

12-1-1935

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1935) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 6 , Article 109.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol6/iss1/109>

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

---

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


---

**I. Amerika.**

**Concerning the Lutheran Union.** — Shall confessionalism and anti-confessionalism be merged into a harmonious whole? And since that cannot be done, shall the union be effected by eliminating confessionalism? Or will the anticonfessionalists have to abandon their position? These questions arose in our mind when we read a communication published in the *Lutheran Companion* of September 28, 1935. We herewith submit it, suppressing the name and address of the writer.

"The *Augustana Lutheran* has been suggested as a substitute for the present name of our English synodical mouthpiece. Well, it might be worse. Personally I don't like the name *Augustana*. Though not a veteran, I can still remember how the near-pioneers at church conventions drawled out the word. They even mispronounced *synod*; it was a new word to them. As they spoke it in Swedish, it almost reminds one of the distant howl of the wolves of the North woods.

"It was in that region *Norelius* had his habitat while here on earth. And it was *Norelius* who with his overstocked orthodoxy tagged that name to our synod. He had to import it from abroad. But here is an immigrant that has never become a naturalized citizen. Friends outside our fold look somewhat bewildered. How do you pronounce it? What does it mean?

"The founders injected into the name a generous dose of canned confessionalism and that despicable Missouri exclusivism. Both tints, however, have faded out in recent years. *Augustana* is equivalent to *Lutheran*; so why call the paper the *Lutheran Lutheran*? Such an extravagance! Why not wait and see what might come out of the churning process of Lutheran synods in the next twenty-five years? Or refer the matter to the centenary convention in Rock Island in 1960. By that time we may expect a new crop of presidents, editors, and what not."

The same questions arose when we read the address delivered at the annual commencement exercises of the Philadelphia Seminary on May 16, 1935, published in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, July, 1935, and came across these statements: "In America the free and joyous association of like-minded Christians in congregations of the type they desired has resulted for Lutheranism in a multitude of synods, some of which have had headaches about the question whether they should fellowship with each other. . . . There is a rustling in the tree-tops to-day, and Lutheran unity is prominent on the agenda of our conventions and at the dinners of Lutheran laymen. More than welcome when and if it comes, but only if it provides a body adequate for the soul of Lutheranism to-day and expressive of its life, without accretions coming from any structure built to be the expression of that soul by a former generation as it understood Lutheranism. . . . There are those still who sing 'A Mighty Fortress' and seize upon these words as representing the type of structure needed; and so they build a fortress with narrow windows, which are chiefly the outlet for the guns, to boom forth anathemas upon all who look upon the structure and venture to question whether the windows ought to be quite so



narrow and the door so firmly buttressed. There are those who would make the edifice an imposing office building with an industrial annex, from which every movement in the church is carefully regulated and its printing-presses thoroughly scrutinized, so that nothing goes forth without the sacred imprimatur." (Pp. 290. 292.) Can there be peace in the family where some stand for strict confessionalism and the others ridicule that as "canned confessionalism" and "building a fortress with narrow windows" from which guns "boom forth anathemas"?

Speaking of Lutheran confessionalism, it is indeed by nature "narrow." For instance, on the question of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures it stands for the verbal inspiration and the sole authority of the Bible and will not tolerate any contrary teaching. The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* has been stressing the contrary teaching. So again in its last issue (July, 1935) Dr. T. A. Kantonen, of the Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O., writes: "The orthodoxists of the seventeenth century, who attempted to preserve in a kind of theological cold storage the insights of the Reformation, were masters of the art of formula construction, and the tribe of those who have repeated their formulas is not extinct even to-day. There has thus come to be this stereotyped pattern for discussing sin: temptation, fall, original sin, actual sin, the punishment of sin, the forgiveness of sin. . . . While this approach has served to list the numerous Scriptural expressions on the subject, it has failed to give a comprehensive and adequate analysis of sin. . . . Relying upon the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, it [this method and approach] has overlooked the progressive stage in the unfolding of divine revelation and quoted Scripture quite indiscriminately, as though a passage from Genesis had equal weight with the words of Christ. Rejecting *a priori* the results even of constructive historical criticism, the adherents of this approach have regarded the stories of the temptation and the Fall as mere historical narrative rather than profound prophetic philosophy of history." (P. 210 f.) *The Pricstly Code* (p. 217). *Deutero-Isaiah* (p. 219). "The social needs are embodied in a code represented as divinely authorized." (P. 218.) From the address delivered at the Tenth Annual Gettysburg Seminary Week, May 8—10, 1935, we quote the following: "Likewise the mind of to-day is not satisfied by the claim of authority for the Scriptures alone. . . . It is manifestly the record of experience, which occurred in an age and place far removed from our own. And it is interwoven with the cosmology, the mythology, and the ethics of an ancient day, which have long since been displaced by the onward march of human knowledge and mastery. We know our universe to be more vast than the writers of the Bible believed it to be. . . . The Bible, it is affirmed, is not the word of God in the sense of a verbal, mechanical, literal inspiration. And the generation to which our preaching is addressed asks for more than the claim of authority for a Book, a claim which is considerably weakened by the controversies of those literalists who have constant recourse to the words *infallible* and *inerrant* and who affirm utterly untenable and most fallible theories of geology, astronomy and millennial events because, say they, 'the Bible is an infallible Book.'" (P. 255.) "An individual brooding upon some condition of life, meditating upon some truth, communing with that beyond himself to which he gave the name God, and setting what



