

10-1-1932

## 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 106.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol3/iss1/106>

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. — Kirχlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.**


---

**I. Amerika.**

**"Lutheranism's Greatest Little Book."**—In an article published in the *Lutheran* for May 19, entitled "As in a Schoolroom," Dr. J. W. Horine writes on the value of "Lutheranism's greatest little book." He takes for his text Dr. Krauth's description of a picture depicting the story of Luther's Small Catechism: "The second result is shown in a scene in a schoolroom in which the Catechism has been introduced. Luther sits in the midst of the children, teaching them the First Article of the Creed. Jonas is distributing the book among them, and in the background a number of teachers listen that they may learn to carry out this new feature in their calling." Dr. Horine writes: "Several expressions are used here which call for comment. The first is the phrase 'a scene in a schoolroom.' . . . If Luther was a Reformer in the sphere of religion, he was a pioneer and pathfinder in the field of education. 'Luther is the father of popular education, its principles and its methods, and his influence has shaped the system of education throughout the civilized world up to this day.' It does not escape us that Luther's interest in this work was primarily religious: with him the general benefit resulting to the individual and the state from the education of its citizens was only secondary. For one thing, if the Bible was to be read by the 'ordinary Christian,' the ordinary Christian must be taught to read. For another thing, Luther knew very well that education 'changes the size, but not the sort,' that 'your biggest rascal is your educated rascal,' that education as such is no guarantee of thinking upon the things which are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, but that these things, in the thoughts of the heart and the habits of the life, are the direct fruit of the sanctifying Word of God. Therefore Luther would countenance no school divorced from religion; therefore he declared: 'Above all, in schools of whatever description, the chief and most common lesson should be the Scripture. Where the Holy Scriptures do not rule I advise no one to send his child'; and *therefore Luther prepared his Small Catechism.*

"We are ready, then, for the second expression used by Dr. Krauth—'a scene in a schoolroom in which the Catechism has been introduced.' . . . No one more earnestly than Luther urged upon parents the importance of home-training and their solemn duty to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and therefore he prepared his Small Catechism and placed it in the hands of the head of the family *first*, whose first duty it was to instruct his own children, and directed that it be so used and taught by him. But what will you? In our own day there are heads of families who read several newspapers a day and who give absolutely no religious instruction to their children, neither by means of Luther's Small Catechism nor by any other means. And in Luther's day there were parents just as slothful and neglectful, plus the disadvantage (and in so far the excuse) that they were illiterate. What if the head of the family was unable to read and to teach or was otherwise unready



and unfit? He sent his children to the school to be taught; and that is how Luther's Catechism got in the school: not finding the child (for whom it was designed) at home, it followed and overtook him in the person of the scholar. This proceeding leads us to remark that, where the parochial school, in which the Catechism is daily taught, has given place to the Sunday-school (a sorry substitute, by the way), in which the Catechism is seldom taught, it would be to the great advantage of the Sunday-school, to the teachers and scholars, to divide the time between the teaching of the Bible and the teaching of the Catechism. In May, 1530, just one year after the Catechism appeared, Luther can write to the Elector of Saxony: 'Now the tender youth of both sexes are growing up so well instructed in the Catechism and the Bible that it does my heart good to see how the girls and boys can pray and believe and speak more of God and Christ than formerly any religious foundation, cloister, or school could or yet can.' That was when the Catechism was studied and learned in *school*. Nowadays it is not often that it does a pastor's heart good to find the boys and girls in the catechetical class 'so well instructed in the Catechism and the Bible.' And yet the Catechism, in its original intention, was a simple introduction to Christianity, a text-book for the instruction mainly of children. Hence this scene in the schoolroom, in which the Catechism has been introduced and Luther is seen sitting in the midst of the children teaching them the First Article of the Creed. It was not a catechetical class he was teaching. The reservation of the Catechism to the catechetical class and the requirement of a knowledge of it for confirmation is to transfer the Catechism from the beginning of religious instruction to its end. . . .

"At this point some one will say: 'You have spoken of the Bible and the Catechism, the Catechism and the Bible; that is putting the Catechism on the same plane with Scripture.' No, we answer, not quite, but on the plane next below it. The Scriptures, of course, are supreme, but of the principal parts of the Catechism—the Ten Commandments are in the words of Scripture, the Creed is consonant with the doctrine of Scripture, the Lord's Prayer is a verbal citation of Scripture, and so much of Scripture enters into the Sacrament of Baptism and likewise the Sacrament of the Altar that these two parts are a virtual paraphrase. It is no wonder therefore that in the Formula of Concord the Catechism is called 'the Bible of the laity,' forasmuch as in it 'the Christian doctrine from God's Word is comprised in the most correct and simple way and, in like manner, is sufficiently explained for simple laymen.' It is no wonder that Luther himself, than whom no one ever revered the Scriptures more highly and adhered to them more solely and wholly, once declared that he would be willing for all his books to perish save the Catechism and his treatise on the Unfree Will, and furthermore declared that in the Catechism 'are comprehended the entire contents of the Christian doctrine which it is needful for the Christian to know for his salvation.' . . .

"This article is already too long, but to omit mention of the contents of the Small Catechism would be to commit a catechetical sin almost unpardonable. . . . It is a model of simplicity and completeness. It leaves out nothing necessary and admits nothing superfluous. Its language is devout, almost devotional. One has said of it, it is a book which can be *prayed*. . . . But perhaps more remarkable still is this, that throughout



the Catechism the catechumen makes *personal* application and appropriation of the saving truth, or rather, perhaps, places himself in a personal relation to the God and Giver of that truth. For this is the significance of 'the pronouns of the Catechism,' of the 'Thou' of the commandments, the 'I' and 'My' and 'Me' of the Creed, the 'We' and 'Us' of the Lord's Prayer, the 'Thee' of Holy Baptism and the 'You' of the Holy Communion. . . ." The *Lutheran* says: "The article is timely." We regret that on account of our limited space only portions of it could be here submitted. E.

**Theology Adjusting Itself to "Science."**—The modern theologian, who insists that theology must be in agreement with science, is not, as a rule, thinking of science, but of speculative philosophy. He does not, usually, attempt to show how the advance of science, the discovery of new facts, modifies the teaching of the Bible. He did not add a new chapter to Christian dogmatics on the strength of Colonel Lindbergh's flight across the ocean five years ago. Nor does he find that the feat of Mrs. Amelia Earhart Putnam, the first woman to make a solo airplane flight across the Atlantic, on May 21, has any bearing on Biblical theology. He may cogitate on the essential equality of the male and the female, but he will hardly on the strength of this achievement go about revising 1 Tim. 2, 12. What is back in his mind is the idea that theology, in conflict with the modern world-view erroneously based on the advance of science, must be brought into harmony with it. He will frequently give plain expression to this idea, and the following quotation, illustrating our point, also shows to what extent he is willing to revise theology. It is taken from a sermon delivered by Dr. George R. Dodson, minister of the Church of the Unity, St. Louis, at the "May meetings" of the Unitarians in Boston. "Traditional Christianity was based upon a world-view. It proclaimed a scheme of redemption which was a great process extending from the creation of the world to the Judgment. This venerable world-view, now dead or moribund, has been replaced by another. We are to-day concerned to know what is man's place in the universe and what will be the probable cosmic fate of the supreme values. We look down the long vistas of evolution in order that we may discover, and work with, the upward tendencies in the universe, and then we look in the other direction that we may, if possible, discern the goal toward which we may hopefully strive to climb. What o'clock is it in the evolution of religion? What is the stage of development that we have reached? . . . The second great event which has taken place in the religious thought of educated men in the recent past is the clear realization of the fact that we are not merely spectators of the process of evolution. We have definitely left behind the *laissez-faire* theory that progress will take place automatically and that we can 'sit back and let evolution do it.' It is true that most progress of the past was not due to human planning and that it has been understood only after the event. Mankind has been pushed up; but it grows ever clearer that, if we are to keep in the ascending path, we must henceforth climb.—We have heard of the man who wished he had been present at Creation, as he would have liked to make a few suggestions. Well, evolution means that creation is still going on, that we are present and that we are making suggestions which are effective. We are remaking plants, animals, sciences,



