

Concordia Theological Monthly

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

Vol. III

January, 1932

No. 1

CONTENTS

	Page
ARNDT, W.: Foreword	1
LAETSCH, TH.: Die Schriftlehre von der Verstockung....	7
MUELLER, J. T.: Introduction to Sacred Theology.....	12
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Apostelamt, Predigtamt, Pfarramt, Synodalamt	23
LAETSCH, TH.: Studies in Hosea 1—3.....	33
Dispositionen ueber die zweite von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe	45
Miscellanea	55
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	57
Book Review. — Literatur.....	72

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 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.

Nach der hermeneutischen Regel *Lectio difficilior praeferenda* sollten wir uns wenigstens mit der Lösung dieser Schwierigkeit befassen. Eine solche, und zwar eine recht annehmbare, bietet Meher in seinem Buche „Jesus Mutter Sprache“, worin er bekanntlich den Nachweis führt, daß der Heiland sich in der Regel der aramäischen Sprache bedient habe. Demnach hätte er hier den Ausdruck gebraucht: *ab'daha*, Tater der Weisheit, oder *abdaha*, Knechte der Weisheit, woraus leicht in der mündlichen Überlieferung *obadaha* oder *abidataha* werden konnte, Werke der Weisheit. Als der Heilige Geist die Evangelien in griechischer Sprache aufzeichnen ließ, nahm er beide Wendungen in die Heilige Schrift auf, und wir berücksichtigen daher auch beide bei der Auslegung der Harmonie des Lebens Jesus. K.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Aus unserm Seminar. Die durch D. F. Piepers Abscheiden entstandene Lücke im Lehrpersonal des Seminars macht sich noch in mancher Hinsicht bemerkbar. Prof. D. L. Fürbringer, der achtunddreißig Jahre lang der Kollege des Entschlafenen war, ist als sein Nachfolger erwählt worden und wurde am 18. November v. J. feierlich in sein Amt eingeführt. Dadurch, daß Prof. D. Engelder die Dogmatik in der zweiten und in der Kandidatenklasse übernommen hat, während ein Teil seiner bisherigen Arbeit auf andere verteilt wurde, ist es möglich gemacht worden, für dieses Schuljahr von der Besetzung der entstandenen Vakanz Abstand zu nehmen, was in Anbetracht der obwaltenden ökonomischen Verhältnisse auch annehmbar schien. Aber die Größe der Klassen ist noch immer ein unliebsamer Umstand, besonders wenn die einzelnen Lehrer nach Wunsch der Synode nicht lediglich diktieren oder vortragen, sondern auch Textbücher gebrauchen und schriftliche Arbeiten in der Stunde und außerhalb der Stunde anfertigen lassen. Wenn die Klassen im regelmäßigen Kursus bis zu 80 Studenten zählen (trotz der stattgefundenen Teilung) und die in einzelnen Wahlfächern bis zu 135, dann ist es sehr schwer, auf den einzelnen Studenten zu achten und ihn zu selbständigen Leistungen heranzuziehen. — Die mit der großen Studentenzahl verbundenen Schwierigkeiten, auch was die Beföstigung der jungen Männer anlangt, sind zum Teil gehoben durch intensivere Arbeit sowie durch das Zusammendrängen des Schuljahres, jedoch unter Beibehaltung der von der Synode angeordneten Anzahl von Schultagen. Die früheren Scheuertage sind im neuen Seminar hingefallen, und die Eintagskonferenz findet, soweit dies tunlich ist, an Ferientagen statt. Auch die Osterferien sind in den letzten Jahren vermindert worden auf Gründonnerstag, Karfreitag und Ostermontag. Die durch derartige Bestimmungen gewonnenen ca. zwei Schulwochen kommen der Studentenschaft und der Synode zugute: ersterer, weil durch intensivere Arbeit mehr geleistet wird; letzterer, weil, was Beföstigung der Studenten und ihr Wohnen im Seminar anbetrifft, auf so viel weniger Tage zu rechnen ist. Die Redaktionsarbeit der Professoren an den von der Synode herausgegebenen Zeitschriften geht natürlich im Winter und im Sommer weiter, und es erscheinen keine Doppelnummern mehr wie früher. — Der auf Beschluß der Synode eingerichtete Korrespondenzkursus des Seminars ist, wie es scheint, noch nicht

überall bekannt. Einige hundert Pastoren haben sich einschreiben lassen, von denen viele die ihnen gebotene Gelegenheit in ausgiebigem Maße und mit ausgezeichnetem Erfolge verwerten. Die eine Tatsache schon, daß man genötigt ist, in systematischer Weise zu arbeiten und seine Zeit recht auszukaufeu, ist für viele ein Ansporn. Aber auch ein anderer Vorteil, der sich daraus ergibt, ist nicht zu verachten, daß nämlich die Bibliothek dieses Departements den eingeschriebenen Pastoren unter überaus günstigen Bedingungen zur Verfügung steht. Man lasse sich das Informationsbüchlein kommen.

K.

“The Weakness of Theological Education.” — Speaking before the Third Conference on Preaching of the Boston University School of Theology, Carl Wallace Petty, minister of the First Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, offered the following criticism of modern theological education: —

“Our seminaries have come in for some criticism in late years concerning the kind of preparation offered students for the ministry. The result of the criticism has been generally a revision of the curricula. To some of us that has seemed peculiar. It has not been the content of theological training that has caused the bother. It hurts no preacher to be able to distinguish between a *piel* and a *hitpael* or to make the verbs in the third chapter of the Epistle to Romans. Knowledge concerning the early heresies of the Church is useful. . . . It is rather the fact that so many students leave their schools with a vast lot of preparation that they do not know what to do with. The diet appears to be all right, but the metabolic process seems to have broken down. They are in the position in which a young medical man would find himself who, though well instructed in diagnosis, anatomy, and pathology and owning a fine kit of surgical instruments, should be thrust into surgery with no technique for exploring an abdomen or operating on a mastoid. What a technique is to a surgeon a synthesis is to the preacher. All preparation for the ministry has just one objective — it is to keep God contemporary and discover ways of making Him available for the needs of men and society. The weakness of theological education, if weakness it has, is not so much in the content of its curriculum as in its failure to create in the mind of the young preacher that synthetizing process by which what a man knows can be put to work at the task of bringing a world of striving, seeking, selfish people in touch with the spiritual resources of the universe.” (*Contemporary Preaching*, p. 21 f.)