he saw in life into the light of what he perceived through his spiritual insight, became convinced of a great truth. He felt that the truth thus communicated was the will of God for him for a people. "The word of God came to him." It was the word of God in the soul of a man. He announced it, and His declaration of it was committed to writing, and because it had the power to create religious experience, it became the word of God no longer in the heart of a man, but in a Scripture." (P. 258 f.) "Seekers for authority in Scripture cannot therefore find it in isolated portions and texts of the Bible, a procedure often followed in the effort to prove certain teachings or doctrines. The idea of verbal inspiration and the practise of literal interpretation may destroy the reality of the Bible's message. Its authority is not to be identified with the form of the language which announces the truth of God, but must be found in the light of the experience through which the word of God came to the soul of a man." (P. 260.) "The word, certifying itself in an experience so intimate and real as the hospitality of host and guest, is the ultimate authority. . . . This is where Jesus and the writers of the New Testament placed religious authority: in the message of God certifying itself to the souls of men. . . . Here the teacher of religion finds his authority. His message is an unceasing 'Thus saith the Lord,' and he speaks with confidence not because he quotes a scripture, but because the word of God has found him." (P. 263 f.)

There are Lutherans in America who utterly loathe the doctrine of the verbal inspiration and the sole authority of Scripture. And there are Lutherans who loathe this denial, yes, anathematize it. These two parties cannot dwell peaceably in the same house. How, then, shall a Lutheran union be effected? Shall Lutheran confessionalism be shown the door? Or shall confessionalism rule the Lutheran home? E.

**The Large Unionistic Conferences.** — Most of us have almost forgotten the Lausanne and Stockholm conferences, which created quite a stir in sectarian circles several years ago. The Lausanne Conference, it may be well to remind ourselves, represented the so-called "Faith and Order" movement, while the activities which the Stockholm meeting sponsored are known as the "Life and Work" movement. The religious press informs us that at a recent committee meeting it was resolved that the next convention of the "Faith and Order" proponents is to be held the first two weeks of August, 1937, in Edinburgh, Scotland, while the "Life and Work" representatives are to meet in Cambridge, England, at the end of July, 1937. The little interval between the two meetings, it is hoped, can be used for a great joint meeting in London, with spokesmen of both movements on the program. The "Faith and Order" movement, we are told, deals chiefly with matters of belief and polity; the "Life and Work" movement concerns itself with what is called "applied Christianity."

We mention these things in order that the readers of our journal may know what these terms stand for when they occur in the daily press. A.

**Unionism kat' Exochen.** — The well-known missionary to India E. Stanley Jones has published a long article having the heading "Christians of America, Unite." It appeared in the *Christian Century* of October 2. He first lays down three fundamental points: "1. that the Chris-



tians are the most united body on earth—if they only knew it; 2. that God is not working particularly or exclusively in any one denomination; 3. that manifestation of this common underlying life is very diverse." It will be observed that here there is some gross confusion of the visible and the invisible Church. Having stressed unity, equality, and diversity as he thinks they can be observed in Christian denominations, Dr. Jones proposes a special plan for action.

"Since we are one in inner life, we will be one in outer expression. We will therefore drop all the labels that divide us and become members of 'The Church of Christ in America.' Since we are all members of Christ, then, we should all belong to 'The Church of Christ.' But since we have a local habitation, we should define it and thus belong to 'The Church of Christ in America.' We are thus unified both in life and in outer effect. But under this unity we will have an equality and a diversity. This would be provided for by having many branches, thus, the Presbyterian branch of the Church of Christ in America, the Episcopal branch, the Lutheran branch, the Friends branch, the Salvation Army branch, and so on down the line. Each would be a branch, but only a branch. Not giving up the name of 'Church' attached to each denomination, we would give up claims to superiority and look upon ourselves and others as branches of the Church. This would give us an equality, but it would also give us a diversity, for each branch would retain what it felt was essential to retain. If a branch had bishops and wanted to keep them, that branch could do so. If it believed in the immersion of adult believers only, it would be free to hold to that. It would not be asked to give up anything which that group felt was an essential principle or practise, nor would it insist on any other branch's taking them. In regard to members' going from one branch to another branch, each would be free to lay down conditions or no conditions, as it saw fit. Some would freely receive all who came from other branches without rite or ceremony; some would feel that they must impose ceremonies under certain circumstances. They could be free to do as they liked. But if they imposed barriers, they would simply have fewer people coming into their branch. The freedom to impose conditions or not to impose conditions would also hold good in regard to the ministry passing from one branch to another."