arts, institutions, and laws and are revising the ideals which led us on. We can discern and work with the upward tendencies in the universe. With the Christ of the fourth gospel each of us can say, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'"  
E.

**A New Denomination Planned.** — The following item we take over from the *Christian Century*: —

"Announcement is made that definite preliminary steps have been taken by commissions of the Unitarian and Universalist churches to organize the 'Free Church of America' as an aid to extending by united action a program of religious liberalism in this country. The new Church would provide an opportunity for other liberal religious groups and independent churches to enter into a 'working fellowship.' Each denomination would keep its own name and organization, but the elimination of duplication would be sought. The commissions have been at work on the plan for six months. The plan is an enlargement of the original proposal to merge the Unitarian and Universalist churches; the present proposal looks toward cooperation in church extension, in social amelioration and reform, and in recruiting a larger number of able men for the ministry. The plan is to be presented for the consideration of the conventions of the two communions. Among the members of the commissions are Dr. Louis C. Cornish, president of the American Unitarian Association, Dr. John Howland Lathrop of Brooklyn, and Dr. Frank D. Adams of Detroit." A.

**News from Two Protestant Conventions.** — The *Methodists* held their quadrennial meeting in Atlantic City. From the newspapers and church journals we gather that the chief topic of discussion was retrenchment and adjustment to the present economic situation. In the Methodist Church a number of papers are being published which bear the name *The Christian Advocate*. The convention resolved to eliminate one half of these *Christian Advocates*, retaining three of them, one to be published in New York, the second in Kansas City, and the third in San Francisco. The salaries of bishops were reduced from \$7,200 a year, each, to \$6,000, "with allowances for house rent, traveling, and secretarial help," as the *Christian Century* informs us. There was a distinct modernistic trend noticeable, as is evident from this report taken from the same source: "A commission on the revision of the Church's ritual reported, and its work was approved. The changes made by this commission, while relatively few, are significant. The marriage ceremony, for instance, has been freed of a phrase not always tending to edification: 'with my worldly goods I thee endow'; and no reference is made either to the institution of marriage 'in the time of man's innocency' or the wedding-feast at Cana. The challenge and warning to the congregation and the principles touching possible impediments to the marriage are deleted. In the burial service the words of committal have lost all suggestion of 'earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust,' and there is nothing said about the resurrection of the body. Some will miss these and other familiar passages, though their vanishing is real gain." The reporter is one of the people who do not believe in the resurrection of the body or in the story of man as recorded in Genesis, and he therefore rejoices in the elimination of statements which touch on these matters. If one of the purposes of the depression is to bring us closer to



the Word of God and make us more faithful to it, this purpose has not yet been realized in the case of the majority of the delegates who constituted the Methodist convention.

The *Presbyterians* (Northern Presbyterians) met in Denver. History has repeated itself touching the election of a moderator. The candidate of the Fundamentalists, who were attacking the "machine," which is largely liberal, was not elected, nor did the outspoken Liberals succeed in placing their candidate in the chair. A Fundamentalist was elected, Dr. Kerr, who, however, as the reporter in the *Christian Century* informs us, is of the gentle kind and places more emphasis "on his religion than on his theology." When the question arose whether the Presbyterians should continue to support the Federal Council of Churches, there was a sharp division of opinion, but a resolution prevailed which favored adoption of a budget including the Federal Council item. Two men, Dr. H. M. Griffiths and Dr. Edwin J. Reinke, described as militant Fundamentalists, were unsuccessful in their earnest endeavors to make the Presbyterians withdraw from the Federal Council of Churches. Their arguments emphasizing the untrustworthiness of the leadership of the Federal Council, the birth-control scandal, and the necessity of economy proved unavailing. Their protest against remaining in the Federal Council was simply recorded. The only positive gain, if it can be called such, which these men achieved was that "the assembly did ask for greater care in the radio program of the Council and a reorganization of the Council committees." The report does not indicate that these men fought their battle on the basis of the Scriptures, pointing to the false teachings which are sponsored by prominent men in the Federal Council of Churches.

As to missionary endeavors, we are told that the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (the official name of the Northern Presbyterians) is one of the few churches which have not curtailed their foreign missionary work during the last year. One of its leaders told the convention that "not one missionary has been withdrawn, not one furlough has been prolonged, not one station has been closed, and sixty new missionaries have been sent to the field." This is truly remarkable in the face of unfavorable economic conditions. The reporter in the *Christian Century* informs us that "this has been accomplished in spite of a loss of \$355,000 in contributions during the past year from living donors. There was a deficit of only \$65,000. This fine record was made possible by gain through foreign exchange, the curtailment of capital expenditures, and the raising of the 'no retreat fund.' The entire staff of the Foreign Missions Board at the home base contributed ten per cent. of their salary to this fund." The forty years of service which Dr. Robert Speer has given to foreign missionary work were recognized by the convention.

As was to be expected, the assembly reaffirmed its "unequivocal endorsement of the Eighteenth Amendment" and called "upon the state and the nation to make effective the enforcement of its supporting laws." With its complaint that "inaneities, imbecilities, immoralities, and obscenities" are terms characterizing what is being offered the people in the moving-picture shows we find ourselves in agreement. It was urged in the report that came before the convention that Federal action should be taken to prevent the showing of such harmful films and that local organizations



should be established which are to inspect the films before they are produced before the public. What is more important is that pastors and teachers warn those committed to their care against the evils lurking in wicked moving pictures.

A.

