Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 7 Article 9

1-1-1936

Theological Observer. – Klrchllch Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Lutheran Union and Verbal Inspiration. — The *Lutheran Herald* (Norwegian Lutheran Church of America) says editorially (June 11, 1935): "The April number of the *Lutheran Theological Quarterly*, published by the theological faculties of Gettysburg and Mount Airy [U. L. C.], contains two articles on the inspiration of the Bible under the captions 'The Bible — the Word of God?' by Dr. John Aberly of Gettysburg, and 'The Formal Principle of the Reformation,' by Dr. A. E. Deitz. Both articles raise the question as to the inerrancy of the Bible and indirectly reject verbal inspiration. . . . However carefully guarded these two contributions may be, the consequences, as far as we are able to understand, will be to discredit the old inspiration teachings of the Lutheran Church and open the door to doubts and questions as to the reliability of the Bible. The writers evidently believe that by rejecting the rigid verbal inspiration theory and giving some leeway to critics and objectors they protect the great central truth of the Bible and 'shorten our defenses.' [Cp. Conc. Theol. Mon., 1935, pp. 538. 832.] . . . Luther made it a rule to test all teachings by the Scriptures and the central truth of the Bible, justification by faith. These two facts have been called the formal and the material principle of the Reformation. They have been considered the fundamentals of Lutheran teaching. . . . We have been taught to depend absolutely upon the written Word of God. Can this be depended upon? Is it inerrant? Is it the Word of God, or is there mixed into the Bible the fallible words of men? Does it only *contain* the Word of God, or *is* it the Word of God? . . . Our Confessions took it for granted that the Bible is the Word of God and speak about the 'Scripture of the Holy Ghost.' The constitution of the former General Council states that the Scriptures are 'inerrant in letter, fact, and doctrine.' Dr. Th. E. Schmauck, president of the former General Council, Dr. George W. Sandt, for many years editor of the *Lutheran*, believed in verbal inspiration. The late Dr. Joseph Stump, president of the Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary of the U. L. C. A., writes: 'The words themselves must be regarded as inspired words, and the exact shades of meaning in the original words are often a matter of the utmost importance in deciding questions of doctrine and life. In 1 Cor. 2, 13 Paul expressly claims for himself a verbal inspiration.' We see no difficulty in adopting the verbal inspiration. If the Bible is inspired, this inspiration must apply to the words which express the thoughts. We are afraid of any theories which raise questions as to the inerrancy of the Bible. It has worked havoc in many churches. *Vestigia terrent*, which means: 'The footsteps frighten me,' said the fox, as he saw that there were no footsteps backward from the lion's lair." E.

Unionism kat' Exochen. — You have read the item with this caption in the December, 1935, issue of the Concordia Theological Monthly. Please read it again. Then read the following, taken from the same article by E. Stanley Jones, entitled "Christians of America, Unite": "What would be the result of this plan of unity if put into operation? . . . 2. What is

good in each branch would be preserved, frankly and honestly. . . . The Friends, in insisting upon 'the inner light'; the Baptists, upon democracy in faith and practise; the Presbyterians, on the sovereignty of God; the Episcopalians, on the continuity of the body of Christ; the Methodists, on personal experience; the Lutherans, on justification by faith, — these and others have something to preserve and something to give to the rest of us. We would recognize that treasure and share it." (*The Christian Century*, October 2, 1935.) *The Christian Century* of October 16 publishes, with other letters of similar import, this communication: "Editor, the *Christian Century:* Sir: Stanley Jones's advice, 'Christians of America, Unite,' strikes me as the plainest kind of common sense. I vote for the plan as it stands. M. Willard Lampe, School of Religion, Iowa City." We vote against the plan, first, because Scripture forbids it and then also because common sense forbids it. E. Stanley Jones has been uttering nonsense. The Friends and the Presbyterians, etc., cannot take over the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith and still retain their distinctive doctrines. The Lutherans cannot take over "the inner light" of the Friends and the Presbyterian teaching on "the sovereignty of God" and still retain justification by faith. If the Friends accept our doctrine on justification, they will have to accept all that goes with it. They must accept justification as offered and conveyed to men in the Gospel, not by means of "the inner light." And does Dr. Jones know what sort of justification "the inner light" of the Friends teaches? It is a justification by works. So, then, according to Dr. Jones's plan of union the Lutherans of the united Church will teach a justification by works and the Friends of the united Church will teach a justification by faith; for they have exchanged their respective doctrines. Has the situation been bettered? Again, in Lutheran theology justification by faith is the central doctrine; in Presbyterian theology the "sovereignty of God" is put in the center and molds all other doctrines. We cannot accept the material principle of Calvinism and still retain the material principle of Lutheranism. In other words we are asked by Dr. Jones to remain good Lutherans, teaching the universality of grace, and to become good Calvinists, insisting on the particular grace that, together with the eternal decree of reprobation, is a corollary of the "sovereignty of God." That does not make sense. — The article we are discussing is an elaboration of the plan of union which Dr. Jones has proposed in his latest book, *Christ's Alternative to Communism*. He says there, on pages 219 f.: "We should say to each denomination: 'We do not want you to give up your special truth; we want you to give it to the rest of us,'" and then goes on to tell how in a religious meeting he, the Methodist (Arminian), had emphasized God's side in conversion and the Presbyterian speaker had emphasized man's side in conversion, and, lo, "the battle was over. We had taken each other's truth and were the better for it." As an Arminian he used to abhor the teaching of the Presbyterians that God does all in conversion. But now, in the united Church, he has taken over the other man's truth. But he is still keeping the best of Arminianism — man contributes much towards his conversion. So the unionist *kat' exochen* is able to accept both statements as true: God does all, and God does not do all. Professor Lampe says: "That strikes me as the plainest kind of common sense." (Cp. Conc. Theol. Mon., 1935, p. 621.) E.

An Important Declaration. — From the official *Proceedings of the Twenty-third Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States*, held at Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minn., August 7—13, 1935, we reprint the following "Reply to the Overtures of the United Lutheran Church": —

"The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, in convention assembled at New Ulm, Minn., has taken notice of an invitation issuing from the United Lutheran Church in America and proposing 'the establishment of closer relationships between them and ourselves,' and now desires that answer be made to this invitation with the following statement: —

"We fully agree as to the desirability of establishing fellowship with all Lutheran bodies of America if that can be effected without sacrifice of principle and confession. We further hold that to refuse such recognition of fellowship where there is actual agreement in all essential points would be equivalent to perpetuating a most serious offense against the truth of the Gospel.

