

3-1-1932

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1932) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 3 , Article 30.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol3/iss1/30>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

---

**Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.**


---

**I. Amerika.**

**Ablgang der humanistischen Bildung.** Wie der „Christliche Apologete“ mitteilt, wird auch auf der berühmten Yale University in Zukunft das Griechische und Lateinische nicht mehr vorgeschriebenes Studiumsfach sein. Wir lesen: „Vom nächsten Jahre an wird die amerikanische Yale University von den Anwärtern auf einen akademischen Grad die Kenntnis der lateinischen und griechischen Sprache nicht mehr verlangen. Dieser Beschluß der größten amerikanischen Hochschule ist bezeichnend für die modernen Ziele des amerikanischen Bildungssystems, und die Studenten von Yale drücken in ihrem täglich erscheinenden Organ ihre Genugtuung darüber aus, daß sie endlich von dem Zwang befreit sind, den ihnen ‚der Unberstand der Vorfahren‘ aufgezwungen habe. Anders urteilt dagegen Prof. Ralph Magoffin, der Altmeister der klassischen Studien an der Universität New York und Präsident des Verbandes der klassischen Philologen. ‚Ich halte es, rundeheraus gesagt, für ein Unglück‘, klagt er, ‚daß nach zweihundert Jahren humanistischer Hochblüte eine unserer großen Universitäten einen Entschluß faßt, in dem viele Sachkundige nur ein bedauerliches Sinken ihres Niveaus zu sehen vermögen. Der Entschluß ist die Konsequenz aus der materialistischen Anschauung unserer Zeit. Er ist um so bedauerlicher, als Yale in unserm Lande den Gipfel humanistischer Bildung bedeutete, der die Universität vor der Versuchung schützen sollte, mit der Popularität zu liebäugeln. Es handelt sich hier ja nicht nur um einen Schlag gegen Lateinisch und Griechisch, nein, es wird vielmehr die Art an die Wurzel der humanistischen Bildung gelegt.“

J. T. M.

**Chiliasm Rejected.** — If all spokesmen for the Lutheran Church of America in the past had observed the sound principles of Scripture interpretation voiced with respect to Rev. 20 in the *Lutheran Standard* for January 2, 1932, Chiliasm would not have been one of the four points which formed one of the chief topics of theological debate in our Church in the sixties and seventies of the last century. The Rev. W. N. Emeh writes in answer to a question pertaining to Rev. 20: "It would be much better, it seems to me, if people would cease to try to figure out 'the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power,' and it certainly would be much better if people would cease to interpret the highly figurative and symbolic language of the Book of Revelation in a way that grossly contradicts the plain statements of the gospels and the epistles. 'Christ will come again to judge the quick and the dead.' His second coming is always associated with the final Judgment of both the just and the unjust. Christ's kingdom is not of this world; it is a spiritual kingdom set up in the hearts of men. Just as many of the Jews misinterpreted the predictions of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah by looking for an earthly prince who would set up, and reign over, a magnificent earthly kingdom, so some now misinterpret Rev. 20 by expecting a splendid temporal thousand-year reign of Christ on earth. St. Paul says: 'If ye, then, be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the



earth,' Col. 3, 1, 2. Thus we are not to look for great things in this world. We will live and triumph with Him face to face above. To that we look forward with great joy and expectation, but not to any visionary millenium in this world. Just how near we are to the end we do not know, and we are not anxious to know. 'Watch therefore. . . Be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh.' Here is the admonition we should heed. Nothing else is asked of us. As a thief in the night He will come; so it is not in the power of man to figure out the time. And when any one tries to predict to you times or seasons, put him down as a misguided fanatic." A.

**The Blindness of Modernistic Unionists.** — It is almost impossible for a believing Christian to understand the unspeakably great spiritual blindness of our modern unionists, of whom Prof. Wm. Lyon Phelps is an example. The *Literary Digest*, in a recent number, quotes him as favoring common action of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews against atheism and kindred evil. The *Literary Digest* writes: —

"Instead of trying to unite, which is both impossible and undesirable, the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish religions 'should stand together against the common foe of atheism, indifference, materialism, and selfishness.' So appeals Prof. William Lyon Phelps in an address before the Free Synagog at Carnegie Hall, New York.

"As it is, he points out, the three faiths 'worship the same God. The religion of all three comes from the same Book. All three believe in a purely spiritual worship and that this worship is indissolubly united with conduct.' Professor Phelps's point is that 'great as are the differences that separate Jews and Catholics and Protestants, the things that unite them are still greater.' And just now, he believes, as he is quoted in the *New York Times*, there is greater need for the exercise of fellowship: —

"Nothing seems to me at once so silly and so tragic as for Catholics and Protestants to be fighting or for Jews and Christians to be fighting. They are fighting in the presence of a common foe, who is able, unscrupulous, and resolute as only such foes can be.

"The army of the foe is made up of atheists, unbelievers, indifferentists, debauchees, behaviorists, sensualists, money-grubbers and money-grabbers, self-lovers, and all selfish, depraved, degenerate, cruel, cold-hearted children of this world.'"

The answer to Professor Phelps's suggestion may be given by any child in the Lutheran school that has passed the primary grades. J. T. M.

**The Purpose of Modernistic Church-Union Movements.** — An interesting and illuminating article on this matter is found in the *Sunday-school Times*, which comments on it as follows: "The purpose of present-day Unitarian Modernism is to infect evangelical churches, and the schemes for church unity promoted by this party are much as if a man sick of typhus should insist on walking down the streets of a city arm in arm with well people. In French Protestantism there are modernist and evangelical groups of churches. The move for 'unity' ever comes from the former. Evangelicals are reluctant or opposed. It seems that an arrangement was made a generation or more ago by which both French groups were to work together along 'social and moral' lines through a commission appointed for that purpose. This, it will be remembered, was the plan



of the Stockholm conference of 1925. But the French Modernists are not satisfied. They want 'cooperation' along religious lines as well, although they know their beliefs are a flat negation of the evangelical faith. *Évangile et Liberté*, the official organ of Modernism, speaking of the last assembly of the French Reformed Church, says: 'Marseille has marked an evident advance in the ideas dear to our paper. The side of the assembly which formerly denied to the Protestant Federation of France the competence required to deal with essentially religious questions now ask for just what they formerly refused.'

