

12-1-1932

Book Review. - Literatur

Th. Graebner

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Graebner, Th. (1932) "Book Review. - Literatur," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 3 , Article 129.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol3/iss1/129>

This Book Review 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.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. III

DECEMBER, 1932

No. 12

Gibt es ein "Victorious Christian Life"?

Randglossen zu der schwärmerischen Irrlehre des Perfectionismus.

1.

Dieser Artikel verdankt seine Entstehung einer uns zur Rezension überwiesenen Broschüre, betitelt *Victory in Christ. How to Live a Victorious Christian Life*. Sie enthält die Vorträge, die Prof. H. G. Randolph, Lehrer am Lutheran Bible Institute in Minneapolis, im Frühjahr dieses Jahres in den Andachtsstunden vor den Studenten des Instituts gehalten hat.*) Da die Irrlehre des Perfectionismus heute mächtig in allen fundamentalistischen Lagern spukt, so ist es Zeit, daß man sich einmal wieder die Lehre von der Heiligung und der christlichen Vollkommenheit nach Schrift und Bekenntnis, wenigstens kurz, bergegenwärtigt. Prof. Randolph selbst zitiert in seinen Vorlesungen einen Brief, worin der Schreiber die Irrlehre von einem "victorious life" scharf kritisiert. Er schreibt: "I have before me a letter which describes the victorious life as 'that unscriptural and unconfessional teaching, that teaching which is contrary to the experience of Christians as we find it expressed in the writings of Luther, John Arnd, Rosenius, and others, that doctrine of a victorious life.'" Wir geben dem Briefschreiber recht: die Lehre von einem "victorious life" ist sowohl gegen die Schrift wie auch gegen das lutherische Bekenntnis. Um so mehr haben wir zu wachen, daß uns Satan auch in diesem Stück nicht betrügt.

2.

Prof. Randolph trägt allerdings seine Lehre vom "victorious life" sehr gemäßigt vor. Vom lutherischen Bekenntnis will er nicht abweichen. Er führt aus: "The victorious life is a) not an untempted life, b) not an uncontested life, c) not the eradication of our sinful nature, d) not

*) *Victory in Christ. How to Live a Victorious Christian Life*. By H. G. Randolph, Teacher at the Lutheran Bible Institute, Minneapolis, Minn. 64 pages. Price, 35 cts. per copy. Printed by Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.

the absence of inner conflict, e) not the absence of possibility of stumbling." Das "victorious life" besteht vor allem in "deliverance from the necessity of sinning". Wie dies gemeint ist, geht aus einigen Zitaten hervor, die wir hier beifügen. Zwar sagt Prof. Randolph einerseits: "Victory is not sinless perfection", fügt aber andererseits hinzu: "Jesus said in a case like that, 'From henceforth sin no more.' This was not merely a word of caution. It was a *word of victory*. He spoke victory into her soul. *What Christ requires He gives*. His words, 'Sin no more,' when received in the believing heart, give and perform what they demand." Wiederum: "The Christian who would live victoriously must be willing to confess and renounce every known sin." Das ist allerdings die Gesinnung des Christen. Aber es heißt nun weiter: "Sin must be handed out summarily and finally in a full confession and renunciation to be judged by the judgment of the Cross." Prof. Randolph lehrt also doch, daß es bei einem Christen zu einer solchen Vollkommenheit kommen kann, daß er nicht mehr sündigt, ja daß es dazu kommen muß. Das ist aber ganz der Grundgedanke der schwärmerischen Trlehre des Perfectionismus. Behalten wir dies vorläufig im Auge!

Schwärmerische Trlehre finden wir ferner in des Verfassers Vereinerung des Kampfes im Christen zwischen Fleisch und Geist. Immer wieder kommt er darauf zurück, daß das "victorious life" nicht durch Kampf zu erreichen sei. Er schreibt: "When you give up completely and put no confidence even in your trying, your struggling, your zeal, your anxiety, and all that, and simply take hold of the Lord Jesus Christ, then you have Him and His life. And that is the only way in which you do have Him." Wiederum: "Many a Christian struggles for mastery over his sins. There is often a terrific conflict over the very matter of yielding all to Christ. But victory does not come from this struggle. On the contrary, only when trying and struggling give way to trusting and *resting in the Lord* can He work out victory in that life." Nach des Schreibers Auffassung soll daher der Christ nicht gegen sein Fleisch kämpfen, sondern sich einfach dem Heiland hingeben, sich ihm anvertrauen, dann kommt es bei ihm zum vollkommenen Siegesleben. "Only when Jacob ceased struggling and clung to God, could He bless him." In diesen Satz faßt er seine ganze mystisch-pietistische Entgleisung zusammen.

Schwärmerische Trlehre finden wir weiter in des Autors Darlegung, wie es bei einem Gläubigen zum "victorious life" kommt. Dazu gehört a) unconditional surrender of sin: "Every known sin has to be laid down"; b) surrender of ourselves, of our members; c) daily exercise in surrender: "We are daily to give ourselves wholly and unconditionally in an act of surrender to claim all that there is in Christ for us"; d) claiming Christ's victory: "Every morning as you wake up, look to the Lord Jesus, commit yourself to Him, and say, 'Lord, I claim Thee, I take Thee as my victory to-day'"; e) watch and pray,

use the Word of God. Das letzte, ja das einzig wirklich Wesentliche bei der Heiligung, kommt also zuletzt! Auch das ist ganz der Schwärmer Art; erst setzt das bedingungslose Sich-selbst-Ergeben ein, und daran hängt man dann das Gebet und das Wort Gottes. Ähnlich wie Kaspar Schwenkfeld, rät der Autor in seiner Beschreibung des self-surrender-Aktes: "Claim victory as a present fact and reality in Christ. Step out, venture out on the ground of victory. Plant your feet there. Next, with victory as your present possession by faith, — because Christ is your possession, — claim by faith the experience and realization of His victory day by day in your life. This is the way of victory." Was soll sich der einfältige Christ unter diesem pietistischen Wortschwall eigentlich denken? Gegen das Fleisch soll er nicht kämpfen; dagegen lautet die Mahnung: "Step out; venture out on the ground of victory; plant your feet there." Für einen angefochtenen Christen bedeutet dies alles gar nichts; was der Autor aber hiermit in Wirklichkeit fordert, ist eine erdichtete Frömmigkeit, eine selbstgemachte Heiligkeit, die in seliger Gefühlsbuselei ihren Höhepunkt findet. Auch hier findet Luthers großes Wort seine Anwendung: „Papatus est merus enthusiasmus.“ Es ist im Grunde die papistische Heiligungslehre, die der Autor hier vertritt.

Endlich finden wir schwärmerische Irrlehre auch in der Behandlung des Schriftwortes, das der Autor ganz nach seinem Belieben verdreht. Bei seiner Darlegung der Irrlehre vom "victorious life" mußte er sich notwendigerweise mit dem Bekenntnis des Apostels Paulus im siebten Kapitel des Römerbriefs auseinandersetzen. Aber das ganze Kapitel, in dem der Apostel den vorliegenden Gegenstand doch so recht ex professo behandelt, tut er mit dem Satz ab: "They [gewöhnliche Theologen, die das "victorious life" ablehnen] think of Romans seven, where the Apostle Paul confesses defeat as the result of *self-effort*, as the description of normal Christian life." Wer sich aber das siebte Kapitel ansieht, der findet darin nichts von einem self-effort als Ursache, warum bei dem Apostel noch kein "victorious life" zu finden war. Dies self-effort hat der Schreiber hinzugebichtet, eben weil er dies für die Lehre von der Heiligung so wichtige Kapitel aus dem Wege schaffen mußte.

3.

Und wie steht es nun mit der Frage, womit wir diesen Artikel betitelt haben: „Gibt es ein 'victorious life'?" Wir haben mit Bedacht die Zitate aus der Broschüre nicht ins Deutsche übersetzt, damit in der Übersetzung nicht etwa zu viel oder zu wenig gesagt würde; der Autor sollte voll und ganz auch im Ausdruck zum Worte kommen. Wer sich aber die Redeweise des Autors ansieht, erkennt alsbald, daß sie nicht aus der lutherischen Theologie stammt, sondern dem reformierten Schwärmgeistertum entnommen ist. Ausdrücke wie "victorious life" und "surrender" in der Bedeutung, in der der Autor sie gebraucht, gehören den methodistischen Perfektionisten an und stehen außerhalb der Schrift und

des lutherischen Bekenntnisses. So gibt es denn auch kein "victorious life", wie es der Autor uns hier vormalt. Wir haben es bei seiner Darlegung mit einer Überspannung zu tun, die der Schrift geradezu höhn-spricht, ja wobei der von seinen Sünden angefochtene Christ gar nicht zur Ruhe kommen kann, sondern sich immer mehr in Werttreiberei hineinpeitscht. Gott bewahre uns vor dem "victorious life", das der Autor in seiner Broschüre anpreist! Er bewahre uns auch vor der ganzen theologischen Literatur, die uns zu einer solchen Konfusion führt! Die Sektenpresse breitet sie ja weit aus; sorgen wir dafür, daß sie uns nicht die Sinne verwirrt!

Und doch gibt es nach Schrift und Bekenntnis ein "victorious life", eine christliche Vollkommenheit, um die wir uns als rechte Jünger Jesu allerdings aufs eifrigste bemühen sollen. Auch im Christenleben sollen wir nicht *νήπιοι* bleiben, sondern *τέλειοι* werden. Dazu ermahnt uns die Schrift in fast unzähligen Sprüchen; mit den vielen Schriftziten, die der Autor für die Heiligung anführt, hat es daher seine volle Richtigkeit. Wir lassen sie ganz stehen, wie sie lauten, und tun ihnen keinen Abbruch. In allen Schriftstellen, in denen uns Gott vor der Sünde warnt und uns das hohe, herrliche Ziel christlicher Vollkommenheit vor Augen malt, erkennen wir Gottes Willen und tun ihn auch vollkommen nach dem neuen Menschen. Soweit wir Christen neue Menschen sind, sind wir eitel Heilige, die täglich über den Teufel, die Welt und das Fleisch triumphieren und Gott ganz zu Gefallen leben. (Vgl. Eph. 4, 24; Kol. 3, 10; 2 Kor. 4, 16 usw.) Luther schreibt ganz mit Recht: „Über was rechte Christen sind, die sind von Gott also geschaffen, spricht St. Paulus, durch den Glauben an Christum zu einem neuen Menschen, der Gott ähnlich, wahrhaftig, vor ihm gerecht und heilig ist, wie erstlich Adam in seinem Herzen sein ausgerichtet gegen Gott und in rechter, fröhlicher Zuversicht, Liebe und Lust und auch der Leib heilig und rein, von keiner bösen, unreinen oder unordentlichen Lust nichts wußte, und war also das ganze Leben des Menschen ein schön Bild und Spiegel, darin Gott selbst leuchtete, gleichwie auch der heiligen Geister, der Engel, Leben und Wesen ist eitel göttlich Ding, wahrhaftige Gotteserkenntnis, Sicherheit, Freude gegen Gott und eitel reine, heilige Gedanken und Werke nach Gottes Willen.“ (XII, 916 ff.) So schreibt auch D. Pieper: „Dieser neue Mensch will nur, was Gott will, Röm. 7, 22: *Συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*. Der Christ ist daher vollkommen heilig, *νεκρὸς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* und *ζῶν τῷ θεῷ*, Röm. 6, 1—11, insofern er ein neuer Mensch oder wiedergeboren ist.“ (Christl. Dogm. III, 16.) Das Leben des Christen ist daher nach dem neuen Menschen wahre Vollkommenheit, ein echtes, rechtes "victorious life".

Leider bleibt aber auch in dem gläubigen Christen während seines ganzen Lebens hier auf Erden noch die alte sündliche Art oder der alte Mensch (Eph. 4, 22; 2 Kor. 4, 16; Röm. 6, 6; 7, 18), und dieser ist der Sünde ergeben (Röm. 7, 18) und streitet wider den neuen Menschen

(Gal. 5, 17). So ist daher auch das ganze Christenleben auf Erden ein fortwährender Kampf, wobei es zu keinem "victorious life" im Sinne der Schwärmer kommt. Es kommt nie, selbst nicht bei dem besten Christen, dahin, daß sich der neue Mensch mit seinem guten Wollen und Tun gegenüber dem bösen Wollen und Tun des alten Menschen so durchsetzt, daß der Christ der Sünde ganz Herr wird, sie ganz meidet und so sich eines gänzlichen Freiseins von ihr erfreuen kann. Das sagt uns Paulus im siebten Kapitel seines Römerbriefs, wo er nicht etwa davon redet, was er mit einem "self-effort" fertigbringen wollte, sondern davon, was er mit allem Bemühen des neuen Menschen gerne hätte erreichen mögen. Derselbe Paulus, der Phil. 1, 21 schreibt: *Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός*, schreibt auch Phil. 3, 12: *Ὀὐκ ὄτι ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι, διώκω δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ καταλάβω*. Paulus konnte schreiben, Gal. 2, 20: *Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός*, und wiederum, Röm. 7, 24: *Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου;* Und dabei wird es bleiben. Über das Wort Gottes kommen wir nicht hinaus; die Religionspsychologie des Heiligen Geistes wird immer obenan bleiben. Prof. Randolphs Broschüre ist aus dem Gedanken heraus geschrieben worden, daß man jetzt vielfach in der Christenheit den Kampf gegen das Fleisch unterläßt, ja ihn gar nicht führen will. Aber diese Gefahr beseitigt man nicht damit, daß man mit einer schwärmerischen Irrlehre von einem "victorious life" kommt; sobald das böse Fleisch von einem "victorious life" hört, wird es auch diesen Wahn dazu gebrauchen, um so mehr zu sündigen. Der Schreiber der Broschüre weist mit Recht darauf hin, daß die Lehre vom "victorious life" diese Gefahr in sich birgt, "that we pride ourselves on our victory". Aber nicht erst dann fängt der Stolz und Hochmut an, wenn wir meinen, das "victorious life" erreicht zu haben, sondern diese ganze Irrlehre fließt aus dem Stolz und Hochmut des verderbten Fleisches.

Über die rechte Vollkommenheit eines gläubigen Christen schreibt die Augsburgerische Konfession (Art. 16): „Die christliche Vollkommenheit ist, daß man Gott von Herzen und mit Ernst fürchtet und auch eine herzliche Zuberficht und Glauben, auch Vertrauen fasset, daß wir um Christi willen einen gnädigen und barmherzigen Gott haben, daß wir mögen und sollen von Gott bitten und begehren, was uns not ist, und Hilfe von ihm in allen Trübsalen gewißlich nach eines jeden Verus und Stand erwarten, daß wir auch indes sollen äußerlich mit Fleiß gute Werke tun und uners Verus warten. Darin stehet die rechte Vollkommenheit und der rechte Gottesdienst, nicht im Betteln oder in einer schwarzen oder grauen Skappe.“ Und die Apologie (*Trigl.*, 216, 232): „Das ist die rechte christliche und geistliche Vollkommenheit, wenn zugleich die Buße und der Glaube in der Buße wachsen.“ Beide Aussprüche richten sich gegen die falsche römische Vollkommenheitslehre; sie lassen sich aber auch anwenden auf die Vollkommenheitsirrllehre, wie diese sich in der modernen Heiligungsbeziehung zeigt. Denn darin sind sich alle Heiligkeitschwärmer einig.

daß sie meinen, der Christ könne und solle hier auf Erden so geheiligt werden, daß er alle Sünde meidet. Die Gradunterschiede, die dabei gemacht werden, ändern das Wesen der Irrlehre nicht. Denn alles das ist Perfectionismus; man meint, ein Christ könne in dem „höheren Leben“ ohne bewußte Sünde leben und so das Gesetz Gottes vollkommen halten. Dagegen betont die Konfessionsformel mit Recht: „Es muß auch und kann die dadurch [durch den Erbschaden] verrückte [verkehrte], verderbte menschliche Natur allein durch des Heiligen Geistes Wiedergeburt und Erneuerung geheilt werden, welches doch in diesem Leben nur angefangen, aber allererst in jenem Leben vollkommen sein wird.“ (Sol. Deel., De Peccato Originis, 14.) Damit fällt der ganze Wahn von einem „victorious life“ in diesem Leben dahin.

4.

Zum Schluß möchten wir noch auf eins aufmerksam machen. Manchem möchte es scheinen, als sei die Darlegung von einem „victorious life“, wie sie Prof. Randolph lehrt, höchst harmlos. Aber das gerade Gegenteil ist der Fall, eben weil sich das verderbte Herz von Natur so viel auf seine guten Werke und sein „Siegesleben“ einbildet. Wird die Lehre von der Heiligung unsicher, so wird auch die sola gratia schwankend; der Teufel hat es ganz und gar auf Werkheiligkeit abgesehen.

Durch Gottes Gnade sind die lutherischen Synoden in unserm Lande so gesinnt, daß sie nichts Sehnlicheres wünschen als eine geeinigte lutherische Kirche. Bisher haben uns Verschiedenheiten in der Lehre und Praxis auseinandergehalten. Aber gerade in bezug auf das sola Scriptura, sola gratia und sola fide ist ohne Zweifel ein Fortschritt zu verzeichnen. Kommen wir in der Lehre immer näher, so können wir uns der Hoffnung hingeben, daß schließlich völlige Einigkeit erzielt wird. Um so mehr müssen wir uns vor dem Feinde vorsehen, der im Unschuldsmantel pietistischer Heiligkeit einherwandelt. Nicht nur die Modernisten, sondern auch die Fundamentalisten stehen der lutherischen Lehre sehr, sehr fern. Haben wir genau acht auf das, was schön gleißt, aber nicht schriftgemäß ist!

J. L. Müller.

Child Study According to the Bible.

The attitude of the Lutheran Church, specifically of our branch of the Lutheran Church, toward the Bible, is one which finds little appreciation in the world to-day. Wherever we turn, we find opposition. The Church of Rome has added to its mutilated Bible the vagaries of tradition and the claims of an „infallible“ Pope. Most Protestant denominations have set aside the inspiration of the Bible or so modified the meaning of inspiration as to make the word meaningless. Moreover, many of the alleged leaders of Protestantism have

joined forces with the enemies of the Word and the Church in denying even the fundamental truths of Scripture, such as the deity of Jesus Christ, the vicarious atonement, justification by faith alone, the Virgin Birth, and others. What Isaiah wrote of the true Church in his day has once more become true of the Church of the pure Word and confession at the present time: "The daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city," chap. 1, 8.

The opposition against the Bible becomes particularly violent when questions of general human knowledge are broached, such as those in the fields of history, geography, chronology, geology, astronomy, and other sciences. It is alleged that the information on these questions was put down by the writers of the Biblical books in the same way as any one else might write from even a meager acquaintance with the subject. For that reason countless pastors, teachers, and professors, both here and abroad, are engaged in pointing out what they consider mistakes on the part of the writers. This was a favorite pastime especially during the last century; but the effects of this false application of higher criticism persist to this day in spite of the many evidences to the contrary, such as were presented by William Ramsay, Robert Dick Wilson, Greene, Kyle, and others.

Yet this situation, far from discouraging us, rather tends to give us a new interest in the Scriptures, to induce us to search, ransack, scrutinize, the holy writings, John 5, 39; 1 Pet. 1, 10, 11, in order that we may be built up, not only in our most holy faith in the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ, but also in our certainty of the truth of every word as given by the Spirit of God. The Bible is not a text-book of geography, history, chronology, and the natural sciences, yet every word, even every incidental remark concerning these departments of human knowledge, is accepted by us as the truth. Likewise the Bible is not a text-book of psychology and pedagogy, yet every statement pertaining to these subjects as found in any book of the Bible belongs to the inspired account and must be so evaluated by us. All other books in the world, no matter on what subject they are written, are only relatively true; they represent, even at their best, only the highest accomplishments of the human mind. The Bible alone is *the absolute truth*, the truth which has survived the storms of centuries and millenniums, and will, as the Word of the Lord, abide forever. And while we rejoice in every discovery in archeology and in the natural sciences which tends to vindicate or corroborate the truth of the Bible, our pleasure is not based upon the fact that the Bible is in need of such defense, but only upon the possibility of removing doubts of earnest searchers for the truth more easily. It is primarily for this reason that we have systematized the defense of the Bible in the science of apologetics.

Since to us, as to all true believers, the Bible is *the absolute truth* in all its statements, therefore we accept also all its statements concerning psychology and pedagogy with becoming meekness and sincerity. He who made man and endowed him with reason, He who searches the hearts and the innermost thoughts of man, He who even understands our thoughts afar off, Ps. 139, 1—16, is surely the one whose inspired Book can best reveal to us the knowledge of man's soul and its workings in the various circumstances of life. If we add to this the fact that Jesus, who knows what is in man, John 2, 25, was the greatest Teacher that ever lived, the incomparable Teacher in both knowledge of the matter which He taught and the methods which He employed, then we have every reason to turn to the Book which He Himself bade us search and scrutinize in order to gain therefrom at least a little of the working knowledge which we so sorely need in our own teaching. No matter from what angle we view our problems, an approach to these pedagogical and psychological problems through the study of the pedagogy of the Bible is a scientific approach. It is in this spirit that we take up a brief discussion of the subject *Child Study according to the Bible*.

The first point that Christian teachers must remember with regard to child study is that children are *a gift of God*. This is clearly stated in the Old Testament. It is mentioned as a blessing of God, Ps. 68, 6, that He "setteth the solitary in families." In Ps. 113, 9 God is praised for His excellency, because "He maketh the barren woman to keep house and to be a joyful mother of children." In Ps. 127, 3 the virtues of God's blessings are set forth: "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is His reward," to which the inspired author adds: "As arrows are in the hands of the mighty man, so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them." The same thought is expressed in Ps. 128, 3, 4: "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house, thy children like olive-plants round about thy table. Behold that thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord."

These declarations concerning children as gifts of God are reflected in the attitude taken by the believers of the Old Testament in desiring the blessing of the Lord. Abram complained to the Lord: "What wilt Thou give me, seeing I go childless?" and we are told that his wife shared his eagerness to have a child or children. Rachel, the beloved wife of Jacob, was so distressed on account of the fact that she had, up to that time, been denied the blessing of the Lord that she cried out: "Give me children, or else I die," Gen. 30, 1. It is expressly stated that it was the Lord who gave to Ruth, the wife of Boaz, the son over whose birth Naomi was so elated, Ruth 4, 13. In the story of Hannah, the very name which she gave to her

son, Samuel, signified "because I have asked him of the Lord," 1 Sam. 1, 20. The story of the Shunammite teaches the same lesson, 2 Kings 4, 16. 17. 36. 37. We might add here also the example of Elisabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, who considered herself as being under the reproach of men because of her childlessness, Luke 1, 7. 24. 25. 58.

The truth that children are a gift of God remains in full force also in the New Testament, as it ever will when men's false economic systems do not interfere with the providence of God. Our Lord speaks of the joy which a mother feels when a child is born into the world, John 16, 21. The Apostle Paul speaks of the function of motherhood in a manner which brings out its privileges in a most amazing way: "Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety," 1 Tim. 2, 15. And shortly afterwards follows his admonition: "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully," 1 Tim. 5, 14.

Since children are thus, in such an emphatic manner, described as the gift of God, it follows that *the Lord's estimate of children* is one which all parents and teachers must share. It was a most searching lesson which the Lord gave to His disciples when they presented their question, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" For He told them: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in My name receiveth Me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea," Matt. 18, 1—6. The same lesson was brought home to the disciples when young children were presented to Jesus and the Savior spoke the well-known words: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," Mark 10, 14—16; Luke 18, 15—17. In His last charge to Peter the Lord commissioned him to feed His lambs, which has rightly been understood of the special care which the young children of a Christian congregation should receive, John 21, 15. It is clear, then, that Christ magnified child-life, that He emphasized the place and the importance of child-training both at home and in the church.

But all this was *not done with a weak sentimentality*, with a gushing emotionalism, which ignores the natural sinfulness of

children and prates about the innocent darlings both before and after the age of self-consciousness is reached, as though children were sinless when they are born into this world. It is said of Adam after the Fall that he begot a son in his own likeness, Gen. 5, 3, that is, in the likeness of sinful flesh. Here the words of the Apostle Paul apply: "As by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned. . . . Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," Rom. 5, 12, 14. This is further proved by the words of God, Gen. 8, 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," that is, from childhood. The same truth is presented in the well-known words of David, Ps. 51, 5: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." And one of the most complete expositions of the question of natural sinfulness is found in the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, John 3, 1 ff., especially v. 6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," the word *flesh* being used as in Gen. 6, 3, 12: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh. . . . All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." Every parent and every Christian educator must keep in mind this inherited depravity, this natural sinfulness of children, otherwise the whole process of teaching and training will rest on a wrong foundation.

But before we follow up the thoughts suggested by this truth, we take note of the fact that the Scripture distinguishes *various periods, or stages*, in the development of children, physically, mentally, morally. The first stage of the child's life is that of infancy, from the time of his birth to the time when he gets his first bearings in life. At this time the child is a *babe*, an *infant*. The Babe Jesus is given that name, Luke 2, 12, 16; the little children whom Jesus blessed are so called by Luke, chap. 18, 15; the Hebrew infants whom the cruel decree of Pharaoh threatened are so designated by Stephen, Acts 7, 19; and the word is applied to Timothy when Paul writes, 2 Tim. 3, 15: "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures." — After the age of the babe (*βρέφος*) comes later infancy, that of the little child (*νήπιος*), originally used with great definiteness of the period after self-consciousness has been established. The distinction is clearly made in Matt. 21, 16, where Ps. 8, 3 is quoted: "Out of the mouth of babes [or little children] and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise." The meaning is quite clearly indicated in Eph. 4, 14: "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine." Here the absence of certainty and assurance, the dependence of the age of early childhood, is used as a figure in spiritual things. The same thought appears in Heb. 5, 13: "For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the Word of Righteousness; for he is a babe [or a young child]."

But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age." Here the contrast brings out the special significance of the word, as of a child that has not yet reached the age of clear discretion and of understanding. — When the child has passed the stage of childhood and reaches the age of discretion, so that he is no longer a *βεβήτος*, a *νήπιος*, or a *παιδίον*, Matt. 2, 8. 9. 11; Luke 1, 59 ff.), then we may expect him to lay aside childish thinking. Cp. 1 Cor. 14, 20; Is. 7, 16, just as in 1 Cor. 13, 11 the apostle had contrasted adulthood with the stage of the little child (*ἀνήρη* — *νήπιος*). It was clearly understood that the period of infancy would be merged into the stage of self-consciousness, that this would develop into the period of discretion, and that the first indications of adulthood might be expected to follow. Our present distinction is only slightly more elaborate, when we speak of infancy, of early childhood, of late childhood, of the preadolescent age, of early adolescence, and of late adolescence.

