

7-1-1937

## 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. (1937) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 8 , Article 60.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol8/iss1/60>

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**

**The U. L. C. Crusade against Verbal Inspiration.**—The Lutheran is fighting the plenary inspiration and infallibility of Scripture in season and out of season. The issue of Jan. 14 carries an article by Dr. H. C. Alleman of Gettysburg, reporting on the seventeenth annual meeting of the Advisory Council of the American Bible Society, which contains these paragraphs:—

"The devotional address was made by President W. Richards, who represented the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Dr. Richards' theme was The Place of the Bible in the Missionary Enterprise, and he wove his thought into answers of two questions, 'What is the Bible?' and 'What is the Bible for?' *The Bible is not a sacred oracle speaking infallibly in every book on everything that is contained in it; yet it is infallible when it speaks of the object of our faith and the way of life. What is infallible in the Bible? The good news, or the Gospel of God, which God revealed in the prophets and fulfilled in the Christ. One misses the mark when he turns to the Bible for science, history, literature, or philosophy. It was not the intention of God or of His prophets, of the Christ or of the apostles, to teach men what they can discover. . . . The Bible does not contain even a system of theology or of ethics. In it there is something far greater, which furnishes the material for theology and ethics, namely, the Gospel of God.*

"The Bible contains many forms of literature. One form belongs to the Bible alone and is not found in the sacred books of the East, and that is the gospels. For the Bible alone contains the Gospel, the good news that God is Love and that His purpose in giving love and that His purpose in giving us His Word is the realization in time and in eternity of an order of life among men of every tribe and nation in whom the Spirit of Jesus prevails. This good news comes to men individually; but God does not call men to solitude, but always into society. Yet no man can serve God in society unless he personally responds to God's call to service. The social message of the Gospel is as much a part of God's plan as the personal message. The Gospel in the Bible must daily be revealed in men and women and be approved by faith working in love; for it cannot be proved by logic or by mathematical demonstration. The whole Bible is not Gospel, but the whole Gospel runs in higher or lower tones through the whole Bible. We must do what Luther said in a homely, but penetrating sentence: *'The pure Scriptures must be separated from their dregs and filth, which it has ever been my aim to do, that the divine truths may be looked upon in one light and trifles of men in another.'*"

So far the quotation from Dr. Alleman's article. We might say in passing that we all are agreed that "the Bible alone contains the Gospel"; also, "that the whole Bible is not Gospel." Furthermore, it is commendable that the author of this article tells us plainly where

he stands: "The Bible is not a sacred oracle, speaking infallibly in every book on everything that is contained in it." But what we are particularly interested in at the present time is the reference to Luther. "We must do what Luther said in a homely, but penetrating sentence: The pure Scriptures must be separated from their dregs and filth, which it has ever been my aim to do, that the divine truths may be looked upon in one light and trifles of men in another." This quotation is supposed to prove that Luther took a "liberal" attitude towards Scripture, that he did not believe that everything in the Bible is inspired and infallible. The list containing similar quotations from Luther, garbled or misinterpreted statements, such as the familiar "was Christum treibt" (Luther, XIV, 129) and "schlechte und geringe Windeln" (XIV, 4), has been thoroughly examined in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 346 ff.; see also CONC. TR. MONTHLY., 1930, p. 868 ff.; 1932, p. 306 ff.; 1936, p. 166. The statement adduced in our article is not so familiar. Let us examine it. Unfortunately Dr. Alleman fails to give its location in Luther's works. That is most unfair. It is possible that the source on which he depended failed in the same respect. Still he should not have published this matter until he had verified it. The context in which this quotation appears in the article makes Luther say that parts of Scripture are pure and other parts filthy, that the careful reader of the Bible must be careful to distinguish between the trifles with which Scripture deals and the important things, because the Bible is made up of infallible truth and fallible statements of men. *Luther never said that!* If you find the context of the above quotation in Luther, you will find that here again Luther has been misinterpreted.