This of course is unionism in fully developed form. The plan will appeal to people who are not anxious to adhere to the Word of God in every particular. But how about those who remember that Jesus said to His disciples that they are to teach people to observe all things whatsoever He has commanded them, Matt. 28, 20? A.

**An Ardent Antievolutionist.**—Dr. R. G. Lee, fighting fundamentalist minister of Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, has just launched another attack on the Liberals, this time picking evolution as his target. "A man can't believe in both the Bible and evolution any more than he can carry water and fire in the same bucket, any more than he can be dead and alive, awake and asleep, at the same time." Dr. Lee's church is the largest Protestant church in this region and is always packed twice on Sunday. Whether he is right or not about evolution, it appears that he takes the right methods for drawing huge audiences.—*Christian Century.*



**Religion in the Colleges.** — “. . . Undergraduates, then, speaking generally, are a race of people who are about twenty years old in most secular subjects, but only about twelve years old in religion. They have a college education in science and art and history and a grade-school education in nearly all matters that pertain to the faith. They are ignorant in the field of religion, and they have studied nearly all secular subjects apart from religion, so that what little religious experience they have had is isolated from the rest of their knowledge in a pigeonhole of its own. Their religion is not housed on the same street with their ideas of economics, or even their ideas of honesty; it is a sort of country house, quite remote from the everyday, to which they go for an odd week-end now and again. . . . I can see no solution for the problem of undergraduate ignorance of religion except the simplest solution, and that is to teach religion to him. . . . But at once there arises the problem of denominationalism. . . .” (Rev. W. O. Cross, in the *Living Church*, May 25, 1935.)

“To the Editor: As a student at Harvard College and a candidate for Holy Orders, I wish to comment on Fr. Cross’s article (*L. C.*, May 25). I heartily agree with his opinion that our students are utterly lacking in a knowledge of the faith and that instruction is sorely needed. This can be done, in my opinion, better by non-parochial priests who are able to give their whole time to student-work. If our religious orders are unable to do this (however, we at Harvard are most fortunate in having the cooperation of the Cowley Fathers at St. Francis House), I should suggest that we start houses such as Pusey House in Oxford, where mass and morning and evening prayer are said and where able-minded priests instruct in the faith. Such houses should have a chapel, a library, and a common room. It seems to me that we have a fine example of such work at Princeton under Fr. Crocker. If we are going to convert America, where is there a better opportunity to start than in our Eastern universities which include in their faculty and students men from all over the country? If we are going to convert students, we have got to give them sound doctrine and not concentrate on social works, as important as these may be. If Protestantism is declining, as it seems to be doing, here is our opportunity to present the Catholic faith in its entirety, without the somewhat rigid philosophy and intellectual conservatism of our Roman brethren, but nevertheless with all their definiteness and security as Catholics. — *Paul Wissinger.*” (*L. C.*, June 29.)

“To the Editor: The letter from a Harvard College candidate for orders (*L. C.*, June 29) complains that students are not instructed in doctrine. Students haven’t anything on the elder communicants of the Church in this respect, with comparatively few exceptions. Most of us receive a little instruction in preparation for confirmation when we are eleven or twelve years old, and that is about the last we ever hear of it. Apparently the idea that a preacher’s business is theology is old-fashioned, and the pulpit is now used for discourses on social, economic, and political questions. Is this because the people as a whole are indifferent to theology and the preachers are trying to give them what they want? — *New York City. Paul U. Farley.*” — *Living Church*, July 20.



"To the Editor: A letter to the editor of the *Living Church* on the subject of Christian religion, I know, may seem a bit odd; for some one will say that is the subject of all sermons. To this I cannot agree; for there are many sermons which have for their main theme something else than the Christian religion—sociology, psychology, philosophy, political conditions, etc., so that to-day sermons which deal altogether with Christian religion from beginning to end and are not controversial are not so very common. I am so impressed with the splendid sermon delivered at Trinity Cathedral, Pittsburgh, June 23, by the presiding bishop that I must say a word of appreciation. Free from appearance of great learning, free from references to books which marked him a man of great learning, or quotations of poetry, Dr. Perry quietly and simply and with evidence of deep earnestness and conviction preached to a crowded congregation on the priceless value of the Christian religion and made a plea for us to appreciate it and make it more and more a part of our lives. Nothing possibly could have been simpler. Several comments I have heard from members of this congregation indicate their reaction and appreciation of this universal Christian message; I believe I would echo the sentiment of the whole congregation in hoping Dr. Perry may long be spared to preside over our Church and to preach, as he did June 23, the simple Gospel of Christ.—Pittsburgh, Pa. *Theodore Diller.*" (L. C., July 20.) E.