We are here confronted with a perennial problem — how to convert theoretical knowledge into practical ability. While it is self-evident that all theological instruction should be given with due regard for its future practical use by the students, the fact remains that practical ability must be acquired in the school of experience. In view of this fact our theological students are being encouraged to serve as supplies before finishing their course at the seminary.

E. J. F.

Professor Price’s “Apologia pro fide mea.” — In the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of October, 1931, appears a remarkable article, in which Prof. George McCready Price of Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich., using the title indicated in our heading, discusses his attitude toward the conclusions of evolutionary scientists. He is an ardent and well-informed student of geology and has become famous as a defender of the inerrancy

of the Bible. His article, to quote the chief statements, sets forth these views. The problem of origins remains still unsolved so far as natural science and philosophy are concerned. The differences between the views of the various advocates of evolution show that permanent truth has not yet been found by them. Since the Bible always speaks of creation as a *finished* work and not as something now going on, we cannot expect to find in the present order of nature any information as to how the world came into existence. We have God's revelation in the Bible, telling of the beginning of things. Nature is another book God has given us, a book second only to the Bible. All naturalistic schemes of accounting for the first appearance of the primary forms of life have failed. Pasteur's patient work has branded as unscientific all speculation regarding the spontaneous origin of life. A definite creation of the first forms of all the distinct kinds of plants and animals is imperatively demanded by clear thinking on the facts of biology.—As far as the time consumed by Creation is concerned, natural science as such can tell us nothing of permanent value. The serial arrangement of the fossils as submitted by biologists is a purely artificial affair, which can be arrived at only by an elaborate process of circular reasoning. It is clear there was one geological age, a previous age of our world, with a very different climate and many other conditions quite opposite to those now prevailing. But the supposed ability of biologists to discriminate among the works of that age, assigning some to one period and some to another, is without any real scientific value. All the true fossils may have been living contemporaneously in the same world. When trilobites and graptolites are found occurring *underneath* dinosaurs and mammals in some localities and *above* them in others, with no physical evidences of any subsequent disturbance in either cases, it is self-evident that all these forms of life must have been living contemporaneously in that ancient world. This of course does not *prove* their simultaneous origin or creation. Belief that there was such a simultaneous origin rests not on science, but on revelation. The Bible, with its affirmation of a fiat creation, gives us the only method which will stand a philosophic or scientific analysis. God's wish or God's thought must be the ultimate cause of both the origin and the continued existence of things. Modern physics, with its apparent proof of the equivalence of matter and energy, would seem to be getting very near to this idea.—And with respect to conditions before the Flood the geological proof of a mild, equable climate over the entire earth, even within the polar regions, is unequivocal. The complete earth-ruin wrought by the Flood is attested not only by the Bible, but by the rocky record of all the lands of the globe, the strata of which testify to wholly abnormal conditions in their deposition. A further proof of the universality of the Flood is furnished by the ease and the completeness with which this idea unlocks those perplexities and problems which have so long been used as an excuse for the theory of organic evolution. Science indeed does not demonstrate that the Flood was the cause of the geological changes recorded in the strata, but the scientific evidence compels us to believe in a great world-catastrophe of some sort and of quite indefinable dimensions. It is important to note that in the Flood we have a sufficient solution for all those geological and biological puzzles which have been relied upon as the chief proof of

organic evolution. The crucial test of any scientific or philosophical theory must always, for the Christian, be its agreement or disagreement with the Bible. Any theory of man's animal origin must deny man's primal innocence and hence the doctrine of the fall of man, and if the Fall is denied, the entire doctrine of the atonement and the sacrificial death of Christ.

While we regret very much that Professor Price, as a Seventh-day Adventist, rejects clear teachings of the Holy Scriptures, we are grateful to him for his valiant defense of the inerrancy of the first chapters of our Bible, showing that the attacks of hostile critics, which are largely based on geological data, are unjustified.

A.

The Itch for Public Attention. — In the *Forum*, Robert G. M. Neville has published an article giving a very drastic commentary on the publicity itch with which many preachers in our day are troubled. He writes: —

"The time can be recalled by living men when the virus of publicity had not bitten the average priest, rector, or divine; when there were no sermon pages on which his Sabbatical conclusions could be recorded for posterity; when no church committees on press relations pleaded with exasperated city editors for space; and when no handsomely paid publicity agents threatened withdrawal of advertising if the paper refused to exhibit curiosity in their clerical clients.

"But alas! that day has vanished. That was a time when churches, like physicians, disdained to spend huge sums of money to advertise their services in the mundane press. It was a time when the press, yet to be won over to the ways of God, refused to recognize that religion was as important as the theater, sports, and finance and to give it equal space. It was a time before modern high-pressure methods had been invented and before publicity, which started with the somewhat shady dealings of the circus, had found an unimpeachable and lucrative client in the representatives of God on earth.

"While the coverage of religious news is now a fever with almost every paper in every part of the country, the regard of the nation's press for religion — and of the pastors for the press — is epitomized by the situation in New York. The Mecca of missionaries from all ends of the earth, the parish of apostles of new religions by the score, and the headquarters of dozens of ecclesiastical organizations, this modern Gomorrah maintains a daily press obsessed with religious zeal.