We are now in for an exploration of Luther's works. We may not find the utterance in question at once, but we are sure to profit by the search. Let us begin with Volume I. Gen. 24, 22 tells of the earring and bracelets given to Rebekah, and Luther comments (p. 1711, St. Louis ed.): "What is here related is adjudged by reason to be a most carnal and worldly affair; and I myself often wonder why Moses expends so many words on such trifling things, since he was so brief on much more important things. But I do not doubt that the *Holy Ghost* wanted these things to be written down for our instruction. For nothing is presented to us in Scripture that is trifling and useless; for *all that is written* was written for our learning, Rom. 15, 4." That does not sound as though Luther held that Scripture contained "trifles of men" which do not belong to the saving Word. Vol. II, on Gen. 29, 1-3 (Jacob meeting Rachel), p. 459 ff.: "Thus the holy fathers, I say, are depicted in a rude and carnal way, in the low estate of this life, than which in the mind of the papists there can be nothing more unclean and disreputable. They say that here nothing better is presented to us than that they took wives, begat children, milked the cows and goats, etc., which are altogether worldly and pagan works. . . . Thou must not think or wonder why the *Holy Ghost* delights in describing such paltry and contemptible things, but listen to what St. Paul says, Rom. 15, 4: 'Whatsoever things were written,' etc. If we firmly believed that the *Holy Ghost Himself*, and God, the Creator of all, is the true

Author of this book and of these paltry and contemptible things, as they seem mean and trivial to our flesh, we should find the greatest comfort therein, as St. Paul says. . . . He would glorify not only their knightly virtues, but also the filthy and mean works, and this description adorns them as with gold and gems." On Gen. 30, 2, p. 538: "This needs to be inculcated why the Holy Spirit, who certainly has a clean mouth, busies himself with these things, which the most holy father, the Pope, and his chaste monks and nuns shrink even from thinking of as things which to them are altogether filthy and carnal." Certainly this cannot be the quotation which Dr. Alleman has in mind. On Gen. 30, 14—16, p. 566 f.: "The Holy Ghost, who is the Author of this book delights to describe, *dass er also spielen und scherzen moege*, these trivial puerile things which are not of much use. We thus understand that it is not useless that the Holy Spirit bids us read, teach, and believe these things. . . . We should glory and rejoice in these common works of the household, since the Holy Spirit condescends to expatiate on them." Still not the quotation we are looking for! Perhaps we shall find it in those sections which record the sins of men, the real filth. On Gen. 38 (the revolting story of Judah and Tamar), p. 1167 f.: "Why did the *Holy Ghost* have these shameful and unspeakable things written down and preserved to be told and read in the Church? Who will believe that such things are profitable for edification and salvation? . . . These examples are set before us for instruction and comfort and for the strengthening of our faith; they show the great grace and mercy of God." Are these the dregs and filth that Luther would have us separate from the pure Scriptures? On v. 19, p. 1200: "Why does the most pure *mouth of the Holy Spirit* stoop down to such low, despicable things, aye, things which are unchaste and filthy, yea, damnable, as if such things should serve to instruct the Church and congregation of God? How does that concern the Church?" Read on for yourself and see why the *Holy Spirit* has put this filth into Scripture. On Gen. 38, 27—30, p. 1214: "Behold how carefully the *Holy Spirit* describes this miserable, piteous delivery!" In Vol. III, p. 559, on Gen. 38, we read: "It is true, this is a rather gross chapter. However, it is found in Holy Scripture, and the *Holy Spirit* wrote it, whose mouth and pen are as clean as ours. . . . If He was not ashamed to write it, we should not be ashamed to read and hear it." This, too, does not sound like Dr. Alleman's quotation.—For the present we shall have to give up the search. But men who so glibly quote Luther should, in all fairness, indicate volume and page. E.