The Jews, who were very careful to follow every hint given by Scripture, observed the divisions, or stages, of development in their school system. Their lowest school was the *infant school*, the pupils being "babies of the teacher's house." Then followed the *elementary school*, or "the house of the book." Next came the *grammar, or early secondary, school*, the "house of study," or "house of learning." This, in turn, was followed by the high school and the academy, or college. Full authority and full privileges were granted only when the actual adult stage had been reached.

Each age of childhood presents problems of a peculiar type, but parents (and teachers) are instructed not to neglect *the care, love, protection, and guidance* of the children and pupils entrusted to them. We find many examples of this attitude in Holy Scripture. Amram and Jochebed, the father and mother of Moses, watched over their son with tender solicitude. Ex. 2, 2 ff.; Acts 7, 20; Heb. 11, 23. Hannah, the mother of Samuel, was deeply concerned about his welfare, even after she had brought him to the Tabernacle to serve before the Lord, 1 Sam. 2, 19. The widow of Zarephath showed her love for her son in a very impressive manner, 1 Kings 17, 21. Just as instructive is the account of the Shunammite woman, 2 Kings 4, 29 ff. The regard in which parents held their children became practically proverbial, as many passages of the Bible testify. Thus the Lord asks, Is. 49, 15: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?" A similar picture is used by Moses, Num. 11, 12: "Have I conceived all this people, have I begotten them, that Thou shouldst say unto me, Carry them in thy bosom as a nursing father beareth the sucking child?" This love and solicitude of parents is pictured also in the New Testament. The father of the lunatic boy besought Jesus: "Master, I beseech Thee, look upon my son, for he is mine only child. And,

lo, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth him that he foameth again and, bruising him hardly, departeth from him," Luke 9, 38. It is evident that his father's love was deeply moved by the affliction which had come upon his son. It is the same attitude which we find also in the case of the nobleman of Capernaum when he cried out, John 4, 49: "Sir, come down ere my child die," and of the Syrophenician woman, when she pleaded with the Lord to heal her daughter, Matt. 15, 22 ff. That this attitude of solicitous care was not confined to the parents alone is seen from 1 Thess. 2, 7, where St. Paul writes: "We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children." Even the pedagogs, or assistants to the teachers, are referred to in Scripture as men to whom a certain part of the boys' training was entrusted, Gal. 3, 24: "The Law was our *pedagog* to bring us unto Christ."

It is in this connection that we note the emphasis of the Bible on *careful, conscientious, comprehensive, and consistent training* of children in order that the natural sinfulness of their hearts might be counteracted and that they might be led to the knowledge of their heavenly Father and their Savior Jesus Christ. The fundamental rule is that summarized by St. Paul, Eph. 6, 1—4: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise: that it may be well with thee and thou mayest live long on the earth. And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The form of this commandment in the Old Testament was: "Honor thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord, thy God, giveth thee," Ex. 20, 12. This is emphasized Lev. 19, 3: "Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father," and is repeated Deut. 5, 16: "Honor thy father and thy mother, as the Lord, thy God, hath commanded thee." It is clear from these passages that the obedience of the Fourth Commandment implies a reciprocal relationship, as we see also from Col. 3, 20, 21: "Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing unto the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children to anger lest they be discouraged." On the part of the parents it means a sympathetic, but firm insistence upon an obedience in keeping with the authority vested in them by the Lord; for they are His representatives with regard to the children entrusted to them. This excludes both an absolute, tyrannical power and a weak sentimentality. And on the part of the children it means obedience *in the Lord*, with an attitude of eager service, or as Luther puts it in his explanation of the Fourth Commandment: "Give them honor, serve and obey them, and hold them in love and esteem." It is in this sense that we must read and interpret the various passages of the Bible which describe the position and the attitude of children.

The Lord says to all children: "My son, keep thy father's commandments and forsake not the law of thy mother. Bind them continually upon thy heart and tie them about thy neck. When thou goest, it shall lead thee; when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee; and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee," Prov. 6, 20—22. And again: "My son, hear the instruction of thy father and forsake not the law of thy mother," Prov. 1, 8. "Hear, ye children, the instruction of a father and attend to know understanding," Prov. 4, 1. "A wise son maketh a glad father, but a foolish man despiseth his mother," Prov. 15, 20. "A foolish son is a grief to his father and bitterness to her that bare him," Prov. 17, 25. "Hearken unto thy father that begat thee and despise not thy mother when she is old," Prov. 23, 22. These passages, rightly understood, find their application also to the relation obtaining between pupils and teachers. From these passages it is clear that all modern educational theories and doctrines which set aside the obedience of the children in the Scriptural sense and advocate either spontaneous development of the children's mind and will or a government in home and school based upon mutual agreement only, are entirely out of harmony with the will of God as so clearly expressed throughout the Bible. This obedience may call for such measures of discipline as the situation may require, primarily earnest admonition, reprimand and reproof. Prov. 1, 8: "My son, hear the instruction of thy father and forsake not the law of thy mother." Prov. 13, 1: "A wise son heareth his father's instruction, but a scorner heareth not rebuke." Prov. 15, 5: "A fool despiseth his father's instruction, but he that regardeth reproof is prudent." Prov. 6, 23b: "Reproofs of instruction are the way of life."

Training in obedience is the first step in the careful rearing of Christian children; but this must be accompanied and followed by a *training in knowledge*. The Bible says: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it," Prov. 22, 6. This is often referred to by modern educationists as speaking of a development of natural talents on the part of the child himself; but the verb means "to initiate or prepare" by imparting information. While education is not merely a telling process, it must begin with the giving of information. It is only later that this process can be expanded into directing the acquisition of knowledge on the part of the children. In the field of religion and morals in particular it is necessary to bring information to children again and again, or as the Bible puts it: "Thou shalt teach them [these words which I command thee] diligently to thy children," Deut. 6, 7, that is, impress the information upon their minds also by constant repetition and drill after they have once gotten at least a word-understanding of the text.

The third step of the training of children is that which pertains

to the training in practise, or the *training of the will*. All the knowledge of the head or intellect will have little value unless a consecrated heart will carry the lessons which have been learned into practise in a life of sanctification. And here the rule is that of 1 Thess. 2, 11: "We exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you as a father doth his children." That is the training which leads to success in teaching: to present information in a telling, helpful way, urgently to invite, to be a pleader for true learning; this will be accompanied by a constant encouragement not to be disheartened by obstacles and difficulties; to which will be added the constant witnessing to the truth of that which is presented and to its value in the life of a Christian. If this is rightly and consistently done, it will most likely lead to self-activity on the part of the pupil, to an effort of his will to make the most of every opportunity, to act upon the best initiative, with a consecration that will produce results.

To this end, of course, the Christian parent and teacher will ever keep in mind that the basis of all true education, and incidentally the means of the only education controlling the heart and mind, is the *Word of God*. The Lord says: "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children," Deut. 6, 6. 7. The Lord says of Abraham: "I know he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." In another passage of Deuteronomy we read, chap. 11, 18—20: "Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, . . . and ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up." Ps. 71, 18: "O God, forsake me not, until I have showed Thy strength unto this generation and Thy power to every one that is to come." Ps. 72, 2—4. 6: "I will utter dark sayings of old which we have heard and known and our fathers have told us. We will not hide them from their children, showing to the generations to come the praises of the Lord and His strength, . . . that the generations to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children." In this making of the Word of God basic for instruction we keep in mind the words of Scripture: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," Ps. 110, 10. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge," Prov. 1, 7; 9, 10. "The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom," Prov. 15, 33. "To know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge," Eph. 3, 19. "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. 3, 15.

By such constant, consistent, conscientious training the objective of Christian education is reached: the knowledge of salvation, full trust in the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and a will consecrated to His service, so that a Christian's life, by the power of God's presence and help, will be a presentation of his body as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, Rom. 12, 1. Then our pupils will be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but, speaking the truth in love, grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ, Eph. 4, 14, 15.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Kurze Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Kirche in Rio Grande do Sul, Brasilien.

(S c h l u ß.)

D. W. Notermunds Zeit.

D. Wilhelm Notermund wurde am 25. November 1843 geboren. Er wollte sich eigentlich dem Lehrerberuf an den höheren Anstalten widmen, mußte aber infolge eines heftigen Katarrhs mit Lungenblutung sein Amt als Pfarrer in der hannoverschen Landeskirche niederlegen und kam nach Barmen. Dort legte Dr. Fabri ihm eines Tages die Frage vor, ob es nicht im Hinblick auf seine Gesundheit wie auch aus Rücksicht auf die kirchlichen Zustände geraten sei, auf einige Jahre nach Brasilien zu gehen. Notermund sagte zu. Da er jedoch gehört hatte, daß in Brasilien der Pfarrertitel kein Ehrentitel mehr sei, erwarb er sich erst das Diplom eines Doktors der Philosophie. Später wurde ihm auch der Titel eines Doktors der Theologie verliehen.

Viel Trubel bereiteten in dieser Zeit noch die Mischehen. Mischehen durften nur von einem katholischen Priester vollzogen werden. Dieser tat es aber nicht, es sei denn, daß der protestantische Teil geschworen hatte, er würde seine Kinder in der katholischen Religion erziehen lassen und dem katholischen Teil nie in der Ausübung seiner Religion hinderlich sein. Der katholische Teil fügte dann noch hinzu, daß er nicht unterlassen wolle, das Gemahl zur römischen Kirche zu bekehren. Kamen später diese Eltern zu einem protestantischen Pfarrer, um ihre Kinder dennoch von ihm taufen zu lassen, so antwortete er meistens: „Ihr habt geschworen, eure Kinder katholisch zu erziehen. Ich kann die Hand nicht dazu bieten, daß der Eid gebrochen werde. Wenn die Kinder erwachsen sind und dann zu uns kommen wollen, so sind sie herzlich willkommen.“ Als Notermund ankam, taufte er sofort die Kinder aus solchen Mischehen und erklärte, daß ihn der Eid nichts angehe. Es sei schlimm genug, daß ein solcher Eid geschworen worden sei; schlimmer sei es jedenfalls, die Eltern zum Halten dieses Eides

zu zwingen. Diese Handlungsweise Notermunds erregte viel Aufsehen in den Kolonien, fand aber überall Nachahmung.

Um ein Organ zu bekommen, worin er zu Worte kommen könnte, bewog Notermund den Eigentümer des „Voten“ von Sao Leopoldo, ihm die Leitung des Blattes zu überlassen. Das geschah aber nur ein Jahr lang. Dann wurde diese Verbindung wieder gelöst. Später hat dann Notermund die „Deutsche Post“ gegründet, die auf den Kolonien viel gelesen wurde. Vor einigen Jahren ist sie aber eingegangen. Die Studenten Porto Allegres sahen eine Bemerkung der „Deutschen Post“ als Beleidigung auf, zogen während der Nacht in corpore nach Sao Leopoldo, zerschlugen und zertrümmerten alles und verbrannten vieles.

Als Notermund in Brasilien ankam, fand er wenig Interesse für die Bildung einer Synode, und es vergingen Jahre, ehe der Versuch gemacht wurde, eine Synodalversammlung einzuberufen. Im Jahre 1886 wurde aber der zweite Versuch, eine Synode zu gründen, gemacht. Die Versammlung tagte wiederum in Sao Leopoldo, und zwar am 19. und 20. Mai. Die von Notermund entworfenen Satzungen wurden angenommen, und Notermund wurde zum ersten Präses ernannt. Es waren sieben Gemeinden, die sich zu der Riograndenser Synode zusammenschlossen: Sao Leopoldo, Lomba Grande, Sao Sebastiao do Cahy, Santa Cruz, Santa Maria do Mundo Novo, Santa Maria da Bocca do Monte, Baumschneiß und Teutonia. Als Glieder des Vorstandes wurden erwählt Pfarrer Brutschin, Lehrer Grimm und die Herren Fr. Engel und Grefler.

Der Bekenntnisparagraph lautet: „Die Synode bekennt sich auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift zu den Symbolen der deutschen Reformation und schließt sich in Kultus, Lehre und Disziplin an die Kirche der Reformation an.“ Im Jahre 1923 wurden die Statuten verändert (Pfarrer Dohms, der jetzige Leiter des Profeminars und Redakteur der „Evangelischen Blätter“ arbeitete die Umänderung aus). Diese Umänderung ist sicherlich eine Verbesserung. Sie lautet: „Die Synode bekennt sich auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift zu den Symbolen der Reformation Luthers, vor allem der Augsburgerischen Konfession und Luthers Kleinem Katechismus. Sie schließt sich in Gottesdienstordnung, Lehre und Kirchengenucht an die evangelische Kirche Deutschlands an.“

Diese Verbesserung ist ohne Zweifel ein Resultat missouriischer Arbeit in Rio Grande do Sul. Aber ganz klar ist die jetzige Verfassung auch nicht. Was heißt „auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift“? Bekennt man sich wirklich zur Irrtumslosigkeit derselben? Welche Augsburgerische Konfession ist gemeint, die ungeänderte oder die geänderte? Gehört der Heidelberger Katechismus auch zu den Bekenntnissen der Reformation?

Über Aufnahme einer Gemeinde in den Synodalverband bestimmt die Konstitution: „Die Zugehörigkeit einer Gemeinde zu dieser Synode wird dadurch bedingt, daß die Gemeinde einen Geistlichen besitzt, der von einer Kirchenbehörde ordiniert ist, welche auf dem Grund der evan-

geliſchen Bekenntniſſe ſteht, oder im Falle, daß die Pfarrſtelle vakant iſt, einen ſolchen Geiſtlichen erbeten hat.“ Daß eine Gemeinde ſich zu der Lehre bekennt, die die Synode führt, wird nicht verlangt. Wie wäre dieſes auch möglich? Denn in der durch und durch unioniſtiſchen Riograndenſer Synode, in der keine Zucht geübt wird, lehrt jeder, waſ er will.

Die Synode beſtand jezt, genoß aber nicht das Vertrauen der Gemeinden, biß der ſogenannte Turmſtreit in Santa Maria da Bocca do Monte dazukam. Laut Artikel 5 der Staatsverfaſſung durften ja die Gottesdienſtlokale der Katholiken nicht die Abzeichen einer Kirche tragen. Die Gemeinde in Santa Maria hatten ſich Glocken von Deutſchland kommen laſſen und ſie in einem Turm über der Kirche untergebracht. Als alles fertig war, wurde die Kirche von den Behörden des Staates geſchloſſen. Jezt ließ der Synodalvorſtand zuſammen mit den Gemeindegliedern Unterſchriften ſammeln, und in kurzer Zeit hatte man 8,000 Unterſchriften. Karl v. Koſeritz telegraphierte dem dortigen Paſtor halb ermunternd, halb ſpottend: „Haben Sie keine Not! Laſſen Sie ſich nur einſtecken; denn wir holen ſie wieder heraus.“ Ein Turm iſt nicht das Abzeichen eines Tempels: das Narrenhaus in Rio hat zwei Türme.“ Zwar fiel der Vorſchlag, den Paragraphen zu ändern, bei der dritten Leſung durch, weil 12,000 Damen ſchriftlich dagegen proteſtiert hatten; aber die Synode war durch dieſen Streit populär geworden, und es erfolgten viele Anmeldungen. Der betreffende Paragraph wurde geändert, als 1889 die Republik proklamiert wurde.

Eine ſchwere Zeit brach für die Riograndenſer Synode an, als während des Weltkrieges die Unterſtützung von ſeiten Deutſchlands in Wegfall kam. Ohne Zweifel hat mancher Paſtor damals ziemlich Not gelitten, und es trat nicht nur ein Stillſtand, ſondern auch ein Rückgang ein. Aber man kam durch. Im Jahre 1913 hatte die Riograndenſer Synode 58 Paſtoren, die 85,595 Seelen bedienten. Folglich kamen auf jeden Paſtor rund 1,500 Seelen. In der Riograndenſer Synode werden beſtimmte Preiſe verlangt für Laufen in der Kirche oder im Hauſe, für Beerdigungen, Hochzeiten uſw. Ferner werden nach Bedarf Verloſungen oder Verſteigerungen veranſtaltet, wofür das Volk noch immer Geld übrig hat. Jedes Glied, das in die Gemeinde eintritt, muß ſich mit einer gewiſſen Summe einen Anteil an der Kirche kaufen. Und ſoll eine Kirche oder ein Pfarrhaus erbaut werden, ſo ſchickt man Leute aus, die „ſechten gehen“, das heißt, in allen Kolonien dafür Geld ſammeln. Auf dieſe Weiſe kam immer viel Geld ein. Wenn deſhalb manchmal angedeutet wurde, daß der Braſilianische Diſtrikt unſerer Miſſionſynode doch von den Riograndenſern lernen möchte, wie man ſelbſtändig werden könne, ſo wäre darauf zu antworten, daß wir nichts von den Riograndenſern zu lernen haben.

Eine eigentümliche Stellung nimmt die Schule in der Riograndenſer Synode ein. Eigentliche Gemeindefchulen gibt es gar nicht. Wohl ſtehen noch wie früher viele Paſtoren dieſer Synode tagtäglich in

der Schule; aber die Schule als solche hat nichts zu tun mit der Gemeinde. Sie gehört einem Schulverein an und wird von diesem geleitet. Die Gemeinde hat kein Recht, einen gottlosen und untreuen Lehrer zu entfernen, sie hat kein Recht zu bestimmen, welche Kinder Aufnahme finden und welche Fächer gelehrt werden sollen. Sogar die Lehrer, die auf dem eigenen Lehrerseminar ausgebildet worden sind, sind nicht Glieder der Synode, sondern meistens Glieder des Lehrervereins in Rio Grande do Sul. Zwischen Pastoren und Lehrern bestehen keine glaubensbrüderlichen Beziehungen, sondern es finden nicht selten starke Reibungen statt, die in den täglichen Zeitungen ihren Widerhall finden.

Seit einigen Jahren ist die Riograndenser Synode dem Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenbund, der am 25. Mai dieses Jahres sein zehnjähriges Jubiläum gefeiert hat, angeschlossen. Über den Nutzen dieses Anschlusses urteilt das „Sonntagsblatt“: „Wir erfahren [vom Kirchenbunde] Jahr um Jahr seine treue Fürsorge trotz der bitter-schweren Lage der Heimatkirche.“

Die Riograndenser Synode hat unsere missourische Arbeit von allem Anfang an gewaltig befehdet. Wie oft sind unsere Pastoren oder unser ganzer Distrikt verleumdet worden! Manchmal haben wir uns im „Kirchenblatt“ dagegen verwahrt; manchmal haben wir es gehen lassen, besonders wenn man immer mit einem und demselben Vorwurf kam. Der älteste und „langlebigste“ ist wohl der, daß wir Brasilien wirtschaftlich für Nordamerika erobern wollen („Erst der Talar, dann der Dollar“) oder deutschfeindlich gesinnt seien. Gerade in diesen Tagen kam dem Schreiber dieser Zeilen das Buch „Raum und Volk“ von Franz Kosaß, erschienen im Verlag von C. Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden, in die Hände. Auf Seite 21 lesen wir: „Dagegen thronte in der Hauptstadt [Porto Alegre] hoch oben auf dem Monte Serrat das Predigerseminar der nordamerikanischen Missourisynode, einer Gemeinschaft, die der deutschen Synode viel Kopfzerbrechen machte. . . . Es sind evangelische deutsche Stammesbrüder vom Missouristrom, die auf diesem prächtig gelegenen Hügel mit seiner entzückenden Aussicht sich eingerichtet haben, um unter den deutschen Einwanderern Südbraziiliens lutherische Mission zu treiben. Wohl trugen sie dieselben deutschen Namen wie wir, legen jedoch Wert darauf, Amerikaner zu sein. Sie warfen uns vor, daß wir das Evangelium hinter unser Deutschtum stellten, daß wir eine nationale, nicht aber christliche Aufgabe an unsern deutsch-evangelischen Auswanderern zu erfüllen trachteten. Hiermit begründeten sie ihr Eindringen in unsere Riograndenser Gemeinden [?], wobei ihnen ihre reichen Dollarmittel die beste Hilfe leisteten. Von einer gemeinsamen Heimat jenseits des Meeres wissen unsere deutsch-evangelischen Brüder von Missouri nichts mehr. Und die ewige Heimat droben über den Sternen meinen sie auf einem enger begrenzten, eigenen Wege zu finden. Sie alle, die von dem ganz neuzeitlich aufgeführten Gebäude auf dem Monte Serrat zu den deutschen Seelen im Urwald vorzubringen suchen, fühlen

nichts mehr davon, wie die Bande des Blutes und Glaubens uns unerschütterlich aneinanderketten können.“ Seite 122: „Wie lange werden die deutschen Siedler noch deutsch fühlen? Wann werden sie gleich unsern amerikanischen Stammesbrüdern vom Missouristrom und vom Monte Serrat bei Porto Alegre sagen: 'We aro Americans' — 'Nos somos Brasileiros'?“

Einzelne Angaben.

Der „Kalender für die deutschen evangelischen Gemeinden in Brasilien“ gibt in seiner Ausgabe 1931 folgende Zahlen für die Riograndenser Synode an: Pfarrer 83, Pfarrer im Ruhestande 10, Gemeinden 322, Gemeindeglieder 27,672, Seelen 152,179. Pfarrer Theophil Dietzsch von Novo Hamburgo ist gegenwärtiger Präses der Synode. Die Synode besteht aus zehn Kreisen, von denen jeder seinen eigenen Vorsteher hat. Alle Kreise halten Kreisversammlungen ab.

„Riograndenser Sonntagsblatt“, Schriftleiter: Pfarrer H. Beder in Novo Hamburgo. 46. Jahrgang. Das Blatt enthält auf der ersten Seite eine kurze biblische Betrachtung, dann einige Nachrichten aus den Gemeinden, eine laufende Geschichte, kleine politische Nachrichten und Anzeigen. Das Blatt erscheint wöchentlich und kostet 7\$500 das Jahr.

„Deutsche evangelische Blätter für Brasilien.“ Eine Monatschrift für die Pflege des Volkstums und der Volkskirche. Es gibt sich fast nur mit völkischen und philosophischen Problemen ab und legt bedeutend mehr Gewicht auf das Deutsche als auf das Evangelische. Redakteur: Pfarrer H. Dohms. 14. Jahrgang. Bezugsgehalt: 10\$000 pro Jahr.

„Kalender für die deutschen evangelischen Gemeinden in Brasilien.“ 11. Jahrgang. Redakteur: Pfarrer H. Beder, Novo Hamburgo. Auflage: 8,000.

„Kinderblatt.“ Erst erschienen im September 1930. Redakteur: Pfarrer Schütz von Montenegro.

Verglichen mit den Zeitschriften des brasilianischen Distrikts, erscheinen diese Blätter in sehr kleinen Auflagen. Unser „Kirchenblatt“ wird in einer Auflage von 2,100 gedruckt, unser Kalender in einer Auflage von 4,000. Die Riograndenser haben also nur eine doppelt so große Auflage wie wir, während doch die Seelenzahl jener Synode siebenmal größer ist als die unsern brasilianischen Distrikts.

Profeminar für evangelische Geistliche. Diese Schule wurde 1921 in Cachoeira, Rio Grande do Sul, gegründet, 1928 nach Sao Leopoldo verlegt, wo sie in den Gebäulichkeiten gegenüber dem Denkmal der deutschen Einwanderung Unterkunft fand. Im letzten Jahre konnte sie ihr Heim auf dem Spiegelberg in der Nähe Sao Leopoldos beziehen. Die Zöglinge erhalten in dieser Anstalt die nötigen Vorkenntnisse, um dann später im Diasporaseminar, Witten, Deutschland, Theologie zu studieren und als Pfarrer in Brasilien arbeiten zu können.

900 **The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.**

Deutsches Lehrerseminar. Nachdem man zweimal vergeblich versucht hatte, ein Lehrerseminar zu gründen (in Sao Lourenço und in Nhl Bella), schritt man zur Bildung einer Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Santa Cruz. Vor einigen Jahren ist dies Seminar nach Sao Leopoldo verlegt worden. 1924 waren 37 Kolonielehrer daraus hervorgegangen.

Evangelisches Stift in Hamburgerberg. Dies Töchterinstitut entstand im Jahre 1886 als Privatpensionat der beiden Fräulein Engel, ging aber 1895 an die Miograndenser Synode über. Bis jetzt hat diese Anstalt an die 600 Schülerinnen ausgebildet.

Altenheim und Waisenhaus. Als in den neunziger Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts eine ziemlich große Einwanderung von Deutschen in diese Gegend einsetzte, wurde Pfarrer Gättinger als Reiseprediger angestellt. Auf diesen Reisen fand er überall Waisenkinder, die ihre Eltern auf der Reise oder gleich nach der Ankunft in Brasilien verloren hatten. Dies führte zu der Gründung der Liebesanstalten der Miograndenser Synode. Am 31. Dezember 1892 wurde das erste Waisenmädchen angenommen. Der Nhlverein hat jetzt ein ansehnliches Eigentum am Taquaryfluß, eine halbtägige Fahrt per Flußdampfer von Porto Alegre, und hat laut eines Berichts vom Mai 1932 etwa 1,000 Pflöglinge (Alte, Heimatslose und erziehungsbedürftige Kinder) aufnehmen können.

D. Notermund hat für den Schulunterricht im eigenen Verlage folgende Bücher herausgegeben: „Katechismus der christlichen Religion“, „Religionsbuch“, Bibel, Lesebücher, Sprachlehre. Ferner hat er in seinem Verlage vierundzwanzig Bände „Südamerikanische Literatur“ herausgegeben. Er selbst hat drei dieser Bände verfaßt: Band 8, 15 und 24. Zweck der Herausgabe ist die Pflege deutscher Sprache und deutschen Wesens.

Porto Alegre, Brasilien.

Paul Schelp.

The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.

“With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer,” Luke 22, 15, that was the text of the sermon with which Innocent III opened the sessions of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215. Employing the allegorical method of Scripture interpretation, which was his favorite method, he found no difficulty in applying the “passover” to the great council now assembled before him. And it was very true that he had desired this council “with desire.” For, in a measure, this council and its activity was the great climax of his papal policy, a policy which had made and unmade kings, had reduced kingdoms to fiefs of the Roman See, had divided lands, had driven multitudes into a crusade, and had reduced great church dignitaries to the position of dutiful and obedient servants of the *Servus Servorum Dei*.