"The *New York Times*, for example, finds it profitable to pay twenty-five reporters — many of them from the Columbia School of Journalism — \$3.25 apiece for worshipping on Sunday, besides maintaining a religious editor to ferret out religious happenings throughout the week. The *Herald Tribune*, which outprints the *Times* on sermons, sends out a group of men to invade the churches for news every Sunday and dispatches its staff of copy boys to fill in.

"This sudden bursting into hallelujahs by the Fourth Estate has been welcomed fervently by the ministers. Often they are ready with extracts of their moral dissertations to hand to the reporters, and more often they apprise the press in advance of any unusual happenings in their congregations.

"Ever vigilant, scanning religious columns with the eye of a hawk,

the publicity agents, secretaries, and press committees intervene in person in the name of the Church and God when their releases repeatedly fail to appear in print.

“Suspicious newspaper men have begun to believe that sermons are not preached for the salvation of a sinful humanity so much as for exploitation by a wayward press and that some parish activities originate not so much out of a love of God as a penchant for publicity.

“There are some ministers, God bless them, who still ignore the press and stick to the Gospel. There are others who profess to despise publicity, but nevertheless contend that they must stoop to conquer, that the church must publicize itself to the fullest extent in order to compete with amusements. The skeptics at the press bench cannot help feeling, however, that the personal ambition of the men of God is the most potent factor in religious news. A divine who prefers to remain in his parish and minister solely to his flock, never venturing into the wider world of the press, may conceivably enter the kingdom of God with full honors, but he will never become a Park Avenue rector with a salary of \$20,000 a year, nor will he be elected a moderator or bishop.”

W. G. P.

The Episcopalians at Denver. — Whatever the Episcopalians may have accomplished when they met in their triennial convention at Denver last year, they cannot complain that the newspapers did not take sufficient cognizance of their gathering and report with comparative fulness the convention news to the general public. To judge by the many times the assembly was mentioned on the first page of the daily papers, great things must have been achieved. Alas! the convention debated rather at length the question of marriage and divorce; hence the wide-spread interest in its proceedings. The points at issue had to do chiefly with the view the Church should take of the remarriage of divorced persons and their admission to the Sacrament. After much discussion a new marriage canon was adopted, which in the *Christian Century* is summarized thus: “Courts may be established in dioceses to hear appeals for nullity on nine grounds; if nullification is granted, appellants may remarry; also to review cases of divorce obtained on the ground of adultery, which, if heard favorably, will permit remarriage; to hear pleas for reinstatement as communicants in good standing of persons who have remarried after having been divorced.” The innovation is the provision looking to the establishment of ecclesiastical courts to determine whether certain marriages should be declared null and void and whether in other cases a divorce may be granted. It will be noted that these courts, according to the new canon, *may* be established; in other words, the establishment is optional, resting with the decision of each diocese. If these courts were to function as advisory bodies, assisting pastors and congregations in arriving at Scriptural, God-pleasing conclusions in difficult cases, nobody could object to them; but since they, wherever established, are to *decide* questions which really belong to the jurisdiction of congregations, the provision is an unwarranted intrusion into the sphere of the rights and privileges belonging to the local congregations.

The much-discussed issue which was raised by the preparation of a new missal, the so-called American missal, which is quite Roman in its complexion, was sidestepped in a manner satisfactory to both the Roman

and the Evangelical party. The book was not condemned, as the former party feared might be done, nor was its use authorized, the convention decreeing that the certificate of the custodian of the Book of Common Prayer must not appear in the new missal. The certificate referred to is found in every authorized copy of the Book of Common Prayer and briefly declares that the particular copy has been compared with "a certified copy of the standard book and conforms thereto." Those who are in love with Romanism will simply use the book, justifying their course by reminding themselves and others that the convention did not forbid the introduction of the new missal, though it had an opportunity to do so, and the enemies of Romanism will assert that they have saved their Church from Popery by withholding recognition of the new book. It is a farce. *Num risum tenetis, amici?*

It seems not unimportant that our clergy should be in possession of the *ipsissima verba* of the marriage canon adopted by the Episcopalian convention, and therefore we append it here, taking it over from the *Lutheran*:—

"Of the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony:—

"Section I. Ministers of this Church shall, within their cures, give instruction, both publicly and privately, on the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the mutual love and forbearance which it requires.

"Section II. Ministers of this Church shall conform to the laws of the State, governing the civil contract of marriage, and also to the laws of this Church, governing the solemnization of holy matrimony.

"Section III. (1). No minister of this Church shall solemnize any marriage before the following conditions have been carefully complied with:

"(A). He shall ascertain by due inquiry the right of the parties, according to the laws of this Church, to contract a marriage.

"(B). He shall instruct the contracting parties as to the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the means of grace which God has provided through His Church.

"(2). There shall be at least two witnesses present at the solemnization of the marriage.

"(3). Every minister shall without delay formally record in the proper register the name, age, and residence of each party. Such record shall be signed by the minister who solemnizes the marriage, by the married parties, and by at least two witnesses of the marriage.

"(4). No marriage shall be solemnized by a minister of this Church unless the intention of the contracting parties shall have been signified to the minister at least three days before the service of solemnization.

"Section IV. If one party to a marriage so grievously offend the other that the security of permanence of the home is imperiled, it shall be the duty of the offended party to lay the matter before a minister of the Church; and it shall be the duty of such minister to labor that the parties may be reconciled.

"Section V. No minister knowingly, after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has been or is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

"Nor shall it be lawful for any member of this Church to enter upon

a marriage when either of the contracting parties is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

“But this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, provided that before the application for such re-marriage a period of not less than one year shall have elapsed after the granting of such divorce and that satisfactory evidence touching the facts in the case, including a copy of the court’s decree and record, if practicable, with proof that the defendant was personally served or appeared in the action, be laid before the ecclesiastical authority and such ecclesiastical authority, having taken legal advice thereon, shall have declared in writing that in his judgment the case of the applicant conforms to the requirements of this canon; and provided, further, that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to solemnize any marriage.

