

# Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

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

Vol. IX

September, 1938

No. 9

## CONTENTS

	Page
Mastering the Technique of Sermon Building. E. J. Friedrich .....	641
Kleine Danielstudien. L. Fuerbringer .....	648
Erasmus on Luther. Wm. Dallmann .....	660
That Review of Pastor Goerss's Book in the "Lutheran" Martin Sommer .....	674
Sermon Study on Jas. 5:13-20. Th. Laetsch .....	678
Miscellanea .....	696
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches .....	703
Book Review. — Literatur .....	713

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 verfuerehen und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

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

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

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



ARCHIVE'S

---

**Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches**


---

**I. Amerika**

**The Differences that Keep American Lutherans from Complete Unification.** — Dr. A. J. Traver's article in "The Young People" section of the *Lutheran* of June 8 is entitled "Growing Lutheran Unity." Under the heading "*Missouri and Ohio*" it states: "About a century ago a wave of German immigration came to the Middle West. A center of this settlement was St. Louis, Mo. Unlike their Eastern brethren of a century before, they settled in such large numbers that whole communities were practically German in language and custom. The Lutheran Church easily became exclusive and separate under these conditions. In addition their leaders had been vigorous opponents of the forced union of Lutherans and other Protestants in Prussia. Some had met persecution for refusal to compromise their convictions. In time a synod was formed named Missouri, and this with other similar synods became *The Synodical Conference*. This body of Lutherans has no fellowship with the United Lutheran Church. It fears what it calls *unionism*. That is the name for any union as to organization that does not fully represent an inner agreement on all essentials. This group refuses to allow other Lutheran pastors to preach in its pulpits and other Lutheran people to commune at its altars. It is a vigorous group, however, fast adopting modern methods for its work. It is becoming increasingly influential in the national life." (We shall not take the time to discuss the last sentence and the latter half of the preceding one.)

"What is said of this group may also be said of the origin of *The Joint Synod of Ohio* and of the various national synods which transplant in a measure their European languages and customs. Every Lutheran nation is represented by some type of national organization — Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Finnish, and the like. Usually these immigrants settled in clans, where the language and customs would not be lost. It is easy to see how they, too, would be led to a position of exclusion so far as other Christian groups were concerned. Hundreds of thousands of their young people drifted into other Protestant churches. But those who remained are giving a *new leadership* to these synods. As a result they are federated into *The American Lutheran Conference*, and while maintaining their identity, they are gradually fusing into a mighty power for Christ. They extend a larger measure of fellowship to the United Lutheran Church and are more often found working with them in their common interests. This group with the United Lutheran Church has a bond of unity in *The National Lutheran Council*. They also belong to *The Lutheran World Convention*."

Under the heading of "*Differences*" four points are discussed. This section reads: "The differences that keep American Lutherans from complete unification are more on the surface than real. They are: 1) All agree that the Scriptures are inspired. But some insist that some certain method of inspiration should be accepted while others, as in the

United Lutheran Church, declare that the fact of inspiration must be accepted while the method may be a matter of opinion." This statement does not describe the situation correctly. There is no agreement on the matter of inspiration between the United Lutheran Church and us. True enough, "all agree that the Scriptures are inspired." But that does not mean a thing in this connection. The rankest liberal, rationalist, Pelagian, will subscribe to the thesis that Scripture is inspired. He will say: Sure, just as Emerson and Shakespeare were inspired. It all depends upon what you mean by inspiration; it all depends on what our article is pleased to call "the method." When we say that every word of Holy Scripture is inspired, the very word of God, absolutely true, and others refuse to say that, the difference between us is not merely on the surface but is a real one. And a vital one. Those who have read *The New Testament Commentary*, H. C. Alleman, ed., know that a wide gulf separates the Lutherans of America in the matter of inspiration. Dr. Reu declared that the gulf is impassable. (See *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, current year, p. 296 ff.) Dr. Dell made the same statement. (See p. 357 ff.) The theologians of the U. L. C. should know, and should tell their young people, that the differences in the doctrine of inspiration as taught by leading theologians of the U. L. C. and by us are irreconcilable.