**Presbyterian Church Withdraws.**—The Rev. Dr. Roy T. Brumbaugh, pastor of the large First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma, has withdrawn from the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., together with a majority of his elders, deacons, and Sunday-school teachers, and, it is claimed, a majority of his congregation. Dr. Brumbaugh was charged with insubordination because he refused to resign from the Independent Board of Foreign Missions. He forestalled a trial by resigning. He and his supporters have organized the First Independent Church and are meeting in the Scottish Rite Cathedral, which adjoins the First Presbyterian Church. *Living Church.*

**Colored Churches Considering United Action.**—In the latter part of August a number of colored denominations met for a convention in Cleveland, O. The press reports that the following Negro churches were represented: African Methodist, African Methodist Zion, Colored Methodist, National Baptist Convention of America, National Baptist Convention of the United States, Inc., and United American Methodists. In addition, individual colored delegates had come from the Methodist Episcopal, Congregational, and Presbyterian churches. The group called itself Fraternal Council of Negro Churches. It was the second time that it held a meeting, having been formed in Chicago a year ago. Its objective is stated thus: "It seeks to become a rallying point for fearless action in behalf of the interests of our people, where religious beliefs and denominational interests and ambitions shall not be permitted to enter to divide our counsels and where partisan and political divisions shall have no place." That social justice is the thing sought by these leaders of large groups of colored people is pointed out by the *Christian Century*, which reports at length on the Cleveland meeting, and is evident from this pronouncement of the assembly: "The hour is at hand when the Negro Church



should unite to challenge fearlessly the faithless stewardship of American Christianity by submitting it to the test of political, social, and economic justice, a justice that accepts no peace on the basis of submission, compromise, or surrender. Shall the American Negro, whose proudest boast is the patriotic devotion and loyalty with which he has defended our flag in all wars, be less devoted and loyal to the cross of Christ when all that it stands for in human relations is either openly denied or menaced in social, economical, and political denial with which it is flouted or assailed? . . . We call upon ministers and lay members in all the churches to cross the boundary lines of their denominationalism to join in the common task of working in the present to secure the future peace and justice not only of our race, but of all underprivileged and oppressed." It is easy to see that this movement may soon take on tremendous, far-reaching dimensions. A.

**Southern Presbyterians and the Social Gospel.** — While Southern Presbyterians are known as conservative folk, they cannot withstand the pressure brought to bear on them by advocates of the social gospel. Their ministers' forum accepted the following statements as representing its convictions: —

"Any social group that refuses to build on the principles of Jesus, denying, for example, the motivating power of love or substituting class and race distinctions for brotherhood, is doomed to ultimate failure. It is our duty as Christians to use every means to see that our social order is built upon, and permeated with, these principles of Jesus.

"1. We must put into practise in our individual lives these principles.

"2. We must recognize that economic inequalities exist in the ranks of the ministry. We must correct our own churches in order to bear a strong and effective testimony against existing economic evils.

"3. We must inform ourselves fully about the world situation and give ourselves afresh to the study of the Bible's social message.

"4. We must courageously teach and preach the principles underlying Christ's ideal for every group relationship of life.

"5. We must foster education on social issues on the part of the people of the Church by formation of study groups in local churches.

"6. We must encourage the formation in our church courts of committees on moral and social welfare.

"7. We hereby go on record as expressing our belief that war is shameful, barbarous, uncivilized, and utterly unchristian, and we call upon our ministers, missionaries, teachers, and people to pray for peace.

"8. We must seek to correct racial injustices in the Southland.

"9. We must seek to secure economic security for all classes of our population.

"10. As the basis for all the foregoing program we must strive with greater earnestness to bring men to accept Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord and extend His kingdom to the uttermost bounds of the earth."

A conservative Lutheran cannot help saying that truth and error are here mixed in helter-skelter fashion. A.



