

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

Lehre und Wehre (Vol. LXXVI)

Magazin fuer Ev.-Luth. Homiletik (Vol. LIV)

Theol. Quarterly (1897—1920)-Theol. Monthly (Vol. X)

Vol. II

July, 1931

No. 7

CONTENTS

	Page
DALLMANN, WM.: How Peter Became Pope.....	481
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Die Familie Davids.....	495
MUELLER, J. T.: Introduction to Sacred Theology.....	500
FUERBRINGER, L.: List of Articles Written by Dr. F. Bente	510
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Aramaismen im Neuen Testament	513
KRUEGER, O.: Predigtstudie ueber 1 Tim. 6, 6—12.....	520
Dispositionen ueber die von der Synodalkonferenz ange- nommene Serie alttestamentlicher Texte.....	526
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	534
Book Review. — Literatur.....	553

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*,
also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie
sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern
auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass
sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit
falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum ein-
fuehren. — *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.



der Abrechnung wird durch das dreimalige „Ich will an sie“ angekündigt. Wie schrecklich wird der Augenblick sein, wenn sein Zorn entbrennen wird! Ps. 2, 5. 12. Man denkt hier unwillkürlich an die Drohungen, die Christus gegen die Pharisäer und Ältesten ausgestoßen hat, Matth. 23. Vgl. auch Jer. 27, 10. 15; Jesaj. 20, 39; Deut. 18, 20.

c. Predigen wir das Wort Gottes nicht länger lauter und rein, warnen und zeugen wir nicht mehr gegen falsche Propheten, dann gelten uns diese Worte unsers Textes. Davor behüte uns Gott! Wir wollen festhalten an dem Zeugnis unserer Bibel und der Väter und beherzigen, was Röm. 16, 17 und 1 Joh. 4, 1 geschrieben steht.

Wo Gottes Wort recht gepredigt wird, da findet man den, von dem B. 5. 6 geredet wird: den Herrn, der unsere Gerechtigkeit ist. Ihn wollen wir predigen. (Lied 253, 1.) D. R.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich=Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Die Kirchen Amerikas im Jahre 1930. Das Monatsblatt *Christian Herald*, das seit Jahren die Berichte Dr. Carrolls über die Kirchenstatistik unsers Landes veröffentlicht hat, hat nach dem Ableben des ebengenannten Kirchenstatistikers D. G. L. Kieffer aus der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche für diese Arbeit berufen, und dessen Bericht über das Jahr 1930 ist in der Mainnummer dieses Blattes erschienen. Der summarische Bericht lautet, wie folgt:

Kirchengemeinschaften.	Mitglieder.	Zunahme.
Katholiken (westliche), 3 Kirchenkörper.....	17,316,673	17,526
Baptisten, 15 Kirchenkörper.....	9,187,498	45,642
Methodisten, 16 Kirchenkörper.....	9,119,069	* A 43,211
Lutheraner, 17 Kirchenkörper.....	2,806,797	56,180
Presbyterianer, 9 Kirchenkörper.....	2,677,369	A 22,763
Jünger Christi, 2 Kirchenkörper.....	1,988,392	A 18,567
Episkopalkirche.....	1,254,227	16,532
Kongregational-Christianer.....	1,048,281	753
Katholiken (östliche), 10 Kirchenkörper.....	711,925	A 37,200
Mormonen, 2 Kirchenkörper.....	689,363	2,268
Reformierte, 3 Kirchenkörper.....	563,148	A 4,512
Vereinigte Brüder in Christo, 2 Kirchenkörper	417,594	2,149
Jüdische Gemeinden.....	357,135	—
Evangelische Synode von Nordamerika.....	257,724	6,022
Evangelische Kirche, 2 Kirchenkörper.....	237,270	2,504
Brüder (Dunkards), 4 Kirchenkörper.....	166,851	A 16
Adventisten, 5 Kirchenkörper.....	162,391	2,604
Assemblies of God.....	107,641	15,660
Freunde, 4 Kirchenkörper.....	107,201	971
Mennoniten, 17 Kirchenkörper.....	100,924	419
Summa.....	49,277,473	42,961
Kirchengemeinschaften, die weniger als 100,000		
Mitglieder haben, zählen zusammen.....	730,708	16,325
Gesamtzahl.....	50,008,181	59,286

* A = Abnahme.

über diesen Bericht stellt der „Friedensbote“ die folgende Betrachtung an: „Vierzig Jahre lang hat der bewährte Statistiker Dr. G. R. Carroll von Jahr zu Jahr die Zahlen aus den Berichten der Kirchen Amerikas zusammengestellt und die Ursachen festzustellen gesucht, die für den jeweiligen Fortschritt oder Rückschritt verantwortlich waren. Er durfte wahrnehmen, daß die Gesamtzahl der Kirchenmitglieder in dieser Zeit von Jahr zu Jahr zunahm. Wenn auch die Zunahme in manchen Jahren verhältnismäßig gering war, so war sie in andern um so größer. Die kleinste Zunahme wurde für das Jahr 1919 verzeichnet, nämlich 51,000, die größte für das Jahr 1928, nämlich 1,111,984. Zuweilen sind die Schwankungen freilich nur eine Widerspiegelung mangelhafter Berichterstattung. Im Hinblick auf das Jahr 1929 meldete er eine Zunahme von 300,419, und er sprach die Überzeugung aus, daß darin der Beweis dafür liege, daß die Kirche in Amerika das Vertrauen des Volkes nicht eingebüßt habe, wie von den Gegnern erklärt worden sei, sondern lebenskräftig sei und hoffnungsfreudig in die Zukunft blicken dürfe. Mit diesem Wort des Vertrauens in die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums schloß er seine Tätigkeit als Statistiker ab. Er hat zwar noch die Sammlung der Zahlen für das Jahr 1930 angefangen, aber mitten in der Arbeit ereilte ihn der Tod.“

„Das vergangene Jahr stand im Zeichen der Geschäftsflauheit und Arbeitslosigkeit; aber das Sprichwort sagt: ‚Not lehrt beten‘, und Notzeiten sind gewöhnlich Erntezeiten für die Kirche. Dazu kam, daß die Kirchen aus Anlaß des Pfingstjubiläums besondere Anstrengungen machten, das Heil in Christo in eindrucksvoller Weise zu verkündigen. [?] Es ist darum etwas enttäuschend, daß die Zunahme an Mitgliedern verhältnismäßig gering war. Sie betrug nur 59,286.“

„Auffallend ist, daß mehrere der größten Kirchengemeinschaften in diesem Jahr eine Abnahme an Mitgliederzahl buchen mußten, während sie noch vor wenigen Jahren verhältnismäßig die größten Zunahmen aufzuweisen hatten. Die Lutheraner haben um 56,567 zugenommen und die Baptisten um 45,642, aber die Methodisten haben eine Einbuße von 43,211 erlitten, die Presbyterianer sind um 22,763 zurückgegangen und die Jünger Christi um 18,567.“