The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council. 901

It was this council which largely codified the great papal principles that had been evolved since the great claims of Gregory VII and were developed to their highest degree by Innocent. The decrees of this council represent the aims and principles of the man who is generally regarded as the greatest Pope of the Medieval Age; these decrees will show us the vast legislative and administrative sphere in which the Papacy of the early thirteenth century together with an obedient council could move.

A proper understanding of the acts of this council requires a knowledge of its historical background. At this time (1215) Innocent had been in office seventeen years. During these seventeen years great political maneuvers had been guided by his hand. Due to his efforts the fourth crusade had been undertaken by the French nobles; and although this crusade never reached the Holy Land, but was diverted to Constantinople, yet its gains were as efficient in enhancing the prestige of the Papacy as a conquest of Jerusalem could have been. For it was due to this crusade that the Greek Church was temporarily united with the Roman Church to some extent, and Innocent had had the satisfaction of performing an act which many of his predecessors had longed to perform: he had ordained an archbishop in the rival city of Constantinople. During that same period of seventeen years various crowned heads of Europe had bowed before the triple crown in Rome. In Germany the strife for the crown between Philip of Swabia and Otto IV had been in progress. After favoring one and then the other at various times, Innocent finally had managed to see his own favorite, Frederick II, in the imperial chair. In England, Innocent had won the great contest with John Lackland. This king had attempted to hinder the appointee of Innocent, Stephen Langton, from occupying the archbishopric of Canterbury. In the ensuing struggle between king and Pope the former saw his land placed under the interdict, observed how his own vassals were ready to revolt against him, was aware that his neighbor Philip IV of France was getting ready to invade England, and at last signed the dominions over to Innocent to receive them back again as a fief of the Pope. Innocent had also separated a king, Alfonso IX of Leon, from his spouse, had annulled the marriage of the crown prince Alfonso of Portugal, and had forced Pedro II of Aragon to hold his kingdom only as a papal fief. All these events were history when the Fourth Lateran Council met in Rome, and they all presaged a similar daring and energetic policy in the canons which this council was about to sanction.

The call for the council was issued April 19, 1213, fully two and a half years before the date which was set for the meeting of the assembly, November 1, 1215. The citations were sent throughout all the provinces of the Church, and they urged archbishops and bishops

902 The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.

to come; priors and abbots of all territories were to be represented. Also the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem received letters from Innocent, not to mention various kings who were urged to help in the matters to be treated by the coming council.

The chief aims of this council were clear to the Pope. These were twofold, and they are expressed by Innocent in the letter to the archbishops and bishops in the province of Vienna as follows: "*Inter omnia desiderabilia cordis nostri duo in hoc saeculo principaliter affectamus: ut ad recuperationem videlicet terrae sanctae ac reformationem universalis ecclesiae valeamus intendere cum effectu.*"¹⁾ The reformation of the Church, then, was one of the great purposes of this council. We shall not go amiss if we understand Innocent to refer the reformation mainly to a reformation of the clergy; it was the clerical body which received an unsparing castigation in many of the council's decrees, and, as will be shown later, the clergy was indeed in need of reformation. It must have been somewhat humiliating for many an archbishop or bishop to be welcomed to the council by the following scathing denunciation: "*Omnis in populo corruptela principaliter procedit a clero: Qua si sacerdos, qui est unctus, peccaverit, facit delinquere populum. . . . Hinc [from clergy] etiam mala provenerunt in populo Christiano. Perit fides, religio deformatur, libertas confunditur, iustitia conculcatur, haeretici pullulant, insolescunt schismatici, perfidi saeviunt, praevalent Agareni.*"²⁾ The various canons prepared against this evil were dictated by such convictions.

The other great aim of Innocent expressed in his call to the council was the organization of another crusade. The recovery of the Holy Land from the Saracens had been nothing less than a passion with him ever since he had been placed in the papal chair in 1198. His fond hopes seemed about to be realized in 1202, when the French nobles took the cross in great numbers. But these plans of Innocent had not materialized, for the host of crusaders was diverted from its real purpose; they had captured Constantinople (1204), but had left the Saracens in possession of the Holy Land. Innocent had drawn up his regulations for a fifth crusade long before the council met and had transmitted them to the various addresses of the papal citations to the council. The regulations were subsequently sanctioned by the council and will be discussed in the proper place. In addition to this effort, Innocent had tried diplomacy as a means of getting the Holy Land back into Christian possession. He had sent letters to the Sultan of Damascus, humbly beseeching him to quit the Holy Land and expressing the hope: "*Fortasse omnipotens Deus suum in eum*

1) Mansi, XXII, 960. (Note: All subsequent references to Mansi will be merely by column number. All the canons of the Fourth Lateran are contained in Vol. XXII of this collection.)

2) Col. 972.

terrorem immittet et benigne rogatus ostendet facere se spontaneum, quod dure compulsus facturum se putaret invitum."³⁾ To this end the patriarch of Jerusalem was urged to send men to the Sultan with this petition.

When the council met on November 11, 1215, Innocent saw a noble gathering before him. There were 71 patriarchs and metropolitans, including the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, 412 bishops, and 900 priors and abbots; in addition to these, envoys had appeared from Emperor Frederick II, from Henry, the Latin Emperor of Constantinople, and from the kings of France, England, Aragon, Hungary, Cyprus, Jerusalem, and others. The council met in three official sessions, November 11, 20, and 30. The unusually short term of this council can partly be accounted for by the fact that it was hardly a deliberative body; its canons had all been prepared before the meeting, and there was very little for it to do but to approve what had already been prepared. With this historical background we can proceed to observe the various spheres of legislation in which the council was active.

Legislation Concerning Reformation of the Clergy.

Since one of the two great aims of the Fourth Lateran Council was the correction of abuses among the clergy, a large number of regulations in this sphere was to be expected. The canons present a veritable array of sins, abuses, threats, and punishments in dealing with the clergy, both regular and secular. In many cases the wrongs committed by them are enumerated; in others we gain a knowledge of them by prohibitions alone. These canons portray the fact that every type of corruption had crept into the clerical body, among both its lower and its higher members. The many laws argue so many sins, and the many regulations adopted argue the prevalence of the numerous clerical misdeeds to which Innocent ascribed all the trouble in the Church.

The sins of greed and extortion appeared in various phases of clerical activity. Some bishops evidently used the demise of a rector as a means of getting some extra money; for they placed a church which had lost its official under the interdict and did not permit a successor to the dead man to take office until the church had paid a sum of money to the bishop.⁴⁾ Some of the regular clergy had a different mode of extorting money from the people. It was the practise of some non-clerical people to seek burial within the precincts of a cloister; this practise was used by the clerics as an occasion for extorting money from the ones desiring such favors.⁵⁾ A graver form of extortion was the following: According to custom a church or

3) 968.

4) 1054.

5) *Ibid.*

904 **The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.**

diocese was to pay the expenses of any legate who might be sent there in the performance of his duties. The prelates of the visited district were required to raise the amount from their charges. This led to the practise of collecting more than was needed for the expenses of the legate and to keep the balance. Evidently some legates also proceeded to collect expenses for visitations which were never held; for the council found it necessary to warn against this dishonesty.⁶⁾ Still another dishonest scheme of some clergy was exercised in performing marriage rites; unless a proper sum was forthcoming, they raised the claim of an impediment to the marriage about to be contracted, and the marriage could therefore be prevented until a "proper" payment had been made. Even excommunication and absolution were used as a means of extorting money.⁷⁾

The Fourth Lateran Council found it necessary also to regulate the private lives and activities of the clergy. The canons present abundant evidence that the clergy were rapidly becoming worldly, played the parts of great lords wherever they could, and looked upon their office as a mere source of income rather than as service to the souls entrusted to them. Innocent wails that both major and minor clergy spend half the night in superfluous banqueting and then sleep in the morning; some celebrate Mass not even four times a year and do not attend; and when they do attend, they gather in a place where they can conduct a conversation with the laymen during the Mass;⁸⁾ the clerics indulge in carousals, even conducting drinking-bouts, in which the greatest honor is given to him who outdrinks the others and empties the deepest cups; they imitate the lords by indulging in hunting and fowling with dogs and falcons.⁹⁾ Some have secular offices and trades, others mingle with jesters and fools, visit taverns unnecessarily, play dice, appear in gaudy green and red clothes, wear stitched gloves, gold and silver buckles, and adorn their horses with fancy harness and gilded bits.¹⁰⁾ In addition to this, unchastity and incontinence are found among the clergy, even among those who on account of some local custom (Greeks) have not renounced marriage.¹¹⁾

To what extent could and did Innocent and his council legislate in this sphere of improving clerical life and activity? One means of effecting a reformation might be called a fixing of responsibility. Innocent's conception of the clergy was that this body constituted a vast army, subdivided into many smaller jurisdictions of well-defined ranks, with papal authority extending down through the superior clergy even to every local parish priest. In agreement with this theory the council demanded a closer supervision on the part of such clergy as had others under their control.¹²⁾ An obvious method of improving this situation and effecting control from above was to keep out the

6) 1022.

8) 1006.

10) 1006.

12) 993.

7) 1035.

9) 1003.

11) 1003.

unfit or at least to prevent them from being promoted to important positions. The provincial synods therefore were to watch over the promotion of the clergy and the conferring of benefices. A metropolitan guilty of promoting the unfit to higher positions should be indicted before his superiors, and his ensuing suspension should not be removed by any one except the Pope or by one of the four patriarchs. This same fixing of responsibility on superiors is evident in the matter of confirming elections. If one has been promoted to a "*regimen animarum*," he who is to confirm the election shall first make a diligent inquiry both as to the fitness of the candidate and as to the process by which he has been promoted. If there is any irregularity in these matters, the superior shall have power to inflict due punishment upon the guilty. In addition, those clerics who are under the immediate jurisdiction of the Roman See shall be required to present themselves in Rome personally to receive confirmation in their office, or they must send a proper person who can give information about their election.¹³⁾

In addition to fixing responsibility as a means of clerical control the council sought to curb evils among the clergy by a great number of regulations concerning penalties of the transgressors. In fact, the reading of the various canons creates the impression that the chief means upon which the council relied in its reformation of the clergy was the threats and warnings which are attached to so many of the reformatory canons. The penalties vary in severity, from mere censure by words to permanent deposition from office and even to lifelong penance in a strict monastery. A superior guilty of improper conduct in office shall be liable to suspension, which only the Pope or one of the four patriarchs shall be able to lift.¹⁴⁾ A prelate guilty of extortion in any matter is to be punished by the exacting of restitution of twice the amount involved. A simoniac is to be "*damnatus*" with Gehazi and Simon.¹⁵⁾ Any one who is careless in the handling of sacred vessels shall be suspended for three months.¹⁶⁾ A most severe punishment was meted out to the confessors who revealed what had been entrusted to them in the confessional; they were to be deposed from office and condemned to perpetual penance in a strict convent. In this respect a priest might become guilty if only by a sign he revealed confessions; if the priest asked another for advice in a confessional matter, the mentioning of a name was strictly prohibited.¹⁷⁾ A further very effective and very common method of controlling clerics was to deprive them of their benefices. A cleric convicted of unchaste living who still dared to officiate was thus to be punished. The effectiveness of this mode of punishment can readily be seen; a bishop, for instance, who had been accustomed to rather high living could thus

13) 1014. 14) 1018. 15) 1051. 16) 1007. 17) 1010.

quickly be reduced to poverty; and the fact that there were always other prelates who were glad to obtain any vacant benefice only made the threat of the council more effective.

A more promising regulation of the council in its efforts to improve the morals of the clergy is to be found in the attempt to provide more adequate facilities for the schooling and training of the clergy. The Third Lateran Council (1179) had already decreed that at each cathedral there be an instructor to teach the clerics of that church and other poor scholars. The Fourth Lateran Council reiterated this measure, with the additional provision that also other churches, such as were not of cathedral rank, should have a teacher to teach the clergy in "*grammaticae facultate et aliis*" without expecting remuneration from them. The metropolitan churches are to do still more: they are to have a theologian to teach the priests and others in "*sacra pagina*" and especially in the "*cura animarum.*" We have here, then, a cathedral school of higher rank, a kind of theological seminary, a most promising institution for the improvement of the clerical state.¹⁸⁾

In this manner the Fourth Lateran Council attacked the problem of a reformation among the clergy. As might be expected, it extended its regulations not only to a certain phase of clerical activity, but it proposed to make regulations for the superiors in their exercise of office, to look into the secret, private lives of the priests, to keep a watchful eye on the prelate in the exercise of the details of his office, to punish in various ways any infraction of discipline, and to demand a certain standard of education from those who intended to be leaders of the flock. The medieval cleric therefore constantly moved in a sphere which was touched at a great number of points by regulations of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Legislation in the Sphere of Church Administration.

We now come to a sphere of the council's activity which concerned itself with various phases of church administration. Here a great variety of regulations presents itself, intended either for the correction of certain abuses or for the expediting of certain activities in the Church. While the acts concerning the clergy were largely negative or prohibitory, the acts which are to be listed here are of a more positive character.

Here again there are a number of regulations concerning the principles which are to govern the clergy in the future. The election of clerical dignitaries by a chapter is guided by the following regulation: When an election by a chapter is to take place, three men are to be chosen for the purpose of gathering and announcing the votes. There is to be no appeal against an election so conducted. It is legitimate also to commit such an election to a few to be chosen for

18) 999.

the purpose; but under no circumstance may an election be secret, and the result of an election of a pastor is to be made public at once. The possibility is left open that in an unusual case there may be an election by divine inspiration.¹⁹⁾ No one is to have more than one "*dignitas ecclesiastica*"; if he attempts to acquire a second one, he is to lose his original benefice, and in case he tries to hold this, he shall lose both.²⁰⁾ An election to a spiritual office by secular help is always void.²¹⁾ No church should be allowed to exist without a pastor for more than three months; if those who are primarily responsible for electing one fail to act, it shall be the duty of the next higher authority to bring about an election.²²⁾ Preaching without license is prohibited and subjects the guilty one to excommunication.²³⁾ Thus the entrance into, and the promotion to, certain offices in the Church was carefully regulated.

Another means of clerical administration was the renewed provisions concerning provincial councils to be held every year. Such meetings were an old institution. The council urges that such meetings be held regularly and makes the following additional provision: A number of proper persons shall be elected who shall be engaged throughout the year in visiting the various dioceses, investigating what may be in need of correction and reporting on such matters in the ensuing provincial meeting. These men shall also be required to supervise the execution of various provincial and other regulations in their circuits.²⁴⁾ We have here, then, a system of visitation which has often been used in church-bodies.

Considerable thought was given by Innocent and his obedient council to matters arising from the ecclesiastical courts; a large number of regulations were made about details of appeals, competency of judges, and other legal matters, so that this part of the canons closely resembles some of the modern judiciary codes with their technical rules. It was the question of appeals from a decision of a judge which seemed most in need of regulation. A few of these judicial regulations follow: In a litigation before a judge an appeal may not be made to a superior judge before a judgment has actually been rendered. This was evidently intended to block what we call a change of venue in order to have the benefit of a more favorable court. Furthermore, if any complainant considers himself entitled to an appeal to a superior judge, he must first place the matter before the original judge.²⁵⁾ If the case reaches the appellate judge and he does not recognize the appeal, the matter, of course, reverts to the original judge. The occasion might also arise that the competency of a judge was questioned and an appeal was to be made to another judge on this account. Provisions for this eventuality were made as follows:

19) 1011.

21) 1014.

23) 990.

25) 1021.

20) 1018.

22) 1011.

24) 991.

908 The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.

If any one regards the judge who has his case with suspicion, he shall first indicate the cause thereof to this same judge. Thereupon the appellant, together with his adversary or with the judge, shall elect arbitrators; if they cannot agree on arbitrators, each of the litigants shall select one man to form a committee of arbitration. These two are to investigate the charge resting on suspicion. If in the opinion of these arbitrators no just cause for suspicion against the judge exists, this judge shall resume jurisdiction over the case; if the suspicion is justified, the case, of course, goes to another judge.²⁶⁾ If the guilt of an appellant is evident and the right of appeal is used merely to endanger innocence, no attention is to be paid to the appeal. An appeal from a decision must be forthcoming within a specified time after judgment has been rendered, the time to be fixed by the original judge; if it is not forthcoming during this time, the appeal is void.²⁷⁾

This judicial administration was regulated by a few more rules. It was evidently the practise in ecclesiastical litigation to appeal to the Pope in order to have a case tried in a special court. In these requests one of the litigants might possibly ask for a court so far removed from the place where the action was really to take place that the opponent dropped the matter rather than to incur the trouble and expense of going to a distant court. To avoid this, the rule is made that a matter cannot be taken before a judge who is distant more than two days' journey, unless both litigants consent to go farther. Clerics are also forbidden to condemn to death, to execute, to help in mutilating offenders; nor shall any one bless an ordeal in which hot or cold water or a red-hot iron is used.²⁸⁾

These phases of clerical activity were not the only spheres in which the canons of this council concerned themselves with ecclesiastical administration. In addition thereto we find a great variety of regulations touching various and unrelated activities of church polity. A very important canon made a far-reaching rule for the practise of confession: It was decreed that all people of proper age should confess all their sins to their own priest at least once a year and commune at least at Easter, on pain of being excluded from the Church and being denied a Christian burial.²⁹⁾ This canon was repeated in later councils, and its provision is official practise to this day.

In the case of an existing interdict in a certain territory the clergy are granted certain privileges. Thus the bishop may perform divine offices in a church in the time of an interdict, but none of the excommunicated or those under the interdict may be present; the doors must remain closed, the voice suppressed, and the bells must not be rung. The regular clergy also, if they are not themselves under

26) 1034.

27) 1035.

28) 1007.

29) 1010.

the interdict, may use a church for burial of one of their brethren though their church may be under the interdict.³⁰⁾

The council was quite explicit in laying down rules concerning excommunication. These rules were all intended to curb abuses that had crept in in the handling of this dangerous weapon. Some of the more important provisions in this sphere were: No excommunication is to be pronounced without a previous warning, and such a warning shall always be given in the presence of witnesses who can testify in case of an appeal. The person excommunicated may enter his plea of unjust treatment with a superior; this superior may then send the plaintive back to the excommunicator with instructions for the lifting of the ban if there be cause, or he may, in the case of urgent necessity, lift the ban himself. These regulations offered at least some protection against an institution which was easily subject to wide-spread abuse.

In dioceses in which different languages are represented, there shall not be a separate bishop for each language, but only one. He shall appoint the proper men to carry out the service required under his control.³¹⁾

Church-buildings are not to be used for non-religious purposes. It had become the custom to place private property into the church-buildings when such property was in danger of being attacked by hostile forces; the church-building was considered hallowed ground. Such practise must not be continued except in case of most urgent necessity. At all times the church utensils are to be kept clean.³²⁾

The use of relics was also regulated. No relics of saints are to be exposed for sale, and no newly found relics shall be venerated unless these have previously been approved by authority of the Pope. The prelates shall not tolerate those who attempt to bring in spurious relics on the testimony of false documents. Neither should every seeker of alms be permitted to ply his trade in the dioceses. All those properly qualified to collect alms shall in the future be identified by a special form letter from the Pope.³³⁾

It must have been a source of special satisfaction to Innocent that the fifth canon could be adopted. This canon indicated the rank which the different patriarchs were to occupy. Rome was placed first; then came the patriarch of Constantinople, then those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in the order mentioned. To place the patriarch at Constantinople in second place was a little more than a mere claim at that time; for the Greek Church was nominally united with the Roman Church due to the Fourth Crusade, and thus the ideal of many Popes had been reached.

30) 1046.

31) 998.

32) 1007.

33) 1050.

910 **The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.**

In these various phases of legislation the council regulated the administration of the Church. The canons, of course, take countless existing administrative regulations for granted and merely add or define such as are necessary. It is remarkable, however, to what minute details of church administration these canons extend.

Regulations in Monastic Matters.

We now come to a sphere of administration which is related to the matters concerning monastic affairs. Monasticism was an old institution of the Church by this time, and it had long lost the sincerity and the self-denying character which had distinguished it in its purest state. Monasteries had become rich, monks had become idle, and abbots were often powerful personages. Various attempts at reformation of the monasteries had already been made, such as the plan of the Congregation of Cluny; the founding of the Dominican and Franciscan orders was also an attempt to place the monastic ideal back on a purer basis. The Fourth Lateran Council therefore quite properly set up regulations also for this field.

Some of the complaints against monastic discipline found their way into the canons of this council. The nunneries are described as admitting hardly any one without the payment of a price, and in defense of this extortion they plead their own poverty. This practise is to be stopped by a measure providing that both the one who accepts such money and the one who pays it are to be transferred to stricter convents and to be placed under perpetual penance. If this penalty cannot be carried out in a certain case, then by way of dispensation a guilty one may remain in the same convent, but he shall be reduced again to the rank of one just entering the convent. This regulation is to apply also to monks, and in order that all may become acquainted with this rule, the bishops are to publish it every year.³⁴⁾ Still other evils are prevalent among the inmates of convents. Complaint is made that some abbots encroach upon the privileges of bishops by interfering in matrimonial affairs, ordering public penances, and granting letters of indulgence, whereby the authority of the bishops suffers.³⁵⁾ The abbots are warned to remain in their spheres. A further regulation of the council is that none of the monks may without the consent of the abbot and the major portion of the chapter give security or borrow money beyond a fixed sum. The convent shall not be liable for such sums, unless the matter has evidently redounded to the benefit of the convent.³⁶⁾

This council also prohibited the founding of new religious orders with separate *regulae*. If any new religious houses are to be founded, the *regula* of one of the approved religious orders must be adopted.³⁷⁾

34) 1051.

35) 1047.

36) 1047.

37) 1003.

The number of orders had been continually on the increase and was generally harmful to monastic life and discipline; hence the prohibition.

An outstanding regulation concerning monastic affairs was the provision that the various abbots of certain orders should all meet at intervals of three years. This had become a standing practise among the Cistercian monks and was evidently considered highly beneficial to the order. The council therefore decrees that the abbots of every province meet every three years. At their meetings they are to invite two Cistercian monks from the neighborhood, under whose leadership the meeting is to be held. The main purpose of these meetings shall be the reformation of the orders.³⁸⁾

These regulations in the monastic field are interesting because of the great amount of detail contained therein. Just as in the case of the clergy, the details of the monks' private lives are within the sphere of conciliar legislation, while the whole monastic system is subject to change in administration due to the decrees of this council.

Legislation Concerning Heresy.

When the Fourth Lateran Council met in 1215, the Papacy had just passed through a great struggle with the Albigensian heresy. This struggle had caused Innocent considerable annoyance, and he had finally settled the matter by the cruel and inhuman crusade against the Albigenses. The bloodthirstiness which had come to the surface in the treatment of the unfortunates was still evident in the canons which Innocent caused the council to sanction. Due to his instigation the council did not confine its legislation to those who were actually guilty or suspected of heresy, but it attacked rulers who tolerated heretics, it condemned clerics not sufficiently eager in ferreting them out, and it outlawed and ostracized even those who were only humanly decent to a heretic.

To effect an extirpation of heresy, the second council first made regulations for the archbishops and bishops. Once or twice every year these officials are to go through a district in which there are persons suspected of heresy. They shall require a number of honest men in a community to swear that they will inform the bishop in the event that a heretic is known to exist or if there are any who hold secret meetings or differ from the common manner of living.³⁹⁾ The secular authorities are coerced as follows: All secular officials must give an oath that they will exterminate those whom the Church designates as heretics. The condemned are to be handed over to secular authorities with instructions for proper punishment. If a ruler fails to act, he is to be ruined. If after due admonition he refuses to purge his land

38) 1001.

39) 990.

912 **The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.**

of heresy, he is first to be excommunicated; if he does not make satisfaction within one year, the matter is to be referred to the Pope, who will release the ruler's subjects of fealty and open the recalcitrant's lands to any one who will occupy them and extirpate the heretics found therein.

The council goes to still wider spheres in the heresy hunt and attacks also those who *help* the heretics. They shall be excommunicated, and if they have not made satisfaction within a year, they shall be "*infames*," not permitted to hold any office nor to help in electing others. Such a one shall not be entitled to will property or to inherit any; no action can be taken by him in court, but he shall be subject to every court action; if he is a judge, his judgment shall have no effect, and no matters are to be brought to him; if he is a lawyer, his pleading shall not be admitted; if he is a notary, his documents shall not be valid. Even those who merely fail to avoid heretics shall be struck by the fury of the Church. They shall be excommunicated; they shall not receive the Sacraments nor a Christian burial nor any alms, and not even their own offerings shall be accepted.

Thus Innocent used his council to enter into all the relations of mankind and to control them, whenever he considered it necessary, for the sake of exterminating those whose religious convictions differed from the Pope's. No relation was too sacred, no oath so binding, that the obedient council was not willing to step in with its decrees and legislate away all human considerations for the sake of destroying heretics. Here the mark of the Antichrist is very evident.

Social Legislation.

A number of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council refer to matters regulating the conduct of man towards man and might therefore be called social legislation. Such provisions are indeed always made with a religious interest and with a view to fostering the Church in some way, but they are yet not directly a part of church administration.