## II. Ausland.

Die Zerrissenheit der christlichen Kirche. Hierüber verbreitet sich die Juninummer des „Luth. Herold“, des deutschen Organs der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche, in einem Artikel, in dem eingehend die Gründe dargelegt werden, die zu den Trennungen und Irrgerissen geführt haben, woran die äußere Christenheit heute leidet, ja seit Jahrhunderten gelitten hat. Sehr richtig legt der Schreiber dar, daß an dieser beklagenswerten Zerspaltung die Christenheit selbst schuld ist: sie blieb eben nicht bei der Schrift. Selbstbewußte Christen haben sich nicht von dem Heiligen Geist durch sein Wort erleuchten lassen, haben sich nicht ganz unter den Gehorsam des Glaubens beugen wollen, sondern haben alte Irrtümer, vorgefaßte Meinungen, Gedanken, Ideen und Einfälle des natürlichen, unbekehrten Menschen beibehalten. Einzelne mißverstandene Bibelstellen sind aus dem Textzusammenhang herausgerissen und so einseitig und übermäßig betont worden, daß ihr eigentlicher Sinn entstellt und die klar offenbarte Heilslehre darüber versäumt, vernachlässigt oder ganz beiseitegeschoben wurde. Solchen Verdrehern der Schrift fehlte es obendrein an der Demut, so daß sie sich nicht belehren lassen wollten. Hochmütig setzten sie sich über alle Mahnungen und Warnungen hinweg und hielten hartnäckig an ihrem Irrtum fest. Sie unterwühlten Glauben und Bucht in der Kirche, so daß diese sich genötigt fand, sie auszuschließen. Andere traten selber aus, um ungehindert ihr Wesen treiben zu können. Dazu hat auch die Kirche nicht immer den Mut gehabt, gegen Irrlehre und Irrglauben ein klares, kräftiges Zeugnis abzulegen. Man predigt und lehrt wohl noch nach Bibel und Bekenntnis, aber man scheut sich, die Widersacher anzugreifen. Wer ist somit schuld an dem zerrissenen Zustand der Kirche? Nicht die treuen Wächter auf Zions Mauern, nicht die wackeren Kämpfer für den wahren Glauben und das reine Bekenntnis, nicht die treuen Zeugen der unverfälschten Wahrheit, sondern die falschen Propheten, die Menschenwort an Stelle des Wortes Gottes setzen; die untreuen Lehrer, die aus Nachlässigkeit und Bequemlichkeit ihre Gemeinden in Sturm und Drang ohne die rechte geistliche Waffenrüstung lassen, Eph. 6, 13—18; die schlechten Weingärtner, die die Bäume nicht bewahren oder wohl gar selber niederreißen helfen, Jer. 12, 10, 11, so daß, wer nur will, hineinbrechen und die zarten Reben Gottes zertreten kann.

Das sind einige der Hauptgründe, die der Schreiber für die Zerrissenheit der äußeren Kirche oder Christenheit geltend macht. Und wir stimmen ihm bei, besonders in dem einen Punkt, daß die Kirche nicht immer den Mut gehabt hat, gegen Irrlehre und Irrglauben ein klares, kräftiges Zeugnis abzulegen. Denn wo dieses klare, kräftige Zeugnis fehlt, insbesondere Tatzeugnis, wenn man nämlich von denen, die Zertrennung und Irrgerissen anrichten, nicht weicht, Röm. 16, 17, da wird der Riß nicht geheilt, sondern schließlich nur immer ärger. Aber da nun der „Herold“ den Schaden so klar erkennt, so sollte er auch das „klare, kräftige“ Zeugnis gegen die Irrlehrer in der eigenen Mitte recht laut und scharf erschallen lassen. In der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche sind, gerade auch in der letzten Zeit, böse, ungehörige Dinge vorgekommen; eine ungesunde Praxis wurde geführt in bezug auf Logen und falsche Propheten und schriftwidrige, unlutherische Lehre wurde geduldet, e. g., Leugnung der Ver-



balinspiration, Synergismus usw. Wer nun diese irrigen Dinge als irrig erkennt, der muß sich als treuen Wächter auf Zions Mauern zeigen, muß wader für Glauben und Bekenntnis kämpfen. Unsere intersynodalen Komiteen werden wenig ausrichten, wenn nicht die erkenntnisreichen, treuen Mitglieder in den irrenden Synoden selbst auf Besserung in Lehre und Praxis hinarbeiten. Mit schönen Artikeln in kirchlichen Zeitschriften allein ist der Sache nicht gebient; man muß persönlich, insbesondere auf Konferenzen, und wo immer Gelegenheit dazu geboten wird, den Kampf für Gottes Wort gegen Menschenwort führen. Und vor allem muß da sein die rechte, in Gottes Wort gebotene Kirchendisziplin, nämlich daß man schließlich alle Irrelehrer, die Glauben und Zucht untergraben, ausschließt. J. T. W.

Die „Sklaverei“ in Abessinien. Unter den Anklagen, die Italien gegen Abessinien erhebt, steht auch die Sklaverei. Es gehe barbarisch zu im Hochland von Habesch; es gebe dort unhaltbare Zustände; es sei Zeit, daß Humanität und Zivilisation dorthin gebracht würden.

Gehen wir dieser Sklaverei auf den Grund. Wir lassen zuerst einen äthiopischen Diplomaten sprechen, der in moderner Zeit mit der Abschaffung der Sklaverei in Abessinien Ernst zu machen suchte. Er hatte während eines Besuches in den Vereinigten Staaten sich für die von Lincoln durchgeführte Sklavenbefreiung so begeistert, daß er sie nach seiner Rückkehr in die Heimat auch auf seinen riesigen Gütern durchführen wollte.