A U. L. C. Theologian on the Real Presence.—The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of October, 1936, publishes an article by Rev. H. L. Creager, entitled "Values Received through the Holy Communion." The concluding paragraphs read: "In conclusion I would offer a few thoughts on how these values are conveyed to us. This is frankly in the realm of theory; positiveness is impossible; I present an idea which I have found helpful and fairly satisfying. We believe, of course, that it is not the bread and wine that are directly efficacious, but it is the living presence of Christ in those physical elements. The important thing is to have

the faith to lay hold on that presence; the appealing power of the picture which Christ's words suggest is worth more than a logical explanation. But in trying to comprehend it, the following conception has helped me to grasp the blessed fact of that Real Presence.

"Jesus said the bread was His body. What is a body? The body of a person is both the abode in which the soul or real personality dwells and also the instrument which he uses in order to accomplish the purposes formed in his will. Now, Jesus chooses this bread to live in and work through; He chooses it as the instrument which He will use to bring His presence and His saving power to us. It expresses and accomplishes the saving purpose of delivering from sin and restoring to God, just as did the flesh in which He once lived. Therefore He properly calls it His body. Likewise the blood is the symbol and power of life. So Jesus chooses and uses this fruit of the vine to bring the power of His life into our lives; He conveys Himself and His living and healing and vitalizing power to all of us through it, just as the blood conveys the purifying and vitalizing oxygen to all parts of the body. Hence He properly calls the wine His blood, the medium of conveying spiritual life and sustenance to us. His Real Presence is truly in the Sacrament; and as we by faith receive it, we receive Him and the blessings of salvation and life eternal which He offers."

This is strange doctrine—to appear in a Lutheran publication. It would not appear strange in some Reformed publications. The so-called Real Presence in the Reformed theology is the presence of Christ with His blessings. And that is what the Real Presence of our article amounts to. But even Reformed theologians, of the regular type, would reject Pastor Creager's interpretation of the words "This is My body" as strange and monstrous. "Jesus chooses this bread to live in and work through; He chooses it as the instrument which He will use to bring His presence and saving power to us. Therefore He properly calls it His body." "This is My body" does not mean the real body of the Lord. Jesus calls the bread His body because it is the instrument through which He works! And that interpretation is offered to the readers of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*. Luther lists seven interpretations of the words "This is My body," current among the deniers of the Real Presence. The first was Carlstadt's: Christ, pointing to his body, said: "Hie sitzt mein Leib." The fourth was Schwenkfeld's "My body is bread; *vernimm, eine geistliche Speise.*" The seventh was fathered by John Campanus: This bread is a body, a dead, lifeless body; but since it is My creature, it is My body, *den ich geschaffen habe.*" (You must read the entire section, Vol. XX, p. 1771 f.) Pastor Creager's interpretation resembles that of Campanus. But it also differs from it. Krauth informs us that "at the beginning of the seventeenth century there were *twenty-eight* contradictory views" current among the deniers of the Real Presence. (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 607.) Perhaps Pastor Creager's view is listed among these twenty-eight. But whatever its pedigree, it is a monstrous thing that the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* publishes this outright denial of the Real Presence without the slightest note of protest. The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* is pub-

lished by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Mount Airy, Philadelphia, and it disseminates views concerning which Luther said: *"Ihr habt einen andern Geist denn wir."*\*