The outstanding regulations in this sphere pertain to matrimonial matters. It is significant, if not surprising, that this council, whose general tone was increasing strictness in determining clerical conduct, should make a noteworthy concession to the laity. This concession was that marriage between those of the second and third degrees of affinity (not consanguinity) and marriage between the children of a woman's second marriage with the relatives of her first husband should be permitted. Innocent justifies this change by referring to the great difficulty encountered in observing the former prohibition and by the consideration that God had also changed many regulations of Old Testament times upon the advent of the New

Testament.⁴⁰⁾ Most of the matrimonial regulations, however, are of the restrictive type, intended to correct certain abuses which had crept in. Some of these regulations are the following: Secret marriages are prohibited as always, and no cleric should dare to solemnize such; an intended marriage shall be announced in the churches for a specific time, so that, if any one knows of an impediment, it may be made known; the presbyters shall investigate a proposed marriage, whether there is any matter of impediment, and if there is any possibility of irregularity, the matter must first be cleared. If any one enters a marriage within prohibited degrees, knowingly or otherwise, the children shall be declared illegitimate; also the children of those parents who married knowing that some other impediment to marriage existed shall be called illegitimate. But if any one out of malice prefers charges of an impediment against a proposed marriage, he shall be subject to ecclesiastical censure.⁴¹⁾

Innocent and his council also proposed to legislate regarding the troublesome social and commercial questions arising out of the presence of Jews among Christians. The Jewish practise of excessive usury was a constant source of irritation during the Middle Ages. The council decrees that, if the Jews under any pretext extort immoderate usury from the Christians, they shall be boycotted, and any Christian who disregards the order of a boycott shall be brought to obedience by ecclesiastical censure; the secular princes should help in this control of the Jews. If the Jews purchase property on which some income is due to the Church, the Jews are bound to pay this to the Church as before.⁴²⁾ Rather unique regulations are made concerning the conduct of the Jews. They and the Saracens are to wear clothes differing from those of the Christians to avoid great confusion. Since the Jews blasphemously make it a practise to appear in gaudy clothes during the Passion season, to the offense of the Christians, they are to appear in public as little as possible during this time, and the secular powers shall enforce this rule.⁴³⁾

A regulation of religious interest which peculiarly affected one class was an instruction to the physicians. Upon being called to a patient, they shall admonish him first of all to call a physician of the soul. The reasonableness of this command is justified by the consideration that, if a person's spiritual welfare has been secured, the cause of the disease has been removed, and therefore the physician's medicine is then more likely to be effective. Ecclesiastical censure shall follow a physician who disregards this rule; furthermore, a physician who prescribes a remedy which is harmful to the soul is to be subject to a perpetual anathema.⁴⁴⁾

40) 1035.

42) 1054.

44) 1010.

41) 1038.

43) 1055.

914 The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Concerning Doctrinal Matters.

The Fourth Lateran Council was not much concerned with matters of doctrine. Its emphasis was distinctly placed on conduct, especially the conduct of the clergy. It did find reasons, however, for giving a doctrinal summary in the first and second canons, the former bearing the heading *De Fide Catholica*; the latter, *De Erroribus Joachim*. The first canon is practically a restatement of the Apostolic and the Athanasian Creed, with a few significant additions. One important point therein is the fact that here we find the term *transsubstantiatio* used officially for the first time in speaking of the Real Presence in the Eucharist.⁴⁵⁾ This term remained a characteristic of Roman Catholic doctrine, and the grave error it represents was destined to be the cause of some of the most serious church dissensions in a later age. Another point confessed in this canon is the statement that not only those who abstain from marriage, but also the married may be saved. This was confessed in opposition to the heretical Cathari, who denied this.⁴⁶⁾ The second canon is a refutation of Abbot Joachim of Flore, in Calabria, who had attacked Petrus Lombardus's *De Unitate seu Essentia Trinitatis*. In this book the author had stated that Father, Son, and Spirit are *quadam summa res*. Joachim declared that with this interpretation God would not be a Trinity, but a "Quaternity," the *summa res* being a fourth factor. The council defended Peter and condemned Joachim.

Legislation in Political Matters.

In view of the many political triumphs which Innocent had to his credit when the Fourth Lateran Council met a large amount of extreme political legislation might be expected in order that conciliar authority might be given to the sweeping principles of universal papal control which Innocent had maintained. But this is not the case. None of the great victories of Innocent is mentioned in the seventy canons of the council; this is perhaps due to the fact that the principle of papal control over secular powers was such a well-established principle that it did not require the sanction of a council.

The council nevertheless adopted a few canons which, though usually dealing with minor details of secular affairs, show that the principle of the Church's being above the State was tacitly assumed. The complaint is made that in some love has waxed cold to such a degree that they have no respect for the immunities of the Church which have been guaranteed by the fathers and the secular princes; by fictitious claims they seek to alienate property of the Church and even of the dead. It is decreed therefore that any sale of church

45) Hefele, *Konziliengeschichte*, V. 878.46) *Ibid.*

property without proper church authority is null and void, and those who attempt such things shall be subject to ecclesiastical censure.⁴⁷⁾

The oft-recurring question of taxing the clergy was treated also in this council. The Third Lateran Council had already urged excommunication of those secular rulers who would dare to tax the clergy. This council went a little farther by stating that the rules and declarations of any one who was excommunicated for taxing the clergy were null and void. It seems that some secular officials employed a rather clever scheme for taxing the clergy in spite of the ban of excommunication. They taxed the clergy while in office and calmly endured the sentence of excommunication for the term of their office. Having been relieved of their secular office, they were no longer in position to restore the ill-gotten tax. The Fourth Lateran Council decrees that such an ex-official be under the anathema until this tax has been returned, and the successor in office shall likewise be under the anathema if restitution is not effected within one month after he has taken office.⁴⁸⁾

A peculiar political provision is made concerning the Jews. They were barred from all public offices, since they abused their position to the detriment of Christians. The council said that it was absurd to have a blasphemer of Christ in a position of authority over Christians. The means of forcing Jews from office was the commercial boycott.⁴⁹⁾

At least two political regulations were sanctioned by the council. In the Albigensian Crusade, Simon of Montfort had driven Raymond of Toulouse from his possessions; despite the plea of penitent Raymond for a return of his property this remained permanently confiscated and by the consent of the council remained in the hands of Simon of Montfort.⁵⁰⁾ Likewise the ban on Otto IV was reiterated and the elevation of Innocent's *protégé* Frederick II to the imperial throne was sanctioned by the council.

Concerning a Crusade.

The crusade, as mentioned before, represented Innocent's one great passion, and he consequently planned its execution years before there was even a faint hope of setting it in motion. It was in this endeavor that Innocent worked out the minutest regulations; and these were sanctioned by the council. In these regulations cognizance was taken of the fact that a crusade is an unusual undertaking, and there was a kind of war-time legislation which made demands upon the people such as would likely have been resented at any other time. Even before the council met, Innocent had sent out men into the various provinces to make preparations for the crusade. The council sanctioned the inviting inducements held out to the crusaders. First

47) 1027.

48) 1031.

49) 1059.

50) 1096—1170.

916 The Legislative Sphere of the Fourth Lateran Council.

of all, the familiar promise was made that those who were truly penitent could use participation in a crusade as a short cut (*compendium*) to heaven. Plenary indulgence was promised to all who penitently would take part in the crusade at their own expense. But those who would send a proxy and pay his expenses should receive indulgence as well as their proxy. Those who would merely contribute according to their means should receive forgiveness *iuxta quantitatem subsidii et devotionis affectum*. To remove a crusader's concern for his relatives and property at home, these were placed under the special protection of Peter, the Pope and the church officials.⁵¹⁾ To help the crusaders still more, it was decreed that no one should be authorized to collect debts or interest for debts from one who participated in the crusade. The Jews, too, had to remit interest to debtors who took part in a crusade; if they failed to do so, they were to be boycotted.⁵²⁾

In order to foster the movement, the clergy must diligently work for the crusade. Any one who has taken the vow of the cross and fails to carry it out shall be excommunicated. Those princes who do not go personally must send a certain number of warriors in their stead. To avoid any aid's being given to the Saracens, a number of prohibitory acts were adopted. Thus any one who would sell weapons to the enemy or serve as a pilot on a Saracen ship was to be excommunicated. This decree was to be made known in all maritime cities. For the space of four years no one was to send even a ship to Saracen lands lest the enemy profit from commerce.⁵³⁾ Any one who would help the pirates or buy and sell in his dealings with them was to be excommunicated.

The clergy also felt the pressure of the crusade. The Pope himself promised to contribute liberally toward the cause; he gave one-tenth of his income. It was made the duty of the clergy everywhere to give one-twentieth.⁵⁴⁾ To the clergy who would take part in the crusade the concession was made that their incomes from their benefices would go on even during their absence.⁵⁵⁾

In another sphere these decrees directly affected the accustomed routine of life. Under pain of excommunication all tournaments were forbidden for a period of three years. And for four years all Christian princes were commanded to observe peace, either by concluding peace or making a truce. Any one despising this regulation was to be excommunicated and his land to be put under interdict.⁵⁶⁾ At the back of all these far-reaching decrees stood Innocent and his subservient council.

Thus the decisions of the council reached down into all phases of human activity and human endeavor. The child in the cradle might

51) 957. 958.

53) 1066.

55) 1059.

52) 1066.

54) 1063.

56) 1066.

be illegitimate as this council decreed; the old man seeking a burial-place might be affected by its decisions. The prelate was surrounded on all sides by conciliar resolutions, and the monk could not escape its many provisions. The ruler who engaged in a war, no less than the one who sued for peace, might endanger himself by transgressing a decree of the council. The sailor and the ship-owner, the tradesman and the artisan, might conflict with the council by indiscriminate activity. The Jew might offend by his attire and might find his business ruined because of the Fourth Lateran Council. Yet the unusual jurisdiction which this council claimed was not an illogical usurpation of power. It was rather the logical deduction from the great pretensions which the Papacy had made since the days of Gregory VII, pretensions which found their fullest expression in Innocent III. The theory of universal papal jurisdiction being accepted, the far-reaching regulations of this subservient council were but the conclusions from accepted premises.

Seward, Nebr.

H. O. A. KEINATH.

NOTE.—The interested student is referred to the following works, which give the sources or offer an extended treatment: Mansi, Johannes Dominicus: *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. Florence and Venice, 1759—1798. (Vol. XXII contains the records of the Fourth Lateran Council. The MSS. on which this edition is based are in the Vatican Library.) — Labbe, Philip: *Sacrosancta Concilia ad Regum Editionem Exacta*. Venice, 1728—1733. (Contains the records of this council, Vol. XIII.) — Potthast, Augustus: *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab a. post Chr. n. MCXCVIII ad a. MCCIV*. 2 vols. Berlin, 1874. (Contains lists of sources, but not the texts.) — Hefele, Carl, Joseph: *Konziliengeschichte*, Vol. 5. Freiburg, 1886. — Luchaire, Achille: *Innocent III. Le Concile de Latran et la Réforme de l'Eglise*. Paris, 1908. — Hurter, F. E. von: *Geschichte des Papstes Innozenz' III. und seiner Zeitgenossen*. 4 vols. Hamburg, 1841—1844. — Walch and Buddeus: *Commentatio Historico-theologica de Conciliis Lateranensibus Rei Christianae Noxiis*. Jena, 1725. — Lessius: *Discussio Decreti Magni Concilii Lateranensis*. — Widdringtonus: *Discussio Discussionis Decreti Lateranensis*. — A limited treatment of the council is found in various church histories, such as Schaff, Kurtz, Moeller, Alzog.

Is the New Science Hostile to Religion?

The question is raised in a letter which just comes to hand from Rev. H. J. S. Astrup of Zululand, South Africa, who calls himself "an unknown far-away man," but whose labors in the South Africa mission-field are not unknown to us. Rev. Astrup particularly refers to a recent book of Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*, a book which in this reader's opinion "has upset many person's faith," particularly in its bearings on the Christian's belief in creation.

The volume here referred to indeed created a sensation on both sides of the ocean when it was published two years ago, and the views of the author are still a matter of lively dispute among scientists. *Philosophy*, Journal of the British Institute of Philosophy, in its January issue of this year, contained an article by Sir James Jeans summarizing the views presented in this now famous volume. Reply was made in the April issue by no less a scientist than Sir Oliver Lodge. Jeans is a famous astronomer and mathematician, while Lodge is one of the famous European students of physics. It is to be noted that he by no means agrees with his brother scientist in his theories about the physical nature of the universe. Let us put a pin there. Whether Jeans agrees or disagrees with Christianity, his book does not represent a consensus of modern science. However, also Sir Oliver Lodge accepts it as a possible conclusion of all modern physics "that the universe is governed by Mind." His chief disagreement with Jeans is on the nature of the ether.

But now let us turn to Jeans's volume.

It cannot be maintained that the author takes the Christian viewpoint of the physical world. He accepts the hypothesis which looks upon the earth as a particle of matter cast off by the sun some two thousand million years ago. Life originated as the earth cooled. He accounts for life through the combination of carbon with other elements and knows nothing of a "vital force." All life will come to an end when the sun loses its heat. Also the human race "is probably destined to die of cold." With all this, Bible Christians must disagree.

The Mysterious Universe deals with some of the most profound mathematical speculations of our day, the quantum theory, relativity, and others. For this reason, and also because the author does not claim to speak the last word on many questions of present-day science, some readers may be left with the impression that the book is antagonistic to the Christian doctrine of creation of the world through divine power. Neither our first reading of the book nor our second, just concluded, bears out this viewpoint.

Over against a prevalent notion of evolutionists, Sir James does not believe that there are many planetary systems; and again in opposition to evolutionism he does not believe that life could originate almost anywhere in the universe, but only in "less than a thousand-million-millionth part of the whole of space." (P. 5.) This makes life a very unique thing. Again, he believes in free will, the basis of all morality, and on this point directly opposes the science until recently in vogue. (Pp. 20. 31.)

References are found to the immense age of the universe, running to "millions of millions of years," a theory for which proof is found in the cooling rate of the sun and of other stars. But Sir

James is fair enough to see evidence of another kind, and he believes that we are living in an expanding universe, which started a limited number of years ago, pointing to a date of creation "not infinitely remote." (P. 154.) His theory in some points is a complete reversal of modern evolutionistic views. For instance, while infidel science looks upon matter as eternal, he believes that matter can be annihilated, indeed "is being annihilated on a vast scale out in the depth of space." (P. 75.) In this manner he accounts for cosmic radiation. (P. 78 f.) As against the materialistic view of the universe he asserts that modern science has dissolved all matter into "waves and nothing but waves." "These concepts reduce the whole universe to a world of light, potential or existent, so that the whole story of its creation can be told with perfect accuracy and completeness in the six words: 'God said, "Let there be light."' " (P. 83.)

Vast, indescribably majestic, and mysterious indeed does the universe appear under the aspect of the new mathematical theories. Infidels point to this fact, and they proclaim that God cannot possibly be concerned in the welfare of human beings, these brief life forms on the crust of "a small planet revolving around a third-rate sun." Jeans does not share this point of view. He says: "It is probably unnecessary to add that on this view of things the apparent vastness and emptiness of the universe and our own insignificant size therein need cause us neither bewilderment nor concern. The immensity of the universe becomes a matter of satisfaction rather than awe; we are 'citizens of no mean city.' Again, we need not puzzle over the finiteness of space; we feel no curiosity as to what lies beyond the four walls which bound our vision in a dream." (P. 153.)

Modern science as represented in this volume has definitely parted company with infidel materialism. Again, we hear scientists speak of a Creator, of an act of creation, and of Mind "as the creator and governor of the realm of matter." (P. 158.) "The universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds." (P. 159.)

Our faith is not based upon the speculations or even on the more solid research of scientists. Whether Jeans, Eddington, Millikan, Einstein, Compton, Planck, agree or disagree with the Bible, contend against it or announce their agreement with it, bears no relation to our Christian conviction. God's Spirit has spoken to us through the Bible, speaks to us through Christian preaching, and creates that response in our hearts which we call faith. Yet it is encouraging to know that amidst the confusion of modern scientific speculation — also *The Mysterious Universe* is self-contradictory in some of its sections — voices are being heard, voices of men in the front rank of scientific research, protesting against a materialistic evolutionism with its denials of all that is fundamental in religion and morals.

If one would ask what is the greatest generalization of twentieth-century science, the answer would undoubtedly be: "I believe in a God."

Henshaw Ward said in the *Saturday Review of Literature* of April 4, 1931: "The mechanistic philosophy has always seemed to me the most incomprehensible product of the human brain. And to most scientists it has appeared to be a blind and monstrous explanation — as if a clam should aver that the universe consists of nothing but mud. There are indications that materialism was the creed of several scientists in the nineteenth century, but I have advertised in vain for any example of it written in the twentieth century by a scientist under fifty years of age. The only profession of materialism that I have ever seen is *Modern Science and Materialism*, by Hugh Elliot, an English writer on philosophical subjects, not a scientist. But even this philosopher concedes 'the whole foundation of knowledge to idealism,' and he remarks: 'I do not for a moment defend materialism in a metaphysical sense, as if I were to affirm that matter is an ultimate fact.'

"A modern scientist who preached materialism — granted that there could be such an animal — would be a laughing-stock to his colleagues. The judgment of W. C. D. Dampier-Whetham on this point represents the overwhelming majority of scientific opinion: 'At the beginning of the twentieth century the majority of men of science held unconsciously a naive materialism — the old materialism is dead.'"

Among the world's astronomers and mathematicians none stands higher than the Cambridge Professor A. S. Eddington. His domain is strictly that of physical science and of mathematics. But a few quotations from his most recent work* will demonstrate how completely materialism has been discarded as an attempt to account for the universe: —

"The modern scientific theories have broken away from the common standpoint which identifies the real with the concrete. I think we might go so far as to say that time is more typical of physical reality than matter." (P. 275.) "To put the conclusion crudely — the stuff of the world is mind-stuff." (P. 276.) "The mind-stuff of the world is of course something more general than our individual conscious minds; but we may think of its nature as not altogether foreign to the feelings in our consciousness. The realistic matter and fields of force of former physical theory are altogether irrelevant." (P. 276.) "The substratum of everything is of mental character." (P. 281.)

Especially the quantum theory has worked havoc with the ancient materialistic views of matter. This theory was developed some

* *The Nature of the Physical World.*

fifteen years ago by Prof. Max Planck. He argued that light does not consist of waves, but comes in bullets or particles, "quanta." Experiments made on X-rays by Compton of Chicago confirmed this theory. In 1927 Dr. Werner Heisenberg built on this basis the daring new theory called "The Principle of Uncertainty" or "Indeterminacy." The quantum theory as well as Heisenberg's principle is so involved with the intricacies of higher mathematics that the layman is unable to form a mental picture of these new scientific principles. As a matter of fact they can be conceived only mathematically. But they belong to the standard doctrine of physics as it is now taught in the universities. Now, the deductions made from the quantum and indeterminacy principles are such as to shake the very foundation of materialistic philosophy. Thus Dr. John C. McLennan, Professor of physics in Toronto University, said in an address delivered May 26, 1931, regarding Heisenberg's discovery: "Here divine intervention enters the picture." And again: "There, then, is room for divine intervention, for free will apart from mathematical predestination. There apparently is the point where something apart from physical laws can enter. That is a very comforting thought. There is no clash between science and religion. They are complementary. One makes provision for the other."

More and more the very concept of matter disappears and the most up-to-date scientific speculation is proceeding along lines of spiritualism, idealism, the recognition of the supernatural, of the divine. The world is not only the product of intelligence, but is receiving its inexhaustible flow of energy from a divine source. Behind all waves of cosmic energy is God.

THEODORE GRAEBNER.

Die Hauptschriften Luthers in Chronologischer Reihenfolge.

Mit Anmerkungen.

(Fortsetzung.)

1524. „Wider den neuen Abgott und alten Teufel, der zu Meissen soll erhoben werden.“ — Diese Schrift erschien spätestens Anfang Juni. Seine Absicht, diese Schrift zu verfertigen, hatte Luther schon Anfang April in einem Briefe an Spalatin angezeigt. (Vgl. XXI a, 608.) Die Schrift behandelt die Kanonisation des im Jahre 1106 oder 1107 verstorbenen Bischofs Venuo von Meissen, die im Mai 1523 stattgefunden hatte und die im Juni 1524 durch eine feierliche Erhebung seiner Gebeine öffentlich kundgegeben werden sollte. In 41 Paragraphen behandelt Luther den Unfug dieser Kanonisation, wobei er auch mit sonderlicher Ironie die Heuchelei geißelt, die bei diesen Heiligspredungen zutage tritt. Er sagt unter anderm: „Denn von den verstorbenen Heiligen hat er [Gott] uns nichts geboten; darum gefällt ihm auch nichts, was wir daran wenden, sondern Menschen haben solche Abgötterei erfunden, darum daß Geld trägt, wie das alles andere vor mir haben genugsam getrieben.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe XV, 2323—2340.)

922 Die Hauptschriften Luthers in chronologischer Reihenfolge.

1524. „Ein Sendbrief an die . . . Herren Bürgermeister, Rat und ganze Gemeinde der Stadt Mühlhausen.“ — Dies ist eine ganz kurze Schrift vom 21. August 1524, wesentlich eine Warnung vor Thomas Münzer, der sich ungerufen in Mühlhausen einschlich. Nachdem Luther seine Warnung ausgesprochen hat, schreibt er weiter: „Wo ihr aber solches verachtet, den Propheten annehmet und euch Unglück daraus entspringt, bin ich unschuldig an eurem Schaden, denn ich euch christlich und freundlich gewarnt habe.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, 2—4.)

1524. „Von Kaufshandlung und Wucher.“ — Diese Schrift erschien spätestens im September. In 60 Paragraphen führt Luther aus, was er von Handel, von Bürgerchaften und von Gesellschaften zu sagen hat. Die biblischen Prinzipien, die er behandelt, sind fein dargelegt, die Schlüsse, die er für seine Zeit zieht, sind jedenfalls auch annehmbar, obgleich unter heutigen Verhältnissen kaum anwendbar. Charakteristisch für die ganze Abhandlung ist der Passus: „Ich will aber hier das Gewissen nicht so gefährlich gefangen noch so eng gespannt haben, als müßte man das Maß so eben treffen, daß nicht um einen Heller sollte fehlen. Denn das ist nicht möglich, daß du so eben treffen solltest, wieviel du verdienest habest mit solcher Mühe und Arbeit; es ist genug, daß du mit gutem Gewissen danach trachtest, daß du gerne das rechte Maß treffest, und doch des Handels Art ist, daß nicht möglich ist, es zu tun. Es wird der Spruch des Weisen auch an dir wohl wahr bleiben, Pred. Sal. 27, 28: ‚Ein Kaufmann mag schwerlich ohne Sünde handeln, und ein Arzthymar [Krämer] mag schwerlich gerechten Mund behalten.‘ Ob du ein wenig zu viel nimmest unwissend und ungern, so laß daselbe ins Vaterunser fahren.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe X, 914—937.)

1524. „Der 127. Psalm ausgelegt. An die Christen zu Riga in Liefland.“ — Schon im Jahre 1523 hatte Luther auf Bitten des Sekretärs der Stadt Riga ein Sendschreiben an die dortigen Christen gerichtet. (X, 1760.) Die hier vorliegende Auslegung ist durchweg in einem höchst tröstlichen Tone gehalten. Die Summa des ganzen Psalms gibt der Verfasser selber an: „Denn Salomo gedenkt eine christliche Ehe zu beschreiben und unterweist jedermann, wie ein christlicher Ehemann und Hausherr sein soll.“ Es lohnt sich das ernsthafte Studium der 36 Paragraphen, da man dadurch nicht nur ein besseres Verständnis des Textes bekommt, sondern auch aus den praktischen Anwendungen, die Luther seiner Gewohnheit nach macht, für sich Nutzen ziehen kann. (St. Louiser Ausgabe V, 1284—1303.)

1525. „Von dem Creuel der Stillmesse, so man den Kanon nennt.“ — Diese Schrift wird von einigen Forschern in das Jahr 1524 oder schon in das Jahr 1523 verlegt; doch ist keine Einzelausgabe vor 1525 vorhanden. Luther nimmt hier die Stillmesse nach ihrem Wortlaut vor, woran er dann seine Anmerkungen knüpft, die scharf, aber durchaus sachgemäß sind. So schreibt er z. B. am Schluß: „Wie es der lästerliche Messpfaße angefangen hat, so führet er's auch hinaus, opfert immerdar und bittet, daß es angenehm sei. Der gute Christus ist nicht angenehm bei dem Vater, es komme denn der heilige Kanon und mache ihn angenehm, also daß ihn das Opfer Gott versöhne. Da ist Christus abermal tot und nichts nüh, sintemal das Werk soll nur die Sünde vergeben und bei Gott Gnade erwerben, daß er Christo und uns gnädig sei.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe XIX, 1198—1215.)

1525. „Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament.“ — An dieser Schrift arbeitete Luther sehr fleißig im Januar 1525. Der erste Teil der Schrift erschien schon am 2. Januar, der zweite gegen Ende des Monats. In der ganzen Schrift redet Luther mit angemessener Schärfe von dem Enthusiasmus Carlstadts und seiner Genossen, im zweiten Teil besonders von der vernünftigen Erklärung der Sakramentsworte. Die umfangreiche Schrift umfaßt 213 Paragraphen, und es ist wohl der Mühe wert, daß sie ernstlich studiert werde. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XX, 132—287.) P. C. R e g m a n n.

(Fortsetzung folgt.)

Divorce and Malicious Desertion.

II. No Divorce, Except It Be for Fornication.

Is there anything besides death that severs the marriage bond? In the opinion of the Pharisees there were quite a number of reasons for which a man might put away his wife. In answer to Christ's apodictic statement they ask: "Why did Moses, then, command to give a writing of divorcement and to put her away?"⁵⁾ How dare you, they mean to say, put yourself in opposition to Moses? Are you more than Moses? Christ answers: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so," Matt. 19, 8. Who was right? Did Moses command, or did he merely suffer, permit? As always, Jesus is correct, as a glance at Deut. 24, 1—4, the Scripture-passage referred to, will show. Unfortunately neither the Authorized Version nor Luther offers an accurate translation. The LXX and the great majority of commentaries agree that vv. 1—4 form only one sentence, vv. 1—3 being the protasis, v. 4 the apódosis, thus: If a man hath taken a wife, etc., and given her a bill of divorcement; and (v. 2) if she hath departed out of his house and hath become another man's wife; and (v. 3) if the latter husband hate her, *then* (v. 4) her former husband, etc. Consequently Moses did not here establish or command divorce nor perhaps even the issuing of letters of divorce. Evidently divorces were not uncommon among the Israelites, the loose morals of Egypt having served to undermine the sanctity of the marriage bond. The issuing of letters of divorce was a restraint which either law or custom or both had imposed. It is difficult to state just what is the exact meaning of the phrase "some uncleanness," v. 1. Adultery is out of the question, since that was a capital crime, Deut. 22, 20—22. It must have been some other grounds sanctioned by custom or pre-Mosaic or perhaps Mosaic law. Moses legislates here with a view of still further curbing the evil of divorce by forbidding the return of the woman to her first husband if, after having been divorced by him, she had married another. The second marriage is expressly said to have *defiled* the woman, hence is clearly denoted as displeasing to God, who still regarded the first marriage as valid. The woman was

5) The varying accounts of Matthew and Mark may well be harmonized if we assume that after the question of the Pharisees, Matt. 19, 3; Mark 10, 2, Christ puts a counter-question: Mark 10, 3. The Pharisees answer: Mark 10, 4; Jesus responds: Matt. 19, 5. 6. Again they voice their objection: Matt. 19, 7. First they had pointed to the fact that Moses *permitted* divorce, then, in order to put Christ in opposition to Moses, they go so far as to claim that Moses *commanded* it. Of course, if He commanded it, then He permitted it. Hence no contradiction between Mark 10, 4 and Matt. 19, 7.

not permitted to return to her first husband after she had been married to another. She was not to be regarded a chattel, to be handed back and forth from one man to the other. According to Jewish custom the unmarried *divorcée* was permitted and even encouraged to return to her husband.

