States, to which he appends both criticism and prediction. The value of the article lies chiefly in the objective estimate of the movement by a learned, unbiased, fair-minded scholar, who is so far removed from the field of events that he must depend entirely on the (somewhat limited) articles which he reads on the subject. We believe that Dr. Hamann on most points hits the nail squarely on the head and that our readers will appreciate his evaluation even where they do not agree with him. He writes: "It was at St. Louis, in the year 1938, that the convention of the Missouri Synod adopted certain resolutions which, together with similar action by the American Lutheran Church, gave rise to the hope that the contemplated establishment of fellowship between these two Lutheran bodies would be consummated within a comparatively short time. It was perhaps unexpected, and it is certainly to be regretted, that this hope grew steadily more dim as time went on. As regards the Missouri Synod, voices raised within that body as well as in the affiliated synods charged the doctrinal basis with a lack of completeness and

clarity. It is no exaggeration to speak of strong opposition to the resolutions of 1938. Yet the Missouri Synod, in its convention of 1941, while expressing regret 'that the American Lutheran Church as a body has not taken as firm an attitude in reference to establishing doctrinal unity as under the circumstances we had reason to hope for,' did not in any way rescind or invalidate or weaken its action of 1938; and the Synodical Conference, while requesting that final action be postponed until certain questions raised had been cleared up, and while urging the advisability of formulating a single document of union, did nothing to discourage the movement, still less did it close the door to further negotiations. What attempts or efforts were made by the American Lutheran Church to bring its partners in the American Lutheran Conference, the Norwegian Synod and the Augustana Synod, into line with its *Declaration* and with the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod, we do not know; but it is unfortunately true that its promise to make such efforts were, at least to a certain extent, counteracted by its *a priori* declaration: 'We are not willing to give up our membership in the American Lutheran Conference.' Divergent opinion within the A. L. C. on this entire matter was indicated occasionally by what some men wrote in its publications and by reports on the results of joint conferences between members of the A. L. C. and members of the Missouri Synod. Then came the *Pittsburgh Agreement*, the fruit of negotiations between the American Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church, which was eventually adopted by both bodies. This development augured ill for the discussion between the A. L. C. and the Missouri Synod (Synodical Conference). For that document is, by reason of its extremely limited range, far too brief to constitute an acceptable doctrinal basis; its statement on Inspiration is justly regarded as inadequate in view of the circumstances that gave it birth; and it met with determined opposition from sections within the U. L. C. A. Still, however ominous this *Agreement* was in view of the continued negotiations with Missouri, only people who knew much more about the trend of events than the present writer could have been prepared for the bomb released by the A. L. C., when it adopted its *Union Resolutions* at Mendota, Ill., in October, 1942. Our readers will have seen the text in the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* (December, 1942, p. 943). Briefly, the American Lutheran Church declared its readiness to establish pulpit and altar fellowship with either or both the Missouri Synod and the United Lutheran Church; such fellowship to be based on 'their full and whole-hearted acceptance of, and adherence to, either of these documents' (i. e., the *Pittsburgh Agreement* on the one hand, and the *Brief Statement* with the *Declaration* on the other). It may be noted in this connection that, according to the Preamble, the A. L. C. accepted the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod 'in the light of the *Declaration* of the A. L. C.' This is historically not true. There is no such thing in the *Declaration*. The phrase 'viewed in the light of the *Declaration*' was first used at Sandusky, we believe, and with a very limited meaning, as the context makes clear. However, all that is past. The very fact that the A. L. C., while stretching out one hand to Missouri, extends the other to the U. L. C. A., makes it impossible for Missouri to accept, unless it can hold