"We feel constrained to say, however, that in our opinion such required unity does not as yet exist between the United Lutheran Church of America and our own body.

"Although the doctrinal statement in which the United Lutheran Church takes its stand on Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions is one with which, as far as it goes, no Lutheran can find fault, it nevertheless fails to take into consideration two facts: —

"1) That doctrinal issues may arise which did not exist and were not even foreseen at the time these confessions came into being.

"2) That confessional writings, even as Scripture itself, may meet with varying and often contrary interpretations.

"Since both of these possibilities have actually occurred among the various Lutheran bodies of our land, we hold that the doctrinal criterion set up in the 'Savannah Resolutions,' while stating the first essentials toward Lutheran unity, cannot take the place of an exhaustive study of the doctrinal differences that have arisen among Lutherans. We hold agreement on these questions to be an absolute prerequisite to true fellowship. 'That ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment,' 1 Cor. 1, 10.

"Practical considerations which preclude any approach between the United Lutheran Church and our own body at the present time are: —

"a) A disturbing tolerance that the United Lutheran Church has shown toward doctrinal statements arising out of its own midst and patently *not* in agreement with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. We hold that this more than weakens the doctrinal platform proposed in the 'Savannah Resolutions';

"b) A treatment of the question of lodge-membership on the part of congregation-members and even pastors, which is not consistent with the principles laid down by the United Lutheran Church itself on this question in its 'Washington Declarations';

"c) A disquieting tendency toward unionism, as shown by the increasing practise of pulpit-fellowship with non-Lutherans.

"While some of these questions are often relegated to the realm of church practise, we hold that it is dangerous thus to segregate practise from doctrine. On the contrary, the practise followed by a Church in such matters is the clearest manifestation of the doctrine which it holds. Tolerance here becomes synonymous with liberalism, indifference, and denial. 'A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,' 1 Cor. 5, 6; Gal. 5, 9.

"These last-named conditions constitute obstacles to an early establishing of fellowship between the United Lutheran Church and our own body, which obstacles only the former itself can remove. Until this is done, we must regretfully decline this invitation.

"We ask that this statement be taken not as captious criticism or wilful faultfinding on our part, but as offered in a sincere spirit of good will and out of earnest concern that fellowship between Lutheran bodies of our land, if and when it comes about, may be based upon a true unity of the Spirit and thus be a God-pleasing union."

This declaration quite succinctly describes the barriers which now separate the U. L. C. and Synodical Conference Lutherans and which have to be removed before there can be a God-pleasing union. A.

Religion and Christianity. — *Christianity To-day* (October, 1935) reprints from the *Covenanter Witness* an article by the Rev. J. G. Vos (graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary and at present missionary in Manchuria under the auspices of the Reformed Presbyterian Church), which primarily is to show that in the two-million-dollar Gothic chapel of Princeton University "the milk-and-water gospel of Modernism is preached to 'cultured' young pagans who know as little of the real Gospel of the blood of Calvary's cross as the heathen on any mission-field." "A conservative, Bible-believing preacher is *simply never* invited to preach to the students." And as the chapel exercises are no longer distinctively Christian, so the entire university, which of course is separate from Princeton Theological Seminary, has lost its Christian character. It still professes "*religion*," but not *Christianity*. In a recent circular letter, entitled "A Statement by the President regarding the Place of Religion in the Curriculum and on the Campus," the word "religion" and "religious" occur eighteen times in its two printed pages, but "Christianity," "God," and "Christ" are not even mentioned. And at this institution, chapel attendance is required! This insistence by the Princeton authorities upon *religion* rather than upon *Christianity* leads the author to distinguish between *religion* and *Christianity*, — a somewhat unfortunate distinction, since, as the writer correctly states, Christianity is the only true religion and all so-called human religions are nothing else than *abominations*. His distinction should have been between Christianity, the true religion, and between the false human religions, which are called religions only in an improper sense. But that is only incidental. What the author writes so compellingly witnesses to the absoluteness of Christianity that it deserves notice. He says: "Christianity is different from all other religions not merely in degree, but in nature. The relation between Christianity and religion [man-made religion] is not that between a part and the whole, but that between something and its opposite. The heathen religions are of Satan, not of God. God calls them over and over in His Word "abominations"; but the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry in its report, *Rethink-*

ing Missions, would have Christian missionaries fraternize and cooperate with heathen religionists for the good of humanity, and some missionaries in the Far East are actually trying to do this very thing." An excellent testimony indeed. In pointing out the absolute character of Christianity in contrast with all man-made religions, the writer stresses the following [we quote in part only]: 1. Man-made religion says: God helps those who help themselves. Christianity says: God helps those who cannot help themselves. 2. Man-made religion consists in man's doing something for himself, or in human works, character, devotion, and merit. Christianity consists in man's doing nothing for himself, but trusting God for all. Divine grace to those who have no merit (Rom. 10, 6—10; 5, 15). 3. Man-made religion holds that man is essentially good and only needs teaching, development, or knowledge in order to become perfect (the root error of Confucianism). Christianity teaches that man is a fallen and sinful being (total depravity) and needs *redemption*, not merely enlightenment, in order to become inherently good (Rom. 5, 12; 6, 23). 4. Man-made religion teaches man's *ability* to turn to God whenever he wishes to do so (free will). Christianity teaches man's *inability* to turn to God until God first works in the soul (the will in bondage to a sinful nature; man is a free agent to act according to his nature, but he cannot originate the love of God in his heart, because his nature is evil, John 6, 44; 8, 44; 3, 3). 5. Man-made religion represents man as becoming divine, as ancient heroes, sages, etc., were worshiped after their death as gods: Buddha, Confucius, the Roman emperors; man becomes God by deification and the human race becomes divine by evolution (Acts 12, 22; Rom. 1, 23). Christianity teaches that God became human in the incarnation of the Son of God, who took to Himself human nature for the redemption of man; God became man (John 1, 1. 14). 6. Man-made religion says: Do. Christianity says: Done (John 19, 30). 7. Man-made religion says: Something in my hand I bring (salvation by works or character). Christianity says: Nothing in my hand I bring; simply to Thy cross I cling (salvation by divine grace, Rom. 11, 6). — The author closes his remarks by saying: "Enough has been said to show that the reality back of the heathen religions is Satanic and that the fallen angels, or demons, accept the worship which the heathen offer to false gods and idols. Those who ignorantly think they are worshiping Buddha, or Kuan-yin (the Chinese goddess of mercy), or the Chinese kitchen god (commonest of gods), or the sun, moon, and stars are really worshiping demons from the pit. And those more 'enlightened' modern pagans in so-called Christian lands are just as truly deceived by Satan and furthering his purposes in the world (2 Cor. 4, 3. 4)." It is understood, of course, that what the author here writes is not new to Lutheran pastors (cf. Dr. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. I); but what is here stated with so much clearness bears repetition and emphasis. Incidentally it shows what position all believing Christians take over against the naturalistic, humanistic religion of the carnal heart. J. T. M.