The other points of difference mentioned are: "2) There is a very marked difference as to the relationship of Lutherans with other Protestants. Unionism seems to be the acme of all sins to many Lutheran leaders. The United Lutheran Church does not fear unionism as do many of the other groups. Dr. Greever suggests [in the *Lutheran World Almanac for 1937*] that there could be a wholesome discussion on the subject, 'Resolved, That the sins of unionism are greater than the sins of separatism.'" The sin of separatism is a grievous sin. But the subject of the present paragraph is unionism. Let us stick to that. We shall call upon Dr. J. C. Mattes to discuss that. He will show that the sin of unionism is a most grievous one. And it will be seen that the difference on unionism is a real one.

"3) Membership in secret orders is another bone of contention. The problem here is whether such a matter is to be regulated by legal enactment of the Church and discipline enforced or whether the entire matter is to be left to the conscience of the individual." The question in reality is whether a Christian can be permitted to join secret orders.

"4) Dr. Greever also suggests that dogmatism stands in the way of Lutheran understanding. He quotes the late Dr. H. E. Jacobs: 'A dogma is a definition of doctrine made by church authority, and therefore the term dogma and doctrine are not synonymous.' The temptation for the theologian is to include too much in his dogma, to go beyond the clearly established facts of the Bible, and to insist upon his own interpretation of them. Says Dr. Greever: 'Open minds for open questions by all might promote fellowship.'" Let him who will discuss the difference between dogma and doctrine. What concerns us just now is that clearly revealed *doctrines* of Holy Scripture are being denied by theologians of the United Lutheran Church, important, fundamental doctrines. Dr. Traver should inform his young people that Dr. C. H. Little of the

U. L. C. has written a book on *Disputed Doctrines*, the very first chapter of which contains the statement that "the Biblical doctrine of predestination excludes synergism in all its forms" and, without mentioning names, takes issue with the men in the U. L. C. who do teach synergism. It is a notorious fact that to this day leading theologians of the U. L. C. publicly teach synergism. The differences that keep American Lutherans from complete unification are real.

The last section, headed "*Signs of the Times*," closes thus: "8) *Impelling Conviction*. There is a universal opinion that Lutherans must get together. Laymen and women are speaking out as never before against separation. They are even forcing the hands of their leaders." Indeed, Lutherans must get together. God wants a united Lutheran Church, united in the truth, free from all false teaching. God bless the laymen who are working towards this end. But we cannot quite understand the statement that in this matter "the laymen and women are even forcing the hands of their leaders." We have not encountered such a phenomenon in our midst. Are the laymen in the U. L. C. forcing the hands of their leaders? Dr. Traver approves of their attitude. He is telling his young people that this is an encouraging sign. Now, are these laymen right? Are they taking the Biblical position, demanding a union in the truth? If so, their leaders must be taking a wrong position. On the other hand, if the leaders are right, they should not permit the laymen to force their hands. Or are some of the leaders of the U. L. C. determined to prevent a union at all costs, even though unity of doctrine is attained? Finally, if the laymen of the U. L. C. are at odds with their leaders, should that not be attended to before a union on a wider scale is attempted? Surely the young people will find this situation most puzzling. E.

**A Pronouncement against Unionism.** — "The Relation of the Lutheran Church to Other Churches" is the title of an article by Dr. J. C. Mattes which appeared in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, April issue, p. 128 ff. The first paragraph reads: "The assertion that one faith is as good as another or that it does not matter what a man believes so long as he is sincere, proves nothing so much as the absence of true faith. It is only another way of saying that a man's inner emotions count for more than God's objective revelation. Sometimes that sentiment takes the form of a pseudo-toleration that would forget all differences of belief because, after all, we are all worshiping one God, accept the same moral code, or think we do, and all have the same laudable purpose of uplifting man."