out its other hand to the U. L. C. A. and thus complete the circle. Besides, the U. L. C. A. has already grasped the outstretched hand of the A. L. C. During its convention held at Louisville, Kentucky, it adopted the following resolution, according to the *Theologische Quartalschrift* of January, 1943 (p. 66): 'Resolved, that (1) We receive with appreciation and deep gratitude to God the resolution of the A. L. C. in convention assembled at Mendota, Ill., which recognizes our fundamental agreement and proclaims their readiness to establish full pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A. (2) We instruct the president of our church, in conjunction with the president of the A. L. C., to consummate and declare at the earliest possible date the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship.'—Thus matters stand. We are not sufficiently well acquainted with the spirit prevailing in the A. L. C. and with the inner working of that body to account for this sudden *volte-face*, which seems inexplicable in men who accepted the *Brief Statement* and declared their conviction in the *Declaration*. One can understand and to some extent condone impatience at the slow progress in the discussions with Missouri, though here impatience should have been held in check by the consideration that Missouri displayed patience at least equally great. The sudden turn from the extreme right to the extreme left of American Lutheranism strains one's sense of reality and makes heavy demands on the charity that 'believeth all things.' The simultaneous offer of fellowship to both wings approaches a bad joke. After that, we do not think that the proviso in the Mendota resolutions will long stand in the way of consummation of fellowship between the U. L. C. A. and the A. L. C. We look to see the proclamation of fellowship take place 'at the earliest possible date.' For the rest, we accept the judgment of Dr. Wm. Arndt in the January issue (1943) of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY (Foreword, p. 6): 'If without insistence on such compliance (*i. e.*, with the proviso just spoken of.—H. H.) the A. L. C., listening to the urgings of its liberal wing, will declare pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A., conservative Lutheranism will receive a severe blow. Such a move will mean the eventual absorption of the A. L. C. in the U. L. C. A., if not organically, then at least ideologically and theologically. If that should come to pass, we should sincerely regret it. Not only should we consider such a course a violation of divine directives, but we believe that both historically and on account of the convictions of many of its members the A. L. C. does not belong in the liberal camp of Lutherans. We, however, much though we should like to establish fellowship with the A. L. C., could not on that account change our own course and likewise become a liberal Lutheran body, condoning or approving tacitly the membership of many pastors of the U. L. C. A. in the Masonic lodge, the almost indiscriminate pulpit and altar fellowship practiced by many U. L. C. A. churches with sectarian congregations, and the denial of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, which is voiced by prominent U. L. C. A. theologians.'—Should all this come to pass, the United Norwegian Synod and the Augustana Synod would probably also find themselves in fellowship with the U. L. C. A. before long, where indeed one would expect them to feel more at home than the A. L. C.; and American Lutheranism would number two main divisions instead of three. It

would truly be a blow to conservatism in America. Still, we should not despair of the future of Lutheranism in America. When the General Council and the General Synod joined in the 'Merger' twenty-five years ago to form the U. L. C. A., it was done to the slogan: 'Let's merge the best and submerge the rest.' How far that submerging process has been carried out we are unable to say; but it is true that, as Dr. Theodore Graebner has recently pointed out more than once, the U. L. C. A. is today far more Lutheran than was the General Synod one hundred or fifty or forty years ago. One should never do evil that good may come of it. But God's providence does often overrule sin and evil for ultimate good." — Should readers complain that Dr. Hamann's article contains too much (for them) repetitious historical material, we reply that the historical data, which are here stated in such clear review, are necessary to understand the final verdict of the author, which, we believe, is well worth considering. Besides, are the historical events, here narrated, really so well lodged in our minds that they do not require repetition from time to time and through repetition pertinent re-study of them, especially since they took place so rapidly? Certainly, pulpit and altar fellowship has not yet been officially established between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A., and in the A. L. C. and some of its affiliated synods conservative pastors and laymen are still earnestly considering the "obstacles" standing in the way of such fellowship. In the meanwhile, conferences between Missouri Synod and A. L. C. pastors are being held, and numerous helpful books and articles, such as *Toward Lutheran Union* (Graebner-Kretzmann) and the four pertinent articles on the union question in recent issues of the *Lutheran Witness*, are doing much to clarify attitudes and situations and to urge upon all pastors involved in the movement sober Christian thinking and careful, profitable speaking and writing. But even if pulpit and altar fellowship should be declared between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A., Dr. Hamann's closing sentences spread a ray of light and hope to such as would see nothing but gloom in that case. At any rate much opportunity is still being given the Synodical Conference to witness to the truth, and Missouri's moderation, patience, and objectivity in dealing in the matter with other synods have done much to gain the good will and confidence of such non-Missouri conservatives as, together with us, desire a church union based on true unity in doctrine and practice. As Dr. Hamann points out, the situation is not so altogether hopeless as some would think. By His grace God may still work the miracle of a Lutheran church union which is in accord with His Word and therefore fully pleasing to Him, if only we continue together in the conscientious study of God's Word. J. T. M.

**The V-12 Program and Chaplaincies.** In the week of July 5 the Navy Department announced the details of the Navy College Training Program for Chaplains. This is part of the Navy's V-12 program. The salient points of this program are the following:

1. "The Navy College Training Program will include a limited number of pre-theological and theological students who will be trained for eventual service in the Navy as chaplains. All denominations and prospective applicants are hereby advised that a man who satisfactorily



completes this program may be appointed a chaplain in the U. S. Naval Reserve, provided he is granted full ordination and ecclesiastical endorsement by his denomination. No applicant will be accepted for this training unless his denomination is prepared to grant full ordination and ecclesiastical endorsement immediately upon the satisfactory completion of this program.