Here are two important doctrines: the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture and the doctrine of the real presence of the body of the Lord in the Lord's Supper. They are publicly denied within the United Lutheran Church. And now there are men traveling up and down the land shouting: The things keeping the Lutheran synods apart are mere trivialities! It is not surprising when a liberal theologian like H. L. Willett speaks of trivialities in this connection. Answering a question "regarding the chief obstacles to Christian unity," he said in the *Christian Century* of January 27, 1937: "The controversies over the inspiration of the Scriptures . . . , creation or evolution . . . , the meaning of Baptism . . . , are ceasing to be counted worthy of causing divisions among the friends of Jesus. There is a growing sentiment that, if God is really concerned about matters of that nature, He is a trivial God." Dr. Willett is a liberal theologian. And here we have Lutherans, some of them of the clergy, who know, or ought to know, that the U. L. C. tolerates or even sanctions the denial of important teachings of Scripture and of the Lutheran Church and still insist (we shall quote the exact words): "Our petty divisions seem pitiful." "How small and mean and contemptible do our petty differences appear in the light of the great fundamental truths that were brought to light again in the Reformation!" "We have been misled to believe that our fine-spun definitions and our growing traditions are eternal and changeless." "I want to state emphatically that the real issue is not Missouri or the United Lutheran Church. That issue is a dead, meaningless issue of yesterday. . . . Basically we are suffering from the deadly disease of orthodoxy. . . . We have come to identify conservative Lutheranism with the dogmatic orthodoxy of Missouri at its worst." "Artificial, man-made barriers have been separating Lutherans in America." "Our minor differences are not fundamental moral and religious differences." "On essentials we are agreed. Why, then, can we not agree on, or forget, non-essentials? . . . When Lutherans forget their silly differences, then the Lutheran Church in America will grow as it never grew before." "The tragedy of this whole battle of words and logic." "The curse of superlogic." "Our divisions, our competition, our cross purposes, are unpardonable sin." — Do these men know what they are talking about? E.

\* The *Lutheran*, published by the Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church, is disseminating the same views. On February 11, 1937, it published a review of Emil Brunner's *Our Faith*, which states: "We even doubt that Lutherans will find fault with his chapter on the 'Lord's Supper' — 'Not simply bread and wine, but Christ Himself is present in the Sacrament,' he affirms." Calvin had affirmed that long ago. When the Reformed speak of a "real presence," they do not mean the real presence of the body of Christ, but the presence of Christ with His benefits. Their phrase: "Christ is present!" takes the place of Luther's statement: "It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine." And Lutherans are not supposed to find fault with this phrase!

**Discussion in the U. L. C. on the Status of Women in the Church.**— It will be recalled that at the 1936 convention of the U. L. C., when the question came before the meeting whether women might be sent as delegates to synod, the majority of the committee which had considered the matter recommended that synod should express itself to the effect that the election of women delegates to meetings of synods is not unscriptural. The convention adopted the committee's recommendation, although the vote was not unanimous. When the question arose whether the resolution of the convention was binding for the consciences of those who did not consider it Scriptural, the Commission of Adjudication was charged with the task of studying, and giving a reply to, this question. If we understand the *Lutheran* of February 4 correctly, the question for the Commission of Adjudication has been worded thus: "Is this action binding upon the consciences of one who cannot accept it as a correct action?" It is our hope that the commission in question will bring in a report which will clearly state both what Scripture teaches on the status of women in the Church and on the binding character of a resolution like the one under discussion. A.

**The Troubles of the Chiliastic Literalists.**— The premillennialists declare that those who reject the doctrine of the millennium are out of harmony with Scripture, since the prophecies plainly state that the earthly kingdom of David will be reestablished, with his throne at Jerusalem. They insist that Scripture, understood in its literal, true sense, teaches that in the millennium Christ will rule this Davidic kingdom in visible glory. They charge the amillennialists, who hold that the prophecies foretell a spiritual kingdom of the Son of David, with apostasy from Scripture. In his book *Premillennialism or Amillennialism?* C. Feinberg, a premillennialist of the antetribulationist school, postponement-theory section, stresses this point again and again. "According to the angel's words Mary literally brought forth a son; His name was literally called Jesus; He was literally great; and He was literally called the Son of the Highest. Will it not be as literally fulfilled that God will yet give to Christ the throne of His father David, that He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and that of His glorious kingdom there shall be no end?" (P. 39.) See Luke 1, 32 f.; 2 Sam. 7, 16; Ps. 132. "Our aim shall be to show the consistency of the premillennial position as it is based on the literal sense of the Scriptures and to demonstrate that by that method, and that alone, can the entire Word of God be brought into harmony." (P. 52.) "Another purpose of the age is to fulfil God's oath and promise to David. God declared time and again that He would not lie to David. The millennial reign proves that He did not lie to him. . . . If God promises Israel a literal kingdom and then gives the world a spiritualized kingdom in this age, what becomes of the promises of God?" (P. 147.) "If the posterity of David in their present dispersion, with the kingdom of the house of David gone and the throne done away with and displaced by a spiritual kingdom, over which Christ rules from the throne where He is now seated, can be reasonably taken as a fulfilment of God's covenant with David, then words have indeed lost their meaning, and the Bible must be for us from henceforth an insoluble