Während der Überfahrt übersehte er die Proklamation Lincolns in seine Muttersprache. Gleich nach seiner Ankunft rief er seine hundert Sklaven zusammen, hielt ihnen einen Vortrag über die Vorzüge des „Wunderlandes Amerika“ und erklärte sie nach Verlesen der Lincolnschen Sätze für frei. „Ihr seid frei und könnt gehen, wohin ihr wollt. Ihr könnt fortan für Lohn arbeiten und euch verbinden, an wen ihr wollt“, verkündete er ihnen als Abschluß seiner Ausführungen. Die Sklaven fragten jedoch erstaunt, wohin sie gehen sollten. „Sollen wir arbeiten und Pflichten übernehmen wie die Freien? Wir wollen lieber bei Euch bleiben, Herr. Ihr könnt uns nicht so fortjagen. Denkt an die Ehre Eurer Familie. Ihr habt versprochen, uns zu ernähren und zu kleiden. Wir wollen nicht von Euch gehen.“ Die Folge dieser „Sklavenbefreiung“ war, daß die hundert Mann mit ihren Familien noch heute als „Sklaven“ auf den Besitzungen des betreffenden Stammesfürsten sind. So weit dies Zeugnis eines „Sklavenbefreiers“. Wie sieht es aber im allgemeinen?

In Abessinien sind bei einer Gesamtbevölkerung von rund zehn Millionen etwa zwei Millionen Sklaven. Außerlich unterscheiden sie sich in keiner Weise von den Freien. Es ist Landesitte, daß jeder Reichs oder jeder, der etwas auf sich hält, einige Sklaven besitzt.

Infolge der von Kaiser Haile Selassie getroffenen Maßnahmen wird die Sklaverei in Abessinien allerdings automatisch verschwinden, weil nach den neuen Landesgesetzen alle Kinder als Freie geboren werden. Der Kaiser hat diesen allmählichen Weg zur Beseitigung der Sklaverei gewählt, weil die Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft von heute auf morgen die gesamte wirtschaftliche Struktur des Landes hätte untergraben müssen. Ein weiteres Gesetz sieht die Todesstrafe für Sklavenhandel vor, der allerdings dadurch keineswegs gänzlich unterbunden werden konnte.

In Addis Ababa hat der Kaiser eine vorbildliche Schule für die Kinder



von Sklaven eingerichtet, auf der sie für ihr ferneres Leben eine gebiegene Bildung erhalten sollen. Die Zöglinge dieser Schule werden bei der Einstellung in den Staatsdienst bevorzugt. Diese Maßnahme drückt in gewisser Weise die Dankbarkeit der Regierung für die Treue der noch in der Sklaverei befindlichen Eltern dieser Kinder aus.

Der Sklavenhandel und die Raubzüge auf Menschen werden in erster Linie von Arabern ausgeführt, deren Vorfahren bereits seit Jahrhunderten diesem einträglichen Gewerbe obgelegen haben. So führen z. B. die bedeutendsten Sklavenhändler in Abessinien ihren Stammbaum gerne auf Tippu Tib, den berühmtesten Sklavenräuber aus der Zeit Stanlehs und Livingstones, zurück. Der Volksfrage zufolge soll er mehr als eine Million Menschen getötet haben. Noch heute erzählen sich die Eingebornen Schauer- geschichten von den brutalen Überfällen der Bande des verwegenen Sklavenhändlers auf friedliche Dörfer und Städte und von den dabei angerichteten Blutbädern. Heute werden die Sklavenjagden weniger blutig, dagegen mit größerer Überraschung vorgenommen. Ein Engländer, Gordon MacCreagh, hat im Laufe seines fünfjährigen Aufenthaltes in Abessinien nicht weniger als fünfzehn Fälle persönlich erlebt, bei denen alleingehende äthiopische Mädchen von Arabern entführt wurden, um später als Sklavinnen verkauft zu werden.

So steht es also mit der Sklaverei in Abessinien. Man ist dort von selbst auf dem Weg, daß die Sklaverei verschwindet.

(Kriur von der Thur

in der Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchzeitung, 13. September 1935.)

The truth about conditions in Germany is not told in the editorial "Move the Olympics" appearing in the *Christian Century* of August 7, 1935, which declares: "No person [in Germany] is safe in the enjoyment of the most elemental human rights." Some of the replies to this editorial, published in the issue of August 21, get nearer to the truth. For instance, this one: "Sir: Your editorial bears the stigma of cheap propaganda, inspired by sinister forces of destruction. Every truth-seeker returning from Germany is full of praise for the German people and their great courageous leader, the greatest German after Martin Luther. Germany is the most enlightened nation in the world. Her youth is not seeking spiritual comfort in the filthy and unclean stories of the Old Testament. No; they are turning to Germany's greatest poet and thinker, Wolfgang von Goethe, who gave the 'philosophy of unity,' Germany's new spiritual movement (you are permitted to call it neopaganism), a perfect poetic expression in his immortal poems *Faust*, *Prometheus*, and *God and the World*. By eternal laws or iron ruled, must all fulfil the cycle of their destiny. And so, believe it or not, the new Germany is the blessed land of 'the good, the true, and the beautiful.' C. H. Ehlers. New York City." This letter truthfully portrays the convictions and faith of the neoheathen section of the German nation. Another communication, though hardly exact in every detail, comes very close to the truth in describing conditions in Germany in general. "Sir: Respecting your hateful editorial any American who has visited Germany within the past twelve months will admit that Hitler has performed wonders and there is more law and order now in Germany than in any other country. There are no gangsters and no racketeers. There are no strikes and no lockouts, and the only dis-



contented people are the political parsons and priests. J. J. Williams. New York City." The readers of the *Christian Century* will have to exercise good judgment, directed by independent investigation, in connection with what they read in their paper. E.