"Applicants who are admitted to this training program will be enlisted or inducted as Apprentice Seamen, U. S. Naval Reserve. They will be placed on active duty and receive the pay, allowances, etc., of Apprentice Seamen. In addition thereto, the Government will provide board, room, tuition, books, and uniforms. While in college they will be given the usual military drills. Theological students in seminaries will not be required to take military drill."

2. All applicants must pass the V-12 screening test and give evidence of potential officer qualifications and scholarship. High school graduates with less than two years of college work are not assigned to the pre-theological program until the end of the first year of college. If not accepted for pre-theological training, such students will continue their college training for some other branch in the service and are not permitted to withdraw from the V-12 program. College juniors and seniors, college graduates, and seminary students, however, may apply directly for admission to the chaplaincy training program, and applicants approved by the Navy for this classification are assured before entering into the service that they will receive pre-theological and theological training.

3. Candidates selected from colleges and universities must attend a school which has adopted the Navy College Program.

4. The time spent for the Bachelor of Arts degree is four academic years of two sixteen-week semesters each. Semesters, however, run consecutively so that the four years' work must be accomplished in three calendar years. The program covering the four years of pre-theological work is as follows: English, 18 hours; History, 22; the Social Studies, 24; Mathematics, 14; the Natural Sciences, 16; Modern Foreign Languages, or Greek, 22; Psychology and Philosophy, 18; and an elective (Bible), 12; Physical Training, 12.

5. For the Bachelor of Divinity degree three academic years of two sixteen-week semesters each are prescribed. The 96 weeks are to be completed in two calendar years. The Navy does not prescribe the curriculum for theological students and "will not exercise any control or jurisdiction over the curriculum of a theological seminary." However, theological students must attend a seminary which in addition to an accelerated program must be near a college training unit, because the theological student "is responsible for military purposes to a commanding officer." Seminary students wear the cadet type uniform with distinguishing insignia instead of the Apprentice Seaman uniform worn by pre-theological students, although retaining the Apprentice Seaman rating.

Any pre-theological or theological student may be dropped from the V-12 program and ordered to general duty in the Navy as an Appren-

ticed Seaman for the following reasons: 1) Disciplinary reasons; 2) failure to maintain set scholarship standards; 3) failure to demonstrate set officerlike qualities; and 4) ecclesiastical endorsement withdrawn by his denomination.

The quota for our Synod would be as follows: three men for the sophomore and junior college years, and two men for each class of the senior college and three classes of the seminary program.

F. E. M.

**Our Theological Curriculum and Navy Chaplaincies.** In reply to a detailed statement concerning the training of ministers in the Missouri Synod, prepared by the undersigned and submitted by the Rev. Paul Dannenfeldt of the Army and Navy Commission, Chaplain Robert D. Workman, Chief of Chaplains, U. S. N., states: "We are all agreed that your course of training for the ministerial students of your denomination is excellent for the purpose for which it is intended. The Navy Department's requirements, however, of those who seek appointment as chaplains in this branch of the armed forces is that each applicant shall have completed four full years of work in an accredited college or university, and three additional years of work in an accredited theological seminary." It is apparent that the Navy's ideals in pre-theological training are different from those of our Church. While we place the major emphasis on such training as will enable men to become strong in exegesis and dogmatics, the Navy is interested primarily in training pre-theological students thoroughly in the social studies, as is evident from the Navy's proposed curriculum for pre-theological training in the V-12 program. In an integrated program such as ours, where the curriculum is fixed beginning with freshman high school, the study of the classical languages can be properly emphasized and progressively intensified during the high school program, so that in reality the four-year high school program in our preparatory schools represents considerably more than the average high school program.—In conferring the A. B. degree on a combined liberal arts and pre-professional program, Concordia Seminary follows the practice of recognized schools in the Middle West. The officials who evaluated our program apparently follow the pattern in vogue among Eastern schools, where the A. B. degree is conferred only upon the completion of four years of strictly liberal arts courses. It is therefore evident that the graduates of Concordia Seminary can meet the requirements of the Navy only if they spend approximately one year in taking additional courses in sociology, economics, psychology, history, and philosophy, and earn their A. B. degree at a school which is accredited with one of the regional accrediting agencies.