"M. Védrines traces in *Le Chrétien Évangélique* the course of the modernist maneuver. He notes a progressive deformation of the Commission on Social Cooperation in a way acceptable to the Modernists. This has been brought about to make way for an ultimate fusion of Evangelicals and Modernists. He notes how evangelical pastors have been invited to occupy liberal pulpits and otherwise to fraternize with Modernists. The methods used so successfully by Unitarians in Boston are being used upon French Evangelicals, so that one wonders whether these methods have not been commended to liberals everywhere as a plan of campaign. M. Védrines is evidently aware of what is going on. He writes: 'It is true that the best means of inoculating our remaining evangelical Protestants with doctrinal skepticism, the infallible precursor of total skepticism, is the daily spectacle of these compromises which are now so customary.'

"It is worth noting that numbers of devout Christians are cutting loose from the French Reformed Church simply because of these sinister union movements. The Salvation Army, which is having a remarkable advance in France, and the Brethren, with now some 160 churches, are said to be the especial beneficiaries of this revolt against 'church unity.'"

J. T. M.

**Does It Indicate a Diseased Mind to Hold that Christianity Teaches the Only Way of Salvation?** — Under this heading *Christianity To-day* takes to task the modernistic secretary of the Committee on Good Will between Jews and Christians of the Federal Council, the Rev. E. R. Clinchy. The article reads: —

"The Rev. Everet R. Clinchy, the Presbyterian minister who is secretary of the Committee on Good Will between Jews and Christians of the Federal Council, seems to think that this question should be answered in the affirmative. In an article in the *National Jewish Monthly* (*B'Nai B'Rith*) he took upon himself as secretary of the committee just mentioned the task of replying to Dr. John R. Mott's pronouncement to the effect that it is a Christian duty to seek to convert the Jews to Christianity. Mr. Clinchy vigorously dissents from this judgment. He not only affirms that the Good-will movement as sponsored by the Federal Council is opposed to efforts to convert the Jews to Christianity, but in the course of his criticism of those Christian missionaries who feel it their duty to approach the Jews says: 'The Christian missionary to the Jews has the conviction (sometimes bordering on the pathological) that he has the only way of salvation.' Mr. Clinchy seems to think it surprising that any intelligent, healthy-minded person should hold that Jesus Christ is the only Savior, though, if such be not the case, the whole missionary work



of the Church has been an impertinence. In that case not only were Peter and Paul mistaken as to Christ's real significance, but the Great Commission (Matt. 28, 19, 20) was itself a crime against humanity since it launched the Christian world upon a fool's errand, almost every step of which has dripped with wasted blood. We are not disposed to argue this matter. Suffice it to say that, if it is pathological to maintain that Christ is the only Savior, we think it a great pity that there are not more suffering from this disease. Be that as it may, those who not only call Christ Lord, but seek to do the things that He says will not be unmindful of their obligation to bear witness to Him as the one and only Savior. There is no reason why they should not recognize to the full all the good that is to be found in other religions; but they should allow nothing to conceal from them the fact that, since Christianity is a true religion, it is the one and only true religion. For good or ill the future of Christianity is bound up with the conviction that it teaches the only way of salvation."

J. T. M.

**Ancient Manuscripts of the Bible.**— Under this heading the *London Spectator* of December 5, 1931, published an interesting note, which Prof. E. G. Sihler, Ph. D., of New York University was so kind as to copy and to send us for our journal. We herewith reprint the note:—

"Many others besides students of Biblical texts and ancient MSS. were thrilled a few days ago by the news of the discovery of 106 of Greek Biblical papyri, fragments of the Old and New Testaments and a portion of the lost Book of Enoch, the apocryphal work quoted in the Epistle of St. Jude. [?] Probably they were found in Egypt, but we only know that Mr. Chester Beatty, whose collection of MSS. is known by the generous loans of his treasures, preserves them, that they were tenderly separated at Berlin, and that Sir Frederic Kenyon has studied them and told us about them in the *Times*. Most are of the third century, but the earliest are of a not late date in the second century and so are actually the earliest known. When ignorant people airily doubt the 'authenticity of the Bible,' we wish that they could realize how far the age and wealth of Bible codices exceed anything of the kind in classical texts which they readily accept as 'authentic.' The *Times* published a photograph of one leaf, giving a passage from Rom. 11, much more legible to the inexpert than many an English deed of the sixteenth century. Such treasures, witnessing to Christianity and to its scholarly treatment eighteen centuries ago, abound with romance and awe."

**The Ecumenical Conference of Methodists.**— In October, 1931, the Methodists of the world held their ecumenical conference, which meets every ten years, in Atlanta, Ga. Practically all the countries of the world and all the various brands of Methodism were represented. From England Rev. J. Ryder Smith of the Wesleyan Methodist Church had come, likewise Prof. H. B. Workman, known as a church historian. If we ask what these distinguished men accomplished, we are bound to be disappointed, provided that the reports of the meetings which have appeared hitherto can be trusted. What these people deliberated on is indicated by the words "war," "the liquor traffic," "capital and labor," "the dangers suggested by the term 'machine age,'" and the like. We are told that the conference went on record as favoring the outlawing of war and as supporting the pro-



hibition cause. This seems to have been the main accomplishment of this World Conference. We cannot help thinking that these people assembled to voice their approval of moral platitudes. When, generally speaking, everybody is against war, they are against war, too. And that the Methodists are in favor of prohibition we have known for a long time. It may be that at the meetings good testimony for the old Gospel as proclaimed in the Scriptures was given which the newspapers and religious journals have not been reporting to us. From this distance it looks as though the World Conference had been an empty, though rather expensive, gesture. A.