Wichtig sind die Bemerkungen, die D. Kieffer selbst zu den gegebenen Zahlen hinzufügt. Er schreibt: „Neunzig Prozent der Gesamtmitgliedschaft der Gemeinden gehören zwanzig Kirchengemeinschaften oder gleichnamigen Kirchengruppen an. Wenn die Kirchen, wie die Zahlen andeuten scheinen, zurückgehen, so ist der Grund dafür zum Teil in der Botschaft zu finden, die sie der Welt verkündigen. Ein Zeitalter des Zweifels und Fragens, des geschäftlichen Niedergangs und der Geselblosigkeit fordert von der Kanzel einen bestimmten und deutlichen Ton derposaune: ‚Wir sollen Gott fürchten und lieben‘ — ‚Verachtet nicht die Kirche Gottes‘ — ‚So spricht der Herr‘ — ‚Es steht geschrieben‘ (im Wort Gottes).“

„Die religiöse Unterweisung der Jugend Amerikas ist ein schreiendes Bedürfnis. Wenn auf den Universitäten und höheren Lehranstalten, wie zuweilen behauptet wird, ein ‚Mangel an Religion‘ sich bemerkbar macht und als Folge davon Aferwissenschaft, Gottesleugnung und ähnliches, so tut es not, daß die Kirchen die Sachlage untersuchen und ein durchgreifendes Heilmittel finden. Es müssen Universitätspastoren angestellt werden, und es ist sehr zu empfehlen, und zwar mit besonderem Nachdruck, daß die

verschiedenen Kirchengemeinschaften und Erziehungsbehörden unter den Studenten arbeiten.“

Interessant ist der Vergleich, den der „Friedensbote“ über die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche vor hundert Jahren und jetzt anstellt. Er schreibt: „Beachtenswert ist, daß der Prozentsatz an Zunahme von Kirchenmitgliedern in den letzten hundert Jahren bedeutend größer war als der der Bevölkerungszunahme. Vor hundert Jahren gab es unter je 75 Bewohnern des Landes zehn Kirchenmitglieder, heute sind es zehn aus je 25.“

Über die Erfolge der Vereinigungsbestrebungen schreibt das Blatt: „Als Frucht der Einigungsbewegung sind zwei neue Kirchenbildungen im Entstehen. Die 1929 in Aussicht genommene Verschmelzung der Kongregationalisten mit den Christianern soll auf einer gemeinsamen Konferenz, die Ende nächsten Monats in Seattle, Wash., tagen wird, durch Annahme einer Verfassung zum Abschluß gebracht werden. Letzten August haben sich die Allgemeine Synode von Ohio und andern Staaten, die Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten und die Buffalosynode auf einer gemeinsamen Konferenz in Toledo, O., unter dem Namen Amerikanische Lutherische Kirche vereinigt. Eine Reihe lutherischer Synoden ist einander näher getreten, indem sie zur Beratung der gemeinsamen Aufgaben eine Föderation gebildet hat, die den Namen Amerikanische Lutherische Konferenz trägt. Sie setzt sich aus der Allgemeinen Synode von Ohio, der Iowasynode, der Buffalosynode, der Norwegisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika, der Ev.-Luth. Augustanasynode von Nordamerika und der norwegischen freien Kirche zusammen.“

Man mag ja über Kirchenstatistik urteilen, wie man will. Eins aber bringt sie uns immer wieder zum Bewußtsein, nämlich die hohe Aufgabe, die die bekennnistreue lutherische Kirche hierzulande hat. Unser bedeutendstes Missionsfeld bleibt noch immer unser eigenes Land. S. L. M.

The „Christian Cynosure“ on Freemasonry and Education. — In the *News Service* of the Board of Christian Education of our Synod some remarks of the *Christian Cynosure* on the influence Freemasonry is exerting, or endeavoring to exert, on our country's system of education are reprinted. The views expressed show such clear discernment that we cannot refrain from submitting one of the paragraphs in question to our readers.

“The general tendency of Masonry in this respect [that is, with reference to education] is well known. It is Masonry that has fought for the exclusion of all private elementary schools in many States of the Union. Why? Because of the Catholic parochial school, it is said. But in reality the measure is directed against all private schools, whether of Rome, dominated by a foreign potentate, or whether of some Protestant denomination with no foreign influence. If a department of our Government is organized to take over all educational matters, a Department of Education, with a secretary sitting in the President's Cabinet, it will be largely because of Masonic influence. If that comes to pass, what will happen to private schools? What will happen to the rights of parents? We certainly agree that the state has the right to demand education in secular matters for the sake of national welfare. But when this is made a means of denying to children the God-given right of being taught religion; when it is made the means of denying to parents their rights as parents in the control of

their children and their education; when it is made the means of instilling teachings that, while not religious, are at least irreligious and anti-Biblical, then it is time for those who have the welfare of the nation at heart to call a halt; for this is just as dangerous as the opposite extreme — control of education by Rome.” A.

Materialism in Ugly Nakedness. — The following paragraph from the *Commonweal* of April 29 will interest our readers: —

“A scientist fed some female rats a manganese-free diet and observed that they thereupon ‘showed no maternal solicitude for their young.’ In summing up these facts before a meeting of his colleagues in Baltimore, he was unable to resist adding: ‘For the present it gives a bare clew that some of our most highly valued social instincts may depend on such trifles as the presence of infinitesimal amounts of certain substances in our food.’ Whereat head-line writers regaled the nation with large-type variations of the proposition that ‘manganese causes mother love.’ Whether this is actually going beyond what is implied by the word ‘depend’ in the above quotation, we leave our readers to judge. What we wish (with all possible mildness) to do is to utter a few reminders, just to keep the record straight. We are certainly not equipped to compete with any scientist in his own field; in the case in question we know nothing of manganese and precious little of rats. But we do know as much as normal beings generally about human personality; and when (somewhat surprisingly) the discussion leaps from the behavior of rats under highly specialized conditions to ‘our social instincts’ and thence to ‘mother love,’ it has entered the field of human personality.” A.

New Law Concerning the Sacredness of Private Confession Enacted. — The *Lutheran Companion* of May 9 reports as follows: “It is gratifying to learn that the bill giving all Christian clergymen alike the same privilege in regard to confidential communications revealed to them in private confession has been passed by both houses of the State Legislature of Minnesota and has been signed by Governor Olsen. Whatever may have been the defects of the present law, after this the Christian minister, whether he be a Protestant or a Roman Catholic, may receive confidential confessions in the State of Minnesota without fear of being asked to reveal them before the courts.” At this writing we have no information on the outcome of the appeal taken by Rev. Swenson, who had been adjudged guilty of contempt of court for his refusal to divulge what had been communicated to him by way of private confession. A.

The Protestant Clergy and the Question of War. — In the *Christian Century* an editorial is given to a report of Mr. Kirby Page, who sent a questionnaire to 53,000 ministers, which number is said to represent one half of the Protestant clergy of the country, and inquired how many of them would never support or sanction another war. Mr. Page “announces that there are 10,427 ministers who absolutely reject war and would refuse personally to take part in any future war as combatants. . . . The entire clergy of eleven denominations received the questionnaire. Out of a total of 19,372 ministers who replied, 10,427 answered ‘Yes’ to the question, ‘Are you personally prepared to state that it is your present purpose not to sanction any future war or participate in it as an armed combatant?’ and 12,076 declared their conviction that ‘the Church should

now go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war.' Of the total number of ministers replying, 17,700, or 91 per cent., expressed a willingness to have their names and replies made public." It is in this way that Reformed ministers think they can usher in the kingdom of God. That the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, that it does not come with observation, that it consists not in meat and drink, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, are matters which these propagandists either have never become thoroughly acquainted with or which they ignore.