The Norwegian Lutheran Church and the Union Movement among Lutherans. — *Lutheraneren* (October 30), reporting that the special committee on Lutheran union appointed by Dr. Knubel resolved that joint sessions with committees of other synods should be held not later than the end of January, 1936, writes: "The committee appears to be

very hasty. It will perhaps be possible to have a few preliminary meetings, but matters of essential significance can certainly not be executed in so short a time. It is best to let the matter take its time and work itself out toward a mutual understanding." On this, *Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende* remarks editorially: "We do not know why *Lutheraneren* fears that this great union endeavor is working too fast. It gives no reasons why it should be necessary or desirable that the committee should take its time. . . . True union consists in one language, one meaning, and one mind, as God's Word demands. If *Lutheraneren* fears the committee is not approaching such a union and unity, then it must take much time and wait a long time for the great union which this movement has for its goal. *Lutheraneren*, however, has a gigantic work to perform in its own body before there can be any negotiations with other synods in the matter of union. We have on many occasions shown that the Union of 1917 is founded upon a compromise in doctrine. The Articles of Union which were agreed upon were not expressions of unity in faith and doctrine. This becomes more evident as time goes on. The troubles in the Norwegian Lutheran Church are not in matters of adiaphora. There is division [*uenighed*] regarding natural man's condition before conversion, regarding the sinner's conversion before God, regarding justification, regarding predestination, regarding the sufficient clearness of God's Word in the revelation of the way to salvation. Not to mention such matters as revivals, laymen's activities, the position of woman in the congregation, secret societies, unionism, etc. If *Lutheraneren* wishes a real and true union and unity according to God's Word, it has enough to do at home for a long time. The columns of our paper have borne sufficient testimony to this fact for many years. Also of late we called attention to the fact that the editors of *Lutheraneren* and the *Lutheran Herald* declared the Oxford Group Movement, or Buchmanism, unchristian and un-Lutheran while one of the theological professors of the Church declared it to be both Lutheran and Christian. When prominent teachers in a Church proclaim different ways of justification and salvation before God, it must cause confusion and apostasy from the faith. And *Lutheraneren* is not ignorant that there are complaints that Modernism, the denial of the whole Christian faith, is working inroads into its Church. That is a fruit of unionism, which the Union of 1917 used for its basis. *Lutheraneren* thus has reason to be afraid at this time." We would call to mind what the Apostle Paul writes to the Ephesians, chap. 4, 11—15. More yet than the Norwegian Lutheran Church the United Lutheran Church ought to secure union and unity in the sense of Scripture within its own circles before it seeks union negotiations with other synods. But may not perhaps the very discussion of Christian doctrine and practise at these intersynodical meetings foster true unity? May not God's Word assert its power for good when it is clearly and sharply confessed by those to whom unity in union is precious? Nevertheless, the points which *Tidende* here stresses are all-important.

J. T. M.

The Liberals and the Apostles' Creed. — That the Liberals are experiencing a good deal of difficulty through the adherence of many of their churches to the use of the Apostles' Creed would be clear even if they did not say so. Now and then some of them frankly speak of their

difficulties with this ancient symbol and ask the question whether they can conscientiously continue to use it. The editor of the *Christian Century*, writing on the subject "Honesty and the Apostles' Creed," has this to say: "No less staunch a churchman than Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts has recently declared that the continued use of the Apostles' Creed should be left to the free choice of each congregation, and a great majority of the professors and students in the Episcopal theological school at Cambridge expressed agreement with this pronouncement. In Bishop Lawrence's opinion no pledge should be required from young people joining the church beyond the confession that they are disciples of Christ. The use of the Apostles' Creed as a test of membership in the church is of course quite another matter from the use of it in the liturgy of worship. In the former use it cannot be regarded as anything but a literal statement of belief, and to demand subscription to it as a condition of church-membership implies an intent on the part of the church to treat it as a literal summary of facts, and of the most important facts, in the Christian Gospel. It also implies that each item of fact or belief in the Creed is given the appropriate emphasis which it should receive in the mind of every faithful Christian. This of course falsifies the actual situation in most Protestant churches." While the editor thinks that as a statement of faith the Apostles' Creed is out of the question for our generation, he has a good word to say for its liturgical use: "The Creed has an honored place in the service of worship. The congregation stands and recites together the ancient words which have been professed by Christian multitudes through the ages. It is pretty hard to shake the Church out of this immemorial habit, and there are plausible rationalizations in defense of it. It is an esthetic exercise, not a prosaic one. This creed is a bridge which spans the centuries, thus connecting the present with the past and helping to unify history as an organic movement." Though he is willing to a certain degree to defend the use of the Apostles' Creed by a liberal modernistic congregation, he says, having balanced the arguments pro and con, that, after all, the argument for relinquishing the Apostles' Creed is more convincing than the argument for retaining it. "In Christianity the ethical, the vital, the real, must be paramount." It seems clear that the position of those who wish to retain a creed for liturgical reasons while they have abandoned the beliefs expressed therein is unworthy of intelligent people. The Modernists should let the Church know where they stand. Nothing else is compatible with honesty. A.

"To Preserve Lutheranism." — It is through the instruction in the Catechism under the tutelage of the patient pastor that future members are prepared for membership in the Church" (meaning, of course, that they are prepared for the duties of their membership). "The future of the Church can be no greater than the effort expended to educate those contemplating confirmation in doctrinal soundness. No one can gainsay the fact that as a Church we would be far more influential than we are at present had the proper doctrinal instruction been given in the past. Suffice it to say that the congregations best weathering the storm of local and national strife are those which understood the importance of indoctrination in the past. The majority of influential and thinking laymen of to-day are those who were thoroughly catechized when received into the

Church through the rite of confirmation. It is a situation peculiar to the Lutheran Church that her most stable congregations are those which have assigned an important place to the Catechism."