Far therefore from commanding divorce, Moses rather frowns upon it. Why, then, does he permit it at all? Jesus answers: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so," Matt. 19, 8. The blame rests not on Moses, but solely on the Jews who were so hard-hearted. We must bear in mind that Moses was not merely the spiritual leader of the spiritual people of God, but also the civic legislator of a nation composed partly of believing children of God and partly of hard-hearted, disobedient unbelievers, who, however, by circumcision had outwardly become citizens of the commonwealth of Israel. Because of their hardness of heart, in order to avoid still greater evil, murder, adultery, etc., he permitted the existing custom of obtaining a divorce for some uncleanness to continue, seeking, however, to discourage and curb this wicked, pernicious practise as much as possible under existing circumstances. Not Moses, but the hard-heartedness of the Jews was responsible for the existence and permission of divorce laws in Israel. Note that Jesus used the second person, *your* hearts, suffered *you, your* wives. He does this not only because they were members of a nation in which so many had been hard-hearted, but chiefly because they themselves were just as stubborn as their fathers in the days of Moses. Else they would not have sanctioned the ever-increasing laxity with regard to divorce, much less have encouraged it by their extremely lax interpretation of Deut. 24; nor would they have sought to hide behind Moses in their endeavor to justify their practise. Rather would they as spiritual leaders have endeavored to curb the divorce evil and to teach the people that, while in civic legislation divorce was permitted because of the hard-heartedness of godless citizens, yet "from the beginning it was not so," and that believing children of God should not disobey the divine ordinance given in the beginning of creation. There is no doubt that pious Israelites did not make use of the liberty granted them by the civic legislation of Moses.

Far from retracting or changing His opinion, the Lord simply reiterates His position, that from the beginning there was no provision made for divorce, that the rule still obtaining in the kingdom of God is the old rule laid down at the institution of marriage in Paradise, that the bond of wedlock be indissoluble: "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

From these words of Christ we learn several lessons of importance. The State may grant a divorce not permitted according to God's will.

While in the kingdom of God marriage is indissoluble except by death (fornication and malicious desertion ought not to occur among Christians), in the State, because of the hard-heartedness of natural man, God suffers divorce to be issued even in such cases where He has not dissolved the marriage. These divorces, however, though acknowledged by other States, are null and void before the forum of the Church, which is ruled, not by civic, but by divine Law. Since the underlying cause for obtaining a divorce against God's will is the hardness of the heart, no Christian will seek to obtain such a divorce, and if he does so, he must be disciplined and, if impenitent, excommunicated, and before he can regain membership, he must do all in his power to reestablish the first marriage. For in the sight of God this marriage was not dissolved, and his second "marriage" is in fact adultery, as we shall see.—Civic authorities and all good citizens should bend every effort toward curbing the divorce evil by adopting marriage and divorce laws as strict as possible under existing conditions.—A Christian may, as citizen of the State, advocate, and vote for, and in his actions as a civic officer be ruled by, divorce laws which are far removed from the ideal prescribed in the Word of God. A judge having in his capacity as a civic officer divorced a couple may as a member of a Christian congregation be obliged to discipline them and vote for their excommunication; for the Church is not the State and the State not the Church.

Now Jesus lays down for all times the rule which is to be observed in His kingdom, His Church, on earth: "I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery," Matt. 19, 9. This is not the only record of these words nor the only time that Jesus laid down this rule. We have a parallel account in Mark 10, 11. 12.⁶⁾ The same lesson was taught in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5, 31. 32, and to the Pharisees on another occasion, Luke 16, 18. The fact that these four passages do not record the same wording of Christ's rule will not surprise us if we bear in mind that, if our second harmonization of

6) According to Matthew, Christ still seems to be addressing the Pharisees; according to Mark He spoke these words in the house to His disciples, who again asked Him regarding the same matter, Mark 10, 10. This difficulty may be solved by assuming either that Matthew simply does not mention that He no longer was speaking to the Pharisees or that He spoke these words twice, first to the Pharisees, to whom also another passage is addressed, Luke 16, 18, and when His disciples asked Him again of the same matter, which seemed strange and harsh to them (cp. Matt. 19, 10 ff.), He simply repeated and emphasized what He had previously told them. That is a method adopted by Jesus on other occasions. Cp. Matt. 26, 21. 23; John 3, 3. 5; 4, 10. 13. 14; 7, 33. 34; 8, 14. 21, etc.

Matt. 19, 9 and **Mark 10, 11** is adopted, it may be assumed that they were spoken on four different occasions. The following compilation will serve to bring out clearly the additions and omissions in every passage:—

	A.	B.	C.
Matt. 5, 32:	Whosoever shall put away his wife,	saving for the cause of fornication,
10, 9:	Whosoever shall put away his wife,	except it be for fornication,	and shall marry another,
Mark 10, 11:	Whosoever shall put away his wife,	and marry another
Luke 16, 18:	Whosoever putteth away his wife	and marrieth another
	D.	E.	F.
Matt. 5	causeth her to commit adultery
Matt. 19	committeth adultery
Mark 10	committeth adultery against her.
Luke 16	committeth adultery
	G.		
			and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.
			and whoso marrieth her which is put away, committeth adultery.
			and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.
	H.		
Matt. 5		
Matt. 19		
Mark 10, 12:	And if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.		
Luke 16		

The complete rule comprising all teachings of Jesus on this subject would read: Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery (and) against her; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. And if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Omitting for the time being the exception, which is evidently in the form of a parenthesis, let us consider Christ's rule on divorce for any other reason than fornication. His purpose very evidently is to bring out the wickedness of divorce in itself and in its consequences, which are truly horrifying, as we shall see.

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery," *μοιχεύει*, constitutes himself an adulterer. The question has been asked, Does Christ brand only him as an adulterer who actually marries another wife after having divorced the first wife, or may both the divorce and the remarriage on the strength of this passage be designated as adultery? The answer depends entirely on the sense in which "adultery" is taken. In its narrower sense *μοιχεία* means the actual extra-

connubial carnal intercourse of two people either or both of whom are married to another. Naturally in this sense divorce is not adultery, and according to our passage the divorcing person becomes an adulterer only upon marriage to another wife. Of course, the wickedness of divorce is in no wise affected by this interpretation. Divorce is and remains an infraction of the divine ordinance, as the Lord had so clearly brought out. If we adopt the narrower sense, we cannot use this passage to prove that divorce is called adultery by Christ. The narrower sense of *μοιχεία* is rendered seemingly plausible by the addition of "marrieth another" in the three passages. Yet we must bear in mind that the entire context stresses *divorce*. So v. 3 and again vv. 7 and 8. While v. 9 the remarriage is mentioned, yet even here divorce is in the foreground of the Lord's thoughts, of course, as we shall see, a divorce permitting a second marriage, yet not the second marriage, but the *divorce* is also here the chief subject in the mind of Jesus. He is still answering the main question, v. 3, and the objection, v. 7. After having described divorce as an infraction of the ordinance given on the last day of creation, He now shows that it is adultery. Hence it is preferable to take *μοιχῶται* in the wider sense, especially also since Christ here clearly refers to the Sixth Commandment, *Ὁὐ μοιχεύσεις*. In fact, in one of the parallel passages, Matt. 5, He had in v. 27 quoted this commandment and cleared away the coarse misunderstanding of the Jews of His day. So evidently in the other passages He refers to the Sixth Commandment as a well-known expression of the will of God. The specific sin designated by this term is taken in the Sixth Commandment as a type of every possible violation of marriage in and out of wedlock by thought, word, and deed, just as killing and stealing are types of other sins forbidden in the Fifth and in the Seventh Commandment. Taking adultery in this wider sense, both the divorce and the remarriage are here stamped as adultery, an infraction of that commandment given by God to protect His own institution and here acknowledged by the Lord as binding for all times in His kingdom. The train of thought in this entire passage, then, is this: Divorce is an infraction of God's ordinance, of the Sinaitic commandment forbidding adultery, of Christ's rule for His Church. What an abomination, then, is divorce in the sight of God!

The sin of divorce leads its unfortunate victim still deeper into the mire of iniquity and wickedness. "*Das ist der Fluch der boesen Tat, dass sie fortzeugend Boeses muss gebaeren,*" this word of the great poet may be applied to divorce also. Not only does such a man "commit adultery," Luke 16, 18, he also constitutes himself an adulterer, *μοιχῶται*, Matt. 19, 9. "In the active voice the subject is merely acting, in the middle the subject is acting in relation to himself somehow." (Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek N. T.*, 1st ed.,

p. 804.) Hence he constitutes himself, or causes himself to be, an adulterer. Moreover, by marrying and having carnal intercourse with another woman, while he is still bound by God to his first wife, he commits a second adultery, Luke 16, 18; Matt. 19, 9. Furthermore, by divorcing his first wife and marrying another, he commits adultery by each one of these acts against her, *μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν*, Mark 10, 11. (Some exegetes refer this phrase to the second wife; by far the greater number, however, regard it as referring to the first wife.) He violates the marriage institution to her harm. Having promised to remain faithful to her, to become one flesh with her alone in a union separable only by death, he ruthlessly dismisses her and takes unto himself another woman. What an insult to discard her as one would discard an old and worn-out piece of furniture! What an outrage in addition to this insult calmly to marry another to take her place! What a shameful setting aside and trampling upon her God-given claims and privileges! And still deeper does he become mired in sin and shame. Says Christ, Matt. 5, 32: He causes her, his wife, to commit adultery, *ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχᾶσθαι*, to constitute herself an adulteress. Again I see no reason to restrict "adultery" to its narrower sense, that she commits adultery only by marrying another. Here also adultery in its wider sense is meant. Sexual desire, natural in itself, its gratification sanctioned in wedlock by God Himself, Gen. 3, 16; 1 Cor. 7, 2, 3, becomes adultery as soon as it is centered upon a person prohibited to you by law, Matt. 5, 28. In the case of a divorced woman the only one toward whom the desire would be lawful, her husband, has divorced her, thereby cutting off every possibility of properly gratifying her sexual desires. These very desires, being directed to other men, are adulteries, as the Lord calls them, Matt. 15, 19, whether they are entertained with a view to marriage or not. Every gratification of these desires, whether the man be married or unmarried, is not simply fornication, but adultery, since she is still the wife of another. Every marriage, whether with an unmarried or a divorced person, is on her part an adulterous marriage in its every phase and action, as long as it exists. Note the infinitive present, denoting continuity, *μοιχᾶσθαι*. While she will have to answer for her own guilt, yet her former husband is in a great measure responsible and will be so held before the tribunal of God on that great day of reckoning. Several manuscripts offer *μοιχευθήναι* for *μοιχᾶσθαι*. That may be either a case of the passive's being used for the middle (cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 334, where quite a number of examples of this usage are cited), or it may be a pure passive, and we would translate: He causes her to be seduced to adultery. In either case the sense is not changed.

And still the dread consequences of the divorce continue. "Whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery,"

Matt. 19, 9. He marries one who before God is the lawful wife of another; his entire marriage is in fact a continuous adultery; it is the marriage to an adulteress by a man who by this very marriage becomes an adulterer. And all in consequence of the first divorce. What a mire of sin and shame in which the husband obtaining a divorce immerses himself and others! And what is said of the man applies with equal force to the woman. "And if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery," Mark 10, 12. Again we see that the Bible knows no double standard. What is wrong for the man is wrong for the woman. Bruce, in *Expositor's Greek Testament* on Mark 10, 12, states that Mark has added a gloss so as to make Christ's teaching a guide for his Gentile readers. Jewish women, he says, could not divorce their husbands. He overlooks the fact that, although such divorces were not permitted by law, they nevertheless occurred. Josephus tells us that Salome, the sister of Herod I, "sent her husband Costobar a *γραμμάτιον*, a letter of divorce, thus herself severing the marriage in a manner not in accord with the Jewish laws." (*Ant.*, XV, 7, 10.) Though not in accord with Jewish custom, evidently divorces were being obtained by women. According to the Talmud the woman could force a divorce in the following cases: if her husband were afflicted with an ulcer or a polypus, immaterial whether this developed before or after marriage or was engaged in a dirty trade, such as that of a coppersmith or a tanner (*Chetuboth*, VII, 10), and if her husband denied to her the marital duty (V. 7). While the Talmud was reduced to writing much later, it frequently records old traditions. Hence already at Christ's time it may have been customary for women to divorce their husbands, and this custom seems the more plausible if we consider the laxity of divorce laws for men. While it may have been contrary to the letter of the Jewish law for a woman to obtain a letter of divorce, yet there may have been ways and means open for her to "force her husband to divorce her," as the Talmud puts it. She practically did what the Savior calls *ἀπολύειν*. Hence there is no reason why Jesus could not have spoken these words. Even if the obtaining of divorces by women had not been customary at His time, He knew the customs of the heathen world and its evil influence on the Church of the future.

However, the rule laid down by Christ and which affirms the indissolubility of the matrimonial bond states one exception, "except it be for fornication," Matt. 19, 9, or as we read Matt. 5, 32, "saving for the cause of fornication." This exception is recorded only in the Gospel of St. Matthew. But in both instances the words are clearly indicated as Christ's own words, the whole sentence of which this forms a part being introduced in both instances by the phrase "I say unto you." Hence the suggestion that the Savior did not speak these

words, that they are an explanatory gloss due to the evangelist or to the tradition he followed (De Wette, Weiss, Holtzmann, and seemingly favored by Bruce in *Exp. Gr. Test.*), is altogether out of question. There can be no doubt that Matthew, writing as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, presents these words as the words of the Savior.

Just what do these words mean? The *Expositor's Greek Testament* (on Matt. 5, 32) calls this "a most important exception, which has given rise to much controversy that will probably last till the world's end." Chemnitz, in his *Examen*, states the reason for such difference of opinion and suggests the proper course for the removal of all doubt. He writes: "If human prejudices and preconceived presumptions are set aside and the question is decided from the very words of Christ, the matter is altogether plain and clear." The words present no grammatical difficulty. For λόγος Thayer prefers the translation case, except in a case of fornication, since λόγος, in the sense of cause, reason, is not used with the genitive. However, the sense is not changed in the least whether we adopt the translation case or cause. In Matt. 19, 9 some MSS. offer παρακτός λόγου πορνείας, some εἰ μή, while all the uncials simply read μή. Again the variant readings do not affect the sense.

We ask, What is πορνεία? Does it mean only fornication, carnal intercourse, or does it cover other forms of unchastity? If we have counted correctly, the word occurs twenty-three times in the New Testament. Besides our passages, Matt. 5, 32; 19, 9, we find it in the apostolic decree, Acts 15, 20, 29; 21, 25, and in several catalogs of sins, Matt. 15, 19; Mark 7, 21; Rom. 1, 29; Rev. 9, 21, which do not describe the exact nature of the sin. In a number of passages it is used in a manner which permits it to be taken only in the sense of fornication, actual carnal intercourse. John 8, 41: "We be not born of fornication"; 1 Cor. 5, 1: "such fornication . . . that one should have his father's wife"; 1 Cor. 6, 13: "The body is not fornication"; v. 18: "Flee fornication." Fornication is a sin against one's own body. Compare vv. 15, 16, which show that the apostle has in mind a sin whereby one is joined to a harlot. Chap. 7, 2: "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." In other passages πορνεία is distinguished from other forms of immorality. 2 Cor. 12, 21 and Gal. 5, 19 it is distinguished from ἀκαθαρσία, uncleanness, and ἀσέλγεια, licentiousness, lasciviousness, unchaste handling of males and females (Thayer); Eph. 5, 3, from "all uncleanness"; Col. 3, 5, from uncleanness, πάθος, ungovernable desire, passion, representing the passive side of the vice, and ἐπιθυμία κακή, the active side, more comprehensive than πάθος, lust; 1 Thess. 4, 3: "Abstain from fornication"; therefore, v. 4, "possess his vessel," procure a wife for himself. Evidently carnal intercourse is here the only possible meaning, since unchastity is forbidden also in matrimony. In the remaining

six passages, all of them in Revelation, it is used of spiritual fornication, idolatry, Rev. 2, 21; 14, 8; 17, 2, 4; 18, 3; 19, 2. The underlying idea here also is that of actual carnal intercourse (cp. 2, 22: "I will cast her into a bed and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation"; 17, 1; 19, 2, Babylon is called the whore; and see Ezek. 16). From these clear passages we conclude that also in the other passages where the exact nature of the sin is not brought out it means nothing more than illicit carnal intercourse. Therefore it does not include every manner of immorality, as some interpreters assert. Nor does it include spiritual fornication, since a marriage with an idolater should not be dissolved, 1 Cor. 7, 12, 13. Neither does Christ mention fornication merely as a type of other sins of equal weight, such as murder, robbery, etc., which bring shame upon his family, or "such sins as, like fornication, destroy the very essence of marriage." We shall see that fornication does not do that and is not on that account mentioned as an exception. All these efforts to mitigate the rule laid down by the Lord, all endeavors to vindicate to spouses on the basis of these words of Christ other grounds besides fornication, do violence to the clear words of Christ. We must bear in mind that the question put to Christ was, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" The Lord does not simply answer either in the positive or in the negative: He says: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except it be for fornication*, and shall marry another committeth adultery." To assume that this may include any manner of immorality, etc., would be laying Christ open to the charge that He had not answered the question clearly, that He had not settled the issue, but had left it as muddled and uncertain as before. The circumstances under which the answer was given render impossible any vague and indefinite meaning of *πορνεία*. It must have a specific, well-defined meaning, that of illicit carnal intercourse, fornication.

The Savior uses the term *πορνεία*, not *μοιχεία*, adultery, not only "because the genus indicates the moral category of the crime in a greater degree" than the species *μοιχεία* (Tholuck, *Bergpredigt*); undoubtedly His intention also was to indicate that not merely adultery, but fornication even before marriage gives permission to dissolve the marriage bond. Note that there is no indication as to the time when the fornication occurs. Our custom therefore of permitting a betrothal or marriage to be dissolved if fornication of the spouse before marriage can be proved, rests on Scriptural basis. It would, however, be wrong to confine *πορνεία* to pre-nuptial fornication. Fornication also is a specific term, as we have seen, while adultery is often used in a wider sense, covering all manner of immorality. Another reason for the choice of this word may have been that among the Jews the term adultery in its narrower sense was limited

to illicit sexual intercourse with a married woman, while the intercourse of a married man with an unmarried woman was called merely fornication, even as the English word fornication is often used in this sense. The Lord wanted to include every form of illicit carnal intercourse, whether it occurred before or after marriage with a married or an unmarried woman, whether it was fornication therefore in the form of adultery or simple fornication. TH. LAETSCH.

(To be concluded.)

Dispositionen über die altkirchliche Epistelreihe.

Zweiter Sonntag im Advent.

Röm. 15, 4—13.

Das Evangelium handelt von der Wiederkunft Christi zum Gericht, Luk. 21, 25—36. Es schließt mit einer ernststen Mahnung: V. 34—36. Wir sollen uns in fortwährender Bereitschaft halten.

Was ist bei uns zur rechten Vorbereitung auf die Wiederkunft Christi notwendig?

1. Friede in der Gemeinde;
2. andächtiger Besuch der Gottesdienste;
3. gewissenhafte Pflege des persönlichen Glaubenslebens.

1.

A. Wo Zank und Zwietracht in der Gemeinde herrscht, hält man sich in der Regel nicht in Bereitschaft auf die Wiederkunft Christi. Man gibt dem Teufel Raum. Eine Sünde folgt auf die andere. Irrgarnis wird gegeben. Starke werden schwach, und Schwache fallen ab. Gal. 5, 20; Jak. 4, 1; 1 Joh. 3, 15; 4, 20.

B. Darum müssen wir den edlen Frieden pflegen. Aber wie?

1. Dadurch, daß man die Schwachen mit Geduld trägt. Vgl. Kap. 15, 1 f. Das ist schwer. Die Schrift rüstet uns aber dazu aus mit Geduld und Trost, V. 4. Zudem haben wir das Vorbild Christi, V. 3.

2. Dadurch, daß die Gemeindeglieder dem Vorbild Christi gemäß untereinander „einerlei gesinnet sind“, V. 5 b. Voraussetzung hierzu ist natürlich die Einigkeit im Geist, die Glaubenseinigkeit. Diese kann nicht von Menschen zustande gebracht werden. Sie ist eine Gabe Gottes, V. 5 a, und muß also erbeten werden.

3. Dadurch, daß sich die Gemeindeglieder gegenseitig aufnehmen, V. 7. Alle Unterschiede müssen der Einigkeit im Geist weichen. Juden-Christen und Heiden-Christen, Starke und Schwache, Reiche und Arme, Diensthboten und Herren, vormals grobe Sünder und Leute, die immer äußerlich rechtschaffen waren, verkehren in der Kirche als Brüder. Das

Vorbild Christi, der sowohl Juden als Heiden in seine Kirche berufen hat, B. 8—12.

C. So wird durch Eintracht in der Gemeinde Gelegenheit gegeben, sich recht auf Christi Kommen vorzubereiten. (Anwendung auf die Gemeinde nach lokalen Verhältnissen.) Solche Eintracht kann aber nur durch Gottes Wort, B. 4, und mit Gottes Hilfe, B. 5a, gestiftet werden.

2.

A. Wo Friede in der Gemeinde herrscht, werden die Gottesdienste erbaulich sein und Gottes Namen verherrlichen. „Einmütiglich mit einem Munde“ lobt die Gemeinde Gott, B. 6. Solche Gottesdienste sind einerseits Beweis der Einigkeit, andererseits bewahren sie dieselbe, indem sie Glauben, Liebe, Hoffnung stärken. 2 Tim. 3, 16; Eph. 6, 17; Kol. 3, 16.

B. Gerade durch andächtige Teilnahme an solchen Gottesdiensten bereitet sich ein Christ vor auf das Kommen Christi. Wer hingegen ohne Not die Gottesdienste versäumt, setzt sich großer Gefahr aus. Muthwillige Übertretung des dritten Gebots führt schnell zum Abfall.

C. Ein ernstes Wort an die Gemeinde in bezug auf den Kirchenbesuch.

3.

A. B. 13 nimmt Bezug auf den einzelnen. Der Christ muß auch gewissenhaft sein persönliches Glaubensleben pflegen. Soll sich prüfen, 2 Kor. 13, 5. Weil aber alles geistliche Wachstum von Gott, durch die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes, kommen muß, muß der Christ fleißig sein im Gebrauch des Wortes und des Gebets, auch privatim.

B. Darauf folgen die Früchte des Glaubens, B. 13: 1. „Freude“ am Heiland und seinen Gaben; 2. „Friede“, wahrer Herzensfriede, der aus dem Frieden mit Gott fließt; 3. „Hoffnung“, die Gewißheit der Vollendung unsers Heils im Himmel. Wer so ausgerüstet ist, ist bereit, seinen Herrn zu empfangen, ja er sehnt sich sogar nach ihm. Offenb. 22, 20b.

Schluß. Bereitet euch vor auf das Kommen des Menschensohns! Matth. 24, 42. (Zusammenfassung.) Lied 31, 5 E. J. J.

Dritter Sonntag im Advent.

1 Kor. 4, 1—5.

Die Adventsbotschaft: „Bereitet den Weg dem Herrn!“ Wie? „Tut Buße und glaubet an das Evangelium!“ Wie wird Buße und Glaube gewirkt? Durch das Evangelium. Sonntagsevangelium: Ein Kennzeichen dieser neutestamentlichen Zeit: „Den Armen wird das Evangelium gepredigt.“ Daß dies bis ans Ende der Tage geschehe..

dafür hat der Herr gesorgt durch die Stiftung des Predigtamts. In der Epistel erteilt der Apostel den nötigen Unterricht darüber, was man von den Predigern des Evangeliums halten soll.

„Dafür halte uns jedermann, nämlich für Christi Diener.“

1. Eine Mahnung an die Gemeinde;
2. ein Trost für treue Prediger;
3. eine Warnung für beide.

1.

Paulus redet von sich und von den Predigern, die mittelbar ins Amt berufen worden sind, 1. Kor. 3, 6. Sie sind von Menschen berufen, aber nicht Menschenknechte, sondern Christi Diener, Apost. 20, 28; 2 Kor. 3, 6. Christus hat ihnen ihre Pflichten vorgezeichnet. Die Gemeinde darf daher von ihnen nur das verlangen, was Christus verlangt: daß sie treue Haushalter seien über Gottes Geheimnisse.

Gottes Haushalt: die Kirche auf Erden, Apost. 20, 28; 1 Kor. 3, 9; 1 Petr. 5, 2. Gottes Geheimnisse: das Evangelium (in Wort und Sakrament), Kol. 1, 25; Eph. 3, 2, 3; Röm. 16, 25; 1 Kor. 2, 7.

Darüber sollen Prediger Haushalter sein: es verkündigen, rein und lauter, öffentlich und sonderlich, Jer. 3, 15; 2 Tim. 4, 2, zur Seligkeit ihrer Zuhörer, Eph. 4, 12, 13; 1 Tim. 4, 16. Sie sollen darum das Wort recht anwenden, Matth. 24, 45; Luk. 12, 42; 2 Tim. 2, 15, den Sünder durch das Gesetz vorbereiten, Röm. 3, 20, dann das Evangelium in seiner ganzen Süßigkeit predigen, 2 Kor. 5, 20; auch sollen sie mit ihrem Wandel nicht wieder zerstören, was sie durch ihre Predigt zu bauen suchen, 1 Kor. 9, 27.

Das soll die Gemeinde von ihrem Prediger verlangen; mehr darf sie nicht von ihm verlangen. 1 Joh. 4, 1; Tit. 1, 6—11.

2.

Das Predigtamt ist ein schweres Amt. Es soll des Teufels Reich zerstören, Gottes Reich bauen. Es hat darum mächtige Feinde: den Teufel, die Gott feindliche Welt, das Herz des Menschen, Apost. 26, 18. Es fehlt oftmals der sichtbare Erfolg. Prediger sind auch nur Menschen, und sie fühlen ihre Schwachheit, 2 Kor. 11, 29, sündige Menschen, denen auch das Fleisch manchen Streich spielt, Matth. 26, 41; Röm. 7, 18. Was Wunder, daß der Mut oft sinkt?