A.

Proposals Looking to Church Unity. — The Episcopalians hope to unite the churches by means of the episcopate. Article IV of the Lambeth Articles, which were formulated for the unity of Christendom, is being stressed particularly to-day. It reads: "The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church." They insisted on it in their negotiations with the churches that are to form the South India Union. "It is proposed that the Indian Church of the future shall accept the episcopate without expressing or implying any theory concerning episcopacy." And the Lambeth Conference of 1930 endorsed this insistence on the episcopate. "The conference has heard with the deepest interest of the proposals for church union in South India now under consideration between the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, the South India United Church, and the Wesleyan Church of South India and expresses its high appreciation of the spirit in which the representatives of these churches have pursued the long and careful negotiations." They refuse to yield on the point of the episcopally ordained ministry. Necessarily so. For, as the Lambeth Conference again put it, this "ministry is the gift of God through Christ and is essential to the *being* and well-being of His Church." And Prof. W. H. Dunphy has lately explained the matter thus: "The doctrine of Apostolic Succession, *i. e.*, the principle that none might validly ordain to the priesthood except an apostle or one who has received by ordination from the apostles the *plenitude* of apostolic power (including the power to ordain) and that only those ordained by them can celebrate a valid Eucharist, absolve, etc., is certainly the doctrine of the Anglican Church no less than of the Roman and Eastern churches." Now, the Episcopalian proposals will never bring about the union. The Methodists, for whom Rev. W. G. McFarland speaks, will not accept them. They consider their episcopate as good as that of the Episcopalians. In a letter published in the *Living Church* of February 14 Rev. McFarland, referring to Professor Dunphy's article, says: "We Americans, not being longer subject to the London bishop's legal jurisdiction, would not be dissenters. So, having long since renounced faith in the myth of Apostolic Succession, he [Mr. Wesley] being himself at the climax of an apostolic ministry of divine mission like unto St. Paul's (see Gal. 1, 1 ff.), the Most Reverend Father in God of Methodism laid his venerable and apostolic hands upon the first Methodist bishop. The children of this episcopacy have received floods of what we believe is not uncovenanted grace." Nor will the Presbyterians and Baptists agree. "My Presbyterian kinsmen and Baptist neighbors would most certainly insist upon laying reciprocal hands upon Bishop Cheshire, his colleagues, and coadjutor." And the Baptists

would offer an additional counter-proposal: "Would you Anglo-Catholics for the unity of Christ's Church let the great Baptist Church immerse you?" As for the Lutherans, they reject at once the doctrine of the necessity of episcopal ordination and of Apostolic Succession as a man-made article.

The Baptists make their counter-proposal in all seriousness. They insist upon the necessity of immersion as strenuously as the Episcopalians insist upon Apostolic Succession. They do not bother much about creeds. "There is nothing binding in them," they say. Yet they stand out for this one article — immersion. They do not make much of Baptism. "It has been said that Baptists make too much of Baptism; but in fact no religious body, except the Quakers, makes so little of it as they. They have very low ideas as to the necessity of Baptism." (Dr. R. S. MacArthur, in *Why I Am*, etc., p. 7.) But they insist on immersion as the condition of any church union. "The baptism of a believer, in the manner appointed by the Lord of the Church is at once a confession of fealty to Christ, an act of obedience to Him, and a symbolical proclamation of the central, essential, fundamental truths of Christianity, the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior of the world. Is it too much for Baptists to claim and require, as a condition precedent to membership, that all believers be immersed on confession of their faith?" (*Watchm.-Ex.*, Sept. 4, 1930.) — The Disciples of Christ make nothing at all of creeds, but they will insist on immersion as the *conditio sine qua non* of church union. "Under the limitations of the times they were not able to make an adjustment between their longings for unity and their conception of the literal authority of the Bible, which seemed to make certain features of church organization and especially a certain mode of baptism mandatory." (*The Christian Century*, Jan. 28, 1931.) Lutherans will not entertain the proposal. The doctrine of the necessity of immersion is a man-made article.

Dr. Fred B. Smith, moderator of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, proposed this platform in 1929: "I am among those who believe the world is on its way to a common prayer, a common altar, a common fellowship. . . . What is the acid test of true, genuine religion? Certainly it is not some cold, metallic formula of salvation which may have been developed by some priest, rabbi, or minister. The acid test of religion is what is accomplished in the realm of morals."

The Lutherans, on their part, offer to unite with all churches chiefly on the basis of the article that the sinner is justified by faith alone, by faith in the forgiveness of sins gained by the vicarious work of the God-man Jesus Christ and offered freely in the means of grace. That has been our ultimatum for four hundred years. "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth, and whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin. *For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved*, says Peter, Acts 4, 12." (*Trigl.*, 463.) That proposal ought to appeal to all churches. There is nothing man-made about this article. It did not originate by any man's whim. It is God's truth. "Lutheranism was a revival of Paulinism," Lyman Abbot assures you. And best of all, through the acceptance of this article unity is brought about, assured, and preserved. "This article concerning justification by faith (as the *Apology* says) is the chief article

in the entire Christian doctrine, without which no poor conscience can have any firm consolation or can truly know the riches of the grace of God, as Dr. Luther also has written: 'If this only article remains pure on the battle-field, the Christian Church also remains pure and in godly harmony and without any sects; but if it does not remain pure, it is not possible that any error or fanatical spirit can be resisted.' " (*Trigl.*, 917.)

We hear voices seconding the proposal to make this article the basis of further discussion. Gieseler, the Reformed church historian, says: "If it be a question which of the Protestant creeds is best adapted to become a basis of union for all evangelical churches, I would pronounce unhesitatingly for the *Confessio Augustana*." And Professor Rockwell of Union Seminary says: "Why cannot Protestantism agree on its oldest creed, the Augsburg Confession? . . . Here [in Article VII] is a great and, in the best sense of the word, *radical* statement: Church unity may be had *without* any so-called apostolic succession of bishops and without any historic episcopate." E.

Magic on the Ivory Coast. — Witchcraft, as we know from the Bible, deals with supernatural forces, with the powers of darkness, and its investigation therefore lies beyond the scope of science. For science deals only with the results of natural forces. We do not look to science to give us the right view of witchcraft. The Bible does that. But we do look to science to confess that it meets with phenomena which it is unable to explain. William B. Seabrook, a sober investigator, makes this confession, and for that reason we here submit the extracts from his article in the *Ladies' Home Journal* which appeared in the *Reader's Digest* of March, 1931. The results of Mr. Seabrook's investigation of the Voodoo religion in Haiti were given in the THEOL. MONTHLY, IX, 371. The incidents here related took place on the Ivory Coast, West Africa, at the village of Doa, where the writer was the guest of the chief. This is Mr. Seabrook's story:

"The most difficult and unsatisfactory experience of my whole African adventure — I dislike even to approach it — involved the strange business of the children who were pierced by swords. Two baby girls and the jugglers had been summoned and had been shut up all day secretly in the witch-doctor's inclosure. Night came, and we gathered in the torch-lighted public compound. The big village crowd — the natives themselves — was nervous, quiet, and almost as if terrorized. The two children, impassive as if drugged, but able to stand and move about, open-eyed like somnambulists, were brought out by the jugglers. And then whatever it was that happened, happened. All the bad fiction-traditional stage props were there — night, torchlight, superstition, crowds hysterical, and mumbo-jumbo raised to its *n*th power. Anything like laboratory control was nonsense. Yet the ordinary hypotheses of trickery — yes, I know them all: group hypnosis, substitution of simulacra, puppets introduced by sleight of hand, and so on — were simply no good in the face of the close visual and tactile evidence. For there were the two living children, close to me. I touched them with my hands. And there, equally close, were the two men with their swords. The swords were iron, three-dimensional, metal, cold and hard. And this is what I now *saw* with my eyes, but you will understand why I am reluctant to tell of it and that I do not know what *seeing* means:

"Each man, holding his sword stiffly upward with his left hand, tossed

a child high in the air with his right, then caught it full upon the point, impaling it like a butterfly on a pin. No blood flowed, but the two children were there, held aloft, pierced through and through, impaled upon the swords. The crowd screamed now, falling to its knees. Many veiled their eyes with their hands, and others fell prostrate. Through the crowd the jugglers marched, each bearing a child aloft, impaled upon his sword, and disappeared into the witch-doctor's inclosure.