The article from which we are quoting goes on to discuss the new ideas and methods in catechetical instruction which are being advocated in certain quarters, has something to say about "Parochial Schools Stressed Doctrines," and concludes with this paragraph: "The solution to the present weaknesses in catechization is, after all, very simple. Our pastors have for a long time been imitating the antics of other Protestant ministers who have no time or sympathy for the Catechism and have lain down on the job. They have felt that the thoroughgoing and detailed catechetical methods common to the Swedish and German branches of our Church are hackneyed expressions and worn-out pedagogical whimsicalities. It is easy to espouse the American dislike for thoroughgoing catechization because of the extra time for leisure on the part of the pastor. It would be wise for the United Lutheran Church to send clergymen to Sweden, Germany, and other Lutheran countries to make a study of correct orthodox catechetical methods. If something of this nature is not done in the near future, our Church will in the next decade lose its denominational individuality and become submerged in the maze of that religious conglomeration known as American Protestantism. There is a disease in the Lutheran Church which must be remedied. If Lutheranism is to be salvaged from the scrap-heap of non-catechetical American Protestantism, it must begin in the present if its constituency is to be indoctrinated in the future. This means hard work, a patient continuance in well-doing, and a general overhauling of the worn-out, un-Lutheran catechetical methods common in the past. This is a serious matter and must receive immediate attention. If present conditions and catechetical methods are not reformed in the near future, the older established Lutheran bodies will some day refuse to recognize our feeble attempts to remain under the banner of the Augsburg Confession." (Mr. Andrew B. Ekel, Renovo, Pa., on "Catechetical Instruction"; *Lutheran*, October 3, 1935.)

An editorial appearing in the same number states: "The article in this issue concerning more thorough catechetical instruction differs from any previously published in one respect. It presents the convictions of a layman. We know from conversations, however, that many thoughtful members of our congregations have deep admiration for pastors who insist upon thorough preparation for active membership in a Lutheran congregation. Etc." Mr. Ekel's words mean something to every Lutheran pastor.

E.

Even to This! — Under this heading the *Lutheran Sentinel* (August 28, 1935) writes: "Yes, it really has come to this that some pastors and congregations within the American Lutheran Conference do not feel, it appears, that they can have a complete social church gathering (which in the very nature of the case must be of a religious character) without a Catholic priest present and *participating* [original italics]. Two separate accounts of such unholy gatherings we read in two of our reputable Norwegian papers. The first appeared in *Skandinaven*, under the date of January 21 of this year. In this account the author, H. C. Casperson, — *Folksbladet's* editor, I believe, — chronicles an event that took place in

North Minneapolis, occasioned by the twenty-fifth anniversary of Pastor O. H. Sletten's ministry in St. Olaf's Congregation. Pastor Sletten has for years been a leader in the Lutheran Free Church, and from a pastor in this church-body, which in its official organ states that it refuses to be scared by a 'ghost from Marburg,' we might well expect even this. Now, what took place at this silver jubilee? Editor Casperson reports, with no sense of shame, it seems, that Father Dunphey, rector of the Church of Ascension (Roman Catholic), was first given the floor and that he delivered a 'very taking and appreciatory speech.' In glowing terms the Father spoke of the 'great light of truth that Dr. Sletten had been granted the privilege of holding aloft in North Minneapolis these many years.' Just think of it, a Catholic priest praising a Lutheran pastor as a beacon light of truth! We had expected that some one either from the Free Church or from the Merger Church would correct or protest this account in *Skandinaven*, but to date none has come to our notice. — About three weeks later I was handed a copy of *Minneapolis Tidende*, of January 31 of this year. This reliable paper tells of a farewell reception tendered Pastor B. E. Bergesen, who has served Zion Lutheran Church (North Minneapolis) for a number of years, having resigned to serve as a traveling evangelist in the Norwegian Church of America. The report indicates that this farewell reception was a colorful and many-colored affair. Among those participating by their presence and addresses were: Dr. O. H. Sletten of the Free Church, Pastor C. S. Thorpe, Dr. J. A. O. Stub, Drs. Stolee and Weswig of Luther Seminary (last four mentioned from the Merger Church), and Father Rakowski of the Catholic Church. The new pastor of Zion Church, the Rev. O. G. Malmin, opened and closed the meeting. All enlightened Lutherans know that the Roman Catholic Church in the Decrees of the Council of Trent has officially pronounced anathema upon *sola gratia* and *sola fide*, salvation by grace alone, salvation by faith alone. And just because of this, Luther often exclaimed: 'Pope, I will be your pestilence!' The old Romans had a striking saying: *'Vestigia terrent,'* the footsteps terrify. (This was said by the fox in Aesop's fable entitled 'The Lion and the Fox' when he saw that there were no footsteps backward from the lion's lair.) What effect must the above display of friendship have upon the souls entrusted to these pastors' spiritual care and guidance? 'If the blind lead the blind, will not both fall into the ditch?' Matt. 15, 14. How long will the lay people in the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, some of whom at least still have some Lutheran consciousness left, tolerate such 'spiritual wickedness in high places'?"

J. T. M.

"Popular Heresies Not New. — A writer in the *Presbyterian Banner* declares that recently he has read through the three volumes of Hodge's Theology with a surprising result. He says: 'The more I read Hodge, the humbler I get. There is not one of these strikingly original thoughts I have had that I do not find in the quotations of the liberals of that day and perhaps of centuries ago, quoted by Dr. Hodge in order to refute them. And besides, a lot of heresies far better than any I ever conjured up. Or did I conjure them up? Perhaps I heard them somewhere and forgot where I heard them — thought they were my own.' That very correctly states the situation. All these wonderful ideas and interpretations put

forth by our modernistic friends have recurred time and again through Christian history. Do not call yourself an 'advanced thinker' when you hold theories that were exploded centuries ago." — *Watchman-Examiner*, September 5, 1935.

Some Interpretations of the Mystic Number 666. — This is a case where the kettle and the pot are calling one another black. Writing in the *Commonweal* David Goldstein, director of the Nation-wide Catholic Campaign for Christ, complains of the mean exegesis engaged in by the Seventh-day Adventists, who maintain that the Pope's title *Vicarius Filii Dei*, when the letters having a numerical value are counted, yields the number 666, which is that of the beast in the Apocalypse. He one day came upon a young convert of Seventh-day Adventism who painted the tiara of the Pope and put on it the title just quoted. In the first place Mr. Goldstein takes the defensive and writes as follows: —

"1) *Vicarius Filii Dei* is not the name of the Pope. He is known as His Holiness Pope Pius XI. That name totals 69 and not 666 as 'the number of his [the beast's] name' must total according to chapter 13 of the Book of Revelation.

"2) *Vicarius Filii Dei* is a title, and it is not the official title of the Pope, though he is the Vicar of Christ, who is the Son of God.

"3) The official title of the Pope is *Vicarius Iesu Christi* (Vicar of Jesus Christ), as it is set down in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and *The Catholic Dictionary*.