Ihr Trost: sie sind Christi Diener. Er, der sie besser kannte, als sie sich selber kennen, hat ihnen das Amt gegeben. Er steht selber hinter ihnen, 2 Kor. 5, 20; das Wort, das sie reden, ist sein Wort, Luk. 10, 16; sie sind nur seine Werkzeuge, die nicht für den Erfolg verantwortlich sind, 1 Kor. 3, 6, 7.

Ihm sind sie verantwortlich, und er verlangt nur Treue mit den Gaben, die er gegeben hat, Matth. 25, 14, 15; und wenn sie aus Schwachheit fehlen, so ist er auch ihr Heiland.

3.

Für Diener kommt ein Tag der Abrechnung, Matth. 25, 19. Ein ernstster Gedanke. Der Herr sucht Treue an ihnen. Treue Diener sollen sie sein, die sich weder durch Lob noch durch Tadel beeinflussen lassen; treue Diener, nicht Herren, Matth. 20, 26; 1 Petr. 5, 3; 2 Kor. 6, 4; 1 Petr. 4, 10. Und der Herr sieht das Herz an, B. 5; 1 Petr. 5, 2.

Aber auch für die Gemeinde kommt ein Tag der Abrechnung. Der Herr wird seine Diener fragen, was für eine Aufnahme ihr Zeugnis gefunden habe, Hebr. 13, 17, ob man sie als Christi Diener aufgenommen und behandelt und ihr Wort als Gottes Wort angenommen habe, ob man mehr von ihnen verlangt habe, als Christus verlangt; ob man sie lieblos gerichtet habe, 2 Kor. 10, 7.

Bei solcher Selbstprüfung werden gewiß beide Teile manche Fehler finden; und das Bewußtsein, daß beide denselben Heiland nötig haben, wird beide bewegen, zusammen diesem Heiland immer dankbarer und gewissenhafter zu dienen. L. G.

Vierter Sonntag im Advent.

Phil. 4, 4—7.

Unser Text bereitet auf die Weihnachtszeit vor, die ja eine Freudenzeit sein soll. Bei vielen will sonderlich in diesem Jahr die freudige Weihnachtsstimmung nicht zum Durchbruch kommen. Aus unserer Epistel können wir erkennen, woran das liegt, und zugleich lernen, wie wir zur rechten Weihnachtsfreude selbst in trüber Zeit gelangen können.

Warum will es bei so vielen nicht zur rechten Weihnachtsfreude kommen?

1. Weil wir uns zu leicht allerlei ängstlichen Sorgen überlassen;
2. weil wir uns nicht in der rechten Lindigkeit üben;
3. weil wir die köstliche Gabe des Friedens Gottes unterschätzen.

1.

Der Apostel mahnt uns zur Freude, B. 4, und in Verbindung mit dieser Mahnung schreibt er: B. 6. Gerade die Sorgen vertreiben die Freude aus dem Herzen und damit auch die Weihnachtsstimmung. Gerade in diesem Jahr meint man Grund zu haben zur Sorge. Ausmalen! Ein Christ hat aber nie wirkliche Ursache zur Sorge, und er begehrt die größte Torheit, wenn er durch ängstliches Sorgen sich an der

Weihnachtsfreude hindern läßt. Er hat ja einen Gott, der durch das Weihnachtskind sein versöhnter Vater geworden ist. Dieser allmächtige, allweise Vater läßt ihn auffordern, alles, was ihm auf dem Herzen liegt, im Gebet und Flehen Gott kundzutun und ihm das Vertrauen zu schenken, daß der Gott, der uns seinen Sohn als Weihnachtsgeschenk in die Krippe legt, uns nicht verlassen noch veräumen werde.

„Mit Dankagung“ fügt der Apostel hinzu. Über den trüben Zeiten vergessen wir leicht, wieviel besser wir es haben als andere Leute. Ausmalen! Denken wir nicht nur der trüben Zeit, sondern dankbaren Gemüts auch der vielen unverdienten Wohltaten, die Gott uns erweist; dann wird Freude unser Herz erfüllen statt ängstlicher Sorge.

2.

Ein anderer Grund, warum es bei vielen nicht zur Freude kommen will, ist Selbstsucht und Eigennuß. Zumal in dieser Zeit, wo man von allen Seiten um Unterstützung angegangen wird, meint man, das sei zu viel, und läßt sich dadurch die Freude verderben. Versuchen wir einmal das Rezept, das der Apostel für die rechte Weihnachtsfreude in B. 5 vorschreibt. Man lese Luthers herrliche Auslegung, St. L. XII, 84—91. Gerade durch solche Lindigkeit, die ja ein Ausfluß der rechten Weihnachtsfreude ist, wird des Christen Freude gemehrt, die Freude, die ihre höchste Wonne darin findet, andern Freude zu bereiten.

Zu solcher Lindigkeit soll ermuntern die Nähe des Jüngsten Tages. Bald wird alles Irdische vergehen. Sollten wir durch selbstsüchtiges Gangehen am Irdischen die Weihnachtsfreude uns verderben lassen? Bald wird er, der als Kindlein in der Krippe lag, kommen, um uns in den Himmel zu nehmen, da wir uns ewig bei ihm freuen werden. Sollte uns dabei nicht das Herz aufgehen und wir zur rechten Lindigkeit gegen alle Menschen bewogen werden? Wollen wir nicht durch solche Lindigkeit unsere Weihnachtsfreude vermehren lassen?

3.

B. 7. Ausmalen, welch ein herrliches Gut der Friede Gottes ist, wie oft wir ihn zu gering schätzen! Was würde schließlich alles andere uns nützen, wenn wir diesen Frieden nicht hätten? Wie freudlos ist oft der Reichste und Angesehenste, der diesen Frieden nicht besitzt! Was schadet schließlich der Verlust aller Güter, wenn wir diesen Frieden behalten? Dieser Friede wird rechte Weihnachtsstimmung in unsern Herzen hervorrufen und erhalten, so daß all unser Sinnen und Denken von Freude über diesen Frieden durchdrungen ist. Dieser Friede wird uns auch vor Mißmut, Murren, Verzweiflung bewahren und uns sicher im Glauben erhalten bis an unser Ende. Lassen wir uns daher durch nichts von der rechten Weihnachtsfreude abhalten! T. L.

Erster Weihnachtstag.

Tit. 2, 11—14.

Die Hirten auf den Gefilden Bethlehems. Die Engelsbotschaft: Luk. 2, 10 f. Eilend gehen die Hirten nach Bethlehem und finden das Kind in der Krippe liegen. An dieser Krippe knien wir heute im Geiste. Deshalb zu unserer Belehrung und Ermunterung:

Der Weihnachtschrift an der Krippe des Jesuskindleins.

1. Er freut sich über seinen Heiland.
2. Er gelobt aufs neue, ihm allein zu leben.
3. Er sehnt sich nach seiner herrlichen Wiederkunft.

1.

A. Das Jesuskindlein ist Gegenstand aller christlichen Weihnachtsfreude. Beispiele: die Hirten, die Weisen aus dem Morgenlande, Simeon. Lied 25, 1.

B. Warum? 1. In ihm „ist erschienen die heilsame Gnade Gottes“, B. 11. Die seligmachende Gnade Gottes, durch die unsere Sünden vergeben werden und wir in den Himmel kommen, ist in ihm völlig offenbart, ja verkörpert worden. Joh. 1, 14. 17. Deshalb freuen wir uns über ihn. 2. Dieses Kindlein ist derselbe, von dem wir lesen: B. 14a. Er hat das Gnadenwerk, die Erlösung, vollendet. Er ist unser Heiland. Unsere Sünden legen wir ihm getrost zu Füßen. Eph. 1, 7. Deshalb freuen wir uns über ihn. 3. „Allen Menschen.“ Keiner ist ausgeschlossen, auch nicht der größte Sünder, auch keiner von uns. Deshalb freuen wir uns über ihn.

C. Ist Jesus wirklich der Gegenstand deiner Weihnachtsfreude? Prüfe dich. Bedenke, über diese Weihnachtsgabe kannst du dich freuen, wenn dir alle andere Freude genommen wird. Lied 40, 16 f.

2.

A. Die seligmachende Gnade Gottes, durch die wir erlöst und belehrt worden sind, „züchtigt“ uns nun auch, i. e., sie erzieht uns als Gottes Kinder, damit wir immer besser lernen, unsers himmlischen Vaters Willen zu tun und ihm so ähnlicher werden, B. 12. Das tut sie dadurch, daß sie uns unterweist und geschickt macht, 1. gottloses Wesen und weltliche Lüste abzulegen und zu verabscheuen (negativ); 2. „züchtig“ zu sein, i. e., uns selbst nach Gottes Wort in jeder Hinsicht in Zucht zu halten; „gerecht“ zu sein gegen unsere Mitmenschen; „gottselig“ zu sein, fromm in unserm Verhalten gegen Gott; „fleißig zu guten Werken“ zu sein, B. 14b (positiv). Kurz, die Gnade Gottes soll uns zu christlichem Wandel und guten Werken erziehen.

B. Wer kann an der Krippe Christi knien, ohne an seine eigene Untreue, an seine Mängel und Gebrechen erinnert zu werden? Wie jämmerlich steht es doch bei uns um die Heiligung! Wir sind schlechte Schüler der Gnade Gottes. Wir wollen Buße tun und aufrichtig geloben, durch Gottes Gnade allein unserm Heiland zu leben. Er ist unser Vorbild. Er wird auch das nötige Vermögen darreichen. 2 Kor. 12, 9; 2 Petr. 3, 18; 1 Petr. 4, 11. Lied 41, 13; 257, 6.

3.

A. Wie gerne wären wir doch mit den Hirten in Bethlehem gewesen! Wie gerne würden wir jetzt unserm Heiland von Angesicht zu Angesicht sehen! Wem kommen nicht bei der Weihnachtsfeier solche Gedanken?

B. Halten wir fest an der Gnade, und lassen wir uns durch sie erziehen; dann werden wir ihn sehen, und zwar in seiner Herrlichkeit, B. 13. Ja, wir werden ewig bei ihm sein. Darauf warten wir. Danach sehnen wir uns. Dadurch werden wir ermutigt und zum Kampf gegen die Sünde angespornt. Was wäre Weihnachten ohne diese Hoffnung?

Schluss. Laßt uns auf wahrhaft christliche Weise Weihnachten feiern, indem wir mit freudigem, dankbarem Herzen zurückblicken auf die Krippe zu Bethlechem, in wahrer Buße und mit dem Vorsatz, uns zu bessern, uns und unsern Wandel betrachten und in sehnlicher Erwartung der Zukunft unsers Heilandes unser Augenmerk auf den Tag seiner herrlichen Erscheinung richten. E. F. F.

Zweiter Weihnachtstag.

Lit. 3, 4—7.

Der Jubel des Weihnachtsfestes hallt noch hinüber in die Feier dieses Tages. Heute wollen wir besonders an den Zweck des Weihnachtswunders denken.

„Nach seiner Barmherzigkeit machte er uns selig.“

1. Er hat selber unsere Seligkeit möglich gemacht.
2. Er hat uns selber die Seligkeit zugeeignet durch die Taufe.
3. Er führt uns schließlich zum ewigen Genuß der Seligkeit.

1.

Beschreibung unsers natürlichen Zustandes, B. 3. Wir waren seinem Gericht verfallen.

Aber Gott wollte nicht, daß wir verlorengehen sollten; darum

sandte er seinen Sohn in die Welt, daß er unsere Schuld auf sich nähme und seiner Gerechtigkeit genuttue.

So ist es ihm nun möglich, daß er seine Freundlichkeit und Leutseligkeit erzeugen, uns unsere Sünde vergeben und uns selig machen kann.

Dazu hat ihn nichts in uns, sondern nur seine Barmherzigkeit bewogen.

2.

Wir sind von Natur tot. Es ist nicht genug, daß Gott uns die Seligkeit bereitet hat; er muß sie uns auch selber zu eigen machen.

Das tut er durch die heilige Taufe. Darin bietet uns Gott alle die herrlichen Güter an, die Christus uns erworben hat, Vergebung der Sünden, Leben und Seligkeit. Durch die Taufe wird der Heilige Geist reichlich über uns ausgegossen. Er wirkt neues Leben in uns, zündet den Glauben an den Heiland in uns an, wodurch wir die dargebotenen Güter annehmen und so vor Gott gerecht werden, und zugleich versiegelt er uns den Besitz der Seligkeit durch die Taufe, daß wir desselben ganz gewiß sein sollen.

Das neue Leben, das der Heilige Geist durch die Wiedergeburt in uns gewirkt hat, erzeugt sich dann auch in der Erneuerung; in der Kraft, die der Heilige Geist gibt, erzeugen wir uns durch einen gottseligen Wandel dankbar für die Freundlichkeit und Leutseligkeit unsers Gottes, die uns so unverdient erschienen ist.

3.

Freilich, die Seligkeit gehört uns jetzt erst nach der Hoffnung. Wir sind Erben, die zwar im Besitz des Gutes sind, das ihnen zukommt, es aber noch nicht genießen. Hier auf Erden sieht es oft nicht so aus, als ob Christen einen so reichen Schatz ihr eigen nennen dürfen. Zudem stehen sie noch immer in Gefahr, denselben zu verlieren; ihre Feinde sind viel und mächtig, sie selber schwach. Sie besitzen das Erbteil nur durch die Gnade Jesu Christi ihres Heilandes; sobald sie aus der Gnade fallen, den Glauben verlieren, gehen sie auch ihrer Kindschaft Gottes und somit auch ihres Erbteils verlustig.

Gott aber erzeugt seine Freundlichkeit und Leutseligkeit schließlich auch darin, daß er selber mit seiner Kraft die Christen stärkt durch Wort und Sakrament, sie sicher durch alle Gefahren hindurchführt, damit sie das Erbe, das ihnen bereitet ist von Anbeginn der Welt, nicht verlieren, sondern beharren bis ans Ende und die Krone des Lebens dabontragen.

O große Gnad' und Gütigkeit! Lied 29, 8.

L. S.



Miscellanea.

Jojakim oder Judi?

Wer hat die Rolle des Propheten Jeremia verbrannt, der König oder der Vorleser? Jer. 36, 21 ff. Langes Kommentar meint, es sei Judi gewesen. Aber die große Mehrzahl der Ausleger (Keil, Orelli in *Strack-Zöckler*, Dächsel, Dummelow usw.) schreiben die böse Tat direkt dem Könige zu. Letzteres ist ohne Zweifel richtig (vgl. S. 491 des laufenden Jahrgangs); denn in V. 25 steht: „Sie baten den König, er wolle das Buch nicht verbrennen“, und in V. 27: „Da der König das Buch . . . verbrannt hatte.“ Es kann hier kaum das Wort angewandt werden: *Quod quis per alios facit, ipse facit*, da der König zweimal als der Missetäter genannt wird.

P. E. K.

Some Principles of Lutheran Liturgics.

1. Those clearly stated in Scripture: "Let all things be done unto edifying. . . . Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14, 26. 40. "God is a spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth," John 4, 24. "That no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way," Rom. 14, 13.

2. The liturgy must always serve as a background and foil for the saving truth of the Word of God. (No part of the Lutheran service may stand out independently or draw the attention of the worshippers from the presentation of the divine truths in hymns, lessons, the sermon, and the Sacraments; everything must point to the means of grace.)

3. The Lutheran liturgy may never bring any *person*, either that of the liturgist or that of any assistant, into the foreground. (It is for this reason that the minister, in officiating in the chancel or before the congregation, wears his official vestment. That is why the regular church service may never become a sacred concert, with the organ most prominent. That is why solos, except as parts of larger movements, are not in place in the Lutheran service.)

4. The Lutheran liturgy should observe historical continuity. (That is why the specific eucharistic vestments were largely discarded as the result of the Leipzig Interim. That is why we do not have the adoration of the elements in the Lord's Supper.)

5. The Lutheran liturgy should observe the sequence of the church-year. (Both the music and the hymns, like the introits, collects, and the lessons themselves, must be in keeping with the character of the respective day or festival.)

6. The Lutheran liturgy may never interrupt the service of the Word by introducing extraneous material. (The service of the Word, from the introduction leading up to the reading of the lessons of the day to the offertory, is a unit which must not be severed by any emotional appeal.)

7. The Lutheran liturgy should not obtrude the element of good works into the sacramental character of its essential features. (For this reason the good works of the Christians are not to be introduced into the service as a dominant feature at any point. If necessary, they may be included in the general prayer.)

P. E. K.

Whither Are We Drifting?

The local congregation is the unit of the so-called visible Church, that is, of the outward organization known by that name. This is clear, not only from the fact that the Church at large (*Gesamtkirche*) never functions as an outward organization in Scriptures, that it is nowhere represented as a governing body, but also from the fact that the highest and most essential activities of a visible church-body, those of establishing the ministry and calling pastors (Acts 14, 23; Titus 1, 5) and of functioning as the final court in excluding from membership in the Christian Church (Matt. 18; 1 Cor. 5) such as will not accept brotherly admonition after a flagrant transgression of the Law of God, are distinctly associated with the local congregation.

In keeping with this Scripture truth, that the local congregation is the unit of any church organization, the organization of our Missouri Synod took place and its government was determined. (Cp. *Constitution*, Arts. V, VI, VII.) It is particularly to be noted that Synod consists and is composed of congregations, not of Districts. The Districts merely represent a convenient form of carrying out the objectives of Synod. The local congregation is the unit of Synod, and the individual member is the unit of the local congregation. Therefore the pastor of each congregation is responsible for the observance of the objectives which Synod has named as purposes governing the common activities of a large organization, or association. Cp. Rev. 2 and 3.

In theory our government has been the *congregational polity*, and is to-day, as a matter of fact. We have been fairly consistent in avoiding a *synodical polity*, a government by Synod as an administrative and executive body. But are we not dangerously near adopting a *bureaucratic polity*, a government by boards and committees and commissions? One who pages through the report of the recent convention in Milwaukee cannot help but notice the constant repetition of resolutions placing important activities into the hands of committees. Were all those matters not studied in the individual congregation? Is it necessary for us to build up more or less elaborate organizations which are, to an extent at least, independent of the local congregation in order to take care of the work of the Kingdom? What about the proper appreciation and use of the laymen's movement as set forth in the Word of God, as practised by the congregations of the apostolic period?

P. E. K.

The Inspiration of the New Testament.

Is the subjective proof for the truth of the New Testament the only one we really can offer? This is the question which was recently put. The *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum* is undoubtedly the strongest argument for the Christian himself, according to John 7, 17. But we may well employ the argument from the promise of the Savior, John 14, 26; 15, 26 f.; 16, 13, with 17, 20, together with the statements of the writers themselves, as in 1 Cor. 2, 4, 13; Gal. 1, 7 ff.; 1 Thess. 2, 13, and certain bits of evidence, as in 2 Pet. 3, 15, 16. For the whole question see the discussion in *CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY*, II, 655 ff. 754 ff.

P. E. K.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Die humanistische Vorbildung der Prediger. Unsere Synode erörtert seit Jahren diesen Gegenstand. Sie erkennt, daß auch auf diesem Gebiet der theologischen Vorbildung sich ein Mangel bemerkbar macht. Das bisherige Survey Committee hat sich darüber also ausgesprochen: "The place of languages in ministerial training. If in our ministerial training, both pretheological and theological, we lose sight of the objectives accepted by Synod in the meeting at St. Louis in 1926, we shall lower the standards which our Church in America has upheld since the founding of the first Concordia at Altenburg, in 1839, and which the Lutheran Church of Germany and the Scandinavian countries established and maintained with consistent endeavor these four hundred years. The training that we have hitherto offered is in keeping with the humanistic ideals of the age of the Reformation. This means, briefly stated, that the social sciences, the natural sciences, and mathematical learning were made secondary and subservient to linguistic training in our pretheological schools. What is to be said at the present time with regard to this policy? Shall we lower the standards of our language requirements in keeping with certain modern demands? . . . 'In the same measure that the Gospel is dear to us should we zealously cherish the languages. Let this be kept in mind, that we shall not preserve the Gospel without the languages.' (Luther.)" Die Synode hat diese Sache und die damit zusammenhängende Frage betreffs der Verlängerung des Gymnasialkurses einem Komitee zur weiteren Prüfung übergeben. Auch in Deutschland beschäftigt man sich mit dieser Sache. Auch in der lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands steht nicht alles so, wie es sollte. Die „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ vom 15. Juli berichtet folgendes, wovon nicht alles, aber doch vieles auf unsern Fall seine Anwendung findet.

„Der Mangel humanistischer Bildung bei den jungen Theologen bedroht immer mehr die geistige Höhe des künftigen Pastorenstandes. Aus dieser Sorge wenden sich die drei ältesten Professoren der Theologie in Halle, Feine, Fieder und Rattenbusch, an den evangelischen Oberkirchenrat mit einem Antrag, unverzüglich eine Aenderung der für Kirche und theologische Wissenschaft gleichermaßen bedrohlichen Lage herbeizuführen. Die Eingabe soll auch dem deutschen evangelischen Kirchenbundesrat und sämtlichen deutschen evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten überreicht werden. Sie lautet: ‚Die Vorbildung der evangelischen Theologen erfüllt uns mit immer wachsender Sorge. Der Rückgang in der Kenntnis der alten Sprachen, schon lange eine schwere Schädigung des akademischen Unterrichts, hat sich in den letzten Jahren in erschreckendem Maße gesteigert. Die Folgen zeigen sich deutlich: Unwissenheit und Unsicherheit in dem, was unumgängliche Voraussetzung des akademischen wie des durch das ganze Leben fortzusetzenden theologischen Studiums ist, verbindet sich mit Geringschätzung höherer sprachlicher Bildung und das Zurückbleiben sprachlicher und damit auch geistiger Durchbildung mit dem Zurückstehen evangelisch-theologischer Arbeit auf verschiedenen wissenschaftlichen Gebieten. Diese Folgen werden sich alsbald in

allgemeinem Umfange auswirken: in dem Sinken der theologischen Durchschnittbildung, in dem wissenschaftlichen Zurücktreten des Protestantismus, im Nachlassen der Mitarbeit der evangelischen Theologie an dem geistigen Leben des Christentums. Die jetzt geschaffenen Sprachenkonvikte sind nur Notbehelfe. Sie sind kein ausreichender Ersatz für die Mängel der Vorbildung. Es ist ganz unmöglich, daß in der für ihren Lehrplan zur Verfügung stehenden kurzen Zeit die sichere Beherrschung der drei Sprachen gewonnen wird, die allein wissenschaftliche Selbständigkeit gewährleistet. Das Bibel muß vielmehr an der Wurzel angefaßt werden. Während die katholische Kirche daran festgehalten hat, daß nur Abiturienten mit der Reife des humanistischen Gymnasiums für das Studium der Theologie angenommen werden, haben die evangelischen Kirchen verschiedenen Konzeptionen zugestimmt und sogar den von der Realschule Kommenden das theologische Studium geöffnet. Der Theologenmangel hat der evangelischen Kirche feinerzeit dazu die Veranlassung und damit eine gewisse Entschuldigung gegeben. Er besteht gegenwärtig nicht mehr, und damit entfällt jedwede Entschuldigung. Damit fällt auf die evangelische Kirche die Verantwortung für die genügende Durchbildung ihrer Theologen jetzt aufs neue in der ganzen Schwere. Uns erscheint es als das dringende Gebot der Stunde, daß alle Ermäßigungen in der sprachlichen Vorbildung der evangelischen Theologen aufgehoben und daß zum Studium der Theologie nur die auf einem humanistischen Gymnasium Vorgebildeten zugelassen werden. Die evangelische Kirche hat Hüterin zu sein des geistigen Erbes der Kirche aller Zeiten, zumal des kostbaren, das ihr von der Reformation als unentbehrliches Lebensgut und als unerläßliche Pflicht überantwortet worden ist. Es geht jetzt um den wissenschaftlichen Verfall des Protestantismus, es geht um die geistige Zukunft der evangelischen Kirche. D. Dr. Feine. D. Dr. Fider. D. Dr. Mattenbusch.“

E.

Das Ergebnis des kirchlichen Zensus in Amerika. Unter dieser Überschrift berichtet der „Luth. Herald“ aus dem „Friedensboten“, dem Blatt der Unierten hierzulande: „Die Kirchen haben zwar unter dem Druck der Not schwer zu kämpfen, sofern die Mittel in Betracht kommen, ihre Werke weiterzuführen; aber es ist für sie eine Erntezeit gekommen, wo sie mit neuer Freude ihre gottgegebene Aufgabe erfüllen können, den Armen zu helfen, die Traurigen zu trösten, die Verzagten zu ermuntern und die von Gott Gesegneten zu größerem Eifer im Dienst der Liebe anzufeuern. Das ist das Ergebnis der Zählforschung D. Vinn Kieffers, der als Nachfolger Dr. Carrolls jährlich im *Christian Herald* über die Zahl der Kirchenmitglieder unsers Landes berichtet. Es sind nur Zahlen, zum Teil leere Zahlen, die keine Gewähr für die Stärke der Glaubenskraft geben; aber sie zeigen doch, daß die Gegner des Christentums im Irrtum waren, als sie voraussetzten, daß die Kirchen ihren Einfluß verlieren und aussterben würden. Statt des von ihnen erhofften Rückgangs weist nämlich das vergangene Jahr eine Zunahme von 433,656 Gemeindegliedern auf. In einer besonderen Zahlentafel weist der Forscher nach, wie die Zahl der Kirchenmitglieder im Vergleich zur Bevölkerungszahl des Landes seit 1800 von Jahrzehnt zu Jahrzehnt stetig zugenommen hat. Wir greifen die folgenden Zahlen heraus. Im Jahre 1800 waren von je 100 Bewohnern des Landes je 6.8 Kirchenmitglieder, 1850: 15.2, 1900: 32.7, 1930: 40.1.