“Section VI. (1). Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court, constituted by canon, of the diocese or missionary district of the said person’s domicile, to have the said marriage declared null and void by reason of any of the following impediments to marriage:

“I. Consanguinity (whether of the whole or of the half blood) within the following degrees: —

“(A). One may not marry one’s ascendant or descendant.

“(B). One may not marry one’s sister.

“(C). One may not marry the sister or brother of one’s ascendant or the descendant of one’s brother or sister.

“II. Lack of free consent of their party.

“III. Mistake as to the identity of either party.

“IV. Mental deficiency of either party sufficient to prevent the exercise of intelligent choice.

“v. Insanity of either party.

“VI. Failure of either party to have reached the age of puberty.

“VII. Impotence of either party undisclosed to the other.

“VIII. The existence of venereal disease in either party.

“IX. Facts which would make the proposed marriage bigamous.

“(2). The bishop in each case, after taking legal advice thereon of the ecclesiastical court proceeding in accordance with the canons and acting through the bishop, shall render judgment in writing to the petitioner. All judgments rendered under this canon by the bishop or the ecclesiastical court shall be made matters of permanent record in the archives of the diocese or missionary district.

“No such judgment shall be construed as referring in any way to the legitimacy of children or the civil validity of the former relationship.

“(3). Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court and pronounced null by the bishop may be married by a minister of this Church as if he had never previously been married.

“Section VII. (1). If any minister of this Church shall have cause to think that a person desirous of holy Baptism or of confirmation or of receiving the holy Communion has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allows, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon.

"The bishop, after due inquiry into the circumstances and taking into consideration of the godly discipline both of justice and of mercy, shall give his judgment thereon in writing.

"Provided, however, that no minister shall in any case refuse these ordinances to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.

"(2). Any persons who have been married by civil authority or otherwise than as this Church provides may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court of their domicile for the recognition of communicant status or for the right to apply for holy Baptism or confirmation.

"After due inquiry into all the facts relevant thereto judgment shall be given in writing to the petitioners by the bishop or by the ecclesiastical court acting through the bishop.

"In case of a favorable decision a minister of this Church may, at his discretion, bless the parties to the union." A.

The Kurtzian Formula for Church Union. — The *Lutheran* of August 13, 1931, says editorially: "In the second volume of our file of the *Lutheran Observer* and soon after Dr. Benjamin Kurtz became its editor in 1833, Dr. Kurtz replied to a letter from a layman who inquired as to the possibility of uniting the Lutheran and German Reformed churches. The correspondent stated that several Lutheran and Reformed persons (laymen, we suspect) had met to consider a combination of the two communions and had not suffered as a result. The editor was asked his opinion and replied that he favored union 'provided it can be accomplished in accordance with the wishes of the great body of the respective churches.'" Dr. B. Kurtz, it is well known, was a radical unionist. He felt no qualms of conscience for attending the German Reformed General Synod as a delegate from the Lutheran General Synod. "Foremost and boldest among the Reformed theologians within the General Synod were S. S. Schmucker and B. Kurtz, who nevertheless insisted on sailing under the Lutheran flag. Brazenly claiming to be the true representatives of Lutheranism, they at the same time assailed the Lutheran and defended the Reformed doctrines with ultra-Calvinistic zeal and bigotry." (*American Lutheranism*, II, p. 69.) Dr. Spaeth said: "For years and years he [Dr. Kurtz] was indefatigable in his coarse and irreverential, yea, blasphemous attacks upon what was set forth as most sacred in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church." (*L. c.*, p. 71.) There can thus be no doubt as to the meaning of his formula for bringing about the union of the two churches. All that is needed is the will of the people.

The *Lutheran* is not adverse to the Kurtzian formula. The editorial states: "We admire the editorial craftsmanship of our brilliant predecessor Dr. Kurtz when he stated that he would advocate a combination 'provided it can be accomplished in accordance with the wishes of the great body of the respective churches.' A union of these German-speaking people in the period prior to the great trek of Germans to the United States and Canada from 1840 to 1895 would have been most expedient. On the surface it would have been the sensible thing to do, and the average layman would probably have accepted the advice of his pastor had the latter urged an organic union between the Reformed and Lutheran groups. But there are fundamental differences of doctrinal conviction between the confessions of the Lutheran and Reformed churches that are keenly discerned by those

on both sides, not only by the ministers, but also by the laity who are above the average. . . . Any layman of reasonably keen intelligence can analyze the catechisms of Luther and Heidelberg to a point where he will choose between the two. Any proposal to unite the Reformed and Lutheran synods would bring on such an analysis, and no compromise by a composite formula would satisfy either. . . . Is a union a present possibility? We do not know the views of our contemporary, the *Reformed Church Messenger*, and its editor, Dr. Paul Leinbach. We ourselves would not be adverse to the Kurtzian formula. If the majorities of the two communions *could* come to a sincere agreement on points of difference, the combination would be of great value. But it would be a negotiation requiring great frankness and sincerity, first among the leaders and later among the constituents. At present the relationships of the Reformed Church are closer to the Presbyterian than to the Lutheran communion."

We do not know what to make of this. The editor of the *Lutheran* "would not be adverse to the Kurtzian formula." And in the next sentence he states that "if the majorities of the two communions *could* come to a sincere agreement on points of difference, the combination would be of great value." But that and the repudiation of a "compromise by a composite formula" is not the Kurtzian formula. That is, if we strike out the reference to "the majorities," the Pauline formula. A church union of the right sort is brought about when a Scriptural agreement on the points of difference is arrived at. Dr. Kurtz does not mention Scripture. According to his formula the "wishes of the great body of the respective churches" decide the matter. We do not see how the platform "No compromise by a composite formula" and the Kurtzian formula can be harmonized. In negotiating a church union on the basis of the elimination of all error, on the no-compromise basis, any favorable mention of the Kurtzian formula is out of place. It can only serve to revive the spirit of 1833. The Kurtzian formula should not be revived. It should be left in the *limbus* of evil spirits.