F. E. M.

**Wrong View of Ordination.** A correspondence from Edinburgh, published in the *Christian Century*, states that a Czech who had studied theology but whose return to Czechoslovakia for ordination had been made impossible by the war, came to Scotland and joined an air force of his countrymen. "In the absence of any Czech chaplain, he also conducted religious services and, indeed, carried on a religious mission among his fellow countrymen in the air forces." He and others held

the strange view that since he was not ordained, he could not administer the Sacraments. He then applied to the Church of Scotland for ordination "not as a minister of the Church of Scotland, but so that he might act as an ordained chaplain for the men of his own communion." The church authorities held that, strictly speaking, the consent of the Church of Slovakia would have to be procured, but on account of the war it was impossible to get in touch with it. The Assembly of the Church of Scotland then ignored "red tape" and instructed the Edinburgh Presbytery to ordain him "to the office of the Holy Ministry for work among the members of the Church of the Czech Brethren in the Czechoslovakia forces." How sad that such a wrong view is taken of a human ordinance, ordination. The matter should have been settled by a call issued to this Czech candidate of theology by the men whom he served. It is the call that makes a person a minister and not the mere outward act of ordination. A.

**A New "High" of Papal Claims.** The following editorial appeared in the *Christian Century*:

"Full text of the new papal encyclical *Mysticæ Corporis* has not yet been published, but the summary with extended quotations in the Roman Catholic press indicates its scope and purpose. The central part of the encyclical is an 'ample theological study' of the doctrine of the church as the mystical body of Christ. The conclusion is that, since refusal to recognize revealed truth has brought the world to its present unhappy state, the remedy is to be found in the acceptance of the law of God and the authority of Christ. The affirmations and arguments of the encyclical purport to establish the identity of accepting the authority of Christ with accepting the authority of the Roman Catholic Church ('as almost another Christ') and of the Roman pontiff as the infallible bearer of Christ's authority in the world today. In the discussion of the church as the 'mystical body of Christ' there is much that will find a sympathetic response from many Protestant thinkers, though it does not appear in the available extracts from the pope's pronouncement that he makes any valuable contribution to the analysis or exposition of this Pauline concept. His assertion that a 'mystical body' is 'necessarily visible and recognizable . . . imperishable and infallible,' and that Christ 'exercise visible power over the universal church through the Roman pontiff, his vicar on earth,' is merely a reassertion of familiar claims which will be convincing only to those already convinced. Saying it over and over again, in solemn language, with great truths interspersed upon which all Christians must agree, adds nothing to the cogency of the papal claim to be the infallible arbiter under which the church fulfills Christ's commission 'to teach, sanctify, and govern.' The Vatican has learned how to phrase its demand for world-wide dominion in somewhat less provocative terms than those of *Unam Sanctam*, but its demand is unchanged."

No one of our readers will fail to note the words "as almost another Christ" which are employed to describe the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. It appears as though the Pope thinks that his temporal power and his papal claims have to be in inverse ratio. A.

**A Post-Mortem of Mussolini.** Our readers will peruse with interest what *America*, a Jesuit weekly, has to say on the downfall of Mussolini. Discussing the subject "Mussolini and the Church," the paper says editorially:

"Five years from now historians will be issuing volumes listing all the books, pamphlets, and articles which will explain the fall of Mussolini. We shall learn how his political demise was expected; who it was that betrayed him among his closest friends, or who most effectively planned his destruction among his open enemies.

"The first indications of waning popularity will be remembered, such as the popular resentment at the lavish sums spent by the Regime in order to entertain Hitler on his visit to Rome in 1938; or the gradual diminution of encores on the occasion of his periodical appearances on the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia. Even back in 1939, it was reported, there were but three or four *pro forma* summonses; then the crowd began to dwindle away.

"Less likely to be recalled will be the praises of Mussolini in his early days offered by leading statesmen and contemporary historians in Great Britain and the United States who have had no good word for him in later years.

"When all is appraised and summed up, however, if it ever is, Mussolini's difficulties with the Church will, in all probability, be found to have contributed to his eventual downfall much more than at first sight would be expected. Or, to put this in another way, these difficulties were the sign of an inner weakness which was bound in time to gain the upper hand.

"When Mussolini concluded the Lateran Treaty with the Holy See in 1929, it was the greatest moral triumph of his career. Whatever were his motives in that transaction, it placed him in a position that the greatest diplomats and statesmen of the world could envy. He had cut through a thousand doubts and perplexities; he had restored to the Italian people the noble task of being the earthly custodians, as it were, of the religious leadership of the world.

"But the hour of his moral triumph was followed by the first indications of his future downfall. The bitter controversy concerning Catholic Action which developed from the interpretation of the treaty led to the *Non Abbiamo Bisogno* of Pope Pius XI and exposed the inmost spiritual contradictions of the Fascist system in its relation to education. Mussolini had shocked and grieved the Holy Father beyond measure by his cynical, anti-clerical harangue in the Fascist Parliament. This outburst was a passionate profession of faith in all that the traditional anti-Catholic or anti-religious elements in Italy had brewed through the years against the Church and against the Holy See; all that had vexed the Church and contributed toward its persecution.