„D. Kieffer hat sehr fleißig gearbeitet. Er hat in diesem Jahr eine Reihe von Religionsgemeinschaften und Vereinigungen mit religiösen Bestrebungen mitgezählt, von denen früher keine Angaben zu erhalten waren. Ein Vergleich mit dem letztjährigen Bericht zeigt, daß die Zahlen in vielen Fällen niedriger sind. Das hat darin seinen Grund, daß er die Zählmethode einheitlich gestaltet hat, indem er sie in Einklang gebracht hat mit den Zensusmethoden der Regierung. Danach werden nur solche, die dreizehn Jahre alt und darüber sind, als Kirchenmitglieder gezählt. Manche Kirchen berichteten früher die Zahl der Getauften, zählten also die Kinder mit. D. Kieffer hat sich die Mühe gemacht, den letztjährigen Bericht auf dieser Grundlage umzuarbeiten, um ein treues Bild der wirklichen Zunahme geben zu können. Wir lassen eine kurze Zusammenfassung seiner Zahltafeln folgen. Unsern Lesern wird es auffallen, daß hier der Name unserer Kirche fehlt. Der Zählforscher hat offenbar angenommen, daß die drei Kirchen, die die Bezeichnung ‚evangelisch‘ führen, zu einer kirchlichen Familie gehören. Hoffentlich wird er im nächsten Jahr diesen Irrtum berichtigen. Seine Zahlen für die Evangelische (unierte) Synode von Nordamerika sind: Mitglieder: 255,141; Abnahme: 2,588.“

Kirchengemeinschaften.	Mitglieder.	Zunahme.
Katholiken (westliche), 3 Körperschaften	14,528,176	15,243
Baptisten, 18 Körperschaften	9,067,152	139,526
Methodisten, 19 Körperschaften	8,135,627	40,225
Jüdische Gemeinden	4,081,242
Lutheraner, 17 Körperschaften	3,032,350	49,126
Presbyterianer, 9 Körperschaften	2,557,541	16,676
Jünger Christi, 2 Körperschaften	1,865,979	— 4,477
Episkopale	1,261,158	6,031
Kongregational-Christianer	1,010,341	— 736
Reformierte, 4 Körperschaften	563,580	2,981
Mormonen, 2 Körperschaften	557,541	11,473
Katholiken (östliche), 8 Körperschaften.....	535,503	1,300
Evangelische, 3 Körperschaften	479,967	— 2,288
Vereinigte Brüder in Christo, 3 Körperschaften..	377,214	3,073
Christliche Wissenschaft	202,098
Adventisten, 5 Körperschaften	169,189	6,854
Brüder (Dunkards), 4 Körperschaften.....	167,317	11,319
Assemblies of God	109,045	12,491
Mennoniten, 16 Körperschaften	102,180	2,125
Zusammen	48,803,200	317,842
Kirchen, die weniger als 100,000 Mitglieder haben, zusammen	949,243	115,814
Gesamtzahl	49,752,443	433,656

S. L. M.

Lutheran Statistics. — From the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* we take over the following paragraphs: —

“Seventeen general bodies of Lutherans in the United States totaled 4,228,268 in baptized membership at the close of the last calendar year, as far as reports were ready by April 1, and 2,853,267 in communicant membership, a gain of 46,470, or 1.65 per cent. over the figures of the preceding year, according to figures released by the Rev. Dr. L. Kieffer, statistician of the National Lutheran Council.

"Of these 1,384,975 were members of the United Lutheran Church in America; 1,308,830 were members of the American Lutheran Conference, comprising the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United Danish Synod; and 1,332,421 were members of the Synodical Conference, comprising the Missouri Synod, the Joint Wisconsin Synod, the Slovak Synod, the Norwegian Synod, and the Negro Missions.

"The greatest gains in membership were in the United Lutheran Church, with an increase of 16,505; the Missouri Synod, with an increase of 16,153; the Norwegian Lutheran Church, with an increase of 7,076 and the Augustana Synod, with an increase of 4,225.

"Bodies which decreased in membership were the Eielsen Synod, with 100 decrease; the Danish Lutheran Church, with 716; the Norwegian Synod, with 321, and the Icelandic Synod, with a decrease of 3.

"Comparing the United States Census figures of 1926 for 'members thirteen years and older,' with the estimated like figures for 1931, Dr. Kiefer reports a five-year gain of 194,630, to which the United Lutheran Church contributed a gain of 125,764, the Missouri Synod a gain of 40,256, the Finnish Apostolic Church a gain of 17,799, the American Lutheran Church a gain of 10,941, the Augustana Synod a gain of 5,653, the Negro Missions a gain of 3,756, the United Danish Church a gain of 2,568, and the Finnish Suomi Synod a gain of 2,047, while the Joint Wisconsin Synod registered a loss of 12,236 and the Norwegian Lutheran Church a loss of 11,463. Communicant membership for the seventeen bodies totaled 2,853,267 in 1931 as compared with 2,806,797 in 1930. The total number of ministers increased from 11,336 in 1930 to 11,735 in 1931, while churches increased from 15,238 to 15,501.

"The communicant membership of nearly 3,000,000 is allocated to the general bodies as follows: United Lutheran Church, 962,461; American Lutheran Church, 328,602; Augustana Synod, 236,617; Norwegian Lutheran Church, 319,484; Lutheran Free Church, 30,504; United Danish Church, 21,419; Eielsen Synod, 900; Church of the Lutheran Brethren, 1,200; Danish Lutheran Church, 13,816; Icelandic Synod, 1,607; Finnish Suomi Synod, 22,711; Finnish National Church, 6,061; Finnish Apostolic Church, 25,300; Missouri Synod, 697,270; Joint Synod of Wisconsin, 153,506; Slovak Synod, 8,675; Norwegian Synod, 5,351; Negro Missions, 3,756; independent Lutheran congregations, 14,027."

NOTE. — The above statement that "the United Lutheran Church contributed a gain of 125,764, the Missouri Synod a gain of 40,256 communicant members" is not fully consistent with the fact since the United States Census for 1926 is not quite correct. According to our own statistics we had 645,345 communicant members in the United States in 1926 and 716,091 in 1931, a gain of 70,746. Mention should be made also of the fact that we changed from "souls" to "baptized members," thus excluding thousands of our non-Lutheran unbaptized Sunday-school children. There are enrolled in our Sunday-schools and day-schools more than 40,000 children of non-Lutherans. So our 1931 figures are too low *in comparison* with the figures of 1926.

The United States Census for 1926 gave us 686,688 members of *thir-*

teen years and over, while the children in our churches are confirmed at the age from *thirteen to fourteen* years. The result is a difference of a few thousands of communicant members; that is to say, the census gives us a few thousands of communicant members more than we really have. Our 1931 figures cannot be compared with the United States Census of 1926.

The method used in arriving at the above statement is an application of the percentage of thirteen years and over, which in 1926 in our Synod was 69.4 per cent. The Missouri Synod has now 1,120,156 baptized members in the United States only. 69.4 per cent. of this is 777,388 communicant members, or since 1926 (686,688) a gain of 90,700. However, as we have already said, a correct comparison of our statistics with the United States Census, or a comparison of "souls" with "baptized members" is almost impossible.

E. E.

The Church in Politics.—History informs us what is liable to happen when the Church enters the political arena. There was a time when President Andrew Johnson was considered by many a failure and a fit subject for impeachment. In the light of history he now bears a different character. But what happened in the days of his incumbency of the Presidency? *The Tragic Era*, by Claude G. Bowers, published by the Literary Guild of America, 1929, relates this, naming its sources: "Then five days of utter madness. . . . One of the persecuted Senators wrote years later in cold blood that the conspirators were ready for assassination. . . . But intimidation—that was the thing! The Grand Army of the Republic, then a political machine, was making flourishing demands. The Methodist Episcopal Church, in General Conference in Chicago, was prevented from adopting a resolution for an hour of prayer for conviction only by the sanity and moral sense of an aged member, who reminded ministers of the sanctity of an oath. But Bishop Simpson . . . rose to the occasion with an amendment for an hour of prayer 'to save our Senators from error.'" And that was unanimously agreed upon. (P. 193.) The General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church at Washington acted along the same lines. (P. 195.) A prayer there offered need not be reproduced here. When the Church stands on the clear Word of God, she stands on safe ground. But in matters not decided in Scripture the churchmen are as liable to err as the politicians, and when they presume to clothe their political views and judgments with the authority of God, they disgrace the Church and the Gospel. The unthinking will blame the Church and the Gospel for the mistakes of the theological politicians. Bishop Simpson was certainly convinced of the justice and wisdom of his position, but he had no right to back it with the authority of God. The churchman is not infallible on political questions and may lose his balance in the turmoil of political warfare as well as others. For good and sufficient reasons God has commanded the Church to keep out of politics. History shows why. But the lesson of history is falling on deaf ears. Says the *Lutheran Herald* of July 19: "Is the Church in possession of all facts regarding state, national, and international questions to such an extent that it can determine in every case what is right and wrong and with dictatorial authority demand in the name of God what must be done? The Pope claims this authority, but not the Protestant Church. We notice that the Methodists in their convention at Atlantic City decided that

Article 231 of the Versailles Treaty should be altered to remove the German war guilt clause. It passed resolutions favoring our ratification of the World Court protocol and our entry into the League of Nations. They demanded that Orientals should be included in the quota of immigration laws; that pacifists should not be barred from citizenship; that exemption clauses should be allowed Methodists as well as Quakers; that military training in all civilian educational institutions should be abolished. . . . We object to Congress's settling our religious questions, and we believe Congress and the Supreme Court should refuse to take dictation from a church convention." In an article on "Resubmission or Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment" it said on July 26: "Furthermore, we do not believe it advisable" (make it stronger!) "for churches to open their doors to political or semipolitical organizations who for the 'good of the cause' are anxious to get into the churches and collect money for the support of political candidates and thus drag the Church into the intrigue, chicanery, trickery, and underhanded work of political schemers. Let them have a hall and discuss their political matters there. It is not the duty of the pastor to tell his Democrats, Republicans, Farmer Laborites, Prohibitionists, or Socialists what ticket to vote." E.

Die Treibkraft der römischen Presse. Während protestantische Redakteure über Verluste an Lesern ihrer Zeitschriften zu klagen haben, gewinnt die katholische Presse hierzulande stetig an Macht. Kürzlich hat Dr. James E. Clarke, der Redakteur des *Presbyterian Advance*, den in Washington, D. C., versammelten protestantischen Redakteuren kirchlicher Blätter nachfolgenden Brief geschrieben, den das baptistische Blatt *Watchman-Examiner* weitergibt. Wir lutherischen Pastoren haben alle Ursache, über das Gesagte nachzudenken und um so mehr um Leser unserer Blätter zu werben. Das Papsttum macht sich wahrlich die Presse, die Luther als ein gesegnetes Mittel zur Verbreitung des Evangeliums so hoch anpries, zunutze. Wir lesen in dem genannten Brief:

"As you know, there has been a steady decline in the circulation of Protestant religious periodicals during the past fifteen years. I undertook this spring an investigation of the situation in the Catholic Church, and I discover that in the ten-year period from 1920 to 1930 Catholic newspapers as a whole practically doubled their circulation. They have sustained a loss during the last year or two, but not nearly so serious a loss as in the case of Protestant papers, which indicates that there is more general interest in church periodicals among Catholics than among Protestants.

"That is rather a surprising statement to make, but it seems to be an indisputable fact. It is unquestionably due to a church-wide determination on the part of Catholic leaders to create, from the church point of view, a more intelligent and better-informed constituency. I requested specific information on this point from Humphrey E. Desmond, who has succeeded his father as editor of the *Catholic Citizen* in Milwaukee, and he confirms my conclusion, stating that the circulation gains have been 'largely due to an intensive promotional campaign for the Catholic press during this period,' the past fifteen years.

"As you probably know, the elder Desmond, long editor of the *Catholic Citizen*, died this spring, and it was he who was largely responsible for

the movement in the Catholic Church. His son and successor writes: 'About 1911 my father suggested a Catholic Press Sunday, with the idea that that particular Sunday in the year would be used for sermons on the Catholic press in all Catholic churches. From this beginning has come the present Catholic Press Month; and in February of each year many sermons are delivered on the subject of the support of the Catholic press, and many programs are arranged for Catholic parochial schools, academies, and colleges. This has been very successful propaganda.'

"It seems to me that the contrast between the situation in the Protestant churches and that of the Catholic Church is a matter of intense interest. It is a rare exception that a Protestant minister or Protestant church official makes any effort to push the circulation of church-papers. Indeed, it is a very common thing in our Church for pastors and sessions to refuse to permit their congregations to be canvassed for any church periodicals. But our Catholic brethren give a whole month to arousing interest in their church periodicals. The priests preach on the subject, and their young people are faithfully taught the value of a church-paper. That is a tremendously significant fact.

"I might add that the latest copy of the *Catholic Press Directory* lists 310 Catholic publications. Of the total 267 report their circulation, giving an aggregate of more than 7,100,000. It occurs to me that it might be of much interest to present these facts to the editors assembled in Washington."

J. T. M.

A Shock to Darwinists. — Ehrliche Gelehrte haben schon so oft darauf hingewiesen, wie unhaltbar vom wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt aus die Entwicklungslehre ist, daß man kaum mehr auf die Widerlegungen wissenschaftlicher Apologeten hinweisen mag. Und doch ist dies nötig. Die Unwahrheit der Evolutionisten wird immer wieder vorgetragen, und zwar so, daß alle Zeugnisse wirklicher Gelehrter ignoriert werden. So dürfen denn auch wir nicht schweigen. Im *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* lesen wir unter der obigen Überschrift über dies Thema:

"When it was learned that a salamander or a newt can reproduce a lost limb or an eye with a brand-new one, it came as a great shock to the Darwinists. But when Hans Driesch showed how to separate the developing embryo in the four-celled or eight-celled stage in such a way that *each of these separated cells would develop into a perfect individual*, the entire mechanistic theory of heredity seemed to tumble in ruins. Even the venerable theory of the three germ-layers of the embryo failed utterly; for organs made of mesoderm cells are shown to be sometimes regenerated from ectoderm cells, or *vice versa*.

"In short, all the mechanical theories of heredity have broken down, and with them the last refuges of mechanical explanations of life in other departments of biology. In all living things we seem to be face to face with the direct working of the Creator. And the persistent failures of mechanistic scientists to obscure this great truth have served only to focus the attention of the present generation on it in a way that makes it live before us as never before.

"Scientists declare that their work is to push back the boundaries between the known and the unknown. Too often it seems as if they are trying to 'explain' the more mysterious phenomena of nature in terms of

other processes which we think we already understand, but which in reality are as unknown as ever in respect to a real *cause* other than the direct act of the God of nature. It is thus that most of the phenomena of nature have been 'explained.' As a matter of fact they have been *explained away*, and in no other department is this so true as in biology.

"This brings us to another great fact which is impressing the scientific world more and more. I refer to the truth of *life only from life*. Time and again since Pasteur demonstrated this truth nearly seventy years ago, have we seen men come forward with the claim that at last they have discovered how to make life where there was no life before. But without a single exception have we seen these men acknowledge their complete failure. And as long as scientists are not willing to draw the obvious conclusion from this perpetual failure, just so long will men fool away their own time and that of others in trying to rule God out of this one very significant point in the works of His creation.

"A last fact in this series, and the only other one I have space to give here, is the gradually dawning fact that organic evolution is breaking down as a logical and scientific system.

"A work like that of Dr. Austin H. Clark's *The New Evolution*, issued about two years ago, shows the almost innumerable gaps in the system as revealed by modern biological research. The figure of a genealogical tree has often been used to illustrate the alleged common origin (stem and root) of all the twigs and branches, the latter representing the modern kinds of living things. As Clark candidly remarks: "The twigs of the tree do not actually join the branches, and the branches do not join the main trunk; and besides, the main trunk itself is not continuous. . . . All lines are broken by gaps which may be small and insignificant or broad and striking." (Pp. 181. 183.)

"Additional evidence of this breakdown of evolutionary theory comes to us from the address before the London meeting of the British Association last autumn. One of the speakers, an ardent evolutionist, admitted: "There is no reptile alive to-day which can give rise to a mammal, no fish that can become a reptile, and no animal that can become a man."

"The standard alibi of the evolutionist that much of his important evidence has been destroyed by the vicissitudes of the fossils in the rocks did not seem to satisfy Professor D'Arcy Thompson, who was reported to the following effect: —

"We have been told that rents have been torn in the veil which surrounds the mystery of evolution and that this has irretrievably destroyed chapters in the old book. That explanation does not suffice for me, and I honestly believe that we are as ignorant as we were seventy years ago.

"In the great gaps between vertebrates and invertebrates there is no possibility of one passing into the other. I am not defying the evidence of evolution, but I believe that any attempt to find an invertebrate which has passed into a vertebrate type is doomed to failure."

"Christian workers ought to know that the tide is turning among the leaders in the scientific world. The outstanding truths of revealed religion are being vindicated by modern research; and all Christians ought to be apprehended of this situation."

J. T. M.

Foreign Missions of Lutherans in America. — A general summary of the Lutheran Foreign Mission statistics of the Lutheran churches having headquarters in the United States and Canada, according to Rev. George Linn Kieffer, D. D., Litt. D., Statistical Secretary of the United Lutheran Church in America and Statistician and Reference Librarian of the National Lutheran Council, states that there are 719 missionaries at work in the fields in India, Africa, Argentina, British Guiana, China, New Guinea, Madagascar, South Africa, Japan, Santal, India, and Persia, aided by 5,446 native workers in 2,804 congregations, which have a baptized membership of 247,762 and a confirmed membership of 103,698. The accessions, according to the latest reports, were 14,721, and there were 16,305 inquirers. The Sunday-schools have 55,761 pupils; other mission-schools number 1,772, with 60,690 pupils. The natives contributed toward the work of missions \$168,484. — From the *News Bulletin of N. L. C.*

Death of an Old Testament Scholar. — The *Christian Century* reports: "Dr. J. M. Powis Smith, Professor of Old Testament Language at the University of Chicago, died September 26 aboard the *Laconia* in New York harbor as he was returning from a summer in England. His death was caused by cerebral hemorrhage. He was sixty-five years old. Dr. Smith was closely identified with the late Dr. William Rainey Harper, first president of the university, as student, literary secretary, and later as colleague. At the time of his death he was vice-chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages in the University. While Dr. Smith's reputation for scholarship was widely recognized by all specialists in his field and by his many former students, his wider fame is due largely to the translation of the Old Testament, which he edited and a considerable part of which he himself made. He had reached the retiring age last December, but by special request of the administrative authorities of the university had continued his work till June, when his retirement became effective." In theology Professor Smith was an outspoken liberal, denying many of the fundamental truths which Bible Christians hold dear. A.

II. Ausland.

Bringing Back Fond Memories. — A description of the divine services held in St. Thomas's Church at Leipzig, Germany, attended by Dr. I. N. Nothstein on July 3 of this year, contains this interesting item: "After the Communion service was concluded, the organ began playing an interlude, during which the adults went out and little children began coming into the church. At 11.30 the children's service began, and a very impressive service it was. The pastor conducted a liturgy, clad in the Luther robe and ruff. The children took part in the responses in a very reverent way. One part of the liturgy consisted of a repetition of a part of the Catechism. There was a fifteen-minute intermission, during which classes were conducted like in a Sunday-school. There followed a sermon on the Gospel-lesson for the day from the pulpit. It was made attractive to the children by being conducted in a conversational tone, questions being asked by the pastor and answered by the audience. After a closing service and a hymn the children's congregation was dismissed with the benediction." (*Lutheran*, July 28, 1932.) The good old *Christenlehre*! Somewhat modified, but still the good old *Christenlehre*. E.

Die Übertrittsbewegung in Deutsch-Österreich. Wie das „Ev. Deutschland“ berichtet, geht die Übertrittsbewegung in Deutsch-Österreich immer weiter. Wir lesen darüber: „In Deutsch-Österreich sind im vergangenen Jahr insgesamt 3,724 Personen zur evangelischen Kirche übergetreten. In Deutsch-Österreich, in den deutschen Gemeinden von Böhmen, Mähren und halb Schlesien und in den tschechischen Gemeinden desselben Gebietes sind im Jahre 1931 zusammen 9,249 Personen zur evangelischen Kirche übergetreten. Vor dem Krieg betrug in dem ganzen damaligen Österreich (zu dem ja außer den genannten Gebieten auch noch der verlorengegangene Süden von Meran bis Marburg und Triest, ferner halb Schlesien, ganz Galizien und Bukowina gehörten) die Höchstzahl der Übertritte nicht ganz 6,700.“

Rev. E. S. Jones Visiting China. — A news item in one of our exchanges tells us that next month Rev. E. Stanley Jones, the well-known Methodist missionary in India, will leave India and go to China to spend several months with the students of that country. He is quoted as writing: “In July I go to China. The different bodies of China have sent an urgent appeal to me to come to China this autumn. There is a race on between Communism and Christianity for the soul of China, with Communism leading. The students are the key to the situation. This invitation was so pressing that I could not refuse.” The same communication reports Rev. Jones as saying about the work of the last months in India: “The last three months have been a period of intense national crisis. Gandhi returned from the Round-table Conference, negotiations for a settlement broke down, and he was swiftly sent to jail along with thousands of others. With constant jailings and the lathi charges, my work seemed impossible. But it has been the best three months I have ever had.” Seeing the zeal of this man, who has but a very imperfect conception of Christ as our Substitute, what should we say who through the grace of God have been shown the full glory and significance of Calvary? A.

Der Koran ver sagt. Aus dem „Brüder-Bootschifter“ gibt der „Luth. Herold“ die folgende für die christliche Mission in mohammedanischen Ländern äußerst wichtige Mitteilung weiter:

„Eine wichtigere Nachricht ist wohl seit langem nicht durch die Blätter gegangen als der Bericht eines Zeitungskorrespondenten in Vorderasien, daß sich die türkische und die persische Regierung darauf geeinigt haben, das Studium des Evangeliums St. Johannis in den Schulen einzuführen! Der Koran, das heilige Buch der Mohammedaner, das bisher dort ausschließlich herrschte, habe ver sagt und sei für die Rückständigkeit dieser beiden Völker verantwortlich; ohne religiöse Beeinflussung aber dürfe die Jugend nicht aufwachsen, und so habe man sich auf das Studium des Evangeliums St. Johannis geeinigt.“

„Wenn sich die Nachricht bewahrheitet, die am 4. Juni in den Großstadtzeitungen erschien, so bedeutet das einen Wandel von fast unberechenbarer Tragweite. Und selbst wenn das Evangelium nicht an die Stelle des Koran gesetzt, sondern ihm nur eine Stellung neben diesem in den Schulen dieser Völker angewiesen sein sollte, so ist auch damit schon eine Wahn für das Christentum freigegeben, wie man sie in absehbarer Zeit nicht zu erhoffen gewagt hätte in diesen Ländern, wo bisher ein Übertritt zum Christentum

nur mit Lebensgefahr gewagt werden durfte; denn der mohammedanische Fanatismus beherrschte Volks- und Staatsleben vollständig. Wir leben in der Tat in Zeiten gewaltiger Umwälzungen auf allen Gebieten, wie sie dem Eintreten ganz großer Ereignisse voranzugehen pflegen!"

„Wenn sich die Nachricht bewahrheitet!“ Davon hängt allerdings viel ab. Der Bericht jedoch stimmt im allgemeinen mit dem, was sonst Missionsnachrichten über Kemel Paschas Stellung zum Koran sagen. Neulich soll dieser sogar den Koran im Beisein vieler Männer mit dem Fuß durch das Zimmer gestoßen haben.

J. L. M.

Vormarsch des Islam in Ostafrika. Nach den neuesten Nachrichten aus Ostafrika nimmt die Werbearbeit der Mohammedaner im Paregebirge mit unverminderter Kraft ihren Fortgang. Von den 58,000 Bewohnern des Gebirges sind bereits 30,000 Mohammedaner geworden, und das in den wenigen Jahren seit der Besetzung Ostafrikas durch die Engländer. Wie ist dieser außergewöhnliche Erfolg zu erklären? — Als die keine Schar Lettow-Vorbeds vor der Übermacht der Engländer zurückweichen mußte, demarschierten viele Regimenter mohammedanisch-indischer Soldaten am Fuße des Paregebirges entlang, um die Verfolgung der Deutschen aufzunehmen. Sofort lief das Gerücht durch die Paretäler: „Die mohammedanischen Soldaten da drunten werden euch alle umbringen, wenn ihr nicht ihren Glauben annehmt!“ Zu diesem ersten Gerücht gesellte sich bald ein zweites: „Es ist der Wunsch der neuen, englischen Regierung, daß ihr keine Sengzi, das heißt, Menschen ohne Zivilisation, mehr bleibt. Gebildete Leute sollt ihr werden.“ Außer dem Europäer ist für den Pareneger aber nur der Mohammedaner ein gebildeter Mensch. Der Höhepunkt der Angst wurde jedoch erreicht, als die Engländer gleich nach ihrem Einzug sämtliche deutschen Missionare und selbst die eingebornen Christenlehrer zwangsweise aus dem Gebirge fortführen ließen. Nunmehr galt es als eine ausgemachte Tatsache, daß die Engländer selbst Mohammedaner sein müßten. — Aber nicht nur die Macht wilder Gerüchte, auch die eigentümliche Arbeitsweise der mohammedanischen Werber begünstigte das schnelle Vorwärtsdringen. Zunächst trieb jeder Mohammedaner, wes Standes und Berufes er auch sein mochte, mit großem Eifer Missionsarbeit. Die Hauptsache aber, die zum Erfolg führte, bestand darin, daß die mohammedanischen Werbearbeiter auf jeden Unterricht verzichteten und keine innere Umwandlung irgendwelcher Art verlangten. Die bloße Willenserklärung, kein verendetes Tier und kein Schweinefleisch zu essen, sondern nur noch geschlachtetes Fleisch zu genießen, genügte, und die Taufe wurde vollzogen. — So sind denn Tausende des Parevolkes aus Furcht, aus Eitelkeit, aus kluger Berechnung, aus Bequemlichkeit Mohammedaner geworden. Daß ein aus derartigen Gründen vollzogener Massenübertritt auf die Dauer keine wirklichen Lebenskräfte in sich birgt, liegt auf der Hand. Schon sind viele Hunderte wieder abgefallen. Die Gesamtlage ist für die Leipziger Mission, die im Paregebirge fünf Hauptstationen und vierunddreißig Außenplätze unterhält, schon deshalb alles andere als hoffnungslos, weil ihre Christengemeinden fest entschlossen sind, dem Ansturm der Mohammedaner entschiedener als je die Stirn zu bieten.

(Ug. Missionsnachr.)

Book Review. — Literatur.

Men Who Knew God: Samuel, Amos, Haggai. By *M. O. Wee*. 122 pages, 5¼×8. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. Price, \$1.00.