What does Dr. Paul Leinbach of the *Reformed Church Messenger* make of the Kurtzian formula? He responded to the *Lutheran's* remarks in an editorial headed "Our Friends, the Lutherans," which the *Lutheran* of September 17 reprints. His rejoinder contains the following: "The *Messenger* believes that our fellow-editor is perfectly safe in adopting what he calls the 'Kurtzian formula.' *We can accept it also without any mental reservation whatsoever.*" (Italics in the *Messenger*.) "Indeed, we suspect it would not be so difficult for us to go half-way in the process of getting together as it would be for our friends, the Lutherans." (Italics our own.) That looks like a "compromise by a composite formula." Particularly as he adds: "The things that divide us, which still loom large in the minds of some theologians and editors, are of comparatively little moment to the great mass of the people." There speaks the indifferentist, the unionist. And he accepts the Kurtzian formula in that sense. In what sense does the *Lutheran* accept it? E.

Why the Southern Presbyterians will Not Unite with the Northern Presbyterians.—It has long been known that the Presbyterians of the South are much more conservative than those of the North. Wherein their conservatism consists and why they will not unite with the

Northern Presbyterians is told in an article by Dr. Wm. Crowe in the *Presbyterian* of September 3, 1931, as it has been reprinted in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*. Dr. Crowe says:—

“In the North, emphasis is laid upon church administration; in the South it is laid upon doctrine. Therefore, when Southern Presbyterians speak of organic union, they are talking about a unity in belief; whereas in the North, in discussing the same subject, the thought in mind is community in government. The development of this differing emphasis may be discovered in a brief review of the history of Presbyterianism reaching back through a century and a quarter.

“By the close of the eighteenth century the Presbyterian Church found that it was facing what seemed to be an impossible task as it surveyed the growing cities and communities of the Middle West. It saw that churches would have to be built as the population advanced its frontier beyond the Alleghany Mountains. Therefore the calls for missionaries and for money were pressing. The Presbyterian Church also discovered that it was not alone in this consciousness of inadequate means for the discharge of its multiplying duties. The Congregational Church, its near neighbor, was also laboring under a like burden. Out of this mutual need a partnership was formed, known in history as ‘The Plan of Union.’

“It was in 1801 that ‘The Plan of Union’ was effected, and for more than thirty years these sister churches were united in their endeavor to overtake the growing West with the message of the Gospel. It was discovered, however, that in the main Congregational and Presbyterian home missionaries were not emphasizing the same principle in preaching the Gospel. The Congregational ministers were from New England and were followers of what is known as the New Haven Theology. The Presbyterian ministers were largely from Pennsylvania and New Jersey and were exponents of what is known as the Princeton Theology. The theology of Princeton found its center in certain principles that were considered essential to the conversion of the individual and to the spiritual building of the Church. The New England theologians, the trainers of Congregational missionaries, were not inclined to consider seriously the principles that were dear to the Presbyterian Church. Friction grew between the two schools of thought, which culminated in the severing of the relationship in the year 1837. Out of that disturbance grew two parties in the Presbyterian Church, known as the ‘New School’ and the ‘Old School.’ The ‘New School’ section adhered to the New England system, the ‘Old School’ stoutly defending the more strictly Calvinistic position. Within a few months the two sections within the Presbyterian Church divided, forming two distinct Presbyterian bodies, with names as above.

“The Civil War came on, with the result that in its opening year the synods of the South were forced to withdraw from the ‘Old School’ body. This excision was caused by the Southern constituency insisting that the bond of fellowship should be belief rather than the dictates of an administrative body either within or without the Church. From that year to the present the Southern Presbyterian Church has remained an autonomous body.

“Immediately upon the close of the war the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., facing increased responsibilities and with a depleted membership,

owing to the loss of the Southern synods, united within two years with the 'New School' Presbyterian Church. This union was upon the basis of a common administration, the question of doctrine being entirely in eclipse. It is therefore seen that within ten years the great Presbyterian Church had indicated its willingness to surrender the greater principle (that of doctrine) for the less (that of government). To it the system of government had become of more importance than the system of belief. The effect has been that to-day the major idea in the mind of the Church is union on the ground of polity rather than of the principles of the interpretation of the Word of God.

"That which was feared by Dr. Hodge and other conservative leaders in the Presbyterian Church happened as a result of the union between the 'New School' and the 'Old School' churches. From the day of the union until the present 'New School' Theology has been a disturbing factor in the ranks of that Church. For instance, Union Theological Seminary, New York, was a 'New School' seminary. This institution was taken into the Presbyterian Church without any requirement being made that it change its position in theology. This accounts for the historic lack of harmony in the Presbyterian Church in the East. More than that, every 'New School' seminary became a center of theological ferment. Out of these hotbeds influences inimical to the traditions of Presbyterianism have reached the remotest bounds of the Church. . . . The point that we are undertaking to make here is that the Presbyterian Church gives no emphasis to any form of belief when the hour for merging other denominations arrives. It is no wonder, then, that it proclaims its readiness to unite with any Protestant body upon a merely governmental basis. . . .

"For a worthy type of union the Southern Presbyterian Church has always stood. . . . Throughout all the succeeding years the Southern Church has held itself entirely ready to enter into a union that would be born of mutual trust, that would be upon a basis of common faith and of interpretation of the historic symbols of the Church, and that would give major place to the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ. This is all that it has asked. Mere administrative arrangements will never produce the form of union that is pleasing to the Master; and the Southern Assembly knows it."