"My first mental reaction, purely automatic, was that I had seen jugglery turn suddenly to ritual murder. But whatever had happened, it was not that. I was assured that in an hour or more, 'if things didn't go wrong,' we would see and touch the children, alive and well.

"I had no doubt that the children would reappear alive, but my mind had reached its old balking-point. I would reject the evidence of my senses rather than accept literally a physical miracle, and I believe I shall do so until I die. And thus it was—please understand I mean no silly blasphemy, but am trying to make clear something very difficult—that, when these two children were brought out presently and I touched them and they were still warm flesh, it convinced me of nothing whatsoever, *except that there may perhaps be elements in this unholy jungle sorcery*, just as there were unknown elements perhaps in the recorded holier miracles of other days, *which transcend what science knows of natural law*, but not our possibility of ultimate knowledge."

The italics in the last sentence are ours. This statement of the noted explorer deserves to be emphasized. He might have eliminated the "perhaps," though. And the hope expressed in the last clause is doomed to disappointment. E.

Our Kind of Fundamentalism.—Under this heading the *Watchman-Examiner* (January 22) defends its unionistic stand in the present controversy between Modernists and Fundamentalists. It writes: "Since the beginning of the movement in our denomination to recall to the faith the ministers, churches, missionary societies, and educational institutions that have gone astray, those standing for the faith have been divided into two groups. Some have felt that they should separate themselves from denominational activities and thus fight for the faith from the outside. Others have felt that they should remain with the organized work and, while loyally supporting it, raise their voices in protest against the evils that have crept in. The *Watchman-Examiner*, without hesitation, took the position of the second group. We may be pardoned for saying that through the years we have influenced many to follow our example. Instead of standing off from our organized work, we have asserted the right to criticize it because we have loyally supported it. The criticisms of non-supporters are neither listened to nor heeded. . . . Dr. W. B. Riley, in a recent issue of the *Christian Fundamentalist*, declares the 'come-outers' have accomplished little by their exclusiveness and that their arguments for the 'come-out' policy are illogical. He illustrates his point by reference to Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln was opposed to slavery and declared that the country could not exist half slave and half free. He stayed with his country, however, and fought the evil that was corrupting it and won the victory."

Sometimes Lutherans wonder how Fundamentalists can remain with

church-bodies which are so completely under the control of Modernists. The explanation is here given, and it shows the great cleavage between confessional Lutheranism and vacillating, half-hearted, unionistic sectarian Fundamentalism. Lutheranism takes the commands of God's Word (2 Cor. 6, 14—18; Rom. 16, 17, etc.) seriously, while Fundamentalism acts on policies of expediency and human reason. That Fundamentalism has not accomplished a great deal the writer readily admits. He says: "Some are saying that Fundamentalists have accomplished that which they started out to do. Can any one believe that who looks into our pulpits and the chairs of our educational institutions?" On the other hand, he is not willing to admit that Fundamentalism "is playing out." He declares: "Others say that the movement is playing out. If it is, may God have mercy on us! When Fundamentalism, or that for which it stands, plays out, the devil will hold high carnival through the Church on earth. No, Fundamentalism is not playing out." We do not doubt the sincerity of the writer; at the same time he ought to know that in every controversial crisis there is a time when the testimony by word must be followed by the testimony by deed.

J. T. M.

The Attitude of the "Lutheran" on the Question of Open or Close Communion Criticized. — Our readers will probably recall that in our last issue we reported on a lengthy editorial which appeared in the *Lutheran*, the official organ of the U. L. C., in which the view was expressed that *ceteris paribus* membership in an erring Church should not bar a person from being admitted to the Lord's Table in a Lutheran congregation. In the issue of February 26 the *Lutheran* publishes a letter by Dr. John C. Mattes of Scranton, Pa., a member of the U. L. C., who takes issue with the editor on the latter's position indicated above. The letter of Dr. Mattes is of such importance that we feel it should be reprinted in these columns.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'LUTHERAN': —

"Much as we sympathize with certain aspects of the recent editorial on 'The Lord's Supper and Denominational Fellowship,' there are certain statements there made that we cannot allow to pass unchallenged.

"While the primary purpose of the Holy Sacrament is indeed to convey to the individual the great pledge of forgiveness that is imparted there to him by the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, it is also an act of confession on the part of the communicant and has always been so recognized. The person who communes with any body of believers *de facto* approves the doctrine of those administering the Sacrament by his act of participation. It shows his agreement with what is professedly done; and if it does not, it shows either his ignorance or his insincerity. A Lutheran who communes with those who deny the Real Presence is denying his own faith before men. The one who is permitted to commune at a Lutheran altar, while actually denying the Real Presence as far as his own convictions go, is put into a dishonest and false position before men. This is the real objection to such 'interdenominational communions' as far as Lutherans are concerned. The Communion cannot indeed produce a unity, but it can give an untruthful appearance of unity where such unity of faith does not exist.

"What is more serious is the assertion that an ecclesiastical body has no right to make rules governing the practise of its congregations in matters involving articles of faith. It certainly has a perfect right to indicate the logical and inescapable consequences of what it confesses, just as much right as it has to have a confession of faith in the first place. A congregationalism that exalts the congregation over the entire Church, that places the fraction above the unit, is neither Scriptural nor derived from the Lutheran Confessions. In the very first place, the stewards who are responsible for the right administration of the Sacrament are not the congregations, but the ministers of Word and Sacrament. It was of them, and not of the congregations over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, that St. Paul said: 'Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God.' Was it actually the intention of this editorial to state that the Church as a whole, in her organized capacity, has no right to make rules for the defense of the truth in matters of practise? Does she not regularly pass regulations even in very non-essential matters? Shall she, then, be denied the right to protect the truth? If that right is not granted to the Church as a whole, but is the sole prerogative of an atomistic congregationalism, then the apostles erred grievously in the first Council of Jerusalem when they laid down certain rules for the guidance of the Gentile congregations and even prefaced them with the statement: 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.'

"When a general body lays down certain principles that are derived as consequences from the truth it confesses, it not only does not violate 'a major Lutheran principle,' but it does exactly what is demanded by the major principles of our faith.