riddle." (P.197.) "Amos predicted that God would raise up the tabernacle of David and 'build it as in the days of old.' In the days of old, if the Scriptures mean what they say, the tabernacle of David was on earth." (P.211.) And what sort of a kingdom does Scripture, taken in its literal, true sense, promise Israel? "Christ will come to reign over the Jewish nation for a thousand years." (P.213.) "Nature will be rejuvenated, and harmony will once more reign. The curse will be removed from the ground, and the desert and wilderness will be abundantly fruitful and productive. Animal creation also will experience a change, in which animals of rapacious appetites will become meek and tame. The age of man will be lengthened; for a man of one hundred years will be esteemed but a child. No longer will there be a division in the midst of Israel, but Israel and Judah will be united and will dwell together in their own land of blessing. The coming of the King to the Mount of Olives will bring about physical changes in the land that will alter its contour. The city of Jerusalem will be built again, adorned, and be fruitful as never before. The nations in the Kingdom will recognize the favored condition of Israel when God wipes away forever their reproach and uses them in the conversion of the Gentiles. The land will be redistributed among the twelve tribes, and the Temple will be rebuilt, with the sacrifices, as memorials, reinstated. Israel will also rule over the nations under the direct command of the King. All nations will dwell in obedience and submission to their righteous King." (P.146.)

The chief trouble with the chiliastic exegetics is that Scripture itself rejects the literalistic interpretation of the prophecies. Scripture itself plainly teaches that the kingdom promised to David and Israel is a spiritual kingdom and that these prophecies have their fulfilment in the Church, in the spiritual reign of Christ. See Acts 2, 16 ff.; 15, 14 ff.; Heb. 12, 22. We shall not discuss this matter in detail here; it is familiar to the readers of Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*; see III, 585 ff. Clinging to the *sensus literae*, the premillennialist departs from the *sensus literalis*, the literal sense being the sense intended.

But there are other troubles involving those who insist that the *sensus literae* is the true, intended, literal sense, and we propose to take that up at the present time because Professor Feinberg himself calls attention to it. He writes: "Amillennialists accuse the premillennialists of taking prophecy in its literal sense and yet shortening the eternal kingdom of Christ to a mere thousand years. We shall deal with this question more fully later." (P. 59.) That certainly presents quite a difficulty. According to these literalists the kingdom promised Israel is an earthly kingdom, with its seat of government at Jerusalem, in Palestine, possessed by the Jewish nation, and it shall endure for one thousand years. There is no getting around the fact that the prophecy (in Revelation) distinctly and repeatedly mentions "a thousand years." However, 2 Sam. 7, 16 distinctly says: "Thy kingdom shall be established forever," and Luke 1, 33: "Of His kingdom there shall be no end." But "one thousand years" and eternity are not equivalents, and an earthly kingdom cannot be an eternal kingdom. Nevertheless, the premillennialist insists that the prophecies have their fulfilment in the millennium. What is the solution of the difficulty? Professor Feinberg promised to