"Once more, on February 11, 1932, Mussolini's ceremonial visit to the Vatican seemed to be a harbinger of a brighter future. But the seed of estrangement had been too deeply planted not to keep on fructifying. Regardless of his personal beliefs or lack of beliefs, Mussolini had maintained a certain link with the Church by his far-reach-

ing plans for social reform, such as his ringing attack on "industrial urbanism" in his historic speech of May 26, 1927. But these were eventually subordinated to his still further-reaching schemes of world empire. It was only a matter of time when the door would be opened for the greatest of all estrangements, the admission of Hitler's militantly pagan ideology to an honored place in Fascist Italy. There was no longer a question of a squint: an eye to a brutal pragmatism, yet still with an eye to the practical importance of religion and of certain spiritual ideas and spiritually inspired social policies. The squint was succeeded by a glare, and that glare was fixed upon objects and aims prescribed by an alien and a master hand.

"The Duce's increasing distance from the Church had the fatal effect of isolating him from his own people, who have remained fundamentally Catholic, as their unswerving devotion in wartime to the Holy Father has proved. At the same time, it built up a wall of spiritual isolation between Italy and the rest of the world." We are not surprised to see this attempt of the Jesuits to make capital out of Mussolini's glorious exit.

A.

**Self-Communion by the Pastor.**—*The Australasian Theological Review* is so delightfully readable, especially in its editorial features *Notes and Comments* and *The Church in the World*, written by the Rev. Prof. H. Hamann, D. D., president of Concordia College, Unley, South Australia, that we heartily recommend it to our pastors who are interested in worth-while theological literature. We are sure they will not regret the small investment which brings them such rich returns. The periodical may be ordered through Concordia Publishing House.—Our brethren in Australia, facing the problem of more frequent communing by pastors living in isolated localities, some time ago considered the question of self-communion by the pastor and published in their official quarterly (March 31, 1943) a conclusive report on the matter adopted by the South Australian District Pastoral Conference. In introducing the report, Dr. Hamann remarks that all that can be said on the matter has already been stated by Dr. Walther in his *Pastoraltheologie* (pp. 197—200; also 175—181), so that there really is no need of further comment. He subjoins also Dr. Pieper's classroom remark: "*Die Gemeinde mag ein Gemeindeglied, etwa einen Vorsteher, dazu bestimmen, dem Pastor das Abendmahl zu reichen.*" Nevertheless, because of its clearness, precision, and completeness the "report" is well worth considering. Professor Hamann writes: "1. There is nothing in Holy Scripture to prevent the pastor from communing with his congregation; on the contrary, it is most reasonable to assume that the 'elders' and 'bishops' in apostolic times joined in Holy Communion with their flock. 2. The greatest theologians of the Lutheran Church, from Luther down, have declared self-communion by the pastor to be permissible in case of necessity; i. e., when the pastor's isolated situation deprives him of the blessings of the Holy Communion except at long intervals. 3. There seems to be a desire in our circles for more frequent Communion on the part of the pastor than on the few occasions provided by pastoral conferences and synodical meetings. There are many good reasons why this should be recom-

mended, and there is no sound reason why it should be discouraged. 4. Another way of meeting the difficulty is to let the congregation appoint one of its members (one of the deacons, or elders) to administer the sacred elements to the pastor. This method must certainly be left open [be permitted] if pastor and congregation prefer it. 5. If, as a result of a favorable vote by the conference, self-communion of the pastor is introduced in our congregations, it is perhaps desirable that some degree of uniformity be aimed at. Two ways suggest themselves: a. that the pastor takes the bread and wine *before* he dispenses them to the congregation; b. that he takes the elements *after* all other communicants have received them. In both cases no dispensing words need be used, but the pastor may well add the prayer: 'May the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His precious blood, strengthen and keep me in true faith to life everlasting. Amen.' Perhaps the second way is to be preferred, because it corresponds more closely to the method now in use when two pastors officiate. 6. In congregations where self-communion or reception of the Sacrament at the hands of an elder has not so far been practiced, the pastor must, of course, discuss the matter with the congregation and give the necessary instruction before the innovation is introduced."