A subsequent paragraph reads: "There is no place in the New Testament for sectarianism. The Lord spoke of one fold and one Shepherd, and His prayer of intercession pleaded that all might be one. St. Paul knows only one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, and he upbraids the Corinthians for the divisions that were among them, 1 Cor. 1:10; 3:3; 11:18, and tells them that there should be no schism in the body. He beseeches the Romans to 'mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.' We might perhaps do well to include the next verse: 'For they that are

such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ but their own belly and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' Can these be prophetic descriptions of some of the paid agents of various union movements? The ideal of the New Testament is not unionism or mere external union but unity. . . . There must be unity, not schism, in the body of Christ, and all that disrupts the body of Christ is sin. But this does not mean that unity is to be preserved at the expense of fidelity or by any surrender of an absolute and uncompromising fidelity to the faith once delivered to the saints. The Church must be kept free from every taint of impure teaching or false doctrine, and all offenders against sound doctrine are to be expelled from the Church. . . . Even the most gentle and loving of the apostles says: 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed; for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.'"

Again: "There can be no outward union with those with whom there is no inward unity. It is impossible for two to walk together unless they be agreed, Amos 3:3. Any attempt to do so must result either in the tacit denial of the importance of all the truths included in God's revelation, by making elaborate distinctions between the truths we must keep and those we can disregard, or else must lead to a most elastic sense of honesty on the part of those who thus seek union even at the cost of true unity. This was Luther's reason for not taking Zwingli's hand at Marburg. He was fully convinced that he was justified in saying: 'Sie haben einen anderen Geist.' And this is the reason why the Lutheran Church has steadfastly refused to become a part of unionistic movements that grope after an outward union, *à la Rome*, but which are ready to disregard the real inner unity of faith."

Dr. Mattes next quotes Luther: "If some broad-minded person, as they like to be called, should say, 'What does it matter, so long as we hold fast to God's Word, if we allow some additional teachings that are not so offensive to stand beside it?' I would answer that they may be called broad-minded people, but they are people with erring and deluded minds." And this from his *Warnungsschrift an die zu Frankfurt am Main, sich vor Zwinglischer Lehre und Lehrern zu hueten*: "If any one knows that his pastor is publicly teaching Zwinglianism, he should avoid him and should rather do without the Sacrament all his life than receive it from him; yea, he should be ready to suffer all things, even death, in so doing. . . . It is terrible for me to hear that in the same church or at the same altar two parties should seek and receive the same Sacrament, the one believing that it receives mere bread and wine, the other believing that it receives the true body and blood of Christ. I marvel that it should be possible that a preacher or pastor could be so hardened or malicious that he could keep silence and allow both parties to go on in their delusion that they have received one Sacrament, each one according to his own belief, etc. . . . It is true that, when the preachers distribute nothing but bread and wine, it does not make much difference to whom they administer it or what those who receive it know or believe. There is a case where 'all sows eat out of one trough,' and there such care is useless. . . . Because we administer Christ's body

and blood in the Sacrament, we neither would nor could administer it to any one unless he was examined, etc." (St. L. ed., 17, 2007 ff.) Dr. Mattes continues: "During the struggles of the last century one statement was formulated that in its primary statement is and remains the correct statement of the Lutheran position and whose principles will always be binding on the conscience and practise of those who profess real Lutheranism. It is the so-called Galesburg Rule: 'Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only, Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only.' This is a correct statement of the normal Lutheran position, which grows logically out of the fundamental Scriptural position as that was outlined before."

The concluding sentences read: "Always and ever we must guard our people against the subtle propaganda of the order of religious camels who want to stick their noses into the tent on the plea that we are all one and who, once they are within, display their love by saying, 'You are all wrong; you must do things our way.' Practically, that is the way it always works. The plea is always for cooperation on their basis, not on the basis of faith. So it seems we can again hear the prophet Amos asking his ancient question: 'How can two walk together except they be agreed?'" — Dr. Traver should inform his young people that his statement "The United Lutheran Church does not fear unionism as do many of the other groups" needs some restriction. E.