**Modern Protestantism Romeward-Bound.** — In the fourth book of his series on *Foundations of Faith* Dr. W. E. Orchard states: "It could be claimed that it was over the question of purgatory that the Reformation took its rise, for it was Tetzel's sale of indulgences that fired the train of revolt in Luther's mind and caused the storm of indignation to burst forth which had long been gathering, with such profound consequences for subsequent history. Yet, strangely enough, it is at the point of this very same doctrine that the Reformation movement is now exhibiting a tendency to return to the Catholic faith." (*Eschatological*, p. 81.) The claim made both by Orchard, the Congregationalist-Catholic, and by the *Catholic Encyclopedia* that a goodly number of Protestants teach some sort of purgatory cannot be denied. The number of those Protestants who believe in a purgatory in the narrow sense or in a purgatory in the wider sense is "legion." And the Lutherans have contributed a strong contingent to this force. There is the Presbyterian who finally joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, C. A. Briggs, who taught a "progressive sanctification" of the believers in the intermediate state and was disciplined for it. There is the Lutheran Kahnis, who taught: "There is certainly this truth lying at the bottom of the idea of a purgatory, that many Christians are still in need of cleansing. . . . They cannot enter paradise as they are if paradise is to remain a paradise. . . . We are thus driven to assume that in the future world purification and development is called for." (*Dogmatik*, II, 498.) There is the Lutheran Martensen, who taught: "As no soul leaves this present existence in a fully complete and prepared state, we must suppose that there is an intermediate state, a realm of progressive development, in which souls are prepared and matured for the final Judgment. Though the Romish doctrine of purgatory is repudiated because it is mixed up with so many crude and false positions, it nevertheless contains the truth that the intermediate state must in a purely spiritual sense be a purgatory, designed for the purifying of the soul." (*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 457. First sentence quoted in *Cath. Encycl.*) And there is Seeberg, who believes in "a purgatory of grace," and many others, Lutheran and Reformed. And it should give these theologians pause when they see the Catholics gleefully noting this development. For it marks a departure, not from some isolated, less important point of doctrine, but from the fundamental truth of Protestantism, the chief article of the Bible. Luther objected to the purgatory not so much because of the crudities with which the papists invested it, but because of the fundamental lie on which they based it: "For they deny the doctrine that faith saves and make satisfaction for sin the cause of salvation." (I, 1762.) Even so the Protestant purgatory is a denial of the free and full forgiveness of sins offered in the Gospel.



Dr. Orchard and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* might have pointed out, while they were at it, that modern Protestantism, assisted by Universalism and the other forms of Modernism, has constructed an extension of purgatory that is much more elaborate than anything the Catholics have essayed in this direction. This extension takes care of the infidels and heathen, at least of a great number of them, after death. Here we have hell as a remedial and purgatorial punishment, or we have Hades, the state of the second probation. The Catholics have not devoted so much time to this matter, though Orchard, the Congregationalist-Catholic, makes the emphatic statement: "That the heathen can be saved without ever having heard of Christ at all is fortunately a doctrine tenaciously held by the Catholic Church." (*Eschat.*, p. 125.) We know that some Catholic theologians have held this view. The Jesuit Andrada, the opponent of Chemnitz, insisted that the natural knowledge of God and the resultant moral endeavor are sufficient to save the heathen. (The *Catholic Encyclopedia* does not hold this doctrine, though it lays the groundwork for it. "The soul is *naturaliter Christiana*. . . . Better than Aristotle guessed, mankind *ἔχει τὸ θεῖον*. . . . History shows us their [the pagans'] efforts and their failure; we thank God for the one and dare not scorn the other." [S. t. 'Paganism.']. W. Wilmers will not go any farther than this: "*Wie anderswo gezeigt wurde, ist der Glaube wenigstens ebenso notwendig zur Seligkeit als die Erfuellung der goettlichen Gebote selbst. Er muss also ebensowohl moeglich sein als diese; moeglich aber ist der uebernatuerliche Glaube nur unter Voraussetzung der Gnade, und folglich wird diese allen IRGENDWIE verlichen; das heisst, allen wird entweder eine an und fuer sich uebernatuerliche Erleuchtung und Anregung, mit der sie die etwa dargebotene Offenbarung erfassen koennen, oder doch irgendein innerer Bestand zuteil, der sie, wenn sie mitwirkten, endlich zum Glauben und zur Seligkeit fuehren wuerde. Deshalb sind auch vom Roemischen Stuhle entgegenstehende Behauptungen verworfen worden, unter andern diese, dass die Heiden, Juden und Haeretiker keine Gnaden empfangen. . . . Klemens IX. verwarf in der Bulle 'Unigenitus' folgende Saetze: Nullae dantur gratiae nisi per fidem. Fides est prima gratia et fons omnium aliarum. Extra ecclesiam nulla conceditur gratia.*" (*Lehrbuch der Religion*, IV, 90.) (Again the groundwork for the thesis of Andrada and Orchard is laid.) Modern Protestantism, however, expends much energy on this matter. It is one of its favorite dogmas. And it is based on the Catholic doctrine of Pelagianism, the inherent goodness of man and salvation by works. Even Lutherans have taught, on Catholic principles, the salvation of the heathen. Hofmann, for instance, taught that the heathen may gain eternal life in virtue of their God-pleasing conduct, flowing from their natural knowledge of God. (*Schriftbeweis*, I, 568 f.) Modern Protestantism is Romeward-bound. The Catholics are glad to hail these men as partners in this matter. But let every man who finds these dreams alluring study the source of them. It is the Catholic denial of salvation by grace alone, grace offered in the Gospel.—Other Lutheran and Reformed teachers provide for the salvation of the unbeliever through a second opportunity of hearing the Gospel in Hades. (Mellenbruch, *The Doctrines of Christianity*, p. 205, treats it as an open question: "Should there be provision made for those



unprovided for in the active Gospel program, God in His loving providence might or might not deem a purgatory necessary or advisable.")

By the way, where do those Catholics who accept Orchard's and Andrada's thesis place the heathen who have not heard the Gospel in this life? It is unbelievable that the heathen should directly enter heaven by virtue of his moral life while the best of Christians, the Popes included, must pass through purgatory. The Catholic future world has but five compartments. These heathen cannot enter purgatory. That is reserved for the Catholics burdened with venial sins. Unless they place them in the *limbus patrum*, which is now vacant, they will have to adopt Orchard's expedient: "The belief has grown up amongst some Catholic theologians, surely of great value and truth, that the Particular Judgment [at the death of the individual] will be inaugurated for the soul by the vision of Christ as incarnate and crucified. . . . Surely we are entitled to believe that those souls who, while on earth, have known nothing of Christ and His Cross because they have dwelt beyond the area of Gospel light, as well as those souls who, though they have heard, have never really seen or understood what the incarnation and crucifixion meant for them, will be presented with a full revelation of the love of God as set forth in Christ's humanity and Christ's Cross. . . . All souls shall have an opportunity of knowing that the incarnate Christ is God seeking them." (P. 73 f.) Or they might adopt the expedient proposed by Kaehler and other Protestants, according to which the needed opportunity will be given the unbelievers by means of Christ's self-revelation at the *parousia*, at the final Judgment. In both cases they would, of course, still have an advantage over the Christians, who must first pass through purgatory. E.