In view of the facts that Holy Communion has the nature of an absolution and that the Office of the Keys and its administration belongs primarily to Christian believers as spiritual priests, Dr. Pieper's *anderer Ausweg* may be preferred to self-communion by the pastor. If, in that case, the pastor receives the Lord's Supper at the hands of a chosen elder or deacon, it is made clear also that he receives it not as a pastor, but as one of the believing members of the congregation. There may be no danger of a *Priesterstolz*, or priestly pride, in our democratic circles, but it is nevertheless well for the pastor, when he receives the Holy Supper, to show also by outward form that he receives it just as do all other believers. Of course, the whole matter belongs into the field of *adiaphora*, which, nevertheless, are governed by the royal rule of Christian conduct that "all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14:40. See also Smalcald Articles, *Conc. Trigl.*, 465, § 4; C. T. M., XI:610 ff.

J. T. M.

**Unscriptural Teaching at Colgate-Rochester.**—Under this heading, Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (May 22, 1943), furnishes proof that Rochester Theological Seminary, now known as Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, is no longer the conservative Baptist Seminary it used to be when Dr. Augustus H. Strong taught there as professor of Christian dogmatics. One of its present teachers is Prof. Conrad Moehlman, who in 1939 published a book called *Protestantism's Challenge: a Study of the Survival Value of Protestantism*. The excerpts from Professor Moehlman's book which Dr. Gordon offers show that Colgate-Rochester's Protestantism has very few survival values left. Here are some of Professor Moehlman's untrue and unchristian pronouncements: "The seven words of the cross are not historically dependable. Did Jerusalem Jews nineteen centuries ago cry: 'His blood be upon us and our children'? Did they publicly choose Caesar as king? The answer of history is, No!" (P. 190.) Again: "John 19:16:

'We have no king but Caesar!' On the face of it this is slander contradicted by the whole history of Israel and Judah." (P. 205.) Again: "Does Jesus anywhere suggest that an atonement must be offered before God can forgive? For Jesus forgiveness is on the basis of repentance and faith." (P. 227.) Has Professor Moehlman never read Matt. 20:28? Or: "Jesus seems unacquainted with man corrupted by an ancient fall. Man is not at all helpless. The human mind is a trustworthy guide. It can be depended on to give us dependable information regarding God. Man can do the will of God. Jesus' view of the splendor of man beckons him to scale the ethical heights of life and is antithetical to the postulates of most Christian churches." (P. 238.) But what about John 3:5, 6? Or: "Invention is resorted to for the purpose of insuring the agreement of the passion of Jesus with what is assumed to be its prediction [*i. e.*, Is. 53, for example. — E. G.]." (P. 208.) But what about the blatant inventions of Modernists to deny the divine truths so clearly taught in Scripture? Again: "The Gospel of John offers a second-century construction of what took place at Calvary." (P. 215.) But even that certainly would be safer than Professor Moehlman's own twentieth-century construction, which simply denies what the four evangelists declare with one accord. Again: "There was no trial of Jesus by the Jewish Sanhedrin. It was Pilate who sent Jesus to the cross as a political revolutionist. Jesus did not die as a religious prophet, but upon the charge of revolution." (P. 208.) Professor Moehlman seems to feel himself quite omniscient in deciding what is fact in sacred history and what is not. Or: "This earliest fellowship meal [the Lord's Supper] was not related to the death of Jesus in any expiatory way." (P. 164.) "The Christian Eucharist is not rooted in the Jewish Passover." (P. 160.) But why add any more Modernistic *no's* to the *yea's* and *amen's* of Holy Scripture? We agree with Dr. Gordon when he writes: "A seminary that countenances such teaching is not worthy of Christian confidence and support. Protestantism of this type has no survival value."

J. T. M.

**Missions as Seen by Modernists.** — *The Presbyterian Guardian* (May, 1943) very interestingly reviews a little book of ninety-six pages, entitled *Christian World Facts* (1942), published "for the use of ministers and lay readers" by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. This booklet, it is said, contains items of information concerning missionary work all over the world, as well as short articles on missions by various persons. The Modernist slant in it is unmistakable both in what is included and in what is omitted. The little book may interest us, because the Foreign Missions Conference of North America represents the Foreign Mission Boards of most of the large and some of the small denominations of American Protestantism. It is one of the eight bodies involved in the recent Cleveland meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and is one of the important organizations that will comprise the projected North American Council of Churches. That means that the Conference is a body of utmost importance in giving out information and deciding issues on missionary work. Now, as the *Presbyterian Guardian* asks, Is it trustworthy in its functions of reporting and interpreting the situation on the foreign mission fields to ministers