Is This Chiliasmus Crassus or Chiliasmus Crassissimus? — The *Lutheran* of March 30 published an article by Dr. Kunzmann, "Revelation. Chapter 20," which contains the following: "And so we are confident that during the millennium the Edenic conditions on earth will be restored and that there shall be a tree of life in the New Jerusalem above which sheds its leaves twelve times a year for the health of the nations upon earth and that those who eat of the tree of life and are subject to the rule of the iron rod and implicitly obey shall live during the thousand years. It is only the disobedient that shall die during that period. Life shall be so prolonged that a transgressor who dies at a hundred years shall be considered only a child." Do the readers of the *Lutheran* believe such things, or does the *Lutheran* want them to read and mayhap believe such things?

Here is another choice bit from the same article. The millennialists use as a *sedes doctrinae* for their teaching of a double resurrection 1 Cor. 15: 23, 24: "But every man in his own order (ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι): Christ the First-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming. Then cometh the end." The accepted interpretation of this passage among the millennialists is (or rather has been): "Each in his own order,' rather rank, 'each in his own regiment.' Christ first and after Him the godly, in a separate band from the ungodly; and 'then the end,' i. e., the resurrection of the rest of the dead. Christ's own flock shall share His glory 'at His coming,' which is not to be confounded with 'the end,' or general Judgment. . . . The second coming of Christ is not a mere point of time but a period beginning with the resurrection of the just at His appearing and ending with the general Judgment, v. 24. Then — after that, next in the succession of 'orders' or 'ranks,' the end — the general

resurrection." (*Jamieson-Fausset-Brown Commentary.*) *The Lutheran Commentary*, edited by H. E. Jacobs, accepts this interpretation. We quote: "V. 23. 'But each in his own order. Three groups, or ranks, successively appear: 1. Christ, 2. 'they that are His,' viz., all believers, and 3. by implication, the resurrection of the unbelieving is included in 'the end,' mentioned in the next verse. (Cp. 1 Thess. 4:16.)" Dr. Kunzmann improves on this interpretation. He is not satisfied with only three orders, troops. He writes: "True, all the dead shall be raised; but Paul tells us that they shall not be indiscriminately raised, but every dead person shall be raised in the 'tagma,' the company, the rank, to which he belongs. So we have had a number of resurrections: the Old Testament saints in Matthew, the elders (*Presbuteroi*) in First Thessalonians, the tribulation saints in the seventh chapter, the seed of the woman caught up to God in the twelfth, the 144,000 in the fourteenth chapter, and here the last company of martyrs, who were slain before the end of the tribulation period in the twentieth chapter. These complete the first resurrection, and over these death hath no power. You will also notice that, when the resurrection of the just and the unjust is spoken of, the just are always mentioned *first*. When the *Codex Sinaiticus* speaks of the resurrection which takes place in Rev. 20:11-15, it tells us that they were all condemned. Certainly God never mixes up things. In this second resurrection were those who perished with Antichrist. In this second resurrection are those who die during the millennium because they do not obey the Law. In this second resurrection are the hordes of Gog and Magog, and after it there are no fallen angels in heaven nor fallen men on earth."—Just why did the *Lutheran* print and publish this?

E.