**A New Sport.**—Wrestling-matches are popular in certain circles. Others prefer attending the Religious Forum. It is great sport. "A pleasant time was had by all," says the *Christian Century* of October 21, 1931. "Just how much is accomplished, we wonder, by these forums, now so popular, in which representatives of the great faiths and of no faith appear on a common platform to present their respective world views. There was one in Chicago a few nights ago. Dr. John A. Lapp spoke for Roman Catholicism, Dr. Charles W. Gilkey for Protestantism, Rabbi Solomon Goldman for Judaism, and Clarence Darrow for agnosticism. . . . Evidently the public was interested, for Orchestra Hall was filled to overflowing. But the impression is as of trains passing each other at high speed in opposite directions on parallel tracks. There is scarcely a single proposition on which any two speakers take definitely opposite positions. . . . Dr. Gilkey likes Protestantism because it is democratic and because it represents religion as a way of life and because it now faces the duty of opposing all forms of social injustice. Rabbi Goldman praises Judaism because it urges the principle of social living, as the Protestants and the Pope do. . . . Mr. Darrow rests his case upon a denial of that Biblical infallibility and that burning hell in which few Protestants or Jews within reach of the discussion believe with any intensity. So a pleasant time was had by all; but it may be doubted whether popular understanding of the great religions and irreligions was much advanced."

Our modern wrestling-matches are not always *bona-fide* bouts. It is not intended that the best man should win. And so the opponents are



very carefully chosen. At the religious forums now being staged throughout America no real clash occurs. No decision is reached. The wrestlers cannot get a real hold. That is to say, these Catholics and Congregationalists and Jews and agnostics occupy common ground, not only for the occasion of the entertainment, but in their deepest religious convictions. Rabbi Goldman describes the situation exactly: "Judaism urges the principle of social living, as the Protestants and the Pope do" and as the upright heathen and the agnostic do. The men usually meeting on the mat of the religious forum are agreed that all hinges on the inherent morality of man. What are they to debate about if they are fundamentally agreed? If these affairs had been staged in Luther's days and the promoter had, for purposes of his own, sent him a pass, Luther would have returned it with the remark: "There is no sense at all in religious debates between papists and Turks. . . . They are possessed by the same idea: If I perform this work, God will be merciful to me; if I do not perform it, His wrath is upon me. . . . There is no difference between a papist, a Jew, a Turk, or a heretic. . . . They are all work-saints." (9, 521; 25, 520.) Nor would the issue be clearly drawn if the selection of the debaters rested with the *Christian Century*. It said in its issue of December 9, 1931: "Darrow prefers to impute to his opponent a belief in hell-fire, an infallible Bible, . . . and the most primitive conception of blood atonement. Naturally it is more fun to slay this straw man than to come to grips with the conceptions of religion advanced by, let us say, Bishop McConnell or Rabbi Louis Mann, both of whom have met Mr. Darrow in debate." The champions of Christianity that the *Christian Century* would select would accordingly deny the infallibility of the Bible and the vicarious satisfaction. They would deny that sin entails eternal damnation and that salvation is by grace alone. The agnostic heartily agrees with that. There is not going to be a clash.

But a pleasant time was had by all. It is great sport. Some indeed do go because they want to hear the agnostic arguments at first hand or because they hope to have certain doubts in their minds removed. But others go because they like to hear Christianity reviled, and according to the *Christian Century* most of them go because they like to show their tolerance. "Modern religious people are far more tolerant of others' opinions than in any previous time. . . . Go to any of these forums and observe the temper of the audience, the attitude of the other speakers, the tone of voice of the chairman when he presents the last speaker. The psychology of the whole situation is set so as to focus the unified impulses of tolerance upon Mr. Darrow. At Mr. Darrow's feet the audience lays its climactic offering of magnanimity. In doing so, it feels that it is paying a tribute to its own tolerance more than to Mr. Darrow. In a debate recently held in Chicago, when the chairman finally presented Mr. Darrow, the exponent of the Christian Church, having just finished his own able address, arose and with both hands waved a gesture to the audience to rise and give the final speaker a grand ovation. This is not usually done for the Catholic, the Protestant, or the Jew. It is a tribute reserved for Mr. Darrow. True, the audience frequently begins to find the exits before he is done, as it becomes patently clear that he is not adding anything of importance to the discussion, but all go home with a feeling of virtue in



having patiently — yea, and enthusiastically — demonstrated their moral capacity to allow free speech to a man who is out to disprove their most precious convictions."

So a pleasant time was had by all, particularly by the canny promoter and the well-groomed champion of the mat. "This show of tolerance is not wholly a spontaneous expression, but is more or less cleverly prompted and exploited for commercial profit. The whole set-up is artificial. The conception of a debate is purely fictitious. The minds of the various champions never meet, their arguments never lock horns. The auditor cannot avoid the feeling that he has been exploited." (Remember this is not a description of a wrestling-match!) The plan of the promoter "is to go into a city, select a prominent Protestant" (and there is always one to agree to the conditions) and a prominent Jew, arrange with them for the date, and engage the hall. The Catholic spokesman is usually an outsider, rarely a priest, nearly always a prominent layman. The representative of agnosticism is always Clarence Darrow. The first three speakers are paid what Dr. Wright" (who served as the Protestant opponent of the title-holder in two of the forums) "describes as a fair amount; what Mr. Darrow is paid is not known." (Remember this is not a description of a wrestling-match!) The *Grand Rapids Herald* says: "We do not believe in capitalizing, in commercializing, in exploiting, faith in God. It is too sacred a thing to be dragged around the country for the sole purpose of making a fat living for the promoters of the 'show.'" But at the next stop — these shows, unlike the wrestling-matches, are hardly ever staged in the same town twice — the promoter will find Congregationalists or Methodists ready to sign the articles.

The most pleasant time of all is had by the arch-promoter. He likes to have Christianity misrepresented by the representatives of Christianity.

E.

**An Interesting Decision of the United States Supreme Court.** In *Permoli vs. Municipality No. 1 of the city of New Orleans*, 3 Howard, 589, 11 L. ed. 739, 748, the Supreme Court of the United States says: —

"The ordinances complained of must violate the Constitution or laws of the United States or some authority exercised under them; if they do not, we have no power by the 25th section of the Judiciary Act to interfere. The Constitution makes no provision for protecting the citizens of the respective States in their religious liberties; this is left to the State constitutions and laws; nor is there any inhibition imposed by the Constitution of the United States in this respect on the States. We must therefore look beyond the Constitution for the laws that are supposed to be violated and on which our jurisdiction can be founded; these are the following acts of Congress."