J. H. C. F.

The End of the Macintosh Case. — The editor of the *Christian Century*, Charles Clayton Morrison, in a signed editorial appearing in the *Christian Century* of October 21, 1931, utters this protest: "The end of the Macintosh case is the beginning of the case of every American citizen who cherishes his liberty of conscience under the Constitution. The Supreme Court last week denied the petition for a rehearing. Every native-born citizen is now not only under obligation to bear arms in any war which Congress may declare, whether that war is held to be just or unjust, in accordance with, or contrary to, the will of God, but has impliedly accepted the obligation in virtue of his acceptance of the status and benefits and prerogatives of citizenship. It was under this interpretation of the Constitution that the court refused citizenship to Professor Macintosh, the decisive argument being that, unless he expressly promised to subordinate his conscience to Congress and accepted the will of Congress as the final interpretation of the will of God, his citizenship would be of a privileged

character in comparison with all native-born citizens. Chief justice Hughes and three other members of the court denied this interpretation, and contended that no such implied promise or obligation is imposed by the constitution upon citizens, whether native-born or naturalized. Dr. Macintosh will not be admitted to citizenship. . . . How many Presbyterian citizens will agree that they no longer hold with their two-century-old confession of faith that 'God alone is Lord of conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship,' so that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience 'is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also'? How many Baptist citizens, remembering the suffering and persecution of their fathers in order that conscience might be freed from control by the State, will now supinely admit that their citizenship under our Constitution places upon them the obligation to accept an enactment of Congress as the definitive revelation of the will of God, from which conscience has no appeal? How many Jewish citizens, whose religion rests upon the divine command, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before Me,' will consent that their citizenship in the United States is conditioned upon their having given the pledge that they will put the will of the State before the will of the living God? . . . How many readers of the *Christian Century* will consent that the Supreme Court shall tear out of their Bible the foundation text of all ethical and spiritual religion, 'We ought to obey God rather than men'?"

The Lutherans have this to say in the Sixteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession: "Of civil affairs they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God and that it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers. . . . Christians are necessarily bound to obey their own magistrates and laws, save only when commanded to sin; for then they ought to obey God rather than men, Acts 5, 29." And, in the Formula of Concord, Art. III, Epitome, § 11: "One is not to imagine a faith of such a kind as can exist and abide with, and alongside of, a wicked intention to sin and to act against the conscience."

The editorial closes thus: "For one, I, a native-born citizen of the United States, will not give my assent to this new doctrine. I will give everything I have for the well-being of the State, including my life, but I cannot give my conscience. That belongs to God. I repudiate the obligation which the Supreme Court would impose upon me and declare that the imposition of such an obligation is the essence of tyranny. I refuse to be bound by it. Charles Clayton Morrison." E.

Build Your Sermon Like a Cathedral. — This is the advice given by Fred Winslow Adams, professor in the Boston University School of Theology. He says: "If the preacher can build his sermon like a cathedral, with its fluted columns and groined arches arising more like the growth of a living thing than piled masonry, bringing a pervasive sense of wonder, mystery, and the manifold grace of God; if the preacher can project his theme like the Gothic arches over doors and windows, as hands lifted in

prayer; if he can make his illustrations like the celestial fire of cathedral glass, responding to the sunshine and reflecting the glory of God; if he can develop his sermons like a cathedral's open doors, veritable pathways of erring man to the altar of redeeming love; if, I say, the preacher can build his sermon like a cathedral, the symbol of the kingdom of God on earth, he shall know what it is to preach as an ambassador of Christ." (*Contemporary Preaching*, The Abingdon Press, p. 146.) E. J. F.

Reducing the Synodical Overhead by Merging and Closing Schools. — According to the *Kirchenblatt*, the budget committee of the American Lutheran Church has resolved to recommend to the general convention in 1932 that the synodical overhead be reduced by closing the schools at Petersburg, W. Va., and Eureka, S. Dak., by merging the institutions at St. Paul, Minn., Clinton and Waverly, Iowa, and Hebron, Nebr., and by merging the theological seminaries now maintained at St. Paul, Columbus, and Dubuque, at the last-named place. E. J. F.

II. Ausland.

„Groteske Logik“ der Missourier. Das Folgende entnehmen wir dem „Elfässiſchen Lutheraner“, der unter dieser Überschrift schreibt: Groteske Logik ist eine „sonderbare, komische, verdrehte“ Logik. In einer Auseinandersetzung zwischen dem Organ des Bibelbundes „Nach dem Gesetz und Zeugnis“ und dem „Oldenburger Sonntagsblatt“ wird eine solche Logik den vielgeschmähten Missouriern zugeschrieben. Da uns die Auseinandersetzung auch um ihres eigentlichen Gegenstandes willen interessiert, so sei sie hier kurz mitgeteilt. In der Augustnummer 1931 von „Nach dem Gesetz und Zeugnis“ lesen wir unter der Überschrift „So geht man mit unserer Bibel um“ unter anderm folgendes:

„Da schiebt uns ein altes, treues Mitglied unsers Bibelbundes das vom Geh. Oberkirchenrat Eben herausgegebene ‚Oldenburger Sonntagsblatt‘ vom 3. Mai 1931 zu. Hier finden wir auf Seite 142 einen Artikel ‚Das Markusevangelium‘. Darin lesen wir: ‚Die Geschichte von dem (von Herodes dem Großen befohlenen) Kindermord ist jedenfalls nicht historisch; sie will zeigen, wie der irdische König trotz aller Grausamkeit dem himmlischen König nichts anhaben kann.‘ So ist also der biblische Bericht unwahr und die Bibel ein Lügenbuch? — Von der biblischen Geschichte über die Hinrichtung des Täufers Johannes (Mark. 6, 14—29) heißt es in diesem Artikel weiter: ‚Diese Erzählung klingt wie eine grausige Volkserzählung. In der Form, wie sie da steht, ist sie nicht historisch.‘ Also lügt die Bibel nach dem Verfasser des Artikels!“