"deal with this question more fully later." But we have been unable to find the page—or pages—where it is discussed. However, from hints found here and there we know what his solution is. On page 147 he states that "the millennium is followed by the new heavens and the new earth." And what place the "new earth" occupies in dispensational theology, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of which Professor Feinberg is a coeditor, fully discloses. We are told, in the issue of October-December, 1936, that "the national entity of Israel will be preserved forever according to covenant promises"; that "Judaism has its eschatology reaching on into eternity with covenants and promises which are everlasting," while "Christianity has its eschatology which is different at every point"; that "the kingdom of heaven is always earthly"; that "one of the great burdens of predictive prophecy is the anticipation of the glories of Israel in a transformed earth under the reign of David's Son and that there is likewise much prediction which anticipates the glories of the redeemed in heaven"; that "there is a present distinction between earth and heaven which is preserved even after both are made new," and that "the Scriptures so designate an earthly people who go on as such into eternity." *Bibliotheca Sacra* of 1934 states on page 147 that "Israelites, as a nation, have their citizenship now and their future destiny centered only in the earth, reaching on to the new earth, which is yet to be, while Christians have their citizenship and future destination centered only in heaven, extending on into the new heavens that are yet to be." So the difficulty is solved. The thousand years extend into eternity. The earthly kingdom of David promised to the Jews will display its power and glory here on earth for a thousand years and eternally in another earth, the new earth. Feinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 238: "Christ will reign a thousand years over the earth with His saints in the covenanted kingdom of David," and p. 245: "He will be rightful King on the throne of His father David and will rule over the house of Jacob forever." So this trouble is ended—but only to beget new troubles. Scripture does indeed tell of "new heavens and a new earth" (see, for instance, Is. 65, 17 and Rev. 21, 1); but what law of chiliastic hermeneutics permits the dispensationalists to populate the "new earth" with Israelites, the "new heaven," however, with Christians? ("New heavens and a new earth" designates the glories of heaven. See CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 1934, p. 29 ff.) Again, "earthly" and "eternal" are contradictories; but the dispensationalist is required to think of the earthly kingdom of heaven as remaining earthly and still being eternal; "an earthly people who go on as such into eternity."

The dispensationalist gets into trouble in another respect. He finds himself relinquishing the *sensus literae* quite frequently. We find the statement on page 62: "The Forty-fifth Psalm depicts the marriage of the King." Here the chiliast finds himself unable to think of anything else than a spiritual marriage, just as he refuses, on this same page, to take the statement concerning the garments of the King smelling of myrrh, aloe, and cassia "literally." He declares that that is spoken "in Oriental fashion."—There is the prophecy Joel 3, 18: "The mountains shall drop down new wine." Dr. Pieper points out that the chiliasts here insist on the figurative interpretation. (*Chr. Dog.*, III, p. 587.)—Professor Fein-

berg on Ezek. 34: "Then will He set up a shepherd who will care for His sheep, even His servant David. Showers of blessing will make the land productive. The blessings of God that will attend the visible kingdom of the King of the lineage and house of David are further set before us in the thirty-sixth chapter." (P. 72.) The prophecy reads: "I will set up one shepherd over them, *even My servant David*," v. 23. Thinking literalistically, we find here the promise that God will raise up His servant David from the dead to rule in the millennium. Our dispensationalist cannot do that. He sees the prophecy pointing to a king of the house of David. He is not true to his principle of interpretation. We are not, of course, finding fault with the premillennialists for departing from the *sensus literae* in the matter of the marriage of the King and of the abundance of new wine and of "My servant David." But we tell them that they are getting in trouble with themselves when they insist that, if we do not take certain expressions literally, "then words have indeed lost their meaning, and the Bible must be for us from henceforth an insoluble riddle." Careful!