**The Presbyterian Moderator Calls the Methodist Bishop to Order.** — It so happened that the same issue of a St. Louis daily carried these two items: "Montreat, North Carolina, May 26. — The Rev. William Crowe, D. D., St. Louis, Mo., was elected moderator by the Seventy-second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States here this afternoon. . . . The St. Louis minister, invited to open the assembly by Dr. R. A. Dunn, the retiring moderator and layman, pleaded for a personal type of evangelism as the only 'guarantee of the future of the Church.' 'National Prohibition,' he said, is an achievement for the American people. But it is no business of the Church of Jesus Christ in its organized capacity to promote the addition of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Nor is it the business of the Church of Jesus Christ in its organized capacity to assume the responsibility of defeating any candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Instead of spiritualizing business and politics, the Church is bent upon the secularizing of the gospel of Christ. . . ." — "Washington, May 26. — Bishop James Cannon, Jr., declared to-day that, should either the Republican or Democratic convention, or both, 'take unfair or unprecedented action on the Prohibition question,' organized dries would insist that the people ignore such action in electing their Senators and Representatives next fall. As chairman of the Board of Temperance and Social Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Bishop Cannon sent a letter to every Senator and Representative saying the 'extreme limit' to which the organized Prohibitionists would go in the party platforms would be to declare for 'vigorous, efficient enforcement,' and further, 'that, whenever the people desire to amend or to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment, etc., etc.'" E.

**How the Catholics Refute the Doctrine of Justification by Faith Alone.** — "*Catholic Belief.* By Very Rev. J. Faà Di Bruno, D. D. Five hundred and fiftieth thousand." This booklet is offered for sale in the vestibule of the St. Louis cathedral. It bears the *nihil obstat* of the *Censor Librorum* and the *Imprimatur* of John M. Farley, Archbishop of New York. We are very willing to give it wide publicity and help to swell its sale by a few more thousand copies. It will serve a good purpose to make men acquainted with the kind of arguments that the archbishop considers convincing. The Catholic spokesman says: "Luther admitted that justification and salvation by faith alone was a new doctrine; for in his comments on 1 Cor. 5 he was vain enough to speak of himself as one 'to whom the mystery of genuine faith, hidden from former ages in God, had been revealed.' But having determined to introduce his newly invented doctrine of justification by a mere reliance on Christ for pardon, which he called faith, and despairing to find another text that could serve his purpose better than the text of St. Paul, Rom. 3, 28: 'For we account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the Law,' thought of making this text the great bulwark of his new doctrine; and being at the same time fully convinced that even this text was insufficient to establish his



new principle, he betook himself to the mad expedient of corrupting this passage, adding the word *alone* to the word *faith* in order to make it appear that saving faith was not only in contrast to the works of the Old Law, called by St. Paul the *law of works*, but also to the deeds of the New Law, called by the same holy apostle the *law of faith*, that thus it might help him to start a new method of justification by faith alone. People remonstrated with him on every side on this account; even his fellow-reformer Zwinglius accused him in these sharp words: 'Luther, thou corruptest the Word of God. Thou art seen to be a manifest and common corrupter and perverter of Holy Scripture.' But it was of no avail. Despairing to find one text in the whole Scripture to prop efficiently his device and seeing the necessity of introducing this word '*alone*' in order to give this passage the appearance of favoring his novel principle of justification by faith *alone*, he declared unblushingly that this word should remain in spite of everything and of everybody; and this on no other but his own authority and for no other reason than his own will. . . . To show the unfairness of taking the word *faith* occurring in Holy Scripture in this new Protestant sense of *trust in Christ for pardon, to the exclusion of any other disposition or means*, and not in the Catholic sense of belief in revealed truths, which belief virtually implies the use of all dispositions, *trust included*, and of all proper means, allow me to use the following illustration: Suppose a man afflicted with a grave disease sends for a physician of repute. The physician comes and prescribes and, to inspire the patient with more confidence, tells him, 'Only believe in me, and you will be cured.' Can we suppose that the poor sufferer on the departure of the physician would say: I shall take no medicine, for the physician said, 'Only believe, and you will be cured'? . . . The Catholic Church teaches the necessity of faith, or belief in revelation, of hope, or trust, fear and love of God, humility, repentance, purpose to observe the commandments and application of the Sacraments to obtain justification. Her teaching accords with Holy Scripture, while the Protestant theory of justification by *faith alone* is not according to Scripture rightly interpreted, but is opposed to it. . . . That St. Paul in these passages, by the expression *without the works of the Law*, did not exclude other dispositions except faith, but implied them in the word *faith*, is made still more clear by other passages of his, in which he also attributes justification to hope, charity, fear of God, penance, willingness to keep the Law, and Holy Baptism. Thus, with regard to hope he says: 'We are saved by hope,' Rom. 8, 24. As to charity he says: '*If I have ALL faith* (therefore also what Protestants call saving faith), *so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing*,' 1 Cor. 13, 2. Again, the faith that availeth is a '*faith that worketh by charity*,' Gal. 5, 6. As to penance he says: '*For the sorrow that is according to God worketh PENANCE steadfast UNTO SALVATION*,' 2 Cor. 7, 10. As to willingness to keep the Commandments, St. Paul says: '*The doers of the law [of faith] shall be JUSTIFIED*,' Rom. 2, 13. Again: '*Know you not that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are whom you obey, whether it be of sin unto death or of OBEDIENCE UNTO JUSTICE?*' Rom. 6, 16. . . . In a sermon on '*Justification by Faith*,' preached in 1812 by Mr. Jabez Bunting and published at the request of the Methodist Conference the preacher devotes a full page to



prove that justification is nothing else in itself than the pardon of our sins. But regeneration and therefore justification and pardon of sins, given for the first time, are clearly attached by our Lord to the Sacrament of Baptism, John 3, 5, which is emphatically styled by St. Paul 'the laver of regeneration,' Titus 3, 5; and again our Lord Jesus Christ has plainly and peremptorily attached the pardoning of sins at other times to the sacramental absolution of the priest, John 20, 21—23, and not to mere *trusting*; though *hope* or *trust in God* is in itself one of the necessary dispositions, never to be omitted on coming to the Sacrament of Penance." Our pen is balking. But the passages transcribed give a fair idea of how the Catholic theologian treats Scripture and his readers. E.

**Controversy about Militarism and Military Training.** — Often it is held that those people who insist on purity of doctrine are the ones who are responsible for all the quarrels and the strife in the Church. Let those who entertain such a view read the account the *Christian Century* publishes of a violent dissension involving members of churches belonging to the Federal Council. The scene of action is Portland, Oregon.

"The question of militarism in education has been much to the front during the past two months in the Pacific Northwest. It came up in Seattle when a large mass-meeting asked the school board to close the schools to military officials engaged in promoting citizens' training-camps. The board compromised by permitting the officials to visit the schools, but only when not in uniform. This action resulted in much feeling on the part of the American Legion, which adopted resolutions about the 'direct insult' and 'affront' thus shown to the uniform of the country and the principles of the organization. The potent influence of Dr. Mark A. Matthews, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, was thrown on this side of the controversy. In a sermon he asserted that 'war has been declared by the forces of evil and bolshevism against the institutions of God and America.' As a chaplain in the officers' reserve corps, with the rank of lieutenant colonel, he exclaimed, 'May God paralyze my tongue if ever it should dishonor the uniform of my country!' The next day the papers carried a front-page statement cogently giving the Christian position on war and condemning the attitude of Dr. Matthews. It was signed by four leading pastors — E. A. Fridell, First Baptist Church; M. O. Sansbury, First Christian Church; F. W. Shorter, Pilgrim Congregational; and L. W. Taylor, Ballard Presbyterian. The parent-teachers' councils of the city and county took their place with these four pastors. At the same time a group of ministers in the eastern part of Washington, headed by Rev. R. B. Shaw of Spokane, started a movement to secure signatures to an initiative bill which would prohibit compulsory military training."