**Der Arianismus des Wulfila.** In einer Serie von Artikeln über „Das Christusbild der jungbekehrten Germanen“ (N. E. L. N., 6. September 1935) kommt der Verfasser, Prof. D. Kurt Dietrich Schmidt in Kiel, auch auf den Subordinationismus des Bischofs Wulfila (geb. 311; Missionsbischof unter den Goten; Übersetzer der Bibel ins Gotische) zu sprechen. Obwohl nach Schmidt Wulfila nicht Arianer im Sinne des Arius sein wollte, so beweist doch sein eigenes, am Schluß seines Lebens ausgezeichnetes und uns durch seinen Schüler Augustinus überliefertes Glaubensbekenntnis, daß er sich gegen die Orthodoxen entschieden und sich zur arianischen Lehre bekannt hat. Sein Glaubensbekenntnis ist höchst interessant. Nach Schmidts Übersetzung aus dem Lateinischen lautet es so: „Ich, Wulfila, Bischof und Konfessor, habe immer so geglaubt, und in diesem alleinigen wahren Glauben werde ich hinüberfahren zu meinem Herrn: Ich glaube, daß ein Gott sei, der Vater, allein ungezeugt und unsichtbar; und an seinen eingebornen Sohn, unsern Herrn und Gott, Bildner und Schöpfer der gesamten Kreatur, der seinesgleichen nicht hat (also ist einer der Gottvater aller, der auch der Gott unsers Gottes ist); und an den Heiligen Geist, die erleuchtende und heiligende Kraft (wie Christus nach der Auferstehung zu seinen Aposteln sagt: Siehe, ich sende zu euch den von meinem Vater Verheißenen; ihr aber bleibt in der Stadt Jerusalem, bis daß ihr angetan werdet mit der Kraft aus der Höhe; desgleichen auch: Ihr sollt die Kraft des Heiligen Geistes empfangen, der auf euch kommen wird, der weder Gott noch Herr ist, sondern der treue Diener Christi, nicht ihm gleich, sondern in allen Dingen dem Sohn untertan und gehorsam); und daß der Sohn in allen Dingen untertan und gehorsam sei seinem Gott, dem Vater, und ihm ähnlich, wie die Schrift sagt.“ In diesem Bekenntnis finden sich alle wesentlichen Elemente des Arianismus: Der Vater allein ist Gott im wahren Sinne des Worts; der Sohn ist Gott nur ähnlich (*ὁμοιούσιος*) und ihm untergeordnet, obwohl er unser Gott ist; der Heilige Geist ist nicht Gott und Herr, sondern nur die erleuchtende und heiligende Kraft (*ἐνεργεια*). Den Arianismus des Wulfila führt Schmidt auf die Idee des germanischen Vater-Sohn-Verhältnisses zurück, das sich auch im „Heiland“, wo Krist Gott als Gefolgsmann dient, findet. Von diesem germanischen Gesichtspunkt aus betrachtet, würde ihm die Trinität zu einer Art göttlicher „Sippchaft“, in der es wirklich eine strenge Sonderung der Personen gab. Schmidt schreibt: „Um die saubere Sonderung der göttlichen Personen aber ging es gerade Wulfila, wie uns Augustinus schildert.“ Doch bezahlte, wie Schmidt weiter ausführt, Wulfila die größere Anschaulichkeit mit einem hohen Preis: er hatte nun zwei wirklich getrennte Götter, einen oberen Vater-Gott und einen subordinierten Sohn-Gott. — Der Modernismus wie auch das neu entstehende Heidentum in Europa (nicht nur in Deutschland!) rückt die Lehre von der heiligen Dreieinigkeit wieder ins Zentrum. Es wäre nützlich, wenn wir uns die Schriftlehre von der Trinität genauer vergegenwärtigten, besonders das studierten, was Luther hierüber so trefflich ausgeführt hat. J. T. M.



"Das Evangelische Deutschland" provides us with the following authoritative statement concerning Jews in Germany: —

Dr. Conti, the Prussian privy-councilor, in a speech delivered in the High School for Politics, touched upon the subject of how many Jews were living in Germany to-day. He explained that quite frequently the erroneous opinion is being disseminated that there have always been only 600,000 Jews in Germany. This figure can be traced back to 1912, when only adherents of the Jewish confession were classified as Jews. Actually there were 2,500,000 non-Aryans at that time. This figure in the mean time has decreased to 1,500,000, and in fact to-day there are in Germany 500,000 Jews who are of orthodox faith, 300,000 Jews of unorthodox faith, and 750,000 Jews of mixed blood and faith.