Der Geheime Oberkirchenrat schreibt nun eine maßvolle Entgegnung an die Schriftleitung des Bibelbundes. Darin heißt es dann aber zum Schluß: „Im übrigen bedaure ich es, daß Sie . . . mit der grotesken Logik, die mir besonders in den Blättern der Missourishnode oft aufgefallen ist, dem Verfasser [jenes Artikels] und weiterhin mir zur Last legen, wir machten die Bibel [will sagen: die gesamte Bibel; d. Red.] zu einem Lügenbuch.“

Der Schriftleiter des Bibelbundes hat sich nun glücklicherweise durch jenen spöttischen Hinweis auf die verdrehten Missourier nicht einschüchtern lassen, sondern hat sich ein Herz gefaßt und unter anderm geantwortet:

„Sie zeigen mich einer grotesken Logik à la Missouri. Glauben Sie

etwa, daß der Verfasser des Artikels wirklich in der ganzen Bibel nur an den beiden aufgeführten Beispielen Kritik zu üben sich berechtigt fühlt? Sie scheinen die Form der Darstellung für unwesentlich zu halten; wenn aber der Verfasser erklärt, die Geschichte der Hinrichtung des Johannes in der Form, das heißt doch in der Darstellung, wie die Bibel sie bringt, sei nicht historisch, so macht er meines Erachtens der Bibel den Vorwurf der falschen Darstellung, also der Unwahrhaftigkeit, das ist, der Lüge.“

Wir danken dem Herrn Schriftleiter dafür, daß er uns wenigstens der Sache nach in Schutz nimmt, und möchten noch bemerken, daß wir Missourier seine getadelte Logik gern für uns in Anspruch nehmen. Denn sie ist die Logik des gesunden Menschenverstandes, die Logik des Volkes, das aus solcher Kritik der Bibel allerdings den Schluß zieht: Die Bibel ist ein Lügenbuch. Wenn aber dem Geheimen Oberkirchenrat solch eine Logik grotesk oder komisch vorkommt, dann möchten wir zunächst gerne einmal wissen, wo er denn Logik gelernt hat, und zum andern, was er dann z. B. zu der wahrhaft abenteuerlichen Logik der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ sagt, die uns oft genug den Mund vor Staunen offenstehen läßt. (Vgl. die Ausführungen im „Erl. Lutheraner“ vom September 1931, S. 70 ff.) Allerdings den Missouriern gegenüber darf sich ja jeder Dummbart dergleichen Urteile erlauben, wieviel mehr ein Geheimer Oberkirchenrat! W. B.

Zweihundert Jahre Herrnhuter Mission. In diesem Jahre sind zwei Jahrhunderte verflossen, seit Zinzendorf die ersten Missionare nach den Westindischen Inseln ausschickte. Schon 1728 machte er Pläne, eine Heidenmission ins Leben zu rufen, und zwar unter den Mohammedanern; Kundschafter wurden in die Türkei und nach Afrika gesandt. Aber in Kopenhagen traf Zinzendorf mit einem westindischen Neger zusammen und wurde dadurch angeregt, seine ersten Missionare, Leonhard Dober und David Nitschmann, nach Westindien zu senden, um zunächst den Negerklaven auf der Insel St. Thomas das Evangelium zu predigen. Das war 1732. Dann breitete sich das Missionswerk der Brüdergemeinde rasch aus: 1733 nach Grönland, 1734 nach Lappland, dann zu den Indianern in Nordamerika, den Hottentotten in Afrika, den Eskimos in Labrador usw. Nach den „Allgemeinen Missionsnachrichten“ sind in diesen zweihundert Jahren neben andern Hilfsarbeitern 1,555 Missionare ausgesandt worden, dazu 62 Missionskaufleute, 93 unverheiratete Missionschwester, zusammen 1,710 Europäer. Von diesen kamen 36 Missionare, 10 Schwestern und 4 Kinder auf gewaltsame Weise ums Leben, die meisten in der Indianermission.

Nicht in allen Stücken ist die Herrnhuter Mission vorbildlich. So hat sie sich mancherorts kein Gewissen daraus gemacht, in fremdes Amt zu greifen und Schafe zu stehlen (in Grönland z. B. hat sie sich in Hans Egedes Gemeinde eingeschlichen). Aber in einem Stück steht sie unerreicht da: in dem Verhältnis zwischen Missionsarbeit und der Zahl der diese Mission unterstützenden Gemeinden und Gemeindeglieder. Die Brüdergemeinde zählt heute 58,932 Glieder in christlichen Ländern. Und diese verhältnismäßig kleine Kirche erhält 262 europäische Missionsarbeiter auf 135 Stationen in Südafrika, Ostafrika, Jerusalem, am Himalaja, in Alaska, Mittelamerika, Westindien, Demarara, Surinam und Labrador; diese bedienen im ganzen 120,236 Befehrte und unterrichten in 440 Schulen 40,806 Schüler.