"4) An examination of pictures of the Pope's tiara shows that neither the title *Vicarius Filii Dei* nor any other title is inscribed thereon.

"5) The title *Vicarius Filii Dei* does not total 666 according to a proper tabulation of Roman numerical values. For instance, when an I appears before an L it does not total, as Seventh-day Adventism says, 1 and 50, or 51. It totals I minus 50, which is 49."

Next Mr. Goldstein turns the tables on his adversaries and vigorously takes the offensive. He points to the indisputable fact that the "prophetess" or "seer" of Seventh-day Adventism is Ellen Gould White. Then he argues thus: "The two L's in Ellen total 100. The U (V) equals 5, the L 50, and the D 500 in Gould; the W equals two V's, 10, and the I is one, in White. Hence the grand total is 666. Thus not the Pope, but the founder of the Seventh-day Adventist sect is the terrible creature depicted in the Book of Revelation according to their own system." What's next? A.

Episcopal Succession Advocates Given a Jolt. — It is a long story, a synopsis of which may be given as follows: A certain Mr. Ringenhjelm, who had served as a Methodist minister and for a short period attended the Augustana Theological Seminary in Rock Island, sought to be ordained by the Augustana Synod. Four times his application was considered and rejected. He was not regarded "qualified to serve successfully as a pastor" (*Lutheran Companion*). Soon thereafter Bishop Stewart of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Chicago ordained him as a deacon. Then Mr. Ringenhjelm went to Sweden, his native country, to seek church-work there. The rest of the story had best be told in the words of the Swedish Bishop of Straengaes, written in reply to inquiries by Dr. Brandelle, till recently president of the Augustana Synod.

"Ringenhjelm was here in Sweden and served as a deacon in the English church in Stockholm. The plan was that he should devote himself to the service of Americans in Stockholm who belong to the Episcopal communion. There are a number of these. The Bishop of Chicago inquired if under the circumstances I would be kind enough to ordain Ringenhjelm on his behalf. I was unable to see that there were any legitimate reasons why I should refuse him this service, inasmuch as he and the Episcopal Church desired to show me and the Swedish Church this confidence. The reasons for my act in ordaining therefore were essentially these two: I desired to render a service when the opportunity was given me, and I regarded it of a certain value to thus demonstrate an ecclesiastical fellowship which stretches beyond one's own communion. As will appear from the above, it was not a question of ordaining Ringenhjelm for service in America; such a rite would naturally have been performed by the proper authorities in America. . . . I may be permitted to add that, if the situation should arise that I should be requested by Augustana to ordain some one on behalf of the synod, I would with great joy assume such a commission."

Canon B. I. Bell (a canon is next in rank to a dean in an Episcopalian diocese) of America wrote quite bitterly about the action of Bishop Stewart of Chicago for requesting this ordination to the priesthood from a Lutheran bishop. Canon Bell now in turn is taken to task by the *Living Church* for speaking so disrespectfully of His Eminence Bishop Stewart. The *Lutheran Companion* editor relates the incident in a fully documented article. One misses, however, the *quod erat demonstrandum* at the conclusion, namely, that loyal Lutherans have no right to maintain fraternal relations with the Swedish State Church. A.

Lutheran Statistics. — Advance figures on Lutheran church-membership in America and their support of congregational and benevolent activities have been compiled for the United Stewardship Council by the Rev. Dr. Geo. Linn Kieffer, National Lutheran Council statistician. Details will appear later. Here are totals: Confirmed membership in United States and Canada, 3,127,765; per capita for congregational support, $10.24; for benevolence, $2.35. The United Lutheran Church total per capita for all support, $12.97, is approached closely by that of the Synodical Conference, $12.96, and the American Lutheran Conference, $12.17. The independent bodies and synods show an average per capita of $8.67.

N. L. C. B.

II. Ausland.

Zur Verteidigung des lutherischen Bekenntnisses. Daß man sich auch in Deutschland, in landes- oder volkskirchlichen Kreisen, wieder auf den Wert des lutherischen Bekenntnisses besinnt und dessen hohe Wichtigkeit wenigstens theoretisch zu schätzen weiß, beweist u. a. auch ein kürzlich in der „A. E. L. K." von P. D. W. Laible, dem Herausgeber dieser theologischen Zeitschrift, unter der Überschrift „Das lutherische Bekenntnis im Feuer von rechts und links" erschienener Artikel, der, abgesehen von einigen Ausdrücken und Sätzen, denen wir nicht beistimmen können, so viel Wahres enthält, daß er eingehenden Studiums auch in amerikanisch-kirchlichen Kreisen würdig ist. Laible geht zunächst von dem Gedanken aus, daß das