In *ex parte A. H. Garland*, 71 U. S. 333—399, 18 L. ed., 366, 376, Mr. Justice Miller says: —

"The Federal Constitution contains but two provisions on this subject. One of these forbids Congress to make any law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The other is that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. No restraint is placed by that instrument on the action of the States; but on the contrary, in the lan-



guage of Story, Comm. Const. Sec. 1878, 'the whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the State governments, to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the State constitutions. If there ever was a case calling upon this court to exercise all the power on this subject which properly belongs to it, it was the case of the Rev. B. Permoli, 3 Howard, 589.' "

In 2 Hare's *American Constitutional Law*, 555, it is said: —

"The argument which has been made in the case of Cummins vs. State of Missouri that the Constitution of the United States guaranteed the freedom of religious worship against interference by the States was not sanctioned by the Constitution. In the case of the Rev. B. Permoli, a Catholic priest who had been fined for performing the funeral services of his Church over the body of one of his parishioners in the Roman Catholic Church of St. Augustine, contrary to an ordinance of the city of New Orleans, which required that all funeral rites should take place in a public chapel, appealed from the sentence to the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision was that the Constitution contained no clause guaranteeing religious liberty against the several States, which might make such regulations on the subject as they thought fit. The State of Missouri might therefore well provide that no priest of any Church should exercise his ministerial functions without showing by his own oath that he had been true to the State and the Union."

E. E.

**The Knowledge of God.** — "*Ipsisque in hominibus nulla gens est, neque tam immansucta, neque tam fera, quae non, etiam si ignoret qualem habere deum deceat, tamen habendum sciat.*" (Cicero, *De Legibus*, I, 8.) "No people has ever been so reprobate as not to institute and observe some divine worship." (Luther, *Trigl.*, p. 585.) "The pigmies of the Congo like all other dwarfs live in the shade of the primeval forest and leave it only when they go to trade for bananas in Negro villages. How often it happens that, when people look at photographs of the Congo pigmies, they exclaim, 'What monkey-faces!' Nevertheless the dwarfs have nothing whatever in common with monkeys. They are human beings precisely as we are, but exceedingly primitive ones; their daily existence is poverty-stricken and their appearance anything but attractive. . . . Was not human flesh the most tasty? asked both the Negroes and the pigmies. For these last also, at least certain tribes of them, looked favorably on cannibalism, as they themselves admit. I shall never forget the scene in which a pigmy explained to me, with all sorts of grimaces, how good human flesh tasted. . . . Only in one sense did the pigmies seem to me comparable with the dwellers in a modern metropolis. This is their attitude toward religion. I lived among them for whole weeks and found no trace of a faith. They said no prayers, there was no trace of a cult or images associated with a cult in their houses, and I had already decided that at last I had come upon people which had no faith and no god. But I had been in total error. At the end of about a month the veil lifted, and I learned that they did know a Supreme Being in which they believed and which they prayed to when they went on the hunt or in search of honey. To this Supreme Being they always made thank-offerings. The practise of giving the first fruits and the first portion of honey and other bits as a sacrifice I found flourishing among all the tribes. Yes, gradually I also came to see something of their



conceptions of the soul and the hereafter, conceptions which indeed sounded very strange, but which were nevertheless present." (Paul Schebasta, in the *Commonweal*, December 2, 1931.) E.

Concerning the "Evolution of Religion."—Under this heading the *Sunday-school Times* reports the following interesting and gladdening bit of news: "In his inaugural address on the occasion of his installation to the chair of Missions in Princeton, Dr. Zwemer described how evolutionary theories concerning religion have lost reputation among students of that subject. He quotes Alkema and Bezemer of the University of Utrecht: 'The study of primitive religion has been altogether too much swayed by the evolutionary hypothesis, and those who wrote on the subject approached it with prejudgments.' And again: 'The fact is that the evolutionary theory as an explanation of the history of human thought is more and more being abandoned. After all, it is only a theory and has raised more difficulties than it has explained. Even as a working hypothesis it is to be condemned.' So, too, Professor Huizenga, also of Utrecht, in speaking of the history of civilization, insists that 'the evolution theory has been a liability and not an asset in the scientific treatment of the history of civilization.' Dr. Zwemer believes that the tide has turned and that we have on the Continent outstanding scholars who hold fast to supernaturalism in opposition to the evolutionary hypothesis. He names the late Archbishop Soederblom, Alfred Bertholet, Edward Lehman, Alfred Blum-Ernst, Le Roy, A. C. Kruijt, and especially P. W. Schmidt, founder of the anthropological review *Anthropos* and professor of Ethnology and Philology in the University of Vienna. 'The exhaustive work of this Roman Catholic savant *The Origin of the Idea of God* is to be completed in three volumes.' Dr. Zwemer also calls attention to a volume on polytheism and fetishism in the *Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses*. The author speaks of five elements in the religion of primitive tribes of West Africa impossible to explain save on the assumption of a primitive revelation. These are: An organized family life; a name for a supreme power, sovereign and benevolent; a moral sense of truth, justice, shame, and a knowledge that there is good and evil; the idea of soul and the conviction that this soul does not die with the body's death; and, lastly, communion with the unseen power by prayer and sacrificial rites. 'Before such considerations the hypothesis of a primitive revelation takes on every appearance of truth.'" J. T. M.

**The Presbyterian League of Faith.**—Concerning this league the *Sunday-school Times* writes as follows: "The Presbyterian League of Faith issued its constitution last May, with the signatures of 150 ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Its objects as stated in this constitution are:—

"1. To maintain loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God in opposition to denials of its full truthfulness;

"2. To maintain the Reformed, or Calvinistic, system of doctrine as it is set forth in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1931, in opposition to all plans of church union which would either break down that system or relegate it to a secondary place;

"3. To oppose changes in the historic formula of creed subscription required of candidates for the ministry and the eldership;



"4. To oppose the attack made by the document commonly called the *Auburn Affirmation* upon the doctrinal pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1923 and to insist, in opposition to that *Affirmation*, that the full truth of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and miracles of our Lord are essential doctrines of the Word of God and our standards;

"5. To warn men everywhere that salvation is to be obtained not by human merit or human effort to please God, but only through the redeeming work of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ as He is offered to us in the Gospel."

These resolutions seem to us of most far-reaching importance. They are not only an absolute renunciation of present-day Modernism, but at the same time a restatement and reacknowledgment of the "Calvinistic system of doctrine." So much the more must Lutheranism not identify itself with Fundamentalism.

J. T. M.

**Dr. Barnhouse to be Censured.** — We see from our exchanges that Dr. Barnhouse, noted radio preacher, by a unanimous decision of the judicial commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania of the Presbyterian Church has been found guilty of the charges preferred against him, accusing him of transgressing the Eighth (Ninth according to Reformed reckoning) Commandment and of violating his ordination vows. The moderator of the Philadelphia Presbytery is instructed to rebuke him in the presence of the presbytery. After he has been censured and admonished, his brethren will offer him their advice, and prayer will conclude the act. It will have to be seen whether the statement that the whole case has been ethical, and not doctrinal, is true.