and church members at home? The *Guardian* is not very greatly pleased with the page of Spanish-American poetry, which opens with a poem called "Deity." The poem is by Amad Nervo, who died in 1910. "But why," asks the *Guardian*, "should it be selected for a place in such a publication as *Christian World Facts*? The pantheizing trend of the first stanza [which the *Guardian* quotes] is obvious. So it asks: "Is the Christianity sponsored by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America inclusive enough to take in pantheism?" Again, the *Guardian* is not at all pleased with the way the book quotes such Modernists as Toyohiko Kagawa and Albert Schweitzer, giving not the slightest hint that these men have departed far from the historic Christian truth. "The uninformed reader would naturally tend to conclude that Kagawa and Schweitzer are Christian believers in the old-fashioned meaning of the word." Lastly, the book, while mentioning the attitude of the Japanese government toward Christianity, creates the totally false impression that the Japanese authorities are favorable or at least fair to true Christianity. After having proved its point, the *Guardian* writes: "If it is true that there has been little or no interference on the part of the Japanese government with Christian institutions in Japan, this is only because of the spineless spirit of compromise with which the churches in Japan, and foreign missionaries along with them, have met every demand on the part of the government. This spirit of compromise prevailed for many months before attack was made upon Britain and America, and there is no evidence of a change since then." The *Guardian* concludes its review with the remarks: "Since a publication such as *Christian World Facts* has nothing whatever to say against the abominable idolatry of Japanese State Shinto and the Christ-dishonoring Religious Bodies Law of Japan, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the paganism of American Modernism is quite compatible with the paganism of Japanese supernaturalism. If *Christian World Facts* represents the real character of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, we cannot avoid the conclusion that that body is neither true to the orthodox Christian faith nor trustworthy in reporting and interpreting conditions on the mission fields to the churches at home." Much has been said recently of the revival of Christian orthodoxy during the last few years, and there may be some truth in it so far as certain religious areas are concerned. But as our reading of late has shown, the backward-leaning, dyed-in-the-wool liberals are fighting a hard battle to hold their battered fortress of infidelity. Christian defenders of the faith have no right at all to think that there is nothing to fear since divine truth finds universal acceptance. Such conditions simply do not prevail during the last period of the world's existence. Our age calls for indoctrinated teachers and bold defenders of the precious truth which is in Christ Jesus.

J. T. M.

**How Does God Speak to Men?** This question Dr. Harris Franklin Rall, prominent Modernist in our country, answers in his department "Dr. Rall Answers Questions on Beliefs" in the *Christian Advocate* (Aug. 12, 1943). When dealing with laymen in popular church periodicals, Modernists dare not indulge in their usual nebulous obscurities, concealing their



ideas (if really they have any) rather than revealing them; but they must speak in terms which laymen can fairly comprehend. The "eighty-five-year-young correspondent" who put the question, insisted that God could not reveal Himself merely by deeds (a common liberal claim), but needed words, too, to make Himself known to men. The reply which is given shows that what Rall teaches is both antichristian and anti-scriptural. Rall contends in his reply that "God's revelation of Himself comes first in action. It is not by words supernaturally dropped from heaven or dictated to the writers of psalm or prophetic sermon, of gospel or epistle" (a denial of Biblical inspiration). He then states that God reveals Himself (which, of course, is right) in nature and history, adding to this the "illumination by His Spirit which enabled them [the Old Testament prophets] to know what was His character, His truth, and His will for men." Rall thus substitutes illumination for inspiration, as modern rationalistic theology has done long ago. Lastly he says: "The supreme deed of God and His supreme Word to man is Christ Himself. He is *the Word*." But how is this to be understood? Rall continues: "When Paul wrote his letters, which give us our best statement of the Christian gospel, the Spirit of the saving and revealing God was present to help him in insight and expression. This was all a part of God's work, only we must not think of that work in a mechanical fashion as a dictation of words or a laying down of ideas. In these words of evangelist and apostle they sought to set down God's Word to them. As we read their words, God is once more present with His Spirit, and through their words He speaks to us. Here again we have the deed of the living God." This sounds quite orthodox, as indeed of late Modernists invariably give to their unbelief a tinge of orthodoxy. According to what he here says, Rall may even be said to teach the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace, *i. e.*, the doctrine of the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost with and through the words of the evangelists and apostles. But Rall by no means thinks of God's self-revealing process in terms of traditional orthodoxy. He closes his reply with the words: "*But we must remember that the Word by which God speaks to us is one thing, the particular words are another*" (italics our own). "God's Word comes to us through the Bible, *but the Bible is not composed of the words of God*" (italics our own). Here again is Rall's fight against, and open rejection of, Biblical inspiration. According to Rall, the Bible neither is the Word of God nor contains the Word of God. It is only the means by which through the Spirit the Word of God comes to us, and this is typically Reformed doctrine (*Schwaermerei*). Rall says: "At their best, words are human affairs, symbols and signs of something that can be indicated by this speech of man, but never defined or wholly encompassed. God is always more than finite mind can grasp or human speech set forth." This indeed is true; nevertheless, as our Lutheran dogmaticians declare, what God reveals of Himself and His works in our simple, imperfect, "prattling" (Luther) *modo concipiendi*, is the divine truth (John 17:17), which we now see through a glass darkly, but then face to face (1 Cor. 13:12). What Rall declares is not at all an argument against Biblical inspiration, but merely a stra-