lutherische Bekenntnis mit der lutherischen Reformation und Kirche aufs innigste verquickt ist. Er schreibt: „Seit es eine lutherische Kirche gibt, hatte sie ein Bekenntnis; dies Bekenntnis war das Banner, um das sie sich scharte, die Mauer, die Gott um sie gebaut, der Jungbrunnen, aus dem sie sich immer wieder erneuerte. Es war aus dem Herzblut der Reformation geboren, mit Märtyrerblut geweiht. . . . Noch keine Schrift hat beschrieben, wieviel Kraft und Segen vom lutherischen Bekenntnis auf Volk und Kirche ausging, welche Waffenrüstung es war, erst im Kampf gegen Rom und allerlei Irrgeister, dann gegen Aufklärung und Rationalismus, gegen Monismus und Modernismus und gegen alles, was wider Gott ist." Dies herrliche, wichtige Bekenntnis der lutherischen Kirche steht nun, wie Laible weiter zeigt, im „Kreuzfeuer von rechts und links". „Die von links sprechen es offen aus, daß *seine Zeit endgültig vorüber sei.* Es sei nur noch eine Sache der Theologen, nicht der Kirche; nur Theologen hätten dafür Interesse und stritten darüber mit ‚Pastorengezänk'. Das Kirchenvolk kenne das Bekenntnis nicht mehr; es sei ihm ‚weithin fremd und zweifelhaft' geworden; es kenne *höchstens* noch den Katechismus." Demgegenüber stellt Laible die Frage, ob dieser Einwurf berechtigt sei, und antwortet u. a.: „Das Kirchenvolk soll sein Bekenntnis nicht mehr kennen? Jeden Sonntag singt es aus dem Bekenntnis heraus und betet aus dem Bekenntnis; und die Gebetbücher in den Häusern, die Erbauungsbücher, alles ist durchtränkt vom Bekenntnis. Alles, was in unserm lutherischen Kirchenvolk vorhanden ist an Glauben, Hoffen, Lieben, atmet den Geist des Bekenntnisses; davon leben unsere Christen, darauf sterben sie. Oder was ist das Kirchenlied anders als das gesungene Bekenntnis der Kirche? Wenn unser Kirchenvolk die einzelnen Sätze der Augustana und der Apologie, der Schmalkaldischen Artikel und der Konkordienformel auch nicht kennt, so ist das nicht ausschlaggebend. Auch die Bibel kennt es nicht in allen ihren Teilen; ist damit die Bibel überholt? *Ein* Bekenntnis hat aber die Gemeinde zur Hand, kennt es Satz um Satz, Buchstaben um Buchstaben, den Kleinen Katechismus. Man sage nicht spöttisch, daß sie ‚*höchstens*' den Katechismus kenne; denn dieser Katechismus ist wirklich das *Höchste*, die Krone des Bekenntnisses, ist die goldene Schatzkammer, in der alle Schätze des lutherischen Bekenntnisses beschlossen liegen. Daher ist ein Katechismusvolk auch bewußtes und gerüstetes Kirchenvolk gegen alle Sekten und Schwärmereien." — Allerdings gibt der Schreiber zu, daß in dem Satz, das Bekenntnis sei dem Volk „weithin fremd und zweifelhaft geworden", etwas Wahres liegt. Das rührt aber nicht daher, daß das Bekenntnis „veraltet", „erstarrt" geworden ist. Das behaupten zu wollen, wäre die reinste Blindheit. „Sondern allerlei kirchenfeindliche, christusfeindliche Mächte unterwühlten seit langem das Bekenntnis der Kirche, erschütterten den Glauben des Kirchenvolks, machten ihm die Bibel fremd und das Bekenntnis fremd, das auf die Bibel aufgebaut ist. Und da wundert man sich, wenn es zu einem ‚Massenabfall' in der Kirche kam, wenn heute Millionen nicht mehr wissen, was Bekenntnis, was Kirche ist. Noch andere Ursachen waren im Spiel, gottentfremdete ‚Weltanschauungen' mit innerem Aufruhr der Menschheit gegen Gott, zumeist getarnt als ‚Fortschritt', als ‚Wissenschaft', als ‚Veredlung' der Religion. Aber das will man nicht zugeben. Man sucht nach einem andern Schuldigen. Darum sei der Glaube erloschen, weil die Kirche kein lebendiges Bekenntnis mehr

hatte; ihr Bekenntnis, einst eine Lebensmacht, sei längst zum toten Buchstaben erstarrt. Der Tod sei in die Kirche eingezogen, sie habe vergessen, was sie ist, nämlich der lebendige Leib Christi." Darauf antwortet der Schreiber: „Jawohl, die Bekenntnisse sind in Buchstaben gefaßt; aber diese Buchstaben umfassen Worte, und diese Worte enthalten Leben. Wohl haben Menschen das Bekenntnis gemacht, und die Spuren der Menschenhände sind sichtbar; aber der wahre Schöpfer ist der Heilige Geist, den JEsus der Kirche verheißen hat. Darum sind auch die Bekenntnisse immer aus einem Geist und Sinn; die späteren verachteten nicht die vorigen, sondern bauten sich auf die vorigen, aber alle zusammen auf die Schrift, den untrüglichen Maßstab Gottes. Wer von ‚Erstarrung' der Bekenntnisse redet, hat nie ihres Geistes Hauch verspürt. Leben aus Gott ist Leben und bleibt Leben; nur des Menschen Augen werden starr, und dann klagt er das Leben der Erstarrung an. Nicht an den Bekenntnissen liegt es, sondern an den Augen der Menschen. Nicht der Mangel ‚zeitgemäßer' Bekenntnisse ist die Not der Kirche, sondern daß sie selbst kein Leben hat; Nervosität genug, aber kein Leben." — „Anders liegen die Dinge, wenn auch von rechts her sich der Widerspruch erhebt, von da her, wo man keinen andern Gott hat, als die Bekenntnisse lehren, keinen andern Christus [?], keinen andern Glauben [?]. Man glaubt, die evangelische deutsche Reichskirche am besten als unierte Kirche bauen zu können, nicht gerade durch die Nivellierung der Konfessionen, aber doch durch deren Abschleifung. Jede Betonung des lutherischen Bekenntnisses hindere diesen ‚Fortschritt'; daher die Pfeilschüsse gegen diese Betonung und damit auch gegen das Bekenntnis. Und nicht allein gegen das Bekenntnis, sondern gegen die lutherische Kirche selbst. Fällt das Bekenntnis, so fällt auch die Kirche. Hat aber die lutherische Kirche ihr Recht, dann auch ihre Bekenntnisse. Was habt ihr gegen diese Bekenntnisse? Sagt es uns doch! Wie oft ist diese Forderung erhoben worden! Nie wurde sie erfüllt. Wir möchten allen Ernstes bitten, nicht länger die Bibel gegen das Bekenntnis auszuspielen. Gibt es verknöcherte Bekenntnischristen, so gibt es auch verknöcherte Bibelchristen; hier Mißbrauch, da Mißbrauch. Aber nicht der Mißbrauch entscheidet, sondern der rechte Gebrauch, und das ist der, daß rechte Bekenntnischristen die Schrift über alles hochhalten, Herz und Leben danach einrichten und immer fragen: Wie steht geschrieben? So lasse man das Bekenntnis unangetastet; ja man halte um so fester dazu, je mehr die Scharen eines säkularisierten Christentums dagegen anrennen. Denn dies Bekenntnis steht auf dem heiligen Boden der Schrift, ist von Gott selbst der Kirche deutscher Reformation eingestiftet, hat sich bewährt in guten und bösen Tagen. Es ist noch zu wenig, es ‚unangetastet' zu lassen. Wir sagen mehr: Erhebt es wieder zum Panier, richtet um dieses Panier her wieder die lutherische Kirche in Deutschland auf! Ihr könnt sie auch, wenn ihr wollt, die ‚evangelische Kirche deutscher Nation' nennen; nur zurück zum Glauben der Väter, zurück zum Bekenntnis der Väter!" — Auch hierzulande ist man, selbst in lutherischen Kreisen, bekenntnismüde geworden und hat Lehrfortbildung mit neuen, der Zeit angepaßten Ausdrücken gefordert. Das hier Gesagte dürfte daher auch uns amerikanisch-lutherischen Christen von Wichtigkeit sein.