A.

**What the Unitarian Thinks when He Thinks about Jesus.** — A communication to the *Christian Century*, March 30, 1932, reads: "Editor the *Christian Century*: Sir: The sketch, 'Suppose,' by E. Robb Zaring in the *Christian Century* for March 16, assumes that, if Jesus, instead of being crucified in youth, had lived to old age, the doctrines which He preached would never have taken root among mankind. Is this assumption justified? Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed all lived to an advanced age and died naturally. Their teachings survive. Certainly Mr. Zaring



does not mean to imply that the teachings of Jesus were so much less vital than these other religions that only a martyr's death could assure the survival of the teachings of Jesus. It is true that a martyr's death does add glory to the name of a great personality, but not unless the person in question is great enough to impress his teachings upon the world in any event. The outstanding greatness of Jesus is attested by the fact that He accomplished His work in so short a time, and that before His powers could have become fully matured. Surely He would have accomplished a far greater work could He have labored thirty years instead of three. Charles G. Girelius, Jamestown, N. Y."

The heading of the letter, supplied, we presume, by the editor, "Was the Crucifixion Necessary?" is somewhat cryptic. E.

On Deut. 18, 10—12. — "While it is true that a considerable substratum of gullible folks have had traffic with soothsaying in all ages, the curious fact is that we are to-day witnessing a recrudescence of superstition considerably broader than the weakness of an occasional nitwit for mild forms of sorcery. It has become a mass pilgrimage to the oldest of shrines. John Mulholland, vice-president of the Society of American Magicians, is authority for the statement that there are to-day 100,000 fortune-tellers of various brands in the United States. Over one hundred broadcasting stations in different sections of the country employ soothsayers. The amount paid for the services of these astrologers, clairvoyants, numerologists, palmists, and the like, reaches the humiliating total of \$125,000,000 annually. Of this sum, Mr. Mulholland estimates that \$25,000,000 comes from New York city alone. . . .

"Recently in New York, a city which always manages to look with severity and disdain upon the rest of the country, the tenants of a fashionable apartment house began breaking their leases. . . . The agitation was traced to the wives of the place: a prominent numerologist in the city had told the ladies that the house number at that address brought static to their destiny. . . . Ranking next to astrology in popularity at the moment is this hoary and putative science of numerology, of calculating destiny by the aerobatics of number. It is said by its lyrical exponents to have been handed down from remotest antiquity and to have been used among the Assyrians, the Greeks, and the Egyptians. . . . Certain vibrations, it appears, are set in motion when a person or a city or a corporation or a speak-easy is named, 'and it is only by knowledge and wisdom that we can govern, direct, and adjust ourselves to these vibrations.' It's all a matter of the name and the number your name gives you. And, say the numerologists, 'you can change your luck by changing your name.' So you see that the women at the fashionable New York address had every cause for grave concern when they discovered how poorly they vibrated under an ominous house number." Then follows a discussion of palmistry, phrenology, and tea-leaf prophecy. (*Christian Century*, March 30, 1932.)

"Astrology enjoys in this age of garish enlightenment a vogue it has not experienced since the clammy days of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when it was the dominating influence at the courts of Europe. . . . When Miss Evangeline Adams came from Boston to New York in 1899, she was denied admittance to the first hotel she entered; the proprietor would have none of her magic. That was thirty-two years ago. . . . Now



her charge is \$50 for a single consultation at her renowned studio in Carnegie Hall, New York." Follows a partial list of her notable clients, embracing the names of some of America's leaders in business and politics. "Miss Adams broadcasts her Babylonian patter three nights a week over an imposing hook-up of ten radio stations, and she enjoys a fan mail comparable to that lately conferred upon Amos 'n' Andy. . . . One astrologer in Chicago has induced a hundred regular clients, all of them business men, to pay him \$1,000 apiece annually. . . . In California an astrologer recently sent out over radio an offer to read gratis the horoscope of any person who would write in. He received 100,000 letters as a result of a single broadcast. Later he enlarged his appeal in a come-on circular, offering fuller information for \$4, and drew 30,000 replies." (*The Christian Century*, February 17, 1932.)

"The ancient Babylonians felt positive that they could divine the fate and future of human beings from the position of the sun, moon, and planets, and the ancient Greeks thought so, too. So did the ancient Romans and all the nations of Europe during the Middle Ages as well as in recent times; and I have heard from several sources that in America and in England, too, for that matter, there are literally thousands of bankers and statesmen and prominent men of all sorts who refuse to take any important step without first consulting an astrologer to find out whether the stars are auspicious. . . .

"Occasionally the best of astrologers had a bit of trouble, especially in predicting the end of the world. Several of the great ones, including a top-notch named Stöffler, figured that in 1524 the planets were going to be so situated that the world would be destroyed by a deluge. Great preparations were made to offset this cataclysm, especially in France, which has always gone in heavily for preparedness. President Auriol at Toulouse, according to the records, even built himself a magnificent Noah's ark, with the intention of diverting himself with a yachting party during the wet season. In London almost the entire population moved out into the country and provided itself with fence rails, blown-up bladders, and other life-saving apparatus in order to keep afloat as long as possible. Apparently Stöffler and his colleagues had made a slight error, as 1524 was an extremely dry year; and President Auriol never even got his ark into the water. When the astrologers went over their figures, they found that they should have said 1624 instead of 1524. . . ." (Kenneth Roberts, in *Saturday Evening Post*, April 23, 1932.)

"What has taken place under the very nose of modern science is but a relapse into superstition of ill repute before Moses. . . . A generation taunted away from piety has gone to the witch for comfort. . . . The methods of the astrologers have the smell of science and the compulsion of religion. It is this two-edged appeal of astrology which accounts for its wide popularity in an age of disenchantment when the irreligious must have a sanctuary." (*The Christian Century*, February 17, 1932.)

"Believing the stars is idolatry, against the First Commandment." (*Luther*, St. L. Ed., XXII, p. 1553.) "*Dominus Philippus, inquit Doctor, he delayed me for a day at Smalcald with his wretched and shabby astrologia, quia erat novilunium. Sic etiam he would not at one time cross the Elbe in novilunio. Et tamen nos sumus domini stellarum.*" (Weimar Ed., *Tischreden*, IV, No. 5147.)

E.



**A Roman Catholic Awakening in Mexico.** — The *N. L. O. Bulletin* carries the following item under the caption "Catholic Mass Instruction in Mexico": —

The April 30, 1932, issue of *America*, a Catholic review of the week, contains an interesting account of how Catholics in Mexico carried out a crusade to instruct the masses in the doctrines and history of the Church, as follows: —

"The Catholic clergy and laity of Mexico carried out, from May to October of last year, one of the most remarkable pieces of mass instruction in Catholic doctrine in the history of the Church. Says their report: —

"The plan originally was to explain to the largest possible number of persons the divinity of Jesus Christ and the divine origin of the Church, with the idea that, if these sublime truths would succeed in restoring the image of Christ, the Redeemer, to the minds of the faithful, the latter could then better take part in the fourth centenary of the Shrine of Guadalupe (in December, 1931).