A.

## II. Ausland.

**Die Muldentaler Konferenz.** Aus einem Artikel in „Schrift und Bekenntnis“ (Sept.-Okt. 1931), betitelt „Muldentaler Konferenz und Missouri“, sei hier folgendes mitgeteilt. „In Nr. 28 des Sächsischen Kirchenblatts vom 15. Juli 1931 berichtet Pfarrer Ranft über die am 15. Juni d. J. stattgefundene Jahrhundertfeier der Muldentaler Konferenz, deren Vorsitzender er ist. Diese Konferenz wurde am 15. Juni 1831 von einem der namhaftesten Theologen des vorigen Jahrhunderts, D. A. G. Rudelbach, gegründet, um die Pastoren seines Kreises in lutherischer Bekenntnistreue zu stärken. . . . So ist es kein Wunder, daß unter seinem Einfluß das konfessionelle Bewußtsein erstarke und somit der sächsischen Landeskirche viel Segen zuteil wurde. Pfarrer Ranft schreibt von dieser Konferenz, unter deren Mitbegründern sich auch die Namen des Pastors Walthers in Langenchursdorf (des Vaters der unter uns bekannten Brüder Otto Hermann und Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walthers) und des Pastors Nehl in Niederprohna befinden, und ihrem Einfluß auf die Entwicklung der Landeskirche folgendes: „Die vom Muldental aus ihre Wellen schlagende Erweckungsbewegung, der D. Rudelbach von Anfang an einen lutherischen, kirchlichen Charakter aufgeprägt hatte, trug an ihrem Teil zur Neubelebung des kirchlichen Lebens in Sachsen überhaupt bei, bis schließlich die sächsische Landeskirche zu einer bewußt in den sogenannten [?] urchristlichen und reformatorischen Wahrheiten wurzelnden Bekenntniskirche wurde.“ Bis auf den letzten Satz, der ja dem wirklichen Zustande der sächsischen Landeskirche nicht gerecht wird,



wird man der Konferenz den Ruhm lassen müssen und sich dessen freuen, daß eine Stärkung des konfessionellen Bewußtseins durch sie erfolgt ist." Es wird dann weiter dargetan, daß eine weitergehende, das Ganze der Landeskirche umfassende Wirkung ausblieb. „Somit schwand freilich die Hoffnung, daß die sächsische Landeskirche noch einmal das werden könnte, was sie in früheren Jahrhunderten war, eine wirklich bekenntnistreue Kirche, in welcher Gottes Wort allein die Herrschaft hat. So ist sie denn auch tatsächlich jetzt nicht eine Kirche, in welcher, e i n t r ä c h t i g l i c h nach reinem Verstand das Evangelium gepredigt und die Sakramente dem göttlichen Wort gemäß gereicht werden', wie dies der 7. Artikel der Augsburgerischen Konfession fordert, sondern, wie uns selbst ein landeskirchlicher Theolog zugestand, ein ‚Zweckverband' mit dem Zwecke, die äußere Organisation und die materielle Versorgung des vorhandenen Kirchentwesens zu erhalten. . . . Müssen wir sonach der Muldentaler Konferenz etwas von ihrem Ruhm, wenigstens was den von ihr erstrebten Erfolg anlangt, nehmen, so freuen wir uns, ihr ein Ruhmesblatt hinzufügen zu können, indem wir auf einen Mann hinweisen, der, aus ihrer Mitte hervorgegangen, das ihr vorschwebende Ziel durch Gottes Gnade wirklich erreicht hat, nämlich auf den schon oben erwähnten zweiten Sohn des Langenchursdorfer Pastors Walther, C. F. W. Walther, der bald nach der Gründung der Konferenz Pfarrer in Bräunsdorf wurde, nachdem er im Elternhause nach schwerer Krankheit sich gründlich in Luthers Schriften vertieft hatte und so ein entschlossener Bekenner der Lehre Luthers geworden war. Es ist auffällig, daß weder im Bericht noch auch in dem Hauptvortrag des Lic. Hennig dieses Mannes ausdrücklich gedacht wird.“ Es wird sodann der Nachruf mitgeteilt, den die „Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ seinerzeit D. Walther widmete („der Erfolg seiner Wirksamkeit ist in der neueren Geschichte unserer Kirche fast beispiellos“ usw.), und die Gründe werden erörtert, die möglicherweise die Konferenz veranlaßt haben, keinerlei Notiz von Walther und dem Erfolg seiner Wirksamkeit zu nehmen. Der Artikel hat folgende Schlussworte: „Es sind also nicht Separationsgelüste, welche Walther und die von ihm geleitete Missourisynode in Gegensatz gegen die sächsische und andere sich noch lutherisch nennende Landeskirchen Deutschlands gebracht haben, und es ist daher die Frage berechtigt, ob nicht das völlige Übergehen Walthers und der Missourisynode bei diesem Jubiläum seinen Grund darin hat, daß die jetzige Muldentaler Konferenz das ursprüngliche Ziel ihrer Gründer, nämlich die restlose Rückkehr zur Kirche der Reformation, aus dem Auge verloren hat und dem Neuluthertum verfallen ist, welches eine völlige Einigkeit in der Lehre, wie sie die Augustana und die Konkordienformel fordern, für unmöglich hält und sich mit dem Nebeneinanderbestehen verschiedener Richtungen abfindet. . . . Man nennt solche Duldung verschiedener Richtungen wohl Ökumenizität und hofft davon eine Einigung der Kirche. Aber die wahre Ökumenizität und die gottgefällige Einigung der Kirche besteht doch darin, daß man a l l e n d e n e n die Bruderhand reicht, die allein Gottes Wort gelten lassen und alle abweichenden Meinungen abweisen. . . . Da P. Ranft als die für die gegenwärtige kirchliche Lage aus den Grundfäßen der Konferenz sich ergebende Folgerung dies bezeichnet, daß Bibel und Kirche [?] allein die objektive Autorität sind, nicht aber religiöse Erfahrung und gläubige Aktivität', so möchte man gern hoffen, daß sich die Konferenz in Zukunft mehr von der neueren Erlebnistheologie



abwenden und auf Gottes Wort allein gründen werde, wie denn die lutherische Kirche in ihrem Bekenntnis sagt: „Gottes Wort soll Artikel des Glaubens stellen und sonst niemand, auch kein Engel“ — freilich auch die Kirche nicht! Wenn man zu diesem Grundsatz rückhaltlos sich bekennen und danach handeln wollte, so würde das Jubiläum zu einem segensreichen Anfang einer Erneuerung der Kirche, aber auch dazu führen, daß man Walthers nicht vergäße und die von ihm gegründeten und beeinflussten Kirchenkörper nicht mit dem Makel des Separatismus belegte. Damit würde auch der wahren Einigkeit der Kirche am besten gedient. E.