## II. Ausland

Ein ernstes Wort gegen die Barmer Unionsplattform. In der „A. C. L. N.“ untersucht in fünf laufenden Artikeln Pfarrer F. W. Gopp von Mühlhausen die bekannte Barmer Unionsplattform, die zwischen bekennenden Lutheranern und Reformierten ein gewisses Einigungsziel herzustellen versuchte. Das Resultat seiner Untersuchung gestaltet sich so: „Beim Rückblick auf die Ergebnisse unserer Prüfung der einzelnen Barmer Sätze stellen wir fest, daß die volle und eindeutige Bezeugung der bisher in den lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften ausgesprochenen Lehreinheit weder für einen einzelnen Satz noch für die ganze Erklärung behauptet werden darf. Deshalb ist die Barmer Erklärung auch in keiner Weise geeignet, zur Beantwortung der sogenannten ‚offenen‘ Lehrfragen beizutragen, über die bisher in unserer Kirche noch keine Einigkeit erreicht werden konnte. Alle, die auf die Zeichen der Zeit achten und auf die Zukunft unsers Herrn Jesu Christi warten als machsame und arbeitende Knechte (nach Luc. 12, 42, 43), sollten verstehen, daß wir in keiner Weise verantworten können, das unserer Kirche vor andern verliehene kostbare Pfund der reinen, schriftgemäßen Lehre unter dem Eindruck augenblicklicher Einnütigkeit in Kampfesfragen zu verschleudern oder auch nur zu verschleiern. Denn wir brauchen dies Erbe für die Zukunft der ganzen Christenheit auf Erden. Wir müßten aber davon lassen, wenn wir der Barmer Erklärung den Preis einer rechten Auslegung und Anwendung unsers Bekenntnisses zuerkennen wollten. Diese Erklärung führt uns zwar zum Fragen, aber ihre Antworten können uns weder trösten noch stärken

noch unsere Gemeinden den unverfälschten Gebrauch von Wort und Sakrament lehren. Allen lutherischen Brüdern aber, die mit uns die Bindung an Barmen ablehnen, muß gesagt werden, daß der unserer Kirche bezordnete Kampf und gewiesene Weg nicht leichter und billiger, sondern härter, teurer und vor allem viel, viel einsamer ist als der Weg von Barmen. Nur wer nicht weniger, sondern mehr als die Barmer Erklärung nach Lehre und Zucht, Kraft und Gewißheit verlangt und den Herrn der Kirche darum bittet, kann heute mit den Vätern unserer Kirche in Einigkeit des Glaubens lehren und bekennen.“ Das ist ein Ausspruch eines Lutheraners, der wohl sieht, wie irreführend eine unionistische Plattform ist und wie wichtig es ist, daß lutherische Pastoren und Gemeinden bei dem Bekenntnis der Kirche bleiben. Nur wird sich für solche Pastoren in der unionistischen Volkskirche keine bleibende Stätte finden lassen, solange sie gewissenhaft auf Gottes Wort dringen. Ihnen bleibt schließlich nur der Austritt. J. T. W.

**Public Recognition of Our Fellow-Lutherans in Australia.** — On June 8 the *Adelaide Advertiser* published an editorial on the Lutherans who immigrated into Australia a hundred years ago, which for the sake of its historical interest we bring to the notice of our readers. The editorial (as reprinted in the *Australian Lutheran*, June 10, 1938) reads:

“One hundred years ago today the first batch of German Lutherans adventurously left their native village of Klemzig, in Prussia, for the newly founded province of South Australia. The reason for their departure was that fruitful one of exile, religious persecution; but in the record of their exodus and subsequent settling stands out, in compelling detail, the figure of the man who so boldly and capably conceived and executed the whole project — Pastor Augustus Kavel.

“He was indeed a minor Moses, successfully conducting his persecuted people out of bondage and into a land of freedom and boundless promise.

“Born in 1798, Kavel was appointed pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Klemzig in 1826, just as the quarrel between King Frederick William III and the Lutheran Church had begun to assume serious proportions.

“It was a modern manifestation of the old, desperate clash between spiritual and temporal values. In 1817 a union had been effected between the Reformed and the Lutheran churches, and as the king was ambitious to bring about the welding together of the Germanic peoples into one people, he issued, in 1822, an entirely new liturgy, which he ordered to be used in the military and garrison churches and recommended to all Protestant communities. The new liturgy was at once unwelcome and met with such determined and continued protestation that at last, in 1829, it was revised and various concessions made.