"This plan was realized. In every part of the Mexican Republic lectures, instructions, and catechism classes were held in accordance with the synoptic plan of development. But more than that took place.' In a few words: —

"The number of catechism classes already established was not only doubled, but in many places increased many times over.

"The attendance at all classes was notably increased.

"Catechism classes were established in rural parishes, on the ranches, in various small places which were heretofore without means of religious instruction.

"A large number of classes for adults were organized and were splendidly attended, especially by the men. Young men of sixteen years and older came to them by the hundreds.

"Besides this there was a remarkable distribution of literature; particularly remarkable for a country in Mexico's present condition. There were distributed: 5,000 copies of the general plan of campaign; 18,000 copies of the statistical questionnaire; 82,000 copies of the *Bulletin*; 88,000 posters (which were sent to 1,912 churches, as well as to all the organizations. These showed in graphic form the need of religious instruction, of "learning about Jesus Christ"); 380,000 leaflets — in all, 573,000 pieces of propaganda printed and distributed by the Central Commission during the Campaign of Instruction for Jesus Christ and His Church.

"Besides these, 50,000 copies of the gospels, in Spanish, were sold in the course of four months. These were so successful that 20,000 more were printed and are now on sale. The total cost of the campaign was \$12,176.22.

"One hundred and one parishes reported an attendance at catechism classes of 97,429 persons (of whom 11,143 were men of sixteen years and over). Sixty-five parishes reported at religious classes 11,820 persons (2,332 men, ditto). Thirty-four parishes reported at religious study clubs: 1,476 persons (518 men, ditto). Fifty-seven parishes reported at lectures on religion: 136,276 persons (33,467 men, ditto).



"The following good works were offered up for the success of the crusade: Masses, 20,080; Communion, 19,525; various prayers, 111,004; rosaries, 26,507; nocturnal adorations, 650; hours of labor, 5,614; visits to the blessed Sacrament, 20,407; visits to Our Lady, 10,462; acts of charity, 5,154,088; other acts of virtue, 38,026; spiritual communions, 55,108; aspirations, 271,500; acts of sacrifice, 86,440; hours of hair-shirt, 233; fasts, 961; almsgivings, 170.

"This is the story of only what was done in one diocese."

It is saddening to observe that in this so-called awakening superstition and anti-Scriptural doctrine play a tremendous rôle. A.

**Mexikos Kirchenstreit.** Hierüber berichtet der „Christliche Apologete“: „Erzbischof Francisco Orozco y Jimenez von Guadalupe wurde zum drittenmal aus Mexiko ausgewiesen. Er wurde abgefaßt und in einem Flugzeug nach einem unbekanntem Bestimmungsort in den Vereinigten Staaten gebracht. Sein Verschwinden wurde zuerst von seinen Verwandten bekanntgegeben. Der Bericht wurde später bestätigt. — Schon während der religiösen Zwistigkeiten der Jahre 1926 bis 1929 verschwand Erzbischof Orozco spurlos und wurde von der Regierung vergeblich gesucht. Nach dem Waffenstillstand zwischen Staat und Kirche tauchte er wieder auf und wanderte von Ort zu Ort. In einem Hirtenbrief an die katholischen Familienväter kündigte Erzbischof Pascual Diaz einen Boykott aller Mittelschulen der Regierung von Seiten der Katholiken an. Der Erzbischof erwähnte in seinem Brief, der im ganzen Bundesdistrikt im Druck verbreitet wurde, daß die Kirche sich infolge der durch die Verordnung des Präsidenten am 29. Dezember 1931 eingeleiteten Verweltlichung der Regierungsschulen gezwungen sehe, ihrer Jugend eine „christliche Erziehung“ zu sichern. Der Hirtenbrief kam etwas überraschend, da seit dem 1. Januar dieses Jahres, als das Gesetz in Kraft trat, das nur 25 Priester im Bundesdistrikt gestattet, vollkommene Ruhe herrschte. Kein katholischer Priester hat sich den Regierungsbestimmungen gefügt, so daß sämtliche Kirchen ohne Prediger sind.“ J. T. M.

**A Valuable Collection of Manuscripts.** — In one of our exchanges we read: "The finest set of early Christian manuscripts, second only to that in the British Museum and outrivaling the collections of the National libraries of Paris and Berlin and of Oxford and Cambridge, has just been accorded a new home in the Selly Oak Colleges library at Birmingham (England). They have been collected by Dr. A. Mingana, late of the Rylands Library, Manchester, and the building is the gift of Mr. Edward Cadbury of Birmingham. They consist of over two thousand Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Persian texts going back to A. D. 500." A.

## II. Ausland.

Sie suchen viele Künste. Warum hat Johannes nicht die Einsetzung des heiligen Abendmahls berichtet? In einer Artikelreihe, „Zur Echtheit des Johannesevangeliums“, die in der diesjährigen „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ erschienen ist und manches Gute bringt, beschäftigt sich der Verfasser auch mit dieser Frage. Es hätte doch wohl genügt, wenn dargelegt worden wäre, warum diese Sache mit der Echtheit des Evangeliums nichts zu tun hat. Statt dessen gibt man sich ab mit der Lösung nicht vorhandener Probleme und belastet die Theologie mit ganz unnötigem Weirwerk. Wollends



unausstehlich wird es, wenn man die dargebotene Lösung bezieht. Wenn wir nun auch unsere Zeitschrift mit der Wiedergabe des auffälligen Passus belasten, so hat das einen guten Zweck. Es wird zeigen, womit mancher der modernen Theologen seine Zeit hinbringt und — wie leicht er zu befriedigen ist. Der Passus lautet:

„Wie steht es mit dem Fehlen des Berichts vom heiligen Abendmahl bei Johannes? Schlatter sagt zu dieser Lücke bei Kap. 13 nur: ‚Daß Johannes bei der Fußwaschung die Stiftung eines Sakraments, etwa als Ersatz für das Mahl Jesu, beabsichtigt habe, läßt sich nicht denken, weil bei Johannes Jesus den Jüngern durch sein Waschen zeigt, was sie zu tun haben, damit ihre Gemeinschaft nicht zerbreche. Das trennt diesen Vorgang sowohl von der Taufe als vom Mahl Jesu, da diese Handlungen dem Jünger nicht das zeigen, was er tun soll, sondern das, was er empfange hat.‘ Ist es so, dann könnte man in der Fußwaschung als Aufgabe geradezu eine Ergänzung zum heiligen Abendmahl als Gabe sehen, und Johannes würde vielleicht dadurch stillschweigend das heilige Abendmahl zu Kap. 13, und zwar wohl zu 13, 30, voraussetzen. Das wäre eine sachliche Lösung des schwereren Berichtsproblems. Im übrigen findet Schlatter einen Ersatz für den bei Johannes fehlenden Abendmahlsbericht in der Bezogenheit von Joh. 6 auf das heilige Abendmahl: ‚Das ist Unterricht, den Johannes der Kirche über das Abendmahl gegeben hat. Er beschrieb ihr Jesus nicht [? d. Wf.] als den Stifter eines Sakraments, wohl aber als den, der sie durch seinen in den Tod gegebenen Leib mit dem Leben speist.‘ Wir wollen dazu aber auch auf einen älteren Erklärer hinweisen. Sartorius sagt in seinen ‚Meditationen über die Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Gottes‘: ‚An die Erwähnung des Hinausgehens des Verräters‘ (der Verrat des Judas wird auch im Bericht des Paulus, 1 Kor. 11, 23, in Zusammenhang mit der Stiftung des heiligen Abendmahls gebracht), in der Nacht (Joh. 13, 30) schließen sich bei Johannes die den Einsetzungsworten, die er nicht berichtet, wie zu einem feierlichen Vorwort dienenden Worte des Herrn, W. 31 f.: ‚Nun ist des Menschen Sohn verklärt, und Gott ist verklärt in ihm. Ist Gott verklärt in ihm, so wird ihn Gott auch verklären in sich und wird ihn bald‘ (*εὐθύς* = sogleich) ‚verklären.‘“ An diese Worte läßt sich sofort, wie an keinem andern Ort bei Johannes, ohne weiteren Zwischenatz das selbstverklärende Wort der Sakramentsstiftung anreihen: ‚Und er nahm das Brot, dankete, brach's.‘ Ist diese Vermutung unerlaubte Harmonisierung oder nicht vielmehr eine berechtigte Annahme? Denn daß der Verfasser des vierten Evangeliums vom heiligen Abendmahl gewußt und deshalb seine Einreihung irgendwo in seinem Bericht für möglich gehalten und sie dort den [christlichen] Lesern seines Buches überlassen hat, darf doch mit gutem Grunde behauptet werden.“ (Zu den Worten „Er nahm das Brot, dankete, brach's“ findet sich folgende Fußnote: „Siehe G. Speckl: ‚Was empfangen beim ersten Abendmahl die Jünger als *donum coeleste*?‘ In dieser Studie wird auch die merkwürdige Erscheinung, daß Johannes die Einsetzung der Taufe ebensowenig erwähnt als die des Abendmahls, in dem Sinne erklärt, daß Johannes die synoptischen Evangelien hierin nur ergänze, und zwar bedeutsam so, daß er ‚die grundlegenden Gedanken für das Verständnis der Sakramente aus den Reden des Herrn mitteilt‘ — für die Taufe Kap. 3, für das Abendmahl Kap. 6; dasselbe gilt



wohl wegen Joh. 20, 22 [Nehmet hin den Heiligen Geist] auch für die Pfingstgabe —, welche [die Reden Jesu] die Jünger befähigten, zu verstehen, um was es sich bei der Taufe sowie beim Abendmahle handle, als nun die Zeit für die Einsetzung der Sacramente gekommen war'. Auf diesen Zusammenhang deutet vielleicht auch die Formel ‚danke und brach's‘, die sich nicht nur bei der Stiftung des heiligen Abendmahls findet [Matth. 24, 26; Mark. 14, 22; Luk. 22, 19; 1 Kor. 11, 24], sondern schon vorher [Matth. 14, 19; 15, 36; Mark. 6, 41; 8, 6. 19; Luk. 9, 16] und nachher [Lu. 24, 50 und Act. 2, 42]; insbesondere ist, wenn Joh. 6 [Speisung der Fünftausend und die Rede Jesu in Kapernaum] sich auf das heilige Abendmahl bezieht, die Parallele Joh. 6 = Matth. 14, 19 = Mark. 6, 41 = Luk. 9, 16 beachtenswert.“ „Warum Johannes aber nicht selbst das heilige Abendmahl berichtet, dafür gibt Vornhäuser eine neue Erklärung (159 ff.): Johannes schweige vom Abendmahl (wie auch von der Taufe), weil es i n t e r n e, g e h e i m zuhaltende Gemeindefeiern gewesen seien, noch mehr als das jüdische Passahmahl eine interne Gemeindefeier war. Er schweige gerade deshalb, weil sein Evangelium M i s s i o n s s c h r i f t — und nur das — sein solle und wolle. „Was vom Abendmahl gilt, gilt ebenso von der Taufe. Erst ergeht die Missionspredigt an Israel. Auf das Ja zu ihr = „Jesus ist der Christus, der Herr“ folgt Taufe und Abendmahl; vgl. die alttestamentliche Arkandisziplin.“ Wieder scheint uns Vornhäusers Anregung sehr dankenswert zu sein. Seine These würde noch mehr gelten, wenn Johannes in Kap. 6 das heilige Abendmahl als geheimnisvolle geistleibliche Gabe verstanden haben sollte. Soll Vornhäuser recht haben, so müßten freilich die drei andern Evangelien, da sie einen Abendmahlsbericht enthalten, keine eigentlichen Missionschriften, sondern Schriften für C h r i s t e n gewesen sein. Für das Lukasevangelium ist dies wegen Luk. 1, 3 (Theophilus!) sehr wahrscheinlich, für Matthäus ebenfalls (vgl. z. B. Schlatters Matthäuskommentar: Matthäus sei für judenchristliche Gemeinden geschrieben); für Markus läßt es sich wohl auch wenigstens vermuten. Dann hebt sich das Johannesevangelium auch dadurch von den Synoptikern ab, daß es allein ausgesprochene M i s s i o n s s c h r i f t ist — vielleicht sogar die offizielle Missionschrift des Apostelkollegiums, die Synoptiker aber nicht; sie werden in erster Linie G e m e i n d e l e h r e, Christen- und Katechumenenunterricht sein.“

Wer von den modernen Theologen noch weiter Zeit hat, mag das Problem lösen: Warum hat Johannes nicht das Weihnachtsevangelium? warum nicht den Himmelfahrtsbericht? Warum hat Lukas die Einsetzung der heiligen Taufe nicht berichtet? Warum kennt Markus nicht das hohepriesterliche Gebet? Ja, und warum berichtet Matthäus nichts über die Fußwaschung? Aber, bitte, keine weiteren Künste! E.

Luther und die Erlebnis-theologie. Darüber teilt Ernst Sommerlath folgendes mit: „Solche Gedanken sind schon an Luther herangeraten. Mögen sie heute im Zeitalter des Erlebnisses und der Erlebnis-kultur sich breiter und leidenschaftlicher geltend machen, so hat sich schon Luther mit ihnen auseinandersetzen müssen. Wiederholt führt er die Rede der Gegner an: ‚Ja man sieht und fulet den nutz nicht‘; ‚ja man fulet und sieht's nicht.‘ (B. A. 23, 257. 259.) Er aber sieht darin eine falsche Haltung dem Tun Gottes gegenüber. Geistlicher Gebrauch ist nicht dasselbe wie ‚Erlebnis‘.