Mohammedanermiffion. über den Fortgang dieser Miffion in Perfien berichtet der anglikanifche Bifchof in den „Allgemeinen Miffionsnachrichten“: „Wir hatten während der Kartwoche jeden Abend in Isfahan Laternengottesdienft. Jeden Abend war die Kirche immer mehr gedrängt voll, bis wir weiteren den Zutritt unterfagen mußten, und die Aufmerksamkeit und Stille unter den Zuhörern war befonders bemerkenswert. Wir hatten als Themen gewählt: ‚Warum Jefus kam‘, ‚Was Jefus lehrte‘, ‚Was Jefus tat‘, ‚Was Jefus für uns tun will‘. Am Karfreitag lasen wir die Abfchnitte vom Gericht und Tod. Ich glaube nicht, daß wir jemals schon folche Gottesdienfte mit einer folchen Befucherzahl in Isfahan hatten.“ Ein Befuch in einem Dorf zur felben Zeit brachte eine Zuhörerfchaft von fünfhundert bei einer Gesamtbevölkerung von zweitaufend, die fich Abend für Abend im Hof des Ortsvorftehers zu einem Laternengottesdienft verfammelte. Am Ende des Befuches fchloffen fich sechs Perfionen zum regelmäßigen Bibelstudium zufammen. Trogdem die Religionsfreiheit noch lange nicht gefichert ift und viele Befehrte von Haus und Hof vertrieben werden, berichtet doch jedes der Hauptzentren miffionarifcher Arbeit von Taufbewerbern. Die ganze religiöfe Tendenz fcheint fich in Perfien zu ändern. Ein befonders heiliger Begräbnißplatz in Mefhed, hinter dem Schrein Imam Rezas, wird gegenwärtig von der Regierung rüdfichtslos von Gräbern gereinigt; die ausgegrabenen Gebeine werden einfach in Lächer geworfen; Schädel werden Ärzten auf Verlangen zu wiffenfchaftlichen Zwecken geliefert; und es regt fich kaum ein leifes Murren gegen die Entweihung des Places.

Auch auf der Inſel Saba wird eifrig unter den Mohammedanern miffioniert. Saba hat eine Bevölkerung von nahezu 42,000,000, 314 auf einen Quadratkilometer (Deutschland hat eine Bevölkerungsdichte von 130 auf den Quadratkilometer), zum großen Teil mohammedanifch. Es arbeiten dort 58 europäifche Miffionare, darunter 8 Ärzte; ihnen zur Seite ftehen 59 Evangeliften und Lehrer und 154 eingeborne Krankenpfleger. Die Zahl der Chriſten beträgt 3,949. T. S.

The Latest Statistics from India. — In September, fo we are informed in an exchange, the government of India published the results of its census taken laſt February. According to this census the total population of India has now reached the high figure of 352,986,876. We are told that this means the population has increased 10.6 per cent. ſince 1921. What we are chiefly interested in are the figures for the field of religion, and they read as follows: Hindus, 238,330,912; Mohammedans, 77,743,928; Sikhs, 4,366,442; Christians, 5,961,794. The Sikhs (representing a ſort of reformed Hinduism) ſhewed the laegeſt gain during the laſt ten years, more than 33 per cent. The gain for the Christians was 32.6 per cent. The Mohammedans grew 13.1 per cent. and the Hindus 10 per cent. Of the total Christian population almoſt two-thirds (3,968,623) are in South India, which includes the native ſtates of Travancore and Cochin, Mysore, and Hyderabad. The report ſays that in the Hyderabad State, which is ruled by a Moslem prince, there has been the laegeſt increase for the Christians; from 62,656 in 1921 they have grown to number 151,946. Here, ſo we are informed, a maſs movement toward Christianity among the Hindu outcaſtes has been in progreſs. The ſtrength of the various Christian denominations has not yet been made known. It is heartening to ſee

that Christianity has gained considerably. But only six million Christians over against a population of three hundred fifty million — what a disparity, what a cry for help in those figures! A.

Der Zionismus lebt noch immer. Der „Christliche Apologete“ berichtet: „In der Welt-Zionistenkonferenz, die in Basel, Schweiz, tagte, wurde letzte Woche mit großer Stimmenmehrheit Nahum Sokolow, der seit Jahren als die rechte Hand Dr. Chaim Weizmanns galt, an Stelle dieses Herrn zum Präsidenten der Bewegung erwählt. In der offenen Sitzung der Delegaten wurde ein Voranschlag der Ausgaben für das nächste Jahr im Betrage von \$1,800,000 bewilligt.“ J. L. M.

übertritte zur lutherischen Kirche in Oesterreich. In einem Bericht aus „D. E. D.“ teilt der „Lutherische Herald“ mit: „Im Jahre 1927 wurden in der evangelischen Kirche in Deutsch-Oesterreich 3,980 Eintritte und 2,565 Austritte gezählt. Die meisten übertritte zum Protestantismus kamen den lutherischen Gemeinden, eine kleine Zahl den reformierten zugute.“ J. L. M.

Book Review. — Literatur.

Psalms. By *W. G. Scroggie*. Harper and Brothers. 144 pages, 4×6. Price, \$1.25.

This is a brief commentary on the first 41 psalms, prefaced by an introduction treating of Hebrew poetry and the divisions, the authorship, the titles, the character of the Psalter and including a reading scheme according to which the entire Psalter may be read every month. We were delighted to read the following exposition of the Twenty-second Psalm, which may serve as a sample of the style of the author: —

“This amazing psalm is in two distinct parts. The first part is a *sob* (1—21), and the second is a *song* (22—31). The key to Part One is, ‘Thou answerest not, and to Part Two, ‘Thou hast answered. The first part tells of sufferings, and the second part, of the glory that follows (1 Pet. 1, 11).

“Not a few answers have been given to the question, Who is the sufferer? But there is only one answer that fits the facts: . . . the sufferer is Jesus. It has truly been said that ‘the psalmist gives a more vivid description of the sufferings of Christ on the cross than the authors of the gospels.’ Mark carefully the parallels. Christ’s dying cry (1); the mockers gathered round the cross and their taunts (7. 8. 12. 13); torture by crucifixion (16); the distorted body (14. 17); the parched tongue and lips (15); the divided garments and unrent vesture (18); and at last the sudden silence in death. Why is there no mention of the spear thrust? Because Christ was already dead when that was done, and the Sufferer could not be represented as telling what happened after He had died.

“The most poignant utterance of Jesus discloses the most tragic factor in His sufferings, namely, His being forsaken of God (1); note, He does not say, ‘My Father — why?’ Now, of no one but Jesus could these words (1—21) have been written, for we know of no one in history but Himself who had such an experience. This, therefore, is pure prophecy, genuine prediction, and whoever was the writer of the psalm, he was writing by