

Concordia Theological Monthly

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

Vol. III

April, 1932

No. 4

CONTENTS

	Page
GRAEBNER, TH.: The Ghost of Pietism.....	241
KKETZMANN, P. E.: Der Spiritus Septiformis.....	245
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Zwei Gedächtnisfeiern.....	252
MAIER, WALTER A.: A Typical Instance of Exaggeration in the Modern Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch...	258
LAETSCH, TH.: Studies in Hosea 1—3.....	262
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Zur Form, Anlage und Sprache der Predigt in der apostolischen Kirche.....	268
POLACK, W. G.: Christian Missions in China before Mor- rison	274
KRETZMANN, P. E.: Die Hauptschriften Luthers in chro- nologischer Reihenfolge	281
Traured Prof. C. F. W. Walthers	283
Dispositionen ueber die zweite von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe	288
Miscellanea	295
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	300

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.



ARCHIVES

Theological Observer. — Kircklich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

National Music Week. — A few years ago the suggestion was made that special efforts ought to be put forth to give publicity to the marvelous heritage of the Lutheran Church in the form of church music and hymns. The suggestion was given concrete form by the introduction of National Music Week, which provides for the observance of a whole week, during which special stress is to be laid on the great hymns of the Lutheran Church, its matchless liturgy, and its incomparable productions in the field of *chorales*, oratorios, and cantatas. The week set aside for this purpose is that of the fourth Sunday after Easter, Cantate, the admonition of whose introit affords the right impetus to the project. The whole congregation may well join in the celebration of Music Week, the suggestion being that an afternoon or evening service be set aside for a church concert, in which some of the masterpieces of Lutheran organ music may alternate with the singing of some of the great hymns of the Lutheran Church by the entire assembly. It is self-evident that a church choir will take the leadership in an undertaking of this kind, not only by participating in the *chorales* of the whole congregation, but also by rendering some of the best setting of Lutheran *chorales* by Walther, Crueger, Ebeling, Praetorius, Schuetz, Bach, and others. The young people's societies are encouraged to have a topic discussion on Lutheran church music and to take part in the special service or services arranged for the celebration. And, quite naturally, the children of the parish-school and of the Sunday-school will be given an opportunity to become acquainted with the doctrinal hymns and the lyrical and musical classics of which our Church is justly proud. Pastors are asked to insert short items on the beauty and significance of Lutheran music and the Lutheran *chorales* in their parish-paper and also in the local press. Appropriate expressions of appreciation by non-Lutherans, such as Catherine Winkworth, F. L. Humphreys, Lutkin, and others, are available. The Walther League Office in Chicago is ready to serve with information on the celebration as planned for this year. K.

The Latest Papal Encyclical Once More. — "What an amazing document is the latest papal encyclical, *Lux Veritatis*, in which the Holy Father commemorates the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus and summarizes the judgments of that important ecumenical synod! The questions of doctrine settled by Ephesus were, according to the Pope, threefold: 'that in Jesus Christ the two natures, divine and human, are united in one divine Person; that the Virgin Mary is the true Mother of God; and that to the Roman Pontiff belongs by divine right a supreme and infallible authority over the whole Church in matters of faith and morals.' (Italics ours.)

"With the first two of these claims we have no quarrel. Historians generally have credited the Council of Ephesus as having set them forth, and they are an essential part of the catholic faith. If the title 'Mother of God' had fallen into disuse in post-Reformation Anglicanism, until its restoration as one of the fruits of the Anglo-Catholic revival, the essen-

tial doctrine which lies behind the words has never been repudiated by our part of the Church, nor could it be without the abandonment of her catholic character. But to impute the modern doctrine of papal infallibility, promulgated in 1870 by the Vatican Council, to the Council of Ephesus in 431 is an example of that which is neither *lux* nor *veritas*.

"As a matter of historical fact the Council of Ephesus owes its very inception to a recognition of papal fallibility, as even such an orthodox scholar as Dom. John Chapman admits in his article on the council in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, was accused of heresy by St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who appealed to Pope Celestine to sustain him in this charge. This the Pope did, directing Cyril to give notice to Nestorius that, unless he recanted his heterodox views within ten days, he was excommunicated and deposed. But Nestorius, paying no attention to the Pope's ultimatum, induced the Emperor Theodosius II to summon a general council to settle the question. If Pope Celestine thought himself infallible, why did he consent to the holding of a council to pass judgment upon a clear question of doctrine, on which he had already given his definite ruling? And why did he send legates to represent him at that council if he had already pronounced infallible judgment on the issue? . . ."

"*Answer to Correspondent*: At the Council of Ephesus (431) Philip, the Pope's personal legate, set forth the claim of papal supremacy, declaring 'that the Apostle Peter is the head of the faith and of the apostles.' However, it was not the papal legate, but the Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria, who presided over this council, and its most important work, the condemnation of Nestorius, had been accomplished before the papal delegation arrived. It was at the next Ecumenical Council, that of Chalcedon, in 451, that the papal envoys presided for the first time, though even then they shared that honor with the Patriarch of Constantinople. It was not until the time of Pope Gregory the Great (590—604) that the claims of papal supremacy (as distinct from primacy) were put into practical effect, while papal infallibility was not made a dogma until 1870."—*Living Church*, January 9, 1932.