Ein wertvolles deutsches Missionsblatt eingegangen. Wie das „Ev.-Luth. Missionsblatt“ berichtet, muß das wertvolle deutsche Missionsblatt „Die Evangelischen Missionen“ infolge der jetzigen Notlage sein Erscheinen einstellen. Wir lesen: „Die Evangelischen Missionen“, das von Prof. D. Julius Richter herausgegebene, vortrefflich geleitete Familienblatt, sieht sich genötigt, am Schluß seines 37. Jahrgangs sein Erscheinen einzustellen. Die im Jahre 1930 eingeleitete Hilfsaktion, mit der man das wertvolle Blatt zu retten hoffte, hat leider nicht die für den Fortbestand erforderliche Steigerung der Bezieserzahl gebracht. Der Herausgeber weist in der Oktobernummer diejenigen, die sich mit den großen Missionsproblemen beschäftigen und zugleich fortlaufend einen Überblick über das weltweite Missionsfeld gewinnen wollen, empfehlend auf die „Neue Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift“ hin.“

J. L. M.

Fortbestehen des christlichen Hochschulwesens in Indien. Wie das Leipziger „Ev.-Luth. Missionsblatt“ mitteilt, hat eine Kommission in Indien nach langer, gründlicher Untersuchung geraten, daß die protestantischen Missionscolleges in Indien weitergeführt werden sollten. Der Bericht lautet: „Im Mai 1931 ist die indische Missionshochschulkommission nach anstrengender Arbeit in Indien und Birma zurückgekehrt. Ihre Aufgabe bestand darin, zu untersuchen, ob und in welchen Bahnen die protestantischen Missionscolleges in Indien weitergeführt werden könnten. Zwei Menschenalter hindurch sind die Missionshochschulen die Bahnbrecher und Vorläufer des höheren Schulwesens gewesen. Seit der Jahrhundertwende jedoch ist die Lage schwierig geworden. Die Regierung hat viele Hochschulen eingerichtet; andere wurden von Gemeinden, Religionsgemeinschaften und eingebornen Fürsten errichtet. Nach eingehender Untersuchung an Ort und Stelle kam die Kommission zu der Überzeugung, daß das christliche Hochschulwesen trotz aller Schwierigkeiten, unter denen es arbeitet, weiterbestehen sollte, da sonst für eine ausreichende religiöse Erziehung der christlichen Jugend nicht gesorgt ist und es auch an einer angemessenen Vorbildung für den geistlichen Stand fehlen würde. Nur sollte die Zahl der Colleges beschränkt und in jeder Provinz ein wohlüberlegter Plan des Hochschulwesens durchgeführt werden.“

J. L. M.

Romish Superstition Manifesting Itself in India. — A correspondent of the *Christian Century*, writing from India, speaks of the use Roman Catholics make of the body of St. Francis Xavier, the famous missionary. „Goa, one of the small territories that the Portuguese still retain in India, which was in the sixteenth century the site of the missionary labors of Francis Xavier, the famous Jesuit missionary, will witness next month a festival centering round the exposition of his body, which Roman Catholics claim to have been preserved miraculously. He died on the island of



San Chan, near China, on December 2, 1552. But his body, or part of his body, is claimed to have been brought to Goa, and this has been an object of veneration for Roman Catholics all these years. Miracles of healing are reported to happen at the time of the exposition of the body of this saint, which takes place once in ten years. Roman Catholic pilgrims will pour into Goa in thousands from all parts of India and Ceylon and from foreign countries during December [1931]. Hindus also visit the shrine in considerable numbers and give offerings for the fulfilment of their vows and prayers. Non-Roman Christians may not be able to understand all that is behind such religious festivals which the Roman Church organizes and maintains. But the Hindus are familiar with such things in their own religion, and a large number of them make their pilgrimage to Goa in search of some physical boon or gift of health, just as they would go to one of their sacred places, like Benares or Rameswaram." Not only does this remind us of the gross superstition rampant in the Roman Catholic Church, but it ought to open the eyes of all who can see to the undeniable fact that these superstitious rites have a paganistic tinge and as a result prove especially attractive to the heathen mind, steeped in idolatry. A.

**The Death of Bishop Gore.** — Of the recent death of Bishop Charles Gore the press reports the following: "Bishop Charles Gore, former chaplain to King George and Queen Mary, died yesterday (January 17) in a Kensington nursing home, a victim of pneumonia. He was seventy-nine years old. He was recognized as a leader of the High Church party in the Anglican communion. He was born in 1853 and was educated at Oxford. He was honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria from 1898 to 1900. He became chaplain in ordinary to the Queen in 1900 and served King Edward in the same capacity in 1901. Later he was Bishop of Worcester and Bishop of Birmingham, until his appointment to Oxford, in 1911. As Bishop of Oxford and an advocate of a League of Nations, Bishop Gore visited the United States in 1918. He resigned at Oxford in 1919. While in the United States, he said he came to cement the moral friendship of the British and American nations and to prove that England appreciated the utterances and aims of President Wilson. He, however, attracted wide attention through criticism of Bible-stories and aroused antagonism of Allied nations by begging forgiveness for Germany after the end of the World War. Widely known for his theological writings, he gave British Fundamentalists a jar in a book, *Can We Then Believe?*" in 1926. Remarking that the Bible was not intended to teach science, but accepted the science of its time, he said its spiritual teachings seemed to cry out for the theory of creation by evolution." J. T. M.

**Nachfolger Söderbloms.** Der „Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchenzeitung“ entnehmen wir folgende Notiz: „Zum Nachfolger des verstorbenen Erzbischofs von Upsala, D. Söderbloms, hat die schwedische Regierung den Professor der Theologie an der Universität Lund Erling Eidem ernannt. Die Vorschlagsliste, aus der die Regierung gewählt hat, enthält außerdem die Namen des Professors der Theologie an der Universität Upsala Knut Westmann und des Professors der Religionsgeschichte in Upsala Thor Andrä. Der neue Erzbischof von Upsala steht im einundfünfzigsten Lebensjahr. Er ist seit dem Jahre 1928 Professor für Neues Testament an der Universität Lund und widmet sich hauptsächlich der Paulusforschung. Auch



an der neuen schwedischen Bibelübersetzung hat er mitgewirkt. Mehrere Studienreisen führten ihn nach Deutschland, Palästina, Ägypten und Griechenland. Als Prediger und Verfasser religiöser Schriften ist er weit hin bekannt. Erzbischof Eidem genießt in Schweden bei den verschiedenen religiösen Richtungen dank seines tief christlichen Charakters großes Vertrauen.“ U.