Professor Wee, formerly of the Hauge Synod, instructs at the theological seminary of the Norwegian Lutheran Church. He has in this volume published a series of simple lectures on Samuel and his ministry, on the message and times of Amos, and on the prophecies of Haggai. The author has worked with the Hebrew text and has given attention to variant interpretations, sometimes a little too trustful of critical scholars, although not sharing their attitude. The reviewer does not believe that "the dervishes of Arabia constitute an analogous phenomenon in our own time" to the prophetic schools of the Old Testament. Strangely enough, Professor Wee's discussion of Amos 9, 11 f. takes no account whatever of the fulfilment authentically recorded Acts 15, 15 ff., where the rebuilding of David's tabernacle is identified with the conversion of the Gentiles. Pul should be identified with Tiglathpileser (p. 80). Except in the importance given to conscious entering into fellowship with the Lord (p. 14) the Haugian viewpoint is not prominent. There are a number of bad misprints (p. IX, Manahaim for Mahanaim; p. 12, Heseekiah for Hezekiah; p. 56, Ramay for Ramah; p. 95, plumet for plummet; p. 119, Jubelees for Jubilees).

T. H. GRAEBNER.

Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk. In Verbindung mit Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, Friedrich Büchsel, Friedrich Hauck, Gerhard Heinzelmann, Joachim Jeremias, Albrecht Köpfe, Heinrich Rendtorff, Julius Schniewind, Hermann Strathmann und Heinz-Dietrich Wendland herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Vehm. Sechstes Teilbändchen: Der Brief an die Römer, überseht und erklärt von Paul Althaus. Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, Göttingen. 126 Seiten 6×9. Preis: Einzeln M. 4.40; bei Subscription M. 3.75.

Wie der Leser aus der obigen Angabe sieht, erscheint gegenwärtig in Deutschland ein neuer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Es ist nicht die Absicht der Bearbeiter und der Herausgeber, ein wissenschaftliches Werk zu liefern, sondern ihr Bestreben geht dahin, eine gute, fließende Übersetzung in modernem Deutsch herzustellen und die großen Gedanken, die sich in den betreffenden Abschnitten finden, in knappen Worten, aber doch so, daß sie leicht gefaßt werden können, herauszuziehen. Grammatische Erörterungen findet der Leser hier kaum, aber Begriffe wie Rechtfertigung, Versöhnung, Glaube, Erwählung werden besprochen, und es wird der Versuch gemacht, so den Inhalt der heiligen Schriften dem christlichen Volk näherzubringen. Es versteht sich von selbst, daß die Verfasser, wenn sie auch populär schreiben, doch durchaus auf grammatisch-historischem Grunde stehen wollen und nur darauf verzichten, dem Leser hier die Gelehrtegänge vorzuführen. Der theologische Standpunkt ist leider nicht der der Verbalinspiration, wie aus dem vorliegenden Bändchen zu ersehen ist, wenn Prof. Althaus z. B. S. 37 die Methode, wonach Paulus das Alte Testament gebraucht, als eine für uns vergangene, zum Teil rabbinische beschreibt.

Was nun gerade den hier zu besprechenden Teil, die Übersetzung und Auslegung des Briefes an die Römer, betrifft, so ist des Interessanten und Anregenden so viel, daß der Theolog großen Nutzen von der Lektüre bekommt. Wir können es uns nicht versagen, einen schönen Abschnitt über die Bedeutung des Todes Christi abzudrucken:

„Daß Christi Tod ‚für unsere Sünden‘ geschehen sei und sühnende Bedeutung habe, diesen Gedanken fand Paulus schon in der Urgemeinde, 1 Kor. 15, 3; 11, 23 ff. Auch von den Bildern und Begriffen, in denen er die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Christi näher auszuführen sucht, wird er einige schon übernommen haben. Sucht man in der Mannigfaltigkeit dieser Bilder und Begriffe (z. B. Opfer, Vorkauf, stellvertretendes Erleiden des Gesetzesfluches) den entscheidenden Gedanken, so ergibt sich etwa folgendes als Kreuzestheologie des Paulus. Das Verhältnis Gottes und der Menschen ist infolge der Sünde das der Feindseligkeit geworden, 1, 18 ff.; 5, 10. Soll es aus dem den Menschen zerstörenden Streite zum Frieden kommen, 5, 1, so bedarf es der Sühne, 3, 25; das heißt, Gottes Strafarnst wider die Sünde muß um seiner Gerechtigkeit willen, 3, 25 f., Genüge geschehen. Die Menschen können die Sühne nicht beschaffen. Gott selber tut es. Nicht die Menschheit kann das sühnende Opfer leisten; Gott bringt es. Er gibt seinen Sohn, der in ewiger Gemeinschaft mit ihm lebt, in die sündige Menschheit und um ihretwillen in den blutigen Tod dahin, 8, 32; Gal. 1, 4. Gott also ist der Urheber der Veröhnung, nicht, wie im Heidentum, die Menschen, die eine zürnende Gottheit erst umstimmen müssen. Gott umzustimmen, ist weder möglich noch nötig; obgleich er zürnend wider die Menschen stehen muß, 1, 18 ff., ist sein Liebeswille der Ursprung, nicht erst das Ergebnis des Wertes Christi: Christi Kreuzestod ist Gottes Liebestat, 2 Kor. 5, 18 ff.; Röm. 5, 8. Denn Christus starb nach Gottes Willen ‚für uns‘. Das heißt, Gott vollzieht an dem Sohne seiner Liebe, der in die sündige Menschheit als ihrer einer eingegangen ist, sein Urteil über die Sünde der Welt, 8, 3; er behandelt den Unschuldigen als ‚Sünde‘, vollzieht den Gesetzesfluch über die Sünde an ihm, 2 Kor. 5, 21; Gal. 3, 13. Sühne kann dieser Tod aber nur darum sein, weil er von dem Sohne in freiem Gehorsam gegen des Vaters Willen erlitten wird, 5, 19; Phil. 2, 5 ff. Das ist nun nach Gottes Ordnung und Willen für alle geschehen. Indem Christus das Urteil über die Sünde trägt, ist die Verurteilung zum Ziele und Ende gekommen — es gibt nun keine Verurteilung für die Menschen mehr, 8, 1. Weil Gott den Sündlosen als Sünder behandelt hat, kann er nun die Sünder um seinetwillen, in ihm, als gerecht behandeln, 2 Kor. 5, 21. Er erweckt Christus aus dem Tode auf zum lebendigen Herrn; damit bezeugt und verwirklicht er die durch Christi Tod für alle beschaffte Gerechtigkeit, 4, 25; 8, 34.“

Mit besonderem Interesse haben wir die Abschnitte gelesen, die von der Gnadenwahl handeln. Nicht allem, was der Verfasser sagt, können wir zustimmen; hier und da müssen wir sogar etwas entschieden verwerfen. Doch finden wir der Hauptsache nach die Darstellung der Konkordienformel hier wiedergegeben. So sagt der Verfasser z. B. S. 76 (zu Röm. 8, 28—30): „In solcher Liebe zu Gott erweisen die Christen sich als berufen durch Gottes ewigen Rat. Nur weil Gott sie mit seiner Berufung begnadet hat, ist in ihnen, die von Natur Gott fliehen und hassen, die Liebe entzündet. Als Berufene aber sind sie aller Dinge mächtig und der Vollendung gewiß. Denn ‚nach dem Rat schluß berufen‘ bedeutet: ein Wille hat sie ergriffen für seinen Plan, der unbedingt, mit göttlicher Sicherheit, zum Ziele führt. Daß sie, wie ihre Liebe zu Gott erweist, berufen sind, das ist nur ein Glied in einer Kette, der ‚güldenen Kette‘ (wie unsere Väter sagten) gött-

licher Heilsakte, nach rückwärts und vorwärts im festen Zusammenhange. Die Enden der Kette reichen in die Ewigkeit. Sie beginnt mit den ewigen Alten, in denen Gott die Seinen sich zuerkannt — das Erkennen Gottes bedeutet hier schon einen Wissensakt — und daraufhin zu dem Heile bestimmt hat.“ Über die Schwierigkeit, die sich für unser Denken erhebt, wenn wir einerseits die Ueinerwirkbarkeit der Gnade und andererseits die Verantwortlichkeit des Menschen betrachten, sagt Althaus, S. 77: „Bei Paulus hebt die Gewißheit der Erwählung die Verantwortung des Handelns im Wissen um die Todesgefahr nicht auf; in dem gleichen Kapitel (8), das die Erwählung bezeugt, stehen die großen Imperative 8, 12 ff., der Ruf zur Entscheidung zwischen Leben und Tod. Eine doppelte Möglichkeit [?] steht vor dem Menschen — der Erwählungsgebante weiß nichts von Möglichkeiten, nur von der einer seligen Wirklichkeit. Gedanklich hat Paulus das nicht ausgeglichen, und kann niemand es ausgleichen. Aber in der Wirklichkeit unsers Lebens vor Gott gehört beides untrennbar zusammen. . . . So ist der Gedanke der Erwählung als ein Satz des Glaubens von einer ‚absoluten‘ metaphysischen Wahrheit streng unterschieden.“ Bei seinen Ausführungen über Röm. 9 gewinnt man fast den Eindruck, als sei D. Althaus zu den Calvinisten übergegangen. Auf Seite 84 lesen wir zu Röm. 9, 17. 18: „Die Freiheit des göttlichen Erbarmens erweist sich in der Freiheit, das Erbarmen zu versagen und den Menschen zu verhärten.“ Es hätte ausgeführt werden sollen, daß auch Pharao reichlich Erbarmen widerfahren ist und daß er erst, nachdem er hartnäckig die Gnade von sich gewiesen hatte, verstoßt wurde. Auf Seite 100 modifiziert der Verfasser diesen Gedanken etwas, indem er sagt, daß Paulus in Kapitel 9 die Freiheit Gottes verkündigt und nicht etwa die Menschen in Erwählte und Verworfenen teile. Doch wir müssen hier abbrechen. — Die Übersetzung, soweit wir sie geprüft haben, ist eine treffliche Leistung und kann dem Bibelleser helfen, schwierige Stellen zu verstehen.

W. A. R. n. d. t.

The Road to Faith. By Winifred Kirkland. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York. 270 pages, 5½×7¾. Price, \$1.00.

The Spirit of God and the Faith of To-day. By Richard Roberts. Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago. 185 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$2.00.

Both these books belong into the department of Christian apologetics, since both are designed to save the Church of to-day from utter unbelief. The first, *The Road to Faith*, appeared five years ago under a different title (*Chaos and a Creed*) and over a pseudonym (James Priceman) and was hailed by H. R. L. Sheppard, author of *The Impatience of a Parson*, as "one of the few great religious books written in our time." Writing from a layman's point of view, the author appeals to the Christian world to consider the perils with which modern agnosticism is fraught and to scrutinize the destructive tenets of Modernism, which already have caused such confusion of thought that no one any longer knows just what to believe. He then examines the charges which higher critics have preferred against the New Testament and with irresistible logic proves them to be false. The gospels are true; their writers were sincere and could write them; to assume that they were composed at a later time is preposterous; Jesus lived, and so as the evangelists picture Him; He suffered, died, and rose again; the resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the evangelists, cannot be denied on scientific grounds; any attempt to do so is puerile.

From this follows that there is a Creator and that there has been a creation; also that the Creator assumed human flesh. "I believe that the incarnate Creator was an actual man, living, breathing, historic, and that His name was Jesus." Unfortunately, however, the author, instead of believing the Scriptures, now builds up a new rationalistic system of doctrine, accommodated to the intellectual and spiritual ideas of the modern man. "I believe that the Creator chose voluntarily to be an example." Beyond this Ritschlian doctrine the writer does not go; to him evidently the *satisfactio vicaria* is as intolerable as it is to the Modernists whom he condemns for their rank unbelief.—*The Spirit of God and the Faith of To-day* was conceived as a contribution to the nineteen-hundredth anniversary of Pentecost. Its purpose was to call attention to the vital work which according to Scripture the Holy Spirit performs among men. Great things might have been expected of a dissertation on this weighty topic of Christian dogmatics, especially since the writer is a Presbyterian minister. But Dr. Roberts, now pastor of Sherbourne Church, Toronto, Canada, missed his opportunity. He interprets the Holy Spirit merely as "the divine Presence of God in the whole field of human life" and His divine operation as a mere stimulation of the natural powers of man. Though wishing to awaken the Church to a deeper appreciation of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, he actually, by his insidious Liberalism, makes it impossible for the Christian to believe in the Holy Spirit of the Bible. Modernism has nothing to fear from the kind of apotheosis which these two books offer.

J. T. MUELLER.

The Partiality of Jesus. By *E. C. Comfort*. The Reformed Press, Grand Rapids, Mich. 154 pages. Price, \$1.25.

E. C. Comfort, the author of this book, is a man living in Texas. More than that the book does not reveal of him, except what he tells us in his foreword. He says: "This book is written by a man who has failed. He knows the sting of defeat, the shame of a fall from a high position, the poignant disgrace of wallowing in the mire, the bitter realization of being a disappointment to loved ones and friends, and the aching remorse of having been an agent of Satan in leading others into abominable practices. But if that were all he knew, the writer would not send forth these words to the world. He has learned, not only the cause of his failures and disgrace, but he now knows, beyond all question, how failure can be turned into 'more than conquest' and how God can restore the years which the canker-worms have eaten. . . . This book contains my first meditations in my new life in Christ Jesus." The book has the following eight chapters: His [Jesus'] Favorite Friend: the Sinner; His Favorite Book: Deuteronomy; His Favorite Name for Himself: Son of Man; His Favorite Title for God: My Father; His Favorite Place: Olivet; His Favorite Time: Evening; His Favorite Tone of Voice: Loud; His Favorite Attitude toward Man. The book is written in an evangelical spirit and shows a good acquaintance with the Bible. The author says: "If you are powerless as a Christian, then cease your own impotent talk and the quoting of religious leaders and give yourself over to 'searching the Scriptures.' Remember His promise that, if you abide in Him and His Word abide in

you, you shall 'ask what you will, and it shall [not may] be done unto you.' . . . Sad indeed we feel when we go into a church and hear a minister read from the Bible a few verses and then preach something else." The author states that the Bible clearly teaches the deity of Christ and the vicarious atonement.

JOHN H. C. FRITZ.

Luthers Werke in Auswahl. Siebter Band: Predigten, herausgegeben von Emanuel Hirsch. VIII und 420 Seiten $4\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Achter Band: Tischreden, herausgegeben von Otto Clemen. VIII und 388 Seiten. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin. Preis: In Leinwand mit Rücken- und Deckeltitel gebunden, je M. 8.

Dies sind zwei vor nicht langer Zeit erschienene Bände in einer sehr handlichen Ausgabe ausgewählter Werke Luthers, die gewöhnlich die „Donner Ausgabe“ genannt wird. Es ist nicht eine Ausgabe für den einfachen Mann, sondern für den Lutherstudenten, und beide vorliegenden Bände sind bearbeitet und herausgegeben von bekannten und anerkannten Luthersforschern. Der Predigtband umfaßt mehr als ein halbes Hundert Predigten Luthers und gibt dem, der sich ein Bild von dem Prediger Luther, so wie er wirklich gewesen ist, machen möchte, alles dazu Nötige in die Hand. Der erste Teil enthält S. 1—38 Selbstzeugnisse Luthers über seine Predigten und eine Einordnung von Luthers Predigt in das Ganze seiner Theologie und seines persönlichen Lebens. Der zweite Teil, S. 39—93, gibt eine historische Übersicht über die verschiedenen Postillen Luthers und ist dadurch historisch sehr wertvoll. Der dritte Teil, S. 94—208, bringt Wittenberger Festpredigten, der vierte Teil, S. 209—355, sogenannte Reihenpredigten über Joh. 17, über 1 Joh. 4, 16 f. und über 1 Kor. 15. Der fünfte und letzte Teil, S. 356—417, bringt Predigten bei besonderen Anlässen. Ein doppeltes Register bietet ein Verzeichnis der aufgenommenen Predigten Luthers nach der Entstehungszeit und nach den Textworten. Die Predigten sind in der alten Schreibweise dargeboten und wenn Luther Deutsch und Lateinisch redete in der Predigt, dann auch in beiden Sprachen. Der Tischredenband enthält eine große Anzahl schöner Äußerungen Luthers, wie sie sich in den Nachschriften von Veit Dietrich, A. Lauterbach, G. Weller, J. Mathesius, R. Heydenreich und J. Kurifaber aus den Jahren 1531 bis 1546 finden. Zugrunde gelegt ist die ausgezeichnete Ausgabe der Tischreden Luthers von Ernst Kroker in den sechs Bänden der Weimarer Lutherausgabe, wie überhaupt unsere ganze Ausgabe eine kleine Weimarer Ausgabe genannt werden könnte. Ein ausführliches Register auf 31 Seiten erleichtert den Gebrauch. Durch beide Bände hin finden sich die wertvollsten Anmerkungen und Erklärungen, die namentlich Ausdrücke und Phrasen Luthers verdeutlichen, die heutzutage nicht jedem gleich verständlich sind; zum Beispiel „die tun es wider den Strom“ wird erklärt mit „im Gegensatz zur ganzen Menschheit“. (S. 57.) Der Satz „sind redlich unter Augen gangen“ wird erklärt mit „haben offen angegriffen“. (S. 238.) Auch fehlt es nicht an der Sacherklärung. Als Luther einmal gefragt wurde, „an Platonis sententia sit vera“ — Luthers lateinische Worte werden auch hier lateinisch wiedergegeben —, so wird hinzugefügt als Erklärung unter dem Texte „von der Präexistenz der Seele“. (S. 278.) Wenn Luther einmal den „Michael Zöll“ nennt, so steht unter dem Text „Michael Bölius, der gräßlich mansfeldische Hofprediger“. (S. 333.) So sind diese beiden Bände nach mehr als einer Hinsicht wertvoll für den, der sich genauer mit Luther beschäftigen will, und sind wieder ein Beleg für die gegenwärtige Lutherrenaissance. L. FÜRBRINGER.

Quellen zur Geschichte des Katechismusunterrichts. Von M. Reu. Dritter Teil: Ost-, nord- und westdeutsche Katechismen. Erste Abteilung: Historisch-bibliographische Einleitung. Zweite Hälfte. Erste Lieferung, S. 505 bis 662. 7×10. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. Preis: M. 8.

In diesem wichtigen Quellenwerk werden zunächst schleswig-holsteinsche Katechismen aufgeführt, teils in niederdeutscher, teils in dänischer, teils in hochdeutscher Sprache verfaßt, dann die Katechismen, die in den Hansestädten Hamburg, Lübeck und Bremen gebraucht wurden. Die Titel werden genau angegeben; dann folgt eine kurze Inhaltsangabe und je nach der Wichtigkeit des Buches kürzere oder längere Zitate, die uns einen Einblick in die Art und Weise des damaligen Katechismusunterrichts geben. Auch bringt D. Reu aus andern Schriften viel Interessantes über Unterrichtsmethoden der damaligen Zeit. Das alles ist nicht etwa eine trodene Aufzählung der verschiedenen Katechismen, sondern der Verfasser versteht es meisterlich, in kurzen Zügen die Einführung der Reformation in diesen Landen zu schildern. Man freut sich, wie das Licht des Evangeliums seinen Schein immer weiter wirft, und erkennt, mit welchen Schwierigkeiten die Mitarbeiter des Reformators zu kämpfen hatten und welch ungeheuren Einfluß Luthers kleiner Katechismus auf die Ausbreitung der Reformation hatte. Wir können das Buch nur warm empfehlen und freuen uns schon im voraus auf weitere Hefte.

L. V ä t s c h.

D. Philipp Bachmann, der Prediger und der Liturg. Von Dr. Hans Kressel. Verlag von Dörffling & Franke. 56 Seiten 5½×8½. Preis: M. 1.50.

Der im vorigen Jahre verstorbene Prof. Bachmann in Erlangen war der Schüler des bekannten Erlanger Gegeeten Prof. D. Theodor Zahn, der ihn überlebt, obwohl er sechsundzwanzig Jahre älter ist, als sein Schüler geworden ist. An Zahns großem Kommentarwerk bearbeitete er die beiden Korintherbriefe, gerade die beiden Briefe des Apostels, die am tiefsten in die Praxis des Gemeindelebens hineingreifen. Bachmann war eben, ehe er auf den Lehrstuhl berufen wurde, im praktischen Pfarramt tätig und hat auch als Professor noch immer viel gepredigt und der Gemeinde gedient, und seine Bedeutung auf diesem Gebiete wird in der vorliegenden Schrift gewürdigt, ein Wiederabdruck einer Reihe von Artikeln, die vor einiger Zeit in der „Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ erschienen sind. Wir wollen nur ein paar Sätze aus der interessanten Schrift mitteilen über das immer noch so stark vernachlässigte Gebiet der Liturgie. Der Verfasser sagt von Bachmann: „Wieviel Zeit und Mühe hat der stark belastete Mann darauf verwandt, die geeignetsten Lieder und Verse aufzuspielen und sie an der geeignetsten Stelle einzureihen! An ihm gemessen, wird so leicht auch kein vielbeschäftigter Prediger eine Entschuldigung finden, die Liedernwahl vernachlässigen zu dürfen.“ (S. 51.) Das ist ganz gewiß richtig. Die Lieder, die im Gottesdienste gesungen werden, sind ein wichtiger Bestandteil des Gottesdienstes; in ihnen ist die Gemeinde unmittelbar und gemeinsam tätig als in einem Kultusakt von größter Bedeutung, und sie sollten darum mit besonderem Bedacht ausgewählt werden. Pfarrer Kressel sagt dann auch, welche Lieder Bachmann besonders pflegte. „Da waren es zunächst die starken reformatorischen und altkirchlichen Choräle, die in den Vordergrund gestellt wurden. An den hohen Festtagen und außerordentlichen Jubiläumsfeiern fehlte selten das Tedeum, „Herr Gott, dich loben wir“, und das deutsche Sanctus, „Jesaja, dem Propheten“. Vom großen

Osterlied ‚Christ ist erstanden‘ an und vom einzig schönen und lieblichen, herzlich und kindlich jauchzenden, vielleicht schönsten Himmelfahrtslied ‚Nun freut euch, Gottes Kinder all‘ . . . über Luthers Pfingstlieder ‚Kommi, Heiliger Geist, Herr Gott‘ und ‚Nun bitten wir den Heiligen Geist‘ bis hin zum schlichten ‚Verleih uns Frieden gnädiglich‘ . . . waren alle Fürsten und Könige unter den Festliedern und Nicht-Festliedern in seinen Gottesdiensten vertreten. . . . Aus manchen Liedern, die er mit besonderer Vorliebe singen ließ, wie das erwähnte Himmelfahrtslied, weiter ‚Lobe den Herren, o meine Seele‘, ‚Morgenglanz der Ewigkeit‘, ‚Erneure mich, o ew'ges Licht‘, insbesondere ‚Herzlich lieb hab‘ ich dich, o Herr‘, meint man den Herzschlag seiner glaubensstarken, herzlich und innigen Frömmigkeit zu spüren. Wie wurden diese Gemeindelieder noch ergänzt durch die entsprechenden Chorgefänge, die nicht im Stil der berühmtesten Konzerteinsagen auftraten, sondern organisch wie die Choräle in den liturgischen Gang eingeordnet waren und nichts anderes erstrebten, als den Gemeinchoral zu bekräftigen und weiterzuführen!“ (S. 52 f.) Und so könnten wir noch mehr Stellen anführen, die Bachmann als richtigen Liturgiker und Liturgen kennzeichnen.

L. F ü r b r i n g e r.

Introduction to Religious Education. General Editor, *J. M. Price*; Associate Editors, *L. L. Carpenter* and *J. H. Chapman*. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1932. 480 pages, 5¾ × 8½. Price, \$3.50.

This book of twenty-four chapters, written by as many different educators, some of them with an international reputation, gives a fine view of the present status of religious education, since it offers five chapters on Orientation, eight on Principles, and eleven on Institutions. Every phase of Christian education is discussed, including objectives, history, curricula, worship, tests and measurements, leadership, etc. Some chapters of the book are, of course, not applicable to our work because we do not have those particular problems. Some paragraphs are of minor value or entirely valueless, especially those which approach the vagaries of social theology. (Cp. pp. 17. 19. 33.) The sectarian viewpoint concerning the Sacraments as mere symbolical acts appears frequently (pp. 119. 129. 171. 207). — But if we regard the information of the book as suggestive rather than directive, we may well read most of its chapters with profit, for there are many stimulating passages, as for example: “The problem of immorality is perhaps more serious than either of the above. The dance-hall, mixed bathing, the sex plays, modern dress, birth control, the double standard, and other forces have made this a powerful problem.” “A purely secular education can produce only a machine without a soul, a social personality without a conscience, a horizon without a heaven and a God. Secularized education has broken down, and the educational world is to-day in the throes of a revolution.” Quoted from Eby. (P. 12.) “These pagans were won to Christ and then taught the mysteries of the Christian faith for three years before they were welcomed into the full membership of the Church. Those early teachers, Clement, Origen, and many others, did their work thoroughly.” (P. 25.) “Parental firmness. The parents’ ‘no’ must be final. No argument should be allowed. If the child is allowed to overrule the will of the parents once, it will expect to do it again. In the matter of punishment. The child should learn that breaking of law brings punishment. In breaking nature’s laws the penalty is inevitable.

It should be so in the violation of parental law." (P. 44.) Thus we might quote for pages, but it will be best to say: Let the interested educator get the book and read it carefully. He will be sure to derive a great deal of benefit therefrom if he uses the book with discrimination.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Convention Year-Book of the Fortieth International Convention of the Walther League, Los Angeles, Cal. *Erwin Umbach*, Editor. Published by the Walther League, Chicago, Ill. 94 pages, 6×9. Price, \$1.00.

To those who know the Walther League, are affiliated with it, or have a Walther League society in their parish this book comes as a matter of course. To such as do not yet know the organization and its work this report will give most valuable information, indicating that organized young people's work is a most blessed undertaking. Every page speaks of true consecration, earnest endeavor, high ideals, and well-organized activities. The book is heartily recommended to our pastors everywhere.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Catalog of Concordia Publishing House, 1932—1933. Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1169 pages, 5½×8½.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—

Joy to the World. A Christmas Service. Revised edition, 1932. Compiled by *Herman Voigt*, 1119 N. 15th St., Melrose Park, Ill. 20 pages, 6×9. Price, 7 cts.; dozen, 72 cts., plus postage; 100, \$5.00, plus postage. May also be ordered from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, London, and Edinburgh:—

God in the Shadows. By *Hugh Redwood*. 127 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Dec 32" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.