"It was because of its principles and not for the sake of 'ecclesiastical seizure of power' that the General Council stated the so-called Galesburg Rule, which is only an expression of what has always been the practise of an overwhelming majority of Lutherans of all lands for four centuries. To call this statement 'an illustration of ecclesiastical seizure of power' is as unwarranted and unfair as it is untrue to the facts. To justify that assertion, we would submit the rule itself and a portion of Dr. Krauth's explanation.

"The Galesburg Rule made the following statements: 'I. The rule, which accords with the Word of God and with the Confessions of our Church, is: Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only. II. The *exceptions* to the rule belong to the sphere of *privilege*, not of *right*. III. The *determination* of the *exceptions* is to be made in consonance with these principles, by the conscientious judgment of pastors, as the cases arise.'

"At the request of the General Council Dr. Krauth prepared 105 theses, in which there was a fundamental discussion of the principles involved. Two brief quotations from these theses should be sufficient for the present: 'In saying that the rule "accords with the Word of God and with the Confessions of the Church" . . . the Council meant that the rule is derived from the Word and the Confessions. It is an affirmation which is the result of their teachings and is necessitated by them and reaches the accord of

a common testimony. The Word of God determines this rule, and the Confessions accept it and set it forth. It is a valid inference from the spirit and letter of both.' (Thesis 2.)

"It is a principle of the New Testament universally recognized in the Church that the reception of the Lord's Supper in a particular congregation or particular communion has as one of its objects the confession of the pure faith as against the false or mingled, the complete as against the imperfect, the sound doctrine as against the corrupt or dubious, the true Church as against the spurious or doubtful. It is the most solemn mode of marking church conjunction and of witnessing for a particular communion as over against all communions in any way arrayed against it or officially separate from its fellowship. It is "that we may testify that we approve the doctrine which sounds forth in that Church in which, together with others, we eat the same Eucharistic bread and drink from one cup." "The Lord's Supper not only separates believers, or the Christian people, from unbelievers, but also distinguishes between Christians themselves who have wandered from the purity of the faith and those of a purer Church sincerely professing and defending the sound faith." (Melancthon, *Repetitio August. Conf., Loci*; Gerhard, *Loci*, X, 371; Carpzov, *Isagoge in Libr. Symb.*, p. 405.)' (Thesis 58.)

"JOHN C. MATTES."

We are glad that this rejoinder appeared, showing that the U. L. C. has not, bag and baggage, gone over into the camp of those who advocate "open Communion." Let us hope that this testimony will bear good fruits. In what Dr. Mattes says about ecclesiastical authority there are several statements which ought to be modified. His remarks create the impression that larger church-bodies are of divine institution and can pass legislation which must be obeyed by all the pastors, teachers, and congregations of the respective body. We hold that the only unit which we can trace back to divine institution is the congregation. With respect to the responsibility for the right administration of the Sacrament we are convinced that the local congregation, which has called the pastor and which possesses the keys of the kingdom of heaven, has as large a share in it as the ministers. Again, when synods pass regulations, these must not be looked upon as being binding *per se*. Such a position would not have any sanction in the Scriptures. Whatsoever authority attaches to them comes from the consent of the congregations when they approve of what their representatives have resolved on. But with the position which Dr. Mattes chiefly has in mind, namely, that a church-body has the authority to state the principles which it holds to be implied in the truth which it confesses, we are in full agreement.

The *Lutheran*, in the same issue, has a few words to say on the rejoinder of Dr. Mattes. We regret that it does not withdraw from the position which is under attack, but declares concerning the Galesburg Rule: "While we have great respect for the views set forth in the letter of Dr. Mattes and realize the dangers resulting from overvaluing the congregational prerogatives, we cannot escape observing the baneful effects on Lutheranism for which the legislation in question gave occasion. A fallacy in a rule has become evident in its effects despite high regard for

its purpose and for the ability of its drafters." These are obscure statements. What does the *Lutheran* mean? What are the effects which it complains of? The questions involved are too important and far-reaching to be dismissed in such a manner.

A.

An Extension of the Doctrine of Intention. — The doctrine of intention, as held by the Catholics, Roman- and Anglo-Catholics, is bad enough in its simple form. "It is a dogma at once abhorrent in the dependence in which it places souls upon human caprice and perilous to the Romish fabric, inasmuch as it puts in question the validity of holy orders. Some of the fathers at Trent were not wholly blind to the former phase. One of the bishops argued against the necessity of inward intention and pointed his argument by supposing a case where a priest, who, being an infidel and a formal hypocrite, might despoil a whole congregation of the Sacraments and cause the perdition of children from lack of valid baptism. 'The divines,' says Sarpi, 'did not approve this doctrine, yet were troubled and knew not how to resolve the reason. But they still maintained that the true intention of the minister was necessary, either actual or virtual, and that without it the Sacrament was not of force, notwithstanding any external demonstration.'" (*History of Chr. Doct.*, H. C. Sheldon, II, 193.) If the lack of the internal intention on the part of the ordaining bishop renders the ordination invalid (and if the bishop is not a true priest because *his* ordination was invalid for the same reason), the priest can never know for certain whether he is a true priest. But the matter becomes still more involved and the doubts of the poor priest grow apace when the doctrine of intention is applied to books and rules and rubrics. Some will doubt that they are priests, and others will find it necessary, in the interest of their priesthood, to contend for the presence of the intention in the ordinal in question. As witness the following. In his book *Why Rome?* Dr. Delaney gave his reasons for going over to Rome, and Rev. Harrison Rockwell answers in the *Living Church* (Oct. 18, 1930) as follows: "His chief contention is that the Anglican Church lost the apostolic succession in the first century after the break with the See of Rome because of lack of intention in the new ordinal. This charge is based on the wording of the consecration of a bishop, where it was not explicitly stated at that precise place in the service that one was being set apart 'for the office and work of a bishop,' as the ordinal of 1661 and all later ones have it. Dr. Delaney has written that he believes the first Edwardine ordinal lost us the apostolic ministry and that therefore he has never been a priest." The possibility of the lack of intention on the part of the ordinal weighs so heavily upon Rev. Rockwell that he is at pains to establish the presence of the intention. He quotes Dr. Francis J. Hall: "In the Edwardine ordinal, which continued in use for a century, the intended grade of order was not explicitly designated in this formula; but it was sufficiently indicated in the rite at large, and such an omission was in accord with ancient Catholic precedent. . . . Moreover, the preservation of an unbroken succession in the Anglican episcopate from the apostles through recognized Catholic channels was provided for with painstaking care by the provision carried out in the consecration of Archbishop Parker; and this line of succession has been reenforced by subsequent events."

"The State Must Yield." — The *Sunday-school Times* (Jan. 17) writes: "The well-known Roman Catholic publicist Hilaire Belloc bluntly told us in the *Atlantic Monthly* some months ago that the Roman Church and the modern state are fundamentally antagonistic and that, when the conflict comes, the state must yield. There are implications of all sorts of trouble in this assertion, and it is breaking out. In Venezuela the Archbishop of Valencia published a pastoral against civil marriage. The president of the country ordered his expulsion. The archbishop asked for a suspension of the decree. It was answered that he must first declare that he 'would respect, and abide by, the supremacy and integrity of our laws.' Other bishops associated themselves with their archbishop in a published statement. The Minister of Public Instruction in reply stated that the bishops had taken an attitude to which the government could not submit without surrendering the independence and sovereignty of the nation. So once more Church and State locked horns in South America. In Malta a world-power, the Papacy, has challenged another world-power, the British Empire. Maltese voters have been ordered not to vote for a candidate unsatisfactory to the Roman Church, although he is actually a Roman Catholic. The British government has answered by suspending elections and the constitution of Malta. It is a reaffirmation of the proud words of the Thirty-seventh Article: 'The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.' The Rev. J. A. Kaye of Tollington Park, London, was for nineteen months a war-time chaplain in Malta. He describes the people of Malta as the most poverty-stricken he has ever seen. Yet there is a priest on the island for every eight inhabitants, and the churches are stored with wealth."