Was ist's mit dem „jungen Luther“? D. Werner Eiert von Erlangen protestiert energisch gegen den Mißbrauch, den viele mit dem „jungen Luther“ treiben. Anstatt daß man bei dem „reifen Luther“ die Theologie der Reformation sucht, möchte man den „jungen Luther“ zur Autorität machen. Wie und wozu? D. Eiert spricht sich darüber in seiner „Morphologie des Luthertums“, S. 7, also aus: „Gab es seitdem [das heißt, in dieser Perspektive] zwei Arten von Luthertum, eins, das in den Bekenntnissen, und ein anderes, das in der Professorentheologie des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts seinen zutreffenden Ausdruck erblühte, so hat die zweite Art insofern neuerdings einen Fortschritt gemacht, als sich ihre Norm für das, was Luthertum im Ursinn heißen soll, wieder verobjektiviert hat. Diese Norm ist der ‚junge Luther‘. Er ist uns durch seine in den letzten Jahrzehnten aufgefundenen ersten Vorlesungen sehr genau bekannt geworden. Für die darin enthaltene Theologie zu werben, ist sehr aussichtsreich, weil man dabei mit dem Kapital an Vertrauen und Autorität rechnen kann, das sich einst der reife Luther erworben hat. Daß in jenen Vorlesungen noch recht viel artfremde Theologie steckt, die Luther aus der Überlieferung übernahm, später aber mit Bewußtsein abstieß, ja zum Teil mit größter Schärfe bekämpfte, bildet für diese Auffassung durchaus kein Hindernis. Hier entscheidet der Interpret diktatorisch, was reformatorisch ist und was nicht. Dieser Luther gestattet viel leichter als der spätere, der durch seine großen Veröffentlichungen gleichsam unter Aufsicht der Öffentlichkeit steht, daß man ihn je nach Bedarf verwende. Vor allem sprengte er noch nicht wie der von Marburg 1529 die ‚Einheitsfront des Protestantismus‘, sientemal Zwingli damals noch Feldprediger und überhaupt noch kein ‚Protestantismus‘ da war. Und vor allem scheint die Theologie jener Vorlesungen noch Raum zu lassen für die These, Calvin sei Luthers ‚treuester Schüler‘ gewesen. Der Leser wird dabei finden, daß auch die Kirchengeschichte nicht ohne Humor ist. Denn die Rolle des ‚treuesten Schülers‘ Luthers wurde einst, von dem alten reformierten Heppie ausgerechnet, demjenigen zugedacht, der angeblich das Luthertum schuf, das heute mit dem jungen Luther aufs Haupt geschlagen werden soll, nämlich — Melanchthon, allerdings demjenigen Melanchthon, der von seinen lutherischen Gegnern mit dem Kryptocalvinismus in Verbindung gebracht wurde.“ E.

**Union of Episcopalians and Greek Orthodox Christians.** — Our journal before this has commented on efforts which are being made to unite the Anglican Church and the Greek Catholics. A report in the *Living Church* says that the first report of the joint commission of theologians of the two groups mentioned brings union a step nearer to reality. The Nicene Creed, so we are told, was accepted as a declaration of the common faith of the two communions. With respect to the *Filioque* the two parties agreed on the statement that the words “and the Son” do not imply the existence of two sources of being in the Triune Godhead. The Holy Scriptures, “giving us divine revelation,” are defined as consisting of the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament, while the Apocrypha are re-



ceived as "matter to be read for instruction and edification, but not for the settlement of ecclesiastical dogmas." On the question of the relation between the Holy Scriptures and tradition a compromise paragraph was adopted, reading thus: "Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the holy tradition by the guidance of the Spirit residing in the Church." The caution was added: "We agree with nothing contained in tradition (*i. e.*, as the word has been defined) that is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be logically defined and distinguished, yet they cannot be separated from each other or from the Church." It will be seen that here the principle for which Protestantism fought some of its mightiest battles, the supremacy of the Scriptures, is virtually surrendered. With regard to rites or customs the commission agreed on the principle that every Christian ought to follow the use of the Church to which he may belong. If this is not made a yoke, we need not take exception to it. On the number of Sacraments the Anglicans seem to have surrendered, the report saying that they readily admitted that the rites looked upon as Sacraments by Catholics besides Baptism and the Lord's Supper have the character of Sacraments and are properly so called. The *Living Church* jubilantly states that great progress has been made since the exchange of letters in 1869 between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Patriarch of Constantinople, from which the modern movement toward union of the two churches is said to date. The Commission's draft of articles of agreement of course has to be ratified before it has binding force. A.

**Church-Membership in Germany.**—During the last few years church-membership in Germany, more especially in Berlin, has shown a remarkable decline. The reason for this is chiefly the economic depression and the consequent poverty. The state claims 20 per cent. of the income, and the assessment papers of church-members another 10 per cent. For many this is impossible. In 1927, 36,700 members of the 3,000,000 belonging to the Protestant Church in Berlin laid down their membership. In 1928 the number increased to 46,000; in 1929, to 50,500; in 1930, to 59,300. In the Roman Catholic Church the figures are in proportion. Of the 400,000 Roman Catholics in Berlin 4,500 resigned membership in 1927, 5,600 in 1928, 6,600 in 1929, and 6,800 in 1930. In Berlin there are about 177,000 Jews, of whom about 560 break their connection with the synagog every year. During the last five years 260,700 Potestants, 30,400 Roman Catholics, and 3,410 Jews have left their respective churches.

*Ev. News Bureau in Holland.*

**Egypt's Ambassador to the United States.**—The recently appointed ambassador of Egypt to the United States, Seostris Sideroes Pasha, is known in Egypt as the head of one of the oldest Roman Catholic families. The house of the new ambassador in Cairo contains a complete chapel, where the Mass is celebrated every day by a priest, while many of the same faith are present at the service. The new ambassador was received in audience by the Pope before his departure for America. It is somewhat remarkable that the by no means Christian Egypt should have sent so pronounced a witness of the Christian faith as its ambassador to America.

*Ev. News Bureau in Holland.*