“But Protestant opinion considered the concessions inadequate and pressed for their reconsideration. The king, however, ignored the request and acted ruthlessly. Dissident pastors were immediately imprisoned, dismissed, or banished; police supervision was enforced, and fines were levied upon them. They were, further, forbidden to administer Holy Communion or to attend private meetings of their parishioners.

“This coercive and insufferable attitude was rootedly unfair, since the new liturgy contained statements which were contrary to the Augsburg-



burg Confession and which violated the Treaty of Westphalia, the standard of appeal for the Reformed faiths. Kavel, in consultation with his congregation, could see only one thing to do — emigrate as a body to some country where they could find refuge and, with it, religious tolerance and be able to continue their lives in physical as well as spiritual freedom.

“But funds available for the undertaking were insufficient; and how were more to be obtained?”

“He had heard, as it happened, from merchants engaged in the Hamburg trade, of the philanthropy of a certain London merchant, George Fife Angas; and he knew of him, further, that he was a founder of the new British province of South Australia. The conjunction of these two facts must have seemed to him providentially hopeful, since both he and his congregation wished, if it were possible, to seek a British possession.

“In 1835 he had resigned his charge, and early the following year he went to England and interviewed Angas — with the most encouraging result. Angas, inspired alike by motives of Christian charity and regard for the profitable well-being of the new province, in which he was so deeply interested (it was difficult to obtain sufficient British agricultural settlers), agreed to interest himself in the future of these Klemzig villagers and to settle them on his estate, on the banks of the Torrens, near Adelaide. (From first to last his advances to them totaled at least £8,000.)

“Overjoyed at the success of his mission, Kavel returned to Klemzig to attend to preparations for departure. But the Prussian government, for several months, refused to furnish the party with the necessary passports. Angas, at length, tired of the delay, sent his confidential clerk, Charles Flaxman (who spoke German) over to inquire into the cause of the Prussian government’s obstruction and to overcome it. This Flaxman eventually succeeded in doing, and on June 8, 1838, a party of about two hundred left Klemzig for their new homes in distant Australia.

“The voyage, by the sailing-ship *Prince George*, took 112 days from Plymouth, Adelaide being reached on November 20, 1838.

“Immediately on landing the party, under Kavel, began to build houses, cultivate its land, and plan its future. And it was only natural, of course, that the name of the new village should perpetuate that of the old one: Klemzig.

“Generally a village grows from the smallest beginnings; at first the nucleus of a farm or two, then a store, later a church, and then an inn; but the new Klemzig was at once a full-grown community, with its single wide street a third of a mile long, lined with the whitewashed walls and thatched roofs of its cottages, its church, and manse, its inn.

“The inhabitants, though nearly all agriculturists or horticulturists, had their physician and, of course, their pastor, together with the necessary several masons and carpenters. Kavel, not only the spiritual guide of the compact community, was also its adviser on practical matters and enjoyed its whole-hearted obedience and respect.

“He kept Angas regularly informed of the progress made. Thus

within four months of having landed, he reported that thirty houses had been built and the fertile sloping bank of the river was covered with vegetable gardens.

"In the beginning of 1840 he mentioned that the settlers were becoming naturalized, and at the end of 1841 he could be justly proud of being able to write that Klemzig now contained 430 citizens, living in one hundred houses and owning 350 head of cattle. Agriculture was extending, and they had hopes of shortly having some two thousand acres under crop.

"The village had certainly been blessed with a favorable beginning.

"The people early attracted favorable comments. The traditional German characteristics of neatness, cleanliness, and sobriety were very much in evidence, and as these were combined with thrift and hard work, the result was soon obvious in the prosperity of the community as a whole.

"Governor Gawler, commenting with admiration upon them, said, 'I would like to see a hundred thousand of them settled between the Murray and the gulfs!'"