All this is worth noting by the citizens of our country, where Romanism is at present dangerously aggressive. Writers like Hilaire Belloc and Gilbert Chesterton are no oily diplomatists as are the wily clergy of the Catholic Church; they may tell us bluntly what Rome purposes to do, but they tell us truthfully; and the actions of the Papacy back up their words.

J. T. M.

The United Lutheran Church and the Suomi Synod. — In the *Lutheran* a contributor, M. L. Canup, writes: "Just now there is a lovely courtship going on between the United Lutheran Church in America and the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (the Suomi Synod), with the possibility of an early marriage. The United Lutheran Church in Michigan is greatly interested in this announced engagement and proposed wedding. The map of the United Lutheran Church in Michigan will be greatly changed with the consummation of this merger. The headquarters of the Suomi Synod is at Hancock, Mich. Here are also located Suomi College and the theological seminary. This young synod has 184 congregations, scattered over eighteen States and the two provinces of Canada, a membership of 35,000, shepherded by more than sixty pastors. The Finns are a thrifty people. They know the history and doctrine of their Church. The United Lutheran Church would be benefited by such a merger, and we trust the Suomi Synod would also. Detroiters and Michiganders are especially interested in the courtship of these two bodies."

J. T. M.

Mormonism Still Very Strong. — The *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council contains an article on the Mormons (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) in Utah in which much interesting information concerning this dangerous sect is presented. We are told that the Mormons, who in 1830 started out with six members, now number 600,000 adherents. The sect is represented in all the States of the Union, in Canada, in South America, in the majority of the European countries, and on islands of the sea. "Mormon accessions average now about 21,000 per annum, of which 14,000 represent an indigenous growth through the reception in baptism of children from Mormon families. About 450,000 of their members live in the 'intermountain' country, especially in Utah and Southern Idaho." In this same territory Protestant churches report 185 congregations and mission-stations (a very limited number self-supporting), with a total membership of 25,000, or, in other words, a ratio of 20 to 1. "In Salt Lake City, with a population of 135,000, the Mormons claim a membership of 45,000, which is distributed in about 55 ecclesiastical wards, each provided with a chapel and corps of officers. On the other hand, though much is said about the fact that the Gentiles outnumber the Saints, the combined strength of Catholics and Protestants is less than 10,000. Lutheranism is represented on the field by three synods, who carry on operations in three congregations in Utah, about seven congregations in Southern Idaho, and a few scattered preaching-stations. In all, the membership totals about 1,500 souls. Handicapped by limited resources and man-power, the results have certainly justified the efforts expended. On the question whether the Mormons believe in the atonement of Jesus, the article says that they make this claim; but "the viewpoint is not evangelical. Hopes for salvation are not based on Christ's mediatorial sacrifice, but rather on the ordinance of Baptism, and the laying on of hands by the priesthood rather than redemption through the grace of God." In practise, polygamy is a thing of the past, but in theory it is still cherished. The life in heaven is dreamt of by some of this sect as polygamous. "Vicarious work for the dead is carried on to the extent that leaders have declared that more is done in behalf of the dead than for the living. Living persons may be baptized by proxy for their dead ancestors and thus secure their release from prison in the spirit world."

One thing remarkable about Mormonism is that it is so well organized. "There is duty for everybody. At the head is the president, who with his two counselors is the highest authority and mouthpiece of God. In a descending scale there are the officers with well-defined duties, such as the 'twelve apostles,' the 'president of the 70's,' or 'stake presidents,' down to the 'bishop' in every ward, who has under him officers and 'block teachers,' sufficient to make weekly contact with all the members. Because of its vast property holdings and accredited divine authority the Mormon Church wields a tremendous political as well as financial power. The annual tithe receipts, which total at least four and a half millions, are administered by the leaders as a church extension fund. . . . Whatever one may say about the teachings of the Mormons, there can be no question about their missionary zeal. Their method of calling young men to serve the Church at their own expense outside of the home territory for a period extending over at least two years is unparalleled. A force comprising about 1,200

in the States and about 900 outside the States is continually spending its efforts in the interest of the Mormon cause. These missions are said to represent an annual cost of two million dollars, and the property is also valued at two million dollars."

The writer of the article has this important practical suggestion: "A better understanding of the Mormon question is essential. It has been proved that persecution and ridicule will promote the cause which is attacked. Evangelical truth must be disseminated by means of every avenue of publicity in Mormon territory, but always in a friendly relationship. The public everywhere should be posted on the Mormon teachings, but, of greater importance still, be grounded in Christian fundamentals." It is well known that our Church is represented in the territory of the Mormons by a congregation located in Salt Lake City, Utah, of which the Rev. F. E. Schumann is pastor, and by missions at Provo and Spanish Forks, which are in charge of Missionary Skov. A.

Repeal of Tennessee Evolution Law Sought. — The Memphis correspondent of the *Christian Century* reports: "There is now a bill pending before the Legislature of Tennessee to repeal the notorious 'monkey law,' which forbids the teaching of evolution in State-supported schools in Tennessee. The matter was brought up for discussion at the April meeting of the Protestant Pastors' Association of Memphis. A paper on evolution was read by Rev. R. G. Lee, leader of the Baptist Fundamentalists in Memphis. Dr. Lee's essay described all evolutionists as atheists and stated that one had to choose between heathen evolution and God's Word, the Bible. Rev. O. A. Marrs of the Methodist church and Dean Noe of the Episcopal cathedral scored Dr. Lee's paper as a caricature of scientific teachings and denied that atheism and evolution are identical. The association, when called on to vote its protest against the repeal of the 'monkey law,' failed to go on record. Although the matter has been carried over till next meeting, it is the consensus of opinion that no concerted opposition will be organized against the repeal."

We cannot vouch for the correctness of any of the statements made. Rev. R. G. Lee is known to us as a very eloquent defender of the cardinal doctrines of the Bible pertaining to the atonement of our Savior and the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Christian parents, it seems to us, are certainly within their rights when they refuse to permit the instructors in schools supported by their taxes to teach their children a false religious philosophy. A.

II. Ausland.

D. Ph. Bachmann heimgegangen. Die theologische Fakultät in Erlangen beklagt den Tod eines prominenten Gliedes, nämlich D. Ph. Bachmanns, der kürzlich in seinem siebenundsechzigsten Lebensjahr abgerufen wurde. Der Verstorbene war bedeutend als Exeget und Systematiker. In Zahns Kommentar bearbeitete er die Korintherbriefe. Als Theolog ging er in den Bahnen Hofmanns und Franke einher und war also nicht Bekenntnistheolog im vollen Sinne des Wortes. A.