Finally, the dispensationalist is going to have a lot of trouble to get us to agree with his interpretation of the Book of Jonah. This matter will also serve to exemplify to what lengths a mind obsessed with a delusion will go in manipulating Scripture in order to find some confirmation of his error. We read on page 79: "When we turn to the prophet Jonah, we find no definite and explicit prophecy of the covenanted kingdom of David." That is certainly true. According to the literal sense we have here a story that deals with *Jonah and Nineveh*, with the perversity of Jonah and the wickedness of Nineveh, and with the patience and all-embracing mercy of God. But now the dispensationalist, who has been upbraiding us for departing from the *sensus literae*, frankly and unblushingly—for no reason whatever except to find support for his pet delusion—finds the chief importance of the book not in the literal story, but in what it allegedly *typifies*. Forget what it literally tells and find a figurative, typical interpretation! "Many are agreed that the sole purpose of the message is not to show the bigotry of the prophet or even how God accepts true repentance. Nor is the only purpose of the book to reveal that God is the God of all nations. The message of Jonah typifies in a most remarkable manner the whole life history of the nation of Israel. She will yet be gathered out of her captivity into her own land, where she will preach God's message to the nations in the kingdom, as confirmed by Isaiah and others. Jonah, then, is a typical book, demonstrating Israel's fulfilling her God-given and long-rejected mission in the age of the kingdom." The dispensationalist will have trouble to make the common Christian believe that.

E.

**A New Sect.**—It has been discovered by the author of the article "India's Seething Untouchables," published in the *Christian Century* of January 13, 1937. P. Oommen Philip (a native Hindu?) writes: "Effect of Christian Divisions. The divisions of the Christian Church with its competing denominations and mutually anathematizing sects are also much in evidence in India. The awakened depressed classes are not

a little confused by the extraordinary claim made by the Roman Catholic Church that it alone is the true Church, and by the counter-claims made by modern sects like Mussourie [1] Lutherans, Seventh-day Adventists and Pentecostal Christians that they are the custodians of true Christianity." We wonder whether Editor Morrison recognized the sect "Mussourie" which Contributor Philip mentions or whether he thought that "Mussourie" is derived from the Hindustani.

The reason why we are preserving this choice item by finding space for it in our MONTHLY is not so much because it illustrates the inability of many to distinguish between the claims of the Roman Catholics and of the Lutherans (there is a difference between saying that a Church is the alone-saving Church and that a Church is the true visible Church), but because it brings to our attention one of the favorite arguments of the unionist. The article is citing the case of "the Christian divisions" as "one of the important considerations which make it difficult for many among the depressed classes to look with favor on Christianity." The unionist likes to argue that, since the heathen and the churchless are confused and scandalized by the divisions obtaining in the Church, it is incumbent on the Christians to forget their differences and form one united Church, even though the differences continue. The premise is correct: People are confused by these divisions; it is a scandal and a crime that Christianity does not form one united visible Church. But the inference is false. The scandal cannot be removed by indifference towards the false teaching which has split the Church. The Christian way is to remove the false teaching. The "confusion" resulting from the divisions in the Church must not be charged to the defenders of the truth, but to the originators and defenders of heresies.

P. Oommen Philip explains in the *Christian Century* of April 21 that he "meant the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri" (which of course we knew), and then goes on to describe quite correctly (for which we thank him) Missouri as the uncompromising foe of unionism. "It is a matter for disappointment to all who have at heart the cause of interdenominational cooperation that this mission in India does not see its way to have, or encourage its converts to have, fellowship with Christians of other denominations. The 'Missouri Lutherans,' as they are briefly known here, do not have fellowship or cooperation even with other Lutheran missions from America and the continent of Europe which are at work in India. This mission and the Church associated with it are not yet constituent bodies of the Federation of Ev. Lutheran Churches in India which was established in 1926." E.

Speaking of unionism (of which the promiscuous exchange of pulpits, "pulpit-fellowship," is an outstanding feature), we submit the following pertinent paragraphs from an article appearing in the *Living Church* (Jan. 16, 1937). The matter is familiar to us, but it is well to know that others view it in the same light as we do. The principle stressed in the *Living Church* article is the correct one.