N. L. C. B.

**A New Gospel Fragment.** — The British Museum, through Messrs. Bell and Skeat of its staff, has published a newly found fragment of an unknown gospel, on which Dr. Goodspeed of Chicago reports in the *Living Church*. The fragment refers to incidents that have their basis in John 5, Mark 1, Mark 12, and probably other sections. It is held to come from the year 150 A. D. and is declared by Dr. Goodspeed to be the oldest manuscript of Christian literature thus far found. It is quite evident that we are here dealing with an apocryphal gospel. Other apocryphal gospels to which it may be related are the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Egyptians, and the Gospel of Peter. On the matter of relationships Dr. Goodspeed says: "With one or another of these three famous old gospels the new fragment is probably to be identified. The London editors, it is true, think differently, though they admit that it may possibly be from the Gospel of the Egyptians. All three of these gospels refer to Jesus as 'the Lord,' as does the fragment. The fragment's vocabulary is almost entirely that of our evangelists. In the closeness of its dependence upon their materials it approaches most nearly to Peter. We must sharply dissent from the notion that 'it represents a source or sources independent of those used by the synoptic gospels'; in fact, I can hardly imagine how any one could have obtained such an impression from a comparison of the fragment with our gospels; it is so obviously based directly upon them and upon little or nothing else.

"It is equally unfortunate to 'suggest for serious consideration the question whether it may be, or be derived from, a source used by' the Gospel of John. On the contrary, it is unmistakably based upon that gospel; of this there is no shadow of doubt.

"But what could possibly be better than this clear evidence that by 150 A. D. — the declared date of the papyrus — a document could have been written in Egypt, perhaps in Upper Egypt, that showed the use of our fourfold gospel? That is the chief significance of this fragment, which has strangely eluded its editors.

"Our four gospels were united into a quartet probably about 125 A. D. The Preaching of Peter, Second Peter, the Gospel of Peter, Papias of Hierapolis, the recently found Epistle of the Apostles, and Justin Martyr — all knew the fourfold gospel. To these early witnesses we may now confidently add the new British Museum fragment; even though later discoveries may possibly cause us to merge it with the Gospel of Peter. It is



a pity that its skilful editors should have missed what is undoubtedly the main bearing of their discovery — the dependence of the new fragment upon the fourfold gospel, the collected corpus of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. But we must thank them for the speed with which they have produced this handsome edition and provided New Testament students with this very significant text." A.

**Why Does the Pope Not Stop the War?** — This is an embarrassing question to Roman Catholics. Pope Pius wishes to be considered an ardent champion of peace. Besides, there are many members of his communion who have denounced Italy's attack on Ethiopia as a brutal, wanton crime against humanity. Furthermore, in Italy the Roman Catholic religion is the state religion, and its rulers are at least nominally Roman Catholics. Why, then, does not the Pope, the head of the Catholic Church, call his children to order and forbid their violation of the commandment "Thou shalt not kill"? The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Hinsley, tries to shield the Pope by describing him as "a helpless old man" in the present situation. He says furthermore, as quoted in the *Christian Century*, that the Pope as head of the Church "has no grounds to interfere in purely political matters unless he be invited." The Pope's predicament is portrayed in these words of that archbishop: "The Holy Father's choice is between two evils: either he must condone what the world regards as a monstrous injustice and a violation of international compacts and treaties, or he can denounce his neighbor (*i. e.*, Italy) as a lawbreaker. He will never condone an injustice. If, on the other hand, he denounces his neighbor as a breaker of treaties and a brigand, he will put a grievous burden on the consciences of such subjects of his neighbor as believe that neighbor to be right." The *Christian Century* aptly remarks: "The Pope's strength as an authority is his weakness as a moral leader. Claiming absolute and divine authority, he dare not exercise it upon a formidable minority lest his prestige be weakened by open resistance. In a controversy with the State about the prerogatives of the Church he can unleash all his thunderbolts in defense of the institution; and so successive Popes kept the kings of Italy excommunicated for years in protest against the sin of despoiling the Papacy of its temporal sovereignty. But on a question of morals unrelated to the prerogatives of the Church — such a question as is presented by the massacre in Ethiopia for the building of an empire — he must be silent for fear of laying too heavy a burden on the consciences of those who do not agree with him and for fear of disturbing that delicate political arrangement upon which rests the stability of the newly regained temporal sovereignty." Archbishop Hinsley certainly is right when he speaks of the Pope as "a helpless old man." A.

**Professor Barth Goes to Basel.** — The famous Prof. Karl Barth has accepted a position as professor of theology at the University of Basel in Switzerland, his native country. German government authorities have since informed him that his presence in Germany is considered undesirable. It is reported that he had been booked for a series of lectures to be delivered at a theological conference at Barmen. He arrived to keep the appointment, but was put under arrest and sent back to Switzerland. Evidently the message which he was expected to deliver was not considered an asset for the Nazi state.