Aber, so möchten wir den Schreiber fragen, warum eine lutherische Kirche, die auf dem lutherischen Bekenntnis steht, evangelisch nennen,

da dieser Name doch so allgemein im Sinn von uniert gebraucht wird? Auch in dem Namen Lutherisch liegt ein gewaltiges Stück Bekenntnis. Was übrigens der Schreiber von den Bekenntnisopponenten von rechts her sagt, nämlich daß sie keinen andern Gott, keinen andern Christum, keinen andern Glauben lehren als den, den die Bekenntnisse lehren, trifft nicht zu. Die zahlreichen Reformierten z. B., die dem lutherischen Bekenntnis je und je opponiert haben, haben sich nie voll und ganz zu dem Christus und dem Glauben bekannt, den unsere Bekenntnisse darlegen und auf Grund der Schrift bekennen. Das hat sich von alters her gezeigt in ihrem Widerspruch gegen die lutherische Lehre von Christi Person, der Mitteilung der Eigenschaften, den Gnadenmitteln, dem heiligen Abendmahl, der Gnadenwahl usw. Laible sollte an diesem Punkt genauer reden und die Gegensätze ins klare bringen. Der unierte, reformierte Geist stand in bezug auf diese Lehren nie rechts, sondern nur links. J. T. M.

Collapse of Religion in Russia. — What Dr. Walter Van Kirk, secretary of the Department of International Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, reports on religious conditions in Russia, which country he has just toured, is sad beyond any lamentations and tears of which we are capable. We quote some of the most important statements in his report.

"The Soviet Government is the sworn enemy of religion. While in Moscow, I stood before the old Duma Building, on one side of which there is inscribed the legend 'Religion is the opiate of the people.' Every day this inscription is read and believed by thousands. . . . I spent a Sunday traveling from the Polish border to the capital city of the Communists. The calendar told me it was Sunday, but the peasants and workers seemed to be wholly unaware that this particular day was the Lord's Day. They were in the fields, pitching hay or threshing wheat. From my train window I saw hundreds of men and women at work in lumber camps and in railroad yards. As I traveled through the villages, I saw innumerable neglected churches, where once the peasants on Sunday worshiped the God of their fathers. There are, to be sure, a number of churches in Russia still open. I visited some of these churches. What I saw, however, only confirmed my impression that the U. S. S. R. is getting God-less. The worshipers were mainly old people. I saw very few young people in the churches. This to my mind is the most convincing evidence of the decadence of religion in Russia. The present youth generation in Russia is the youth generation of the Communist revolution. These youngsters have been brought up on a diet of atheism. They are strongly antireligious. They do not believe in God. They have no use for the churches. I talked with many of these young people. They laughed at me when I sought to interpret religion as something more than creeds and dogmas. They replied that they were through with God, with religion, and with the institutions of religion. One day I visited a kindergarten, where I found nearly a hundred little children. I asked these children what they thought about God, and I was politely informed by these little ones that there was no God. . . . Despite the constitutional guarantees of religious freedom the Church in Russia is persecuted in many ways. It is a matter of common knowledge that hundreds of priests have been slain, while hundreds of

others have been sent into exile. Still others have just disappeared, and God alone knows where they are or what they are doing. A worker who frequents church is discriminated against in various ways. He cannot be a member of the Communist party till he formally disavows belief in religion and in the Church. The priests are reduced to a state of beggary. All professional ecclesiastics have been disfranchised, and they are not for this reason permitted to engage in labor of any kind, nor are the pastors of the Evangelical Church permitted to propagandize their respective faiths. Of three hundred Lutheran pastors in prerevolution days only thirty remain. A little way out of Moscow I passed a forced-labor camp, where I was told a number of Lutheran pastors were working at the point of a bayonet. . . . I visited in the homes of peasants; and when I asked about religion, I was told that only the old and feeble-minded had any interest in the things of God. I happened on a Sunday to be in one of the rural villages in the wheat belt of Southeastern Russia. I wanted to go to church. I had to travel for miles in a truck since the churches in the immediate neighborhood were closed. The service was attended by a mere handful of people. I talked with the local priest, and the first question which I put to him was this: 'What is the future for religion in Russia?' And without a moment's hesitation the priest replied, 'There is no future for religion in Russia.' I asked this aged man of God whether or not any priests were being trained in Russia for the ministry. His answer was a solemn negative. . . . The offering at this particular church consisted of five pieces of black bread, four green apples, and an egg. I asked the priest what he would do when he had eaten his bread, apples, and egg, and he unblushingly told me that he would visit among the homes of the faithful and beg for food. While I was talking with the priest, the head of the local Soviet walked into the altar room unannounced and uninvited. The priest gave me a warning look, and I knew that the time for further questions had passed."

In our prayers let us not forget poor Russia. A.

The Lutheran Church in France. — Since the third Lutheran World Convention, during the past October assembled in Paris, France, the church-papers submit a good deal of information on the status of Lutheranism in that country. The following is taken from the *National Lutheran Council Bulletin:* —

"The size of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of France is overwhelmingly determined by the allegiance of Alsace and Lorraine. In 1871, after those two provinces had been taken by Germany, she was so weak that the General Synod was uncertain whether to lie down in defeat or go on courageously. She decided on the latter and has given an example of devotion to her faith that should hearten the entire Church. Lutherans were the first Protestants in France to be martyred for their faith in the sixteenth century, and they have maintained a vigorous religious life throughout the centuries.

"The Church in France at present numbers about 398,000. She is divided into three groups: a) Paris, with 22 pastors and 13,000 members in 20 parishes; b) Montbeliard, with 37 parishes and 90 congregations and 35,000 members, served by 45 pastors; c) Alsace-Lorraine, with a

membership of 238,578 in 210 congregations, served by 174 pastors. The Church of Paris is constantly expanding in congregations and in works of mercy and foreign missions. She is active in mission-work in Madagascar and conducts a deaconess training-school and a health center near the city."

Lutheranism which is loyal to the Confessions of the Church is represented in Paris by our brother the Rev. F. C. Kreiss, who is affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Alsace-Lorraine. A.