tegic, "false prophet" move to draw the reader's attention away from the real issue at stake. Rall closes his reply with the words: "It is enough that through these words [those of the evangelists and apostles. But why not of the prophets?] we are brought face to face with God and hear His summons, and that when we hear and follow, we know Him in a life of saving fellowship." Rall's reply falls under the condemnation of Luther's words in the Smalcald Articles: "All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve into enthusiasts and led them from the outward Word of God to spiritualizing and self-conceit, and nevertheless he accomplished this through other outward words. Just as also our enthusiasts condemn the outward Word, and nevertheless they fill the world with their pratings and writings, as though, indeed, the Spirit could not come through the writings and spoken Word of the apostles, but through their writings and words He must come." And just before this, Luther says: "And in those things which concern the spoken, outward Word, we must firmly hold that God grants His Spirit or grace to no one except through or with the preceding outward Word, in order that we may be protected against the enthusiasts" (*Triglot*, p. 495). We have quoted Rall's words chiefly because there prevails today the erroneous impression that Modernists have swung back toward Christian orthodoxy by way of Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr, whose influence upon them has indeed been pronounced. But this "orthodoxy" is only in word, not in deed, as the recent book *Liberal Theology. An Appraisal* (Scribner's 1942), which deserves study by all who are interested in modern non-Christian theological trends, proves. We welcome, of course, the fact that liberal attacks upon Christian truth just now are less ferocious than they used to be some time ago, but antagonism against the divine truth is often more dangerous in its subtle than in its brutal form. Non-Christian theology today stands about where Schleiermacher stood a little over a century ago. Barthianism somewhat shifted the controversy, but has not brought liberal theology closer to Christian conservatism. This is true also of Reinhold Niebuhr's theology, which, despite many expressions to the contrary, has not gone back to the basic Christian conceptions of the Law and the Gospel. Niebuhr is not any more orthodox than is Professor C. H. Dodd of Cambridge, whose influence upon the young generation of liberal theologians is indeed great. As *Time* (Aug. 23, 1943) reports, Niebuhr recently received the degree of D. D. from Oxford University, which thus recognized him as an outstanding religious teacher, and, of course, as one quite in accordance with Oxford Liberalism. Speaking of this, *Time* appends also a rather scurrilous, blasphemous Oxford witticism (a proof of the levity prevailing among Liberals): "Thou shalt love the Lord thy Dodd with all thy heart and thy Niebuhr as thyself." As much as one may detest such blasphemy, there nevertheless lies in it some truth. Liberal Niebuhr may be mentioned with liberal Dodd in the same breath, just as Luther used to mention in the same breath Mohammed and the Pope, accusing them both and in equal measure of antichristian heresy. Dodd, of course, too, has of late gone back to orthodox terminology in speaking of God and divine things.

J. T. M.

**Brief Items.** A book has appeared (*Celestial Homespun* by Katherine Burton) in which the biography of Isaac Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Fathers, is presented. As the review of the book in *America* points out, his parents, strange to say, were Protestants. The Paulist Fathers are a prominent missionary order of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Now what we apprehended has come to pass. That which in our plans we foresaw is a very sad reality, for one of the most famous basilicas, that of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, is now in very great part destroyed." Thus wrote Pope Pius XII to a cardinal after the bombing of Rome.

A remarkable election is reported in the London Letter of the *Christian Century*. Dr. Harold Moody, "a West Indian of African descent," was elected to become the chairman of the London Missionary Society and has now entered upon his office. He is a medical man and has his practice in London.

In Paris a prominent Protestant leader has died, Wilfred Monnot, who was especially interested in the Christian Student Movement in France. He was instrumental in bringing about a reunion of the two factions of the French Reformed Church.

"It used to be doubted whether a man's personality could make itself felt over the radio. All such doubts have long since vanished." These words which we read in an exchange may well lead us to ponder the power of the radio today.

The preacher's sense of fair play should restrain him from using his pulpit as a platform for political harangue or as a soap box for presenting economic panaceas. Such questions can be handled fairly only in forums of free discussion.—Ralph W. Sockman quoted in the *Christian Century*.  
A.