We submit a few selections from President Knubel's comment in the *Lutheran* of January 7, 1932: "The Christmas encyclical issued from Rome by the Pope reveals once more his scholarship, wisdom, and spiritual-mindedness. . . . There comes then a third and extensive topic, in that the Pope aims to prove that as far back as the Council of Ephesus the supreme authority and infallibility of the Pope were recognized. He frankly acknowledges the objections of ancient and modern writers which he must meet, but he will fail to convince scholars that this idea became an established one even in Roman Catholicism earlier than the Vatican Council of 1869–70. . . . Throughout the three parts of the document runs like a refrain the call unto all Christians now separated from the papal Church to return to its fold. The appeal is a yearning one and gives us to realize once more that amid all efforts for church union at the present time no Church honestly desires it more than the Roman Catholic Church. Upon its fidelity to the historic Christian faith, upon the need for moral uplift in the world, upon the name of Mary, and upon the certitude provided by papal infallibility this call is based. Nobody can doubt the utter sin-

cerity of the appeal." There can be no doubt that the Pope is utterly sincere in his efforts to lead the Eastern and the Protestant churches back to Rome. But the use of the words "sincerity, honestly, yearning, spiritual-mindedness," and even of the much-abused term "church union" strikes one as rather incongruous in this connection. E.

What a Catholic Archbishop Says of "Lux Veritatis." — At the end of the Lenten Letter of Archbishop John Joseph Glennon of St. Louis, which he issued on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1932, there is a note which calls the attention of all members of the Roman Church to the recent encyclical of Pope Pius XI. The note reads as follows: "Very recently our Holy Father Pius XI has published under the title *Lux Veritatis* an Encyclical Letter appealing to all who are outside the true Church to return to the *One Fold* and under the *one Shepherd*, of Whom the Holy Father is Vicar. We recommend to the priests and people the purchase of this Letter and its wide-spread distribution. In those [*sic!*] days of storm and stress the only haven of security is the Church of the living God, and it is only through its teachings and the observance of the same that we may hope for a return of the reign of social and national well-being and the restoration to the people of prosperity, justice, and peace. Last year we administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to 1,340 converts, which is 12 per cent. of all confirmed in the diocese. It is a source of consolation that so many have, by the grace of God, come to see the divine truth as taught by the Church which He established; but unfortunately there is, on the other hand, a considerable number of those who walk no more with us." (Capitalizations and italics the author's.) Rome's supine self-assurance has not changed since the Council of Trent. K.

Superstition in Catholicism Pointed Out. — Prof. G. J. Laing of Chicago University has written a book entitled *Survivals of Roman Religion*, in which, as the reviews show, there are some things that are highly reprehensible; for instance, when he tries to demonstrate that the observance of Sunday and the use of the sign of the cross in Baptism are derived from Mithraism. But what he says on several other points rests on incontrovertible, that is, documentary evidence. He submits a list of saints published for the use of Spanish peasants, which reads thus: "San Serapio should be appealed to for stomach-ache; Santa Polonia, for toothache; San Jose, San Juan Baptista, and Santa Catalina, for headache; San Bernardo and San Cirilo, for indigestion; San Luis, for cholera; San Francisco, for colic; San Ignacio and Santa Lutgarda, for childbirth; Santa Balsania, for scrofula; San Felix, for ulcers; Santa Agueda, for nursing mothers; San Babilas, for burns; San Jorge, for an infected cut; Santa Quitera, for dog's bite; San Ciriaco, for diseases of the eye; Santa Lucia, for the eyes; Santa Bibiana, for epilepsy; San Gregorio, for frost-bite; San Pantaleon, for hemorrhoids; San Roque, for the plague; Santa Dorothea, for rheumatism; San Pedro, for fever; and Santa Rita, for the impossible!" Let no one say that the spreading of the light which was ushered in through the Reformation of Dr. Luther no longer is needed. A.

A Liberal Paper on Christian Burials. — Many people say they fail to understand why pastors of the Lutheran Church refuse to officiate at funerals of unbelievers. Such people ought to read an editorial in the

Christian Century (February 7, 1932) written in reference to the memorial service "for the late William Wrigley, of chewing-gum fame." It was an Episcopal rector who officiated, and the *Christian Century* editor wonders why "the rector did not seek asylum in the superior custom of the Anglican Communion of refraining from any kind of eulogy." He adds: "If a saint has died, a eulogy is useless; if a sinner, a eulogy is impossible; and if, like Tomlinson and the rest of us, the deceased is neither a sinner nor a saint, a eulogy tempts the parson to dishonesty." It is pointed out that Mr. Wrigley was an extremely successful business man, who spent much money on his estates on Catalina Island, at Pasadena, in Arizona, and in Chicago. He was known as a patron of baseball. If he was a generous Christian giver, the world did not discover it. What his rector praised chiefly was that William Wrigley "lived; his real life did not and will not die." The editor rightly says: "One could say that this is merely a neat way of playing with words. But it is, of course, more than that. It is a prostitution of the Christian criterion of character." In speaking of burials for people not connected with the Church, the editor says: "What is needed is a much greater variety of burial rites, which could be adapted to various circumstances and save the Church from the hypocrisy of reading every one into the kingdom of God just because the relatives ask for a Christian burial."