A Survey of Lutheranism throughout the World. — A remarkable address was delivered by Prof. Dr. Herman Sasse of Erlangen on the subject "The Present Situation of the Lutheran Church throughout the World" when the Neuendettelsau Missionary Society held its 1935 mission-festival. The address reveals such a penetrating study of conditions in the Lutheran Church that we should like to quote it in its entirety. Considerations of space compel us to limit our quotations to a few salient utterances. Speaking of Germany and condemning the union of 1817, he writes: —

"Dare an evangelical Church forget that to this prayer ["that they may all be one"] there also belongs 'Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth'? Can there be a real unity of the Church when there is no unity in the teaching of the Gospel and in the interpretation of the Sacraments, for example, in the question whether Jesus Christ, the Lord, is really, personally present in the Sacrament of the Altar according to His human and His divine nature? When we are once agreed and able to express our unity in one definite confession, then a real step toward unity of the Church will have been taken; but the unions brought about in the nineteenth century signified that it was the opinion that confessional unity was unnecessary, that it was necessary only to act as if they were united. What came out of this is evident. We shall give but one example. At a Rhenish teachers' institute the future teachers are instructed in the Lutheran as well as in the Heidelberg Catechism in order that, according to the requirements, they might give instruction either in Lutheran or Reformed religion and so that in case of a change they can go over from one confession to the other without difficulty. The training of future preachers by the majority of German theological faculties has not been much different lately. Is it surprising that our Church has lost its moral esteem among the people in most of Germany? The people certainly do not understand much theology, and they do not have to know much of it; yet they understand something about veracity and have a finer feeling for it than many an educated person. They understand more about theological honesty and veracity than many an educated theologian. . . . If our Church cannot remain a confessional Church, if it must join with other churches of different confessions in spite of the unsolved question of doctrine, then the four-hundred-year story of the Reformation is at an end in our fatherland. . . . 'A German Evangelical Church' which would surrender the unadulterated Augsburg Confession would be only a new sect, whose superfluousness would soon be shown in church history."

Concerning the Lutheran churches of America Dr. Sasse has high words of praise. "Who of us knows that in New York, Philadelphia, or

in Chicago on every Sunday more Lutheran services are held than in a large German city? Who knows that in New York there are a great many more Lutheran churches than, for example, in Berlin, that there are a great many more preachers than in a German city like Hamburg? We do not know that here. Who knows that hundreds of thousands, even a million, children in America are brought up upon the Small Catechism, not only in the German language, but also in English? . . . The fact that the Lutheran congregations and synods have held so firmly to the confession of their Church, that their theologians have withstood the temptations of syncretism, — all this cannot be explained simply by confessional obstinacy or even by a romantic conservative sentiment. Where should that have come from in the United States? The power of American Lutheranism to resist and the strength for a great development of the Church grew out of a church-forming power in substance of its confession. If the church history of the nineteenth century has recorded a defeat for German Lutheranism in general, it has chronicled victory for Lutheranism in America. The development of the Lutheran Church in the vast expanses of the North American continent in the course of a few generations is the greatest positive event in the history of our Church since the close of the orthodox period."

To the churches in the Scandinavian countries Dr. Sasse sounds a well-founded warning. "Ever since the time of the Reformation there always has existed a more or less strong exchange between German and Nordic Lutheranism, as a single glance into the hymnal and at the theological literature will reveal. Recent developments in the Church indicate that this exchange has become more and more supplemented by an ever stronger relation between the Scandinavian and the Anglican churches. Indeed, here and there it is already beginning to be endangered by this intimacy. Not Wittenberg, but Canterbury is the place which is attracting the attention of the Northern churches and their theologians. This change began with the grand church polity of Nathan Soederblom, who personally maintained the peculiarity of the Nordic Lutherans and at the same time the connection with the German Church. His death, however, closed a period of Nordic church history and opened a new one, in which the force of attraction of the Church of England is becoming more evident. The wavering and the compromising of German Lutheran theology in the decisive years of the German Church, the adulteration of German Lutheran theology with the thought and forces of Calvinism, and finally the complete collapse of the German Church in our day have hastened the process in the North. The Nordic churches are on the way from Wittenberg to Canterbury."

We merely wish to say that Dr. Sasse would be surprised if he knew to what an extent many American churches which are sailing under the flag of confessional Lutheranism are willing to fraternize with Calvinistic denominations. A.

Roman Catholic Influence in Scotland Growing. — In Scotland, overwhelmingly Protestant, Roman Catholicism has of late been making headway and accomplishing some of its objectives. There were outbreaks of ill will, accompanied by attempts at violence, when the Eucharistic Congress was held in Edinburgh and when Catholic individuals were singled

out for special honors. The inimical manifestations were rather disgraceful. That the Protestants, however, have been provoked rather tryingly is brought out in the following paragraph from the report of the correspondent in the *Christian Century:* "The grounds of grievance were well stated in the report of the Church Interests Committee to the last assembly. The committee had engaged in a careful and dispassionate survey into the workings of the 1918 Act, which had transferred the Roman Catholic schools from Church support to that of the State. The report pointed out that an additional burden had been put on taxpayers in four ways: the £. 771,000 cost of purchasing the schools already erected; the annual rent paid for buildings taken by lease; the cost of out-of-date buildings (at least £. 1,335,000); and the fact that the Roman Church had successfully demanded the erection of separate schools even in areas where there was already adequate accommodation for all children of school age." The correspondent then quotes from the report alluded to: "The Roman Catholic Church has thus been enriched to an enormous extent, both through the lifting of the burden of building and maintaining schools and through the largely increased remuneration of its staffs. In addition, it may be mentioned that a considerable number of the teachers are in religious orders, and their salaries, by the terms of their vows, therefore go into the coffers of the Church." This explains, though, of course, it does not excuse, the drastic manifestation of anti-Catholic feeling on the part of many Protestants in Scotland. A.

Calendar Trouble in Greece. — Just as though this poor world had not sufficient conflicts and squabbles to torment it, some people in Greece are fomenting strife on the question whether the old calendar, known as the Julian, or the new, usually called the Gregorian, should be followed. The former, we are told, is now about fourteen days behind the sun and for that reason ought to be regarded as antiquated. However, there are people in Greece who are not willing to take this practical or pragmatic point of view. The *Living Church* informs us that two bishops in Greece "who had once agreed with the rest of the synod to use the revised or Gregorian calendar, like the rest of Christendom, refused to do so later and have fallen back on the use of the old Julian calendar." These people now "have started an open schism by consecrating a rival hierarchy of the 'Orthodox Old Calendarian Rite.' They have already consecrated four bishops of this rite and propose to lay hands on three more, making nine recusants in all." The ultra-conservatives, so the article on which we draw says, have been permitted the use of the old calendar for themselves, but these "Paleohemerologists" insist that, if the calendar is changed, this is identical with apostasy, and they will oppose it with all their might. The controversy has its semihumorous aspect, inasmuch as some of these standpatters tell their people "that a large number of children will not be able to have any birthdays this year, for the omission of fourteen days from the calendar would have that effect inevitably." Shall we laugh or weep? A.