„Die wollten gerne tappen und fuhlen, auff das sie nicht glauben müssen.“ (L. c., 257.) — Ebenso hält sich der Glaube an das Wort des Abendmahls, das den Leib des Herrn verheißt. Christus' Leib ist wohl, an ihm selber eitel Leben, seligkeit und wol Gott, aber es bedarf nicht des Fühlens; der Glaube weiß, daß der Leib nütze sein muß, wenn Christus uns essen heißt. (L. c., 259.) Luther lehnt es somit deutlich ab, daß der Wert des Abendmahls bemessen werde an seinem Erlebnisgehalt. Ebensovienig wie das Sakrament nicht danach zu beurteilen ist, wie weit es rational begriffen werden kann, ebensovienig ist es danach zu werten, wie weit sich seine Wirkung gefühlsmäßig erfahren läßt. Dabei ist keine Frage, daß das Abendmahl Luther auch nach der Erlebnisseite hin tief bewegt hat; er hat etwas erfahren von ‚dem Leben und der Seligkeit‘, die in ihm gegeben wird. — Grundsätzlich ist aber bei der Frage, was das Abendmahl sei, der Gesichtspunkt des Erlebnisses auszuschalten. Das Erlebnis schein t nur etwas Sicheres und Festes zu bieten, wonach man ‚fuhlen und tappen‘ kann. Im Grunde trägt es immer wieder die Merkmale der Unsicherheit und Flüchtigkeit in sich. Das Sakrament dagegen stellt sich dar in der gleichmäßigen Dauer seines Inhalts. Es bietet etwas, was weit abliegt von seelischem Erleben, was auch unabhängig bleibt von dem Auf und Nieder des Erlebnisses: Leiblichkeit. Aber gerade darin kommt zum Ausdruck, daß es hier um mehr geht als um Erlebnis, nämlich um Leben. Nicht um Erlebnis, sondern um Leben ist es Luther zu tun. Wo Christus in Fleisch gewordener Leiblichkeit sich gibt, da ist Leben, weil er selbst Leben ist.“ (Der Sinn des Abendmahls, S. 72 f.) Sommerlath tut gut daran, daß er die Schwärmererei der Erlebnisethologie aufweist und dargetut, daß der Glaube sich allein auf das Wort gründen kann, das im Abendmahl die Vergebung der Sünden darbietet und durch Darreichung des Leibes und Blutes Christi versiegelt. Er tut aber nicht gut daran, daß er den Wert des Abendmahls in der „Leiblichkeit“ sieht und S. 122 seines Buches behauptet: „Das Abendmahl ist Inkarnation des Wortes und damit der Logos selbst.“ Diese Schwärmererei ist ebenso gefährlich wie die Gefühlschwärmererei. Der Leib Christi an sich tut es nicht, sondern der i n s W o r t gefaßte Leib. E.

Die Gottessohnschaft Jesu im tiefsten und eigentlichen Sinne der neulutherischen Theologie erschließt uns die „A. E. L. N.“ in einem Artikel über das „Jesusbuch“ von Paul Feine. Die Frage, was denn unter der Gottessohnschaft Jesu zu verstehen sei, beantwortet dieser in seinem Buch also: „Jesus ist sich bewußt, als Sohn den ganzen Gott, besser gesagt, den ganzen Heilswillen Gottes mit der Menschheit, zu kennen und an den Menschen zur Verwirklichung zu bringen. Dies Bewußtsein kann nur darin seinen Grund haben, daß Jesus sich in voller Einheit mit dem Wesen und Willen Gottes wußte, daß er dies Einheitsbewußtsein nicht besser ausdrücken konnte als in der Vater-Sohnesvorstellung. . . . Die Person Jesu, und zwar die irdisch-menschliche Person Jesu, ist von diesem neuen Gottesglauben untrennbar. . . . Jesus glaubte nicht nur an Gott, sondern er wußte sich in Gemeinschaft mit Gott stehend.“

Jesus ist also seiner Person nach nicht Gott, sondern Mensch. Er ist aber ein solcher Mensch, der nicht bloß an Gott glaubt, sondern auch weiß, daß er in Gemeinschaft mit Gott steht. Ja er weiß sich in voller Einheit mit dem Wesen und Willen Gottes. Und wenn er nun behauptet, daß er



der Sohn Gottes sei, so will er weiter nichts sagen, als daß er sich dieser seiner Gemeinschaft und Einheit mit Gott bewußt sei. Der Katechismus der Liberalen im Elsaß sagt daselbe in den Worten: „Jesus ist der Sohn Gottes, weil er in ununterwählender Gemeinschaft des Geistes und der Liebe mit Gott steht.“

Die „N. E. Z. N.“, die die obige Leugnung der Gottheit Christi zum Abdruck bringt, straft diese nicht bloß nicht, sondern lobt sie vielmehr und sagt, sie sei „ein schöner Beweis, daß echte theologische Wissenschaft den Dienst tun kann, im tiefsten Sinn die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments zu erschließen und neu zu verkündigen“.

(Der Elsässsische Lutheraner, Februar 1932.)

**Slavery Still Practised on a Large Scale in Africa.**—The following communication in the *Christian Century*, written by Henry Rising of Los Angeles, California, seems to be so important that we should reprint it here.

“Sir: New information on the status of slavery in Abyssinia (and incidentally in Arabia) was contained in a dispatch from London recently, which stated that Lord Noel Buxton, chairman of the Antislavery Society’s mission to Abyssinia, has returned with a promise from Emperor Haile Selassie that he would free all the 2,000,000 slaves in his country within fifteen years. Although fifteen years is a long time to bring about a condition which should take only one or two years, this ‘promise’ would not be so bad if the emperor is sincere. But is he? It will take fifteen years to find out.

“Lady Kathleen Simon, in her book *Slavery*, goes into the horrors of this subject. She states that the slave-traders’ armed column swoops at night on a village and the entire population of salable men, women, and children is carried off in chains. For days they are marched towards the coast, through Abyssinia and French Somaliland, right into the streets of Tajoura and Obok, and there shipped in dhows and carried across the Straits of Perim to Southern Arabia.

“Gangs of slaves, marching in misery, the men chained together in rows, and the women and children dragging themselves along beside the main body, can be seen by any traveler in Southern Abyssinia to-day. Some of the big slave-owners own as many as 15,000 slaves. A British officer counted the dead and dying bodies of more than fifty captives who had dropped by the roadside. Death would result from thirst and hunger or by wild animals. In Addis Ababa, the capital of Abyssinia, it is stated, there are more slaves than free men.

“How can the people in the Christian countries be aroused, so that a demand will be made for the liberty of the slaves in Abyssinia and Arabia at a reasonably early date? Why wait for fifteen weary years to end this monster? Will long petitions to the League of Nations or to the rulers of these countries accomplish anything? Is an antislavery society in America needed? What can be done for these 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 wretched slaves?”

A.