Das Datum der Kreuzigung unsers Heilandes. Im „Friedensboten“ findet sich folgende dem „Apologeten“ entnommene Notiz: „Prof. Dr. Oswald Gerhardt in Berlin will, wie er in der Zeitschrift „Forschungen und

'Fortschritte' mitteilt, genau herausgefunden haben, an welchem Datum die Kreuzigung Jesu Christi nach unserm Kalender geschehen ist. Er erklärt, die Berechnung sei in ihrem Kern eine rein astronomische Aufgabe und spize sich zu der Frage zu: Welchem Datum unsers Kalenders entspricht der Freitag, der 15. Nisan, weil Jesus am Freitag im Passah starb? Auf Grund der biblischen Angaben gelangte er zu der Überzeugung, daß nur eins der fünf Jahre 29 bis 33 in Betracht kommen könne. Er gibt nach sorgfältigen Untersuchungen an, für ihn stehe es unwiderleglich fest, daß die Kreuzigung Freitag, den 7. April, im Jahre 30, stattgefunden hat." A.

Regarding the "Miracles" at Lourdes. — The *Commonweal* feels it necessary to defend the authenticity of the so-called cures at Lourdes. The occasion of its remarks on this subject is furnished by an editorial in the April number of *Hygeia*, a journal published by the American Medical Association, in which the writer, Dr. Fishbein, places the "cures" at Lourdes in the same class with those of "charlatans who use the power of suggestion." The *Commonweal* says: "Dr. Fishbein in this instance proves himself to be anything but scientific; for he ignores the testimony given by scores of physicians of the highest repute to the effect that many of the cures at Lourdes cannot possibly be explained by suggestion. Dr. Alexis Carrel of the Rockefeller Institute, winner of the Nordhoff-Jung cancer prize for 1930, for example, is such a witness to the inexplicable character of some of the Lourdes cures. In a letter to Dom Francis Izard, recently quoted by the latter in the *London Tablet*, Dr. Carrel says: 'Certain facts observed at Lourdes cannot be accounted for by any of the known laws of wound-healing and tissue regeneration. In the course of a miraculous cure the rate of tissue regeneration greatly exceeds that which has ever been observed in the healing of a wound under optimum conditions.' Such a case, the instantaneous cure of tuberculosis disease of both kidneys, was observed at Lourdes in September, 1929, the person cured being Mlle. Marguerite Adam, a Belgian. After waiting a year, this case was declared inexplicable by the medical bureau at Lourdes. Dr. Carrel was present during the discussion and signed the *dossier*."

"There are literally scores of such cases. Dr. Fishbein, as editor of a journal published by the American Medical Association, should be better acquainted with the facts concerning Lourdes before committing himself and, by inference, the American Medical Association to such an ill-informed statement as that contained in the editorial in *Hygeia*. Scientists, as the *London Tablet* remarks, are entitled to say that they expect somebody, some day, to explain the Lourdes cures somehow, without going outside of what we call the natural course of things. But they are not entitled to say that the Catholic explanation is untenable. Still less are they entitled to class them with the hocus-pocus of such 'suggestionists' as Alexander Dowie and Coué, as Dr. Fishbein does. Scientists should make a virtue of prudence, as religion does, especially those who write for the press."

The remarks of the *Commonweal* create the impression that the cures must be either natural or divine and that *tertium non datur*. A reference to 2 Thess. 2, 9 will show that there is a third possibility. A.

über Landeskirchen und Sekten. Vollzieht sich in Deutschland gegenwärtig ein Wechsel in der Anschauung betreffs des Verhältnisses zwischen Landeskirche und Freikirche? In vielen Kreisen ist dies ohne Zweifel der Fall. Dabei werden Irrtum und Wahrheit gewaltig ineinandergemengt. Im „Christlichen Apologeten“ berichtet Bischof Nölken, einer der führenden Methodisten in Europa, über Vorträge, die der Kirchenhistoriker Prof. Dr. Köhler von der Universität in Heidelberg gehalten hat und worin dieser sich gerade über den ange deuteten Gegenstand ausspricht. Prof. Köhler sieht in den Sekten ein Stück christlichen Lebens, „das nun einmal da ist, eine ungeheure Anziehungskraft besitzt und nicht nur erklärt, sondern vor allen Dingen verstanden sein will. Der Standpunkt der ‚alleinseligmachenden Landeskirche‘ — man mag ihn ablehnen, soviel man will, vorhanden ist er doch — muß verschwinden; es muß aufhören, daß man den Sektierer oder Gemeinschaftschriften mit einem gewissen Odium verfolgt und von ihm abrüdt, selbst dann, wenn man ihm innerlich ganz nahe steht, nur weil man ‚kirchlich‘ ist. Die Fronten laufen heute nicht mehr: Landeskirche — Sekte, sondern: Christentum — Widerchristentum. . . . Und das Urteil? Ich sehe es Röm. 14, 5, und nur da. Solange die Sekten, und seien sie für unsereinen noch so abstrus, die religiösen Bedürfnisse weiter Kreise befriedigen, solange sie [ihre Zuhörer] zu sittlich ersten Menschen erziehen; solange die Heilsarmee oder die Ernsten Bibelforscher oder wer es sei, einen Verelendeten zu retten vermögen, den die Landeskirche zu retten nicht fähig ist; solange von Mennoniten, Baptisten, Quäkern oder wer es sei, . . . religiöse Kräfte ausströmen: so lange darf das Urteil nur auf den persönlichen Gewissensentscheid abgestellt werden. Die Sekten haben ihr Recht auf Existenz hinlänglich bewiesen“.

Es ist ja einerseits erfreulich, daß Prof. Köhler einsieht, die landläufige Anschauung über die Landeskirche lasse sich nicht halten. Andererseits aber ist es traurig, daß er bei seiner Beurteilung von Kirchengemeinschaften nicht den Maßstab des ewigen Wortes Gottes anlegt, sondern die Sache mit den Brillen der Vernunft ansieht und einer Gemeinschaft Anerkennung angedeihen lassen will, wenn sie religiöse Bedürfnisse befriedigt, auf sittlichem Gebiet Erfolge aufzuweisen hat, soziale Hilfe pflegt usw. In seinem Fall fließt die Toleranz nicht aus gesunden Grundsätzen. A.

Neue Vereinigungsversuche in Europa. Vertreter der kirchlichen Presse Belgiens, Frankreichs, Großbritanniens, Deutschlands und der Niederlande haben eine Konferenz gebildet, die unter anderm auch Mittel und Wege sucht, wie die christlichen Zeitschriften die Vereinigungsversuche der verschiedenen Kirchen befördern können. Prof. D. Ginderer in Berlin unterbreitete der Konferenz Vorschläge: Man sei sich doch darin einig, daß man miteinander und nicht mehr gegeneinander arbeiten wolle (*to work with each other and not on one another*), z. B. durch Propagandamachen für einzelne Kirchen, Gruppen oder Meinungen; die Interessen der verschiedenen Länder würden immer enger ineinander verflochten; geistige und moralische Bewegungen übersprängen Volks- und Landesgrenzen; dadurch sei brüderliches Zusammenwirken, besonders von seiten der christlichen Presse, zur notwendigen Pflicht geworden, wenn sich auch noch gewisse Spannungen und kirchliche Scheidewände fänden, die solche Vereinigung auf das Äußere beschränkten. Besonders durch das Schaffen einer Atmosphäre des gegenseitigen Wohlwollens und durch Austausch sorgfältig ausgewählter Nach-

richten könne gerade die kirchliche Presse viel dazu beitragen. — Der Einfluß des gedruckten und gelesenen Wortes auf die öffentliche Meinung kann nicht leicht überschätzt werden. Eine gute kirchliche Zeitschrift, die sich nicht scheut, die Wahrheit zu bekennen und die Wahrheit zu sagen, ist von unberechenbarem Wert für die Kirche. Wenn aber alles, was geschrieben und gedruckt wird, einem vorgefaßten Zweck dienen soll und demgemäß ausgewählt und zugefugt wird, so wird die kirchliche Presse nicht nur wertlos, sondern schädlich. So vage und verschwommen die obenerwähnte Geschichte ist, so scheint sie doch auf ein Komplott hinauszulaufen, um die Christen, auf gut deutsch, anzuführen. Die Heilige Schrift nennt solche, die „Friede, Friede!“ schreien, so doch kein Friede ist, falsche Propheten. L. S.