We should like to emphasize two things. It is not the Church's business to serve as an ornament at funerals; and secondly, funerals where hypocrisy is practised are an abomination in the sight of God. A.

The Position of Anglicans toward Their Creed. — The following remarks of the *Australian Lutheran* are illuminating: —

"Formerly we were accustomed to judge the doctrinal position of a denomination by its confession of faith. Thus the Augsburg Confession has always stood as the voice of the Lutheran Church, telling the world for what doctrine it stands. So also it was always assumed that in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as found in the Book of Common Prayer we have the doctrinal position of the Anglican communion set out. In our days, however, we are learning that even the older and conservative (as we consider them) churches no longer hold out their former confessions of faith as a doctrinal banner. In England the Bishop of Southwark (so we read in the London Letter of the A. C. W.), in a letter to his diocese, referred to the continuance of the requirement that candidates for the holy ministry declare their assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. He expressed the opinion that the Thirty-nine Articles were tolerated in the Anglican Church only because each party in the Church gives its own interpretation to them, selecting as of vital importance those which confirm its views and rejecting as obsolete or unsigned those which it dislikes. Whilst admitting that some test of doctrinal soundness is required, the bishop advocates 'a clear, short, and simple statement of the fundamental platform of the Church of England, which, without narrowing its comprehensiveness, would be free from ambiguity.' He believes, however, that there will be little chance of such a change until the complete separation of State and Church is accomplished in England. It would appear from this that the Thirty-nine Articles can no longer be taken as a statement of the Christian faith as taught in the Church of England. The Anglican

Church as a whole, for instance, no longer subscribes to Art. VI, which says: 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith.' Whilst the Anglo-Catholics teach men to believe many things of which we find nothing in the Scriptures, Modernists such as Bishop Barnes deny the necessity of accepting many of the plain teachings of the Bible. Nor does the Anglican clergy as a whole still subscribe to Art. XI, which says: 'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works and deservings.' This is proved by the close affinity between Anglicanism and Freemasonry. We know there are still men in the ranks of the Anglican clergy who desire to uphold the old faith as taught by the fathers, but there are also others." We need hardly add that the conditions portrayed above are found also in the daughter of the Church of Anglicanism which is our neighbor, the Protestant Episcopal Church of North America. A.

Reunion of the Baptists Discussed. — Opening the *Watchman-Examiner* of January 7, 1932, one will find an editorial on the question, "Will the Baptists Unite?" It will be recalled that the Baptists split into Northern and Southern Baptists at the time of the Civil War, the issue being, of course, the attitude the Church should assume toward slavery. While the doctrinal platform of both bodies of Baptists is the same, our editorial describes the situation correctly when it says: "By the well-informed it will be conceded that, broadly speaking, the churches constituting the Northern Baptist Convention have shown a tendency to become more modernistic and liberal in doctrine and in polity than have the churches of the Southern Convention." The *Watchman-Examiner* opposes organic reunion. When Baptists hold their conventions, every church has a right to send delegates and to speak its mind. What a huge assembly would result if the reunion should take place! "A western prairie would have to be chosen to hold the annual meeting." Our editorial says that it would be better to break up the large bodies into a number of smaller ones, in which real discussion could take place. Besides, nothing would be gained by formal union, says our editor. There is very little overlapping, and it hardly seems that more efficient work would result. "Except for the doubtful value of appearing as a united body before an indiscriminating world, we can see no value in the proposed union."

This is wisely spoken, it appears to us. What is important is not that we create and establish large church-bodies, but that we establish fellowship on the basis of the Scriptures with those who profess and practise loyalty to the Scriptures. A.