Aus der Hamburgischen Volkskirche. Die „Ev.-Luth. Freikirche“ vom 24. April 1932 entnimmt der Zeitschrift „Nur selig!“ folgendes: „Der Pastor Hennede, der in der Hamburgischen Volkskirche schon vor vier Jahren öffentlich die Grundwahrheiten des christlichen Glaubens geleugnet hatte, damals aber ruhig im Amte bleiben konnte, ist jetzt dazu übergegangen, in seinem Blatte, dem ‚St. Nikolai-Woten‘, das er auch an seine Konfirmanden verteilen ließ, den außerehelichen Geschlechtsverkehr als christlich und sittlich erlaubt hinzustellen. Das fand natürlich lauten Beifall bei allen kommunistischen und sozialdemokratischen Zeitungen, erregte aber großen Unwillen bei christlich und sittlich denkenden Gemeindegliedern, weniger, wie es scheint, bei der Kirchenbehörde, die sich mit irgendetnem Einschreiten dagegen sehr viel Zeit ließ. Weil aber im weiteren Verlauf der Angelegenheit die Erregung in den Gemeinden in bedrohlichem, für die Volkskirche gefährlichem Maße wuchs (so berichtet das ‚Evangelische Deutschland‘), so konnte die Kirchenbehörde endlich nicht umhin, einzuschreiten. Sie hat Pastor Hennede vorläufig vom Amte suspendiert und gegen ihn das Disziplinarverfahren eröffnet. In der Synode der Volkskirche, die gerade bei Bekanntwerden dieser Maßnahme tagte, verließ darauf die liberale Gruppe als Protest gegen das Einschreiten gegen Hennede die Verhandlungen und beteiligte sich nicht mehr daran. Und der liberale Protestantenverein der Hamburger Volkskirche, dem zahlreiche Pastoren angehören, dessen Vorsitzender Hennede ist, veröffentlicht einen Protest gegen das Verfahren der Kirchenbehörde in den Zeitungen, in dem er schreibt, daß jene Äußerungen Pastor Hennedes, in denen gegen das sechste Gebot der außereheliche Geschlechtsverkehr empfohlen wird, ‚aus religiösem Drang und sittlicher Überzeugung‘ hervorgegangen sind. Darum hätte die Behörde nach Ansicht des Protestantenvereins nicht mit einem Disziplinarverfahren gegen Hennede einschreiten dürfen. — So ist gekommen, was kommen mußte. Nachdem man in den Volksschulen zuerst die Leugnung der christlichen Glaubenslehren als gleichberechtigt gebildet, dann anerkannt hat, will man jetzt auch für die Leugnung und Bekämpfung der einfachen sittlichen Forderungen der Zehn Gebote Freiheit und Gleichberechtigung haben.“ E.

Das Christentum in Indien. über die Stärke des Christentums im Vergleich mit dortigen heidnischen und mohammedanischen Anbetern schreibt das „Ev.-Luth. Missionsblatt“ das Folgende: „Die Bevölkerung Indiens ist im letzten Jahrzehnt um 34 Millionen gewachsen und beträgt zur Zeit rund 353 Millionen. Davon sind 238,330,912 Hindu, 77,743,928 Mohammedaner, 4,306,442 Sikhs, 399,000 Buddhisten und 5,961,794 Christen. Die Zahl der Christen ist in den letzten zehn Jahren um 32.6 Prozent gewachsen, während die der Hindu nur um 10 Prozent, die der Mohammedaner nur um 13.1 Prozent gestiegen ist. Am stärksten ist die christliche Bevölkerung in der Madras-Präsidentschaft, wo auch unsere Leipziger Mission arbeitet. Der Zuwachs kommt noch immer vorwiegend aus den Kreisen der Kastenlosen, den ‚Abi-Dravida‘. Von deutschen Missionen arbeiten noch vier in Indien: Basel, Leipzig, Breklum und Gogner. Die tibetische Mission der Brüdergemeinde ist endgültig an deren englischen Zweig abgegeben. Die Hermannsbürger Mission hat ihre Arbeit im südlichen Telugulande nach dem Weltkrieg von der amerikanischen Ohiosynode nicht zurückerhalten. Der Morgenländische Frauenverein hat seine selbständige, in Verbindung mit der englischen Kirchenmission betriebene Arbeit aufgegeben.“ J. T. M.



Prof. D. Julius Richter siebzig Jahre. Im „Ev.-Luth. Missionsblatt“ lesen wir die folgende Mitteilung: „Am 19. Februar beging Prof. D. Julius Richter in Berlin seinen siebzigsten Geburtstag. Durch Prof. D. Schlunk wurde ihm eine Festschrift ‚Botschafter an Christi Statt‘ überreicht, die fünfzehn Beiträge aus der Feder der sachkundigsten Missionsmänner über die wichtigsten Missionsfragen der Gegenwart enthält. Auch unser Missionsdirektor D. Dr. Ihmels ist mit einem Artikel ‚Unsere Botschaft im heutigen Indien‘ beteiligt. Die 306 Seiten umfassende Festschrift ist im Verlage von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh erschienen. D. Julius Richter hat die Missionswissenschaft im Sinne Gustav Warneds weitergeführt und durch ein reiches literarisches Schaffen in hohem Maße befruchtet. An erster Stelle sei seine großangelegte ‚Evangelische Missionsgeschichte‘ genannt, die unmitttelbar vor dem Abschluß steht, ein Werk von grundlegender Bedeutung. Sie umfaßt die Missionsgebiete in Indien, im Orient, in Afrika, China und Niederländisch-Indien. Daneben steht die zweibändige ‚Evangelische Missionskunde‘, die auf dem engen Raum von 531 Seiten ein vollständiges und in seiner Knappheit nicht zu überbietendes Kompendium der gesamten Missionskunde darstellt. In der ‚Neuen Allgemeinen Missionszeitschrift‘, die D. Richter mit D. Schlunk herausgibt, besitzen wir ein missionswissenschaftliches Rüstzeug von anerkanntem Wert.“

J. L. M.

**Death of Patriarch of Syrian Church.** — In our issue of December, 1931, we adverted to the visit of the Syrian patriarch in India who had gone there to remove dissensions which were harassing his church-body. While engaged in his mission of peace, he took ill, the climate proving too exacting, and a few days later died. This happened in the first week of February. For the *Living Church* the Rev. C. T. Bridgeman, canon of St. George's Cathedral at Jerusalem, wrote an interesting and informing article on the life of the deceased patriarch, adding a few paragraphs on the Syrian Church, from which we cull the most illuminating items.

Syriac, which is another name for Aramaic, was the language of the people in the early Christian centuries in Mesopotamia, Syria proper, and Palestine. Syriac was one of the great tongues in which the Gospel was spread, ranking next to Greek and Latin. The chief city from which the message of Christianity was promulgated in Syriac was Edessa. About one half of the Syriac Christians of the early Church were under Parthian dominion in the East; the other half were subjects of Rome, Antioch in Syria being the western outpost. The East Syrians in the course of time turned Nestorians; the West Syrians, while rejecting Nestorianism, embraced monophysitic teachings and thus separated from the greater part of Christendom. Under the Moslems the Western Syrians, also called Jacobites, or Old Syrians, were prosperous. The Crusades, however, made the Mohammedans feel more definitely hostile toward all Christians, including those constituting a small minority party like the Old Syrians. The period of decline began at that time and has continued till now. The chief centers of the Jacobites outside of India are Mardin (Turkey) and Mosul on the Tigris. In Syria itself, the part which the French received as mandated territory, now contains a good many Syrian Christians, many of whom came there as refugees. The Syrian Church in India, as far as it is not under Roman Catholic control, first seems to have been Nestorian, but is now chiefly Jacobite.

A.