J. T. M.

**Brief Items.** — Efforts are being made to collect sufficient money to maintain St. John's Church, Richmond, Va., as a national shrine. The building is 196 years old. It was here that Patrick Henry spoke the famous words "Give me liberty or give me death."

According to press reports Geoffrey West, who wrote a book on Charles Darwin (Yale University Press), in this work maintains that Darwin is responsible for the appearance of Hitler and other dictators. If Darwin were living, he probably would complain that in thus applying the theory of evolution his critics are becoming too personal.

The Introduction of the New Testament written by the German scholar Paul Heine (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, published by Quelle & Meyer, Leipzig) has now appeared in its eighth edition and has been edited by Johannes Behm. This scholar, successor to Adolf Deissmann at the University of Berlin, follows, as advance notices indicate, in the footsteps of the conservative author of the book. He holds that Ephesians is an encyclical actually written by St. Paul, that Second Corinthians is not a composite letter, but a single document, that John's gospel rests on materials supplied by John, the brother of James, and that the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James give us the messages of these two apostles, although he holds they were not the real authors. While we do not agree with him in his views on John, First Peter, and James, we see that he is miles away from the destructive higher criticism which looks upon these works as having nothing to do with the apostles whose names they bear.

In Germany some unbelieving critics are concerned about the question how they may foster Bach's sublime music without retaining the text of his cantatas and oratorios expressive of our Christian faith, often couched in Scripture language. In all seriousness it is proposed that some gifted poet change the text of these immortal works. Here there is exhibited a hatred of Christianity which in its intensity has few parallels.

We must submit a good paragraph written recently by the editor of the *Lutheran* with respect to one feature of the ceremony of confirmation, that in which those about to be confirmed pledge loyalty to the teachings of the Lutheran Church: "As for 'pledging children' to a loyalty they cannot understand, there is no sound criticism of that. Every generation owes as its most sacred obligation to those that will come after them the acknowledgment of faithful stewardship of truth and of obedience to the best that has become known to it. Where the Gospel is purely taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered, that is, where the Church stresses the obligations of parents and sponsors to bear witness to the grace they have received and to set the feet of youth upon the way of life, they perform their highest service. The real traitors to youth are those who would thrust them into the turmoil and confusion of the earth with no helpful teaching and no commitments from the past."

How often an audience is bored by a supposedly gifted extemporaneous speaker! Such do exist, but are really somewhat rare. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, writing in the *Baptist Quarterly*, teaches this point in a way preachers and other speakers ought to heed: "J. H. Jowett, who had the great quality of lucid simplicity in his sermons, was once called on to speak without preparation and contented himself with a few words. His audience cried, 'Go on!' He said, 'I cannot go on. God has not given me the gift of extemporaneous utterance. All I do is done with the most laborious preparation.' I am inclined to think that, when people say of their minister that he is preaching 'over their heads,' what they really mean or ought to mean is that he has not learned how to speak their language." Thus reads an item in the *Presbyterian*. We suggest an additional explanation of the remark of people that the preaching is "over their heads." What happens at times is that the preacher feeds them platitudes, which are just as killing for attention as abstruse jargon.

In a correspondence from London we read the remarks of Arthur Mayhew, secretary of the Education Committee of the Colonial Office, in which he expresses doubt whether as regards missions the England of the twentieth century is much more enlightened than the England of the eighteenth. "People in the latter century may have spent ten times as much on powdering their wigs and rouging their cheeks as they did on missionary work overseas; but today three times as much is spent on cosmetics as on missions, which occupies the same position in national expenditure as dog licenses."

How views change is well illustrated by the attitude of Reformed bodies toward the church-year. While formerly the emphasis on the seasons of the church-year was anathema with these churches, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America now has issued a pamphlet having the title *The Christian Year — a Suggestive Guide for the Worship of the Church*. The old Puritanic divines certainly would be surprised if they came back to life and saw how their successors have totally reversed the position of their fathers concerning the ancient church-year.

A.