Further Proof for the Antichristian Character of Freemasonry. Since the warfare against the Freemasons and other lodges continues and has to continue as long as their character is not changed, our readers will welcome a few remarks made by the *Australian Lutheran* on the subject "Freemasonry Rejects Christ." As the paper of our brethren points out, a prominent Freemason of Australia, who is a pastor, said in an address that he had been "approached by theological students who were desirous to know whether they could logically line up with an order from which the central figure of the Christian Church was excluded." His reply was

that "Freemasonry is not a religion, but rather a religious order." Remarking on this, the *Australian Lutheran* says: "We learn two things: first, that Freemasonry is a religious order, that is, an organization which exists also for the teaching and spreading of religious principles and precepts; and secondly, that Freemasonry excludes Christ and that therefore Freemasonry's religious principles and precepts are Christless. According to its ritual Freemasonry in its religious press 'unites men of every country, sect, and opinion.' What does the Bible say to this? 'Whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father which is in heaven,' Matt. 10, 33. 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers,' etc., 2 Cor. 6, 14—18. How sad to think that in spite of these very definite and emphatic declarations of the Bible 'Christian' ministers can unite with Freemasonry, which excludes Christ, can participate in its Christless prayers, can in churches which are dedicated to the preaching of the message of Christ Crucified conduct Masonic services, and extol the religious principles and precepts of Masonry, admittedly Christless, and can officiate at Masonic burials, and blasphemously declare that the Freemason who died without Christ, but true to the Christless precepts and principles of the order, is in heaven!" In conclusion the paper of our brethren draws attention to a book entitled *The Menace of Freemasonry to the Christian Church*. The author, Rev. C. Penney Hunt, B. A., is a Methodist minister. The editor adds: "The rumor is abroad that the circulation of the book is to be prohibited." A.

A Monastic Order Devoted to the Establishment of Church Union. — In the *Commonweal* a writer, choosing the intriguing title "*Ut unum sint*" (John 17, 21), tells us that "a group of Benedictine monks is patiently working to clear the route toward union and everlasting peace." He thinks that the dogmatic differences between the Church of Rome and the churches of the Orient are "so few that the question of reunion would seem to be a very easy one to solve. In fact, there are only two dogmas of the Catholic Church that are not practised or admitted by the Oriental churches: 1. the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady and 2. the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope." In commenting on these two points of difference, he makes some surprising statements. He says: "Of these two fundamental beliefs of the Catholic Church the first one was actually followed by the South Russian Orthodox Church, with its center in Kiev, throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and was dropped only after a long fight with the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg. As to the second, the attitude of the majority of Oriental churches was determined by a false translation, which, instead of 'infallibility' used 'impeccability,' thus deforming completely the entire essence of this dogma." The Benedictine monks, so we are informed, were urged by Pope Pius XI, as far back as 1924, to start active work towards bringing about the union of churches "by the study of the language, the history, the institutions, the psychology, the theology, and the literature of the people who are members of the Oriental Church." These monks are supposed to be particularly well suited for the work in question because the founder of their order sought inspiration in the East for the founding of this order of monks, which was the first Catholic monastic order, and because he is still highly venerated by the Oriental Church. In favor of

this order it may be stated, too, as our informant says, that the Benedictine monks have never been "associated with the active and, one must admit, sometimes arrogant proselytism manifested by some other Occidental monastic orders." A special Benedictine priory, devoted to the union of churches, has been founded in Amay-sur-Meuse, Belgium, which country was selected because it is "small, unaggressive, without any international ambitions, and is essentially Catholic." We are told that the work which is being accomplished is remarkable. "Century-long prejudices are gradually fading away before the light which radiates from it." There are at present about thirty monks in this monastery, not counting the novices, many nations being represented. A review is published, called *Irenikon*. Of the two chapels one is used for services in the Latin and the other for services in the Slavonic language. Among the methods employed are "indiscriminate hospitality" to Catholics and Orthodox and "the establishment of personal relations with prominent members of the Western and Eastern churches." In spite of the beautiful name *Irenikon* given the journal of these monks it will be seen that in the last analysis these workers for union will insist on surrender to the Pope. A.

The Garble Brothers. — The Garble Sisters of the comic sections of the metropolitan press, who never can get the news of the day straight and think nothing of making Hoover governor of the Philippines and Hitler president of Germany, serve to amuse the readers and are thus engaged in a useful calling. The same cannot be said for the Garble Brothers of the theological world. Theirs is a disreputable work. A number of them specialize in misquoting Luther for the purpose of making him out an advocate of a liberal view of Inspiration. They have repeatedly been called to order, but they will not desist. Dr. Pieper has conclusively shown that they are guilty of misquoting Luther (*Chr. Dogmatik*, I, 346 to 360.) "Examining these statements of Luther, we find that they demonstrate, not Luther's 'liberal' attitude towards Scripture, but the unscientific and slovenly methods employed by modern theologians in quoting Luther," meaning that they are garblers. Dr. V. Ferm's *What Is Lutheranism?* contains some horrible specimens of the garblers' art in this field. (CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, I, 868.) The youngest Garble Brother is Emil Brunner. He states on pages 94 and 84 of *The Word and the World*: "The orthodox teachers could never have repeated Luther's words that 'the Scriptures are the crib wherein Christ is laid,' and Luther would never have approved of the opinion of later orthodoxy that everything in the Scriptures, just because it *is* in the Scriptures, is equally inspired by the Holy Spirit. . . . For the true Christian the Bible is not a divine oracle of instruction. . . . Luther, perhaps the most congenial interpreter of Scripture the Church has ever had, explicitly asserted the subordination of the Scripture to Christ, in such well-known utterances as these: 'The Scriptures are the crib wherein Christ is laid'; 'If our enemies uphold the Scriptures against Christ, we, on the other hand, if necessary, uphold Christ against the Scriptures'; 'The Scriptures are apostolic and canonical in so far as they teach Christ, and no further'; 'It is for Christ's sake that we believe in the Scriptures, but it is not for the Scriptures' sake that we believe in Christ.'" These quotations are intended to prove that Luther did not believe that every word of the Bible is God's Word and

that Luther found it necessary to cast aside certain portions and statements of the Bible as human errors. "No doubt we have to chisel off much more than Luther believed necessary, but the inscription has remained the same: Jesus Christ, the Word of God." (P. 102.)

Dr. Brunner is a clumsy garbler. Luther made his position on Inspiration very clear. "The Creed [Nicene] thus speaks of the Holy Ghost: 'who spake by the prophets.' The Holy Ghost is thus recognized as the Author of Scripture, of the entire Scriptures." (3, 1890.) Only by garbling statements of his can a different impression be created. Garbled quotation No. 1: "The Scriptures are the crib wherein Christ is laid." Luther certainly said that. But it becomes a misquotation when it is used to substantiate the thesis that Luther did not regard the entire Scriptures as divine. The statement is made in Luther's Foreword to the Old Testament, Vol. 14, col. 4. (Dr. Brunner never indicates his source by volume and page and title; that is rather an imposition on the reader.) Luther says: "The Scriptures are the swaddling-clothes and the crib wherein Christ lies; thither also the angel directed the shepherds, Luke 2, 12. Poor and mean are the swaddling-clothes, but precious is the treasure, Christ, that lies therein." The statement declares nothing more nor less than this: As the shepherds found Christ in the crib, so shall we find Christ in the Scriptures; Christ was there, though the crib was mean; though the Scriptures have a mean appearance, written in weak human language, they still bring Christ to us. It is a sorry piece of garbling to make Luther say that, as only *a part of the crib* contained Christ, so only certain portions of the Scriptures have to do with Christ. Luther compares the *entire* Scriptures to the crib. Did Dr. Brunner read the entire paragraph? Luther distinctly says: "I beg and earnestly warn every good Christian not to take offense at the simple speech and story which he will *often* find, not to doubt that, however mean it appears, it is *altogether* the words, works, judgments, and acts of the sublime divine majesty, power, and wisdom." Did not Dr. Brunner in his study of Luther come across this statement: "Scripture forms a harmonious whole, and all examples and histories, yea, the entire Scripture, in all its parts, aims at this, that one should learn Christ"? (3118.) Or this: "Christ is the center of the circle, and all that is told in Scripture, in its real import, refers to Christ." (7, 1924.) Or this: "When I read David, that is, the Book of Psalms, in the right way, as one who bears witness of Christ, I find Christ there." (7, 2187.) In the face of these statements Dr. Brunner is spreading the slander throughout Christendom that Luther found it necessary to chisel off, and cast on the dump, certain portions of Scripture.

Falsification No. 2: "If our enemies uphold the Scriptures against Christ, we, on the other hand, if necessary, uphold Christ against the Scriptures." Luther is made to say that, though the Holy Ghost wrote every word of Scripture, Christ sees fit to protest against some of these statements! Christ against the Holy Ghost! At first glance it is a startling statement. The context, however, leaves no room for doubt as to Luther's meaning. It is Thesis 49 of a disputation on Rom. 3, 28. (19, 1441.) Thesis 41 reads: "You must not take Scripture against, but for Christ; if it is not in conformity with Christ, it is not the true Scripture." Theses 42—48 then show that, if passages like Luke 10, 28: "This do, and thou

shall live" are interpreted to mean that men are justified, not through faith in Christ, but through works, such "Scripture" is not the true Scripture. It is the misunderstood, misapplied Scripture that Luther has in mind when he says: "If our adversaries insist on 'Scripture' against Christ, we insist on Christ against [their alleged] Scripture." (See *Chr. Dogmatik*, I, 354.)

Misrepresentation No. 3: "The Scriptures are apostolic and canonical in so far as they teach Christ, and no farther." Yes, Luther said that or something similar. We find him saying Vol. 14, 129: "Whatever does not teach Christ, that is not apostolic, even if St. Peter or Paul taught it. On the other hand, whatever preaches Christ is apostolic, even when preached by Judas, Annas, Pilate, and Herod." Luther cannot mean that any portion of Scripture which has no reference to Christ cannot be inspired, apostolic, canonical—because Luther insists that all Scripture deals with Christ. He does so two times above: "*sintemal alle Schrift Christum zeigt, Roem. 3, 21, und St. Paulus nichts denn Christum wissen will, 1 Kor. 2, 2.*" And when he then proceeds to say that any teaching of Paul which would not refer to Christ would not be apostolical, no great intelligence is needed to understand that he is dealing with an *assumed* case. (*Chr. Dog.*, I, 353 ff.) — Dr. Brunner gives a fourth quotation. Being unable to place it at the moment, we shall not discuss it beyond saying that there is no reason to doubt that Luther said it and that we have all the reason in the world for asserting that Luther did not mean it in Dr. Brunner's sense. But we refuse to discuss it without studying the context.

We leave that to the Garble Brothers. We expect to find them in the near future quoting Luther for their liberal view of Inspiration on the authority of Dr. Brunner. He enjoys a great vogue in certain circles, and the garbling will merrily go on. E.

Lynching Not Yet Exterminated. — On this sad feature in our public life the *Congregationalist* submits the following report: —

"From Tuskegee Institute comes the annual report on the great American folly of mob murder. In 1931 thirteen people were lynched, which was less than in 1930, when there were twenty-one, but more than in 1929 and 1928, when there were ten and eleven lynchings, respectively. Of the thirteen persons killed seven were taken from jails, one from a hospital, and two were out on bail, leaving three who were at large and captured through the efforts of the mob. Ten of the thirteen were already in the hands of the law. Racially, twelve were Negroes and one white. The offenses charged were murder in five instances, wounding a man in five cases, and attempted rape in only three instances. As to geography, Mississippi had three lynchings, Florida and West Virginia two each, while Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Dakota, and Tennessee had one each. Of the Southern States, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas had no lynchings. Cheering is the news that in 57 instances officers of the law prevented violence. Fifty of these cases were in the South. In forty-five cases, prisoners were removed or the guards increased; in twelve cases armed force was used to repel the mob. By such steps eighteen whites and seventy Negroes were saved from death at the hands of mobs." A.

Prof. B. W. Bacon, Deceased. — When Dr. B. W. Bacon died on February 1, one of the most widely known American scholars departed this life. He had been professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis at Yale Divinity School from 1897 till five years ago, when he resigned. He was in his seventy-second year when death called him. The *Congregationalist* says: "As a scholar Professor Bacon won the highest recognition both in Europe and America; the most coveted academic honors were conferred upon him." Sad to say, he was a confirmed Modernist in theology. While he, for instance, spoke of Th. Zahn with respect, he was unwilling to follow him in his conservatism. His books and treatises are numerous, prominent among them being an *Introduction to the New Testament*. His book *The Apostolic Message*, which appeared in 1925, was largely devoted to the thesis that Jesus did not teach the doctrine of the atonement as it is proclaimed by the orthodox Church to-day. Prior to his professorship Dr. Bacon served Congregational churches in Connecticut and New York.

A.

II. Ausland.

Die evangelische Kirche in Österreich. In Wien war neulich eine Generalsynode versammelt, die die evangelischen Kirchen in Österreich auf eine neue Grundlage stellte. Es ist interessant, in diesem Zusammenhang zu lesen, daß in diesem Lande sich 260,000 Lutheraner und 13,000 Reformierte befinden. Der Eindruck, der in manchen Berichten hervorgerufen wurde, als hätten die Lutheraner und die Reformierten sich vereinigt, wird als verfehlt bezeichnet. Es wurden aber die Schwierigkeiten beseitigt, die sich da erhoben, wo zwei protestantische Gemeinden verschiedenen Bekenntnisses eine und dieselbe Kirche benutzten. Ein uns vorliegender Bericht sagt: „Da die bisherige Kirchenleitung, der ‚Evangelische Oberkirchenrat‘, noch eine von der staatlichen Regierung ernannte Behörde darstellt, wurde sie als letzter Rest des alten ‚Landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments‘ aufgehoben und durch freiwählbare Organe ersetzt. An der Spitze der Kirche wird künftig ein evangelischer Landesbischof stehen, dem ein weltlicher Präsident mit dem Titel ‚Kanzler‘ beigegeben ist.“ Man will also Kirche und Staat reinlich scheiden. In der neuen Verfassung wird leider auch grundsätzlich den Frauen das aktive und passive Wahlrecht gewährt, obwohl eine Klausel es den einzelnen Gemeinden möglich macht, für ihren eigenen Kreis diese Neuerung abzuweisen.

A.

Die kirchliche Lage in Spanien. Der „Friedensbote“ druckt interessante Bemerkungen ab, die das „Evangelische Deutschland“ seinen Lesern über Spanien unterbreitet:

„Die weitverbreitete Vorstellung, als ob Spanien ein katholisches Land im Sinne einer muftergültigen und das ganze Volk erfassenden Organisation der Kirche bis jetzt gewesen wäre, ist durchaus irrig. Interessante Einzelheiten, die jetzt die katholische Presse nach der katholischen Zeitschrift *La Croix* mitteilt, geben ein ganz anderes Bild. Spanien hat zwar 40,000 Welt-priester für 20,000 Pfarren, die Priester sind aber hauptsächlich in den Städten konzentriert; auf dem Lande muß ein Pfarrer oft drei bis vier Pfarren versehen. Es gibt daher ganze Gegenden, deren Bewohner keinen klaren Begriff von Gott und Christo haben, ja die nicht einmal — immer nach diesem katholischen Zeugnis — die Zehn Gebote und das Vaterunser

kennen. Auch die Seelsorge in den Vororten der Großstädte ist durchaus mangelhaft. In Madrid mit seinen 800,000 Einwohnern hat die katholische Kirche nur 30 Pfarren, darunter einige bis zu 70,000 Seelen. Auch der Religionsunterricht ist nach katholischem Urteil stark vernachlässigt worden. Teilweise waren die gesetzlichen Vorschriften über den pflichtmäßigen Religionsunterricht undurchführbar, weil es trotz der Anzahl der Priester an Schulen und Lehrpersonal fehlte. Dort, wo Schulen bestanden, wurde der Religionsunterricht nicht vorschriftsmäßig erteilt. Die Priester kamen häufig gar nicht in die Schule, sondern begnügten sich damit, den Erstkommunikanten eine Unterweisung in der Kirche zu geben. Daß ein solcher Unterricht keine dauerhaften Spuren hinterlassen konnte, wird heute offen zugegeben. Auch der Religionsunterricht in den Mittelschulen, der für die ersten drei Schuljahre pflichtmäßig war, war völlig unzulänglich, um den heranwachsenden Universitätsstudenten eine religiöse Fundierung zu geben. Angesichts dieser Eingeständnisse ist es allerdings begreiflich, daß das spanische Volk dem Angriff auf die Religion einen so geringen Widerstand entgegensetzte, so daß die „Germania“ (1931/476) heute urteilen muß, „daß das spanische Volk nicht kannte, was zu verteidigen seine Aufgabe war; es stand der Propaganda seiner Feinde waffenlos gegenüber“. Wirklich eine weltgeschichtlich erschütternde Bankrotterklärung eines christlichen Kirchentums.“

II.

D. Nade tritt zurück. Leser der „Lehre und Wehre“ haben häufig den Namen D. Nades gesehen, da er als Schriftleiter der „Christlichen Welt“ eine hervorragende Stellung bekleidete. Er hat in seiner fünfundvierzigjährigen redaktionellen Tätigkeit sehr radikale Ansichten vertreten, die einen bekennnistreuen Lutheraner mit Schmerz und Abscheu erfüllen mußten. An seine Stelle sind D. Mulert, Professor der Theologie in Kiel, und D. Siegmund-Schulze von Berlin getreten. Letzterer wird geschildert als ein Vorkämpfer auf dem sozialen und ökonomischen Gebiet. D. Nade war ein brillanter Schriftsteller; aber was die Welt rettet, ist nicht glänzende Begabung, sondern das alte Evangelium.

II.

Is Gandhi a Christian or at Least a Near-Christian? — Those who say so, knowing his position, do not know what Christianity is. Many, even among the theologians, say so. They style him “a Christian in everything but the name.” They assert that he is instrumental in bringing the best of Christianity to his Indian brothers. E. Stanley Jones declares: “Mahatma Gandhi does not call himself a Christian. In fact, he calls himself a Hindu. But by his life and outlook and methods he has been the medium through which a great deal of interest in Christ has come [to India].” (*The Christ of the Indian Road*, chap. IV.) The *Western Christian Advocate* of March 21, 1929, declared that it was the central teaching of Christ that attracted Gandhi most of all. Dr. John Haynes Holmes declares, not merely that he is a Christian, but a veritable Christ. A communication to the *Christian Century* of December 30, 1931, states: “This saint of our own day,” Dr. Holmes rhapsodizes [in the issue of November 25] ‘is instinctively characterized by all Westerners . . . as the Christ of modern times.’ I have been apprehensively expecting something like this. . . . Is our appreciation to end in apotheosis? Apparently Dr. Holmes would make of Jesus a sort of John the Baptist, who, were he here to-day, would say of Gandhi, ‘He must increase, but I must de-

crease.'” Mr. Gandhi is not a Christian, does not want to be known as a Christian. He says: “In my religion there is room for Krishna, for Buddha, for Christ, for Mohammed. I cannot set Christ on a solitary throne because I believe that God has been incarnate again and again.” But, they say, while Gandhi will not accept Christianity, he has accepted the best in every religion, the best in Christianity. And what is that? E. Stanley Jones’s proof that “the Christian spirit is at work in him” is this: “Gandhi has taught us that one can be rich not only in the abundance of one’s wealth, but in fewness of one’s wants. In his *Ashram* he has the principle of non-thieving, thieving being defined as holding in your possession something that some one needs more than you.” (*The Christ of Every Road*, p. 155.) And the *Western Christian Advocate* establishes its point thus: “Gandhi felt that all that the Buddha in ancient India had intended to set forth by his doctrine of compassion had been taken up into a new and living form by Christ in the gospels. . . . Christ has said in the Sermon on the Mount, ‘Love your enemies.’ It was this central teaching of Christ that attracted Gandhi most of all.” Now, Mr. Gandhi does indeed look upon this thing as the central teaching of Christ. “The greatest non-Christian, Mahatma Gandhi, when asked by E. Stanley Jones what would make possible the naturalization of Christianity in India, promptly replied: ‘I would suggest first of all that you, Christian missionaries and all, must begin to live more like Jesus Christ. . . . I would suggest that you put your emphasis upon love; for love is the center and soul of Christianity.’” (*Pentecost and the Holy Spirit*, by J. B. Hunley, p. 166.) We are not surprised to hear Gandhi designate love as the center and soul of Christianity. He is a heathen, and the heathen religion is the religion of work-righteousness. And when Christian teachers hail him on that account as a brother or near-brother, when they see the essence of Christianity in the exercise of love and other duties, they reveal their ignorance of Christ and the Christian religion. Christ is the center and soul of Christianity, the vicarious work of Christ. And the love flowing from any other source than the cross on Calvary is not Christian love, as J. B. Hunley points out: “And this suggests the necessity of turning again to the Holy Spirit; for it is not in the natural heart of man to love and forgive as Christ did. ‘The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us.’” So it amounts to this: If the virtuous life is the main thing in the Gospel, Gandhi is a pretty good Christian. And if work-righteousness is the essence of heathenism, those admirers of his are pretty good heathen.

But what really is the religion of Gandhi? An article in the *Living Church* of January 23, 1932, headed “What Is Gandhi’s Religion?” states: “Now, as a matter of plain fact, Mr. Gandhi is not a Christian, makes no pretense of being so, and owes very little, if anything, to the teaching of Christ. This can be proved from his own words. There is really, and has been, a great deal of sloppy sentimentalism on the part of many Christian and near-Christian leaders in this country in regard to Gandhi and his movement in India. . . . Being, like all Hindus, a thoroughgoing eclectic, he has appropriated certain superficial Christian beliefs as have appealed to him, but he has not the slightest idea what it means to be an orthodox Christian. ‘In my religion,’ he once said, ‘there is room for

Krishna, for Buddha, for Christ, for Mohammed. I cannot set Christ on a solitary throne because I believe that God has been incarnate again and again.' In another place Mr. Andrews says of him: 'Mahatma Gandhi has left a place for idolatry in his own religious scheme of things.' Here is another statement, quoted by Mr. Andrews: 'I consider the four divisions of the Hindu caste system to be fundamental, natural, and essential to the human race. Prohibition of intermarriage and interdining is essential for the rapid evolution of the soul.' A statement like this is very interesting, especially when we take it in conjunction with the statement that he finds the teaching of Mohammed 'fully compatible with the principle of *ahimsa*.' Gandhi believes that each caste should 'stick to its trade.' He is of the 'merchant' caste; therefore shedding of blood is forbidden to him. But not so to the soldier class, whose 'trade' is the protection of the state. . . . Therefore, when Gandhi makes a pronouncement about loving one's neighbor and practising *ahimsa* ('refraining from killing' is the proper translation of this word) toward those who spitefully use one, it must be understood that all these statements are strictly qualified by Gandhi's acceptance of the caste system. What may be forbidden to one caste may well become the duty of another. This is a point which seems to have escaped Mr. Steenkiste, who, in a recent article in the *Commonweal*, says of Gandhi: 'He hates no one, as the following statements testify: "Though a Mussulman or a Christian or a Hindu may despise me, I want to love him and serve him. *For me the road to salvation lies through incessant toil in the service of my country and of humanity.*"' [Italics by E.] In that last sentence lies the point—"for me; but for a man of another caste the road to salvation may be something else.' For Gandhi, the orthodox Hindu, the road to salvation is to follow the rules laid down for his caste. One of them is 'cow protection,' which is for him the embodiment of the *ahimsa*, or 'non-killing,' principle. 'Cow protection,' said he, 'is an article of faith in Hinduism. Apart from its religious sanctity it is an ennobling creed. I would not kill a human being in order to protect a cow, and neither would I kill a cow to save a human being, be it ever so precious. Cow protection is the dearest possession of the Hindu heart. It is the one concrete belief common to all Hindus. No one who does not believe in cow protection can possibly be a Hindu. That which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its cow protection. Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow. The way to protect her is to die for her.' . . . Where, then, does he get his idea of 'passive resistance'? Certainly not from the gospels. Christ taught non-resistance, not passive resistance. . . . 'Civil disobedience' is a perversion of Christ's teaching and not the practise of the Gospel of Love."

The *Lutheran* of July 7, 1930, published a review of *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, by C. F. Andrews, a book much quoted in the article of the *Living Church*. If the reviewer had had the facts mentioned above before him, he would not have written: "As we see how closely Mahatma Gandhi has been associated in various periods of his life with Christians and with Christian teaching, and as we read in some places his close approach to the Christian position, we feel like saying: 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'"

E.