A Union Lutheran Seminary in India. — A Union Lutheran Seminary for theological training will be opened in July at Gurukul, Madras, South India. Synods and societies joining in the movement are the United Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran Church, the Danish Missionary Society, the Ev. Luth. Leipzig Mission, the Swedish Mission, and the Tamil Ev. Luth. Church in India. The last-named is an offshoot of the Leipzig Mission. It is planned to offer a course of three years. "Each cooperating body will furnish one professor, whether Indian or foreign, and will be responsible for his salary and housing and will also send students for the graduate classes and, maybe, other classes." — We sincerely regret that our Missouri Synod, which is also doing mission-work in India, cannot join in the new venture; for the constituent groups tolerate much doctrinal error in their ranks. Our Concordia Theological Seminary in India is located at Nagercoil, Travancore.

FREDERICK BRAND.

Schulverhältnisse in Sowjetrußland. Der „Christl. Apologete“ schreibt: „Mit dem bekannten Dekret vom 12. August 1930 ist auch in Sowjetrußland der allgemeine Schulzwang eingeführt worden. Bereits mit Beginn des Schuljahres 1930–31 sollte mit dem Pflichtbesuch der Volksschule aller Kinder im Alter von acht, neun und zehn Jahren begonnen werden. Gleichzeitig sollten auch Kinder zwischen elf und fünfzehn Jahren, die die Volksschule nicht besucht haben, in besonderen — noch zu schaffenden — Anstalten im Laufe von ein bis zwei Jahren Unterricht erhalten. Im Vergleich mit dem Programm, mit welchem die Kommunisten in Rußland bei ihrer Machtergreifung auf dem Gebiet der Schulbildung auftraten, ist dies Dekret ziemlich bescheiden. Außerdem steht die neue Verfügung nur auf dem Papier. Selbst der Sowjetpresse erscheint die Verwirklichung dieser Maßnahme sehr zweifelhaft. Nach der „Iswestja“ müßten 58,900 Klassen eröffnet, 50,300 neue Lehrer ausgebildet und ernannt und ca. 750 Millionen Rubel ausgegeben werden. Der offizielle Schulzwang kann aber als gefährliche Waffe dort angewandt werden, wo man Kinder, die von den Eltern bisher sorgsam dem entfittlichenden Einfluß der Sowjetschule ferngehalten wurden, unter diesen Einfluß bringen will. Eine ganze Reihe von Presseberichten weist darauf hin, daß im ganzen Schulwesen eine für westeuropäische Verhältnisse beispiellose Desorganisation eingerissen ist. überhaupt hat das Erziehungssystem in der Sowjetunion schon jetzt zu einem Sinken des geistigen Niveaus in allen Schulen Rußlands, von der Volksschule angefangen, bis zur Universität geführt.“ J. T. M.

Neue Funde im Irak. Nach einer Meldung im „Christl. Apologeten“ sind bei den neuesten Grabungen der Oxford- und Field-Museen an der Stätte des alten Risch im Irak kostbare Juwelen und wunderbolle Goldschmuckgegenstände gefunden worden, die einst am Hofe Nebukadnezars getragen wurden. Nach dem Bericht des Leiters der Grabungen, Professor Langdons, wird dieser Schatzfund aus der babylonischen Epoche besonders Aufsehen erregen, da dadurch auch auf die biblische Geschichte neues Licht fällt. Tief unter dem Tempel des Königs Nebukadnezar wurde eine neue Reihe sumerischer Königsgräber aufgedeckt, die man als 5,500 Jahre alt schätzt. Dabei wurden Täfelchen mit Keilschriften gefunden, die neue Aufschlüsse über die Geschichte dieser Zeit bringen. Man hat berechnet, daß diese Schriften älter sind als die Sintflut. Die Grabungen ergaben auch Funde von vorzüglichen Skulpturen aus der Sassanidenzeit um 250 nach Christo. — So weit der Bericht. Der Wert dieser Funde besteht vor allem darin, daß sie die „Geschichte der ersten Menschheit“, wie sie von den ungläubigen Bibelkritikern konstruiert worden ist, in Stücke reißen und die Wahrheit des alttestamentlichen Berichts direkt wie indirekt bestätigen. Die bibelfeindlichen Evolutionstheorien erleben an diesen archäologischen Funden ihr Waterloo. J. L. M.

Wiederaufnahme der anglikanisch-freikirchlichen Besprechungen. Wie das „Ev. Deutschland“ mitteilt, hat die anglikanische Bischofskonferenz, die im Sommer vorigen Jahres in London stattfand, in weiten freikirchlichen Kreisen stark enttäuscht, da sie nichts dazu beigetragen hat, die Einigungsbestrebungen zwischen der englischen Staatskirche und den englischen Freikirchen zu fördern. Nach der Mitteilung des *Methodist Recorder* hat nun der Erzbischof von Canterbury dem Bundesrat der evangelischen Freikirchen Englands seinen Wunsch dahin geäußert, daß die Besprechungen zwischen Vertretern der anglikanischen Kirche und der Freikirchen wieder aufgenommen würden. Eine Reihe solcher Besprechungen fand bereits im Jahre 1920 nach der Lambethkonferenz statt; doch wurden sie Mitte des vorigen Jahrzehnts wieder eingestellt. Bisher scheiterten die Einigungsbestrebungen zumeist an den hohen Anforderungen der englischen Staatskirche, namentlich an der Forderung, die *continua successio* anerkennen zu müssen, die besonders die hochkirchliche Partei aufrechterhält, während die niederkirchliche Partei wie auch die breittkirchliche den Einigungsbestrebungen zugeneigt ist. J. L. M.

Ein wichtiger Fund. Wie „D. E. D.“ mitteilt, ist kürzlich ein wichtiger Fund gemacht worden. Der Bericht lautet: „Der Professor der semitischen Sprachen und der Ägyptologie an der Universität Toronto in Canada, Dr. Mercer, meldet als Ergebnis einer Forschungsreise nach Abessinien die Entdeckung eines alten Bibelmanuskripts, das einen um zweihundert Jahre älteren Text biete als alle bisher bekannten Übersetzungen der Heiligen Schrift. Die bisherige Prüfung des Textes habe ergeben, daß auf Grund dieser Handschrift an wichtigen Stellen der ursprüngliche Text des Alten Testaments wiederhergestellt und von Irrtümern der späteren Ausgaben gereinigt werden könne. Der Gelehrte kündigt zunächst die Veröffentlichung des Textes des Prediger Salomo an.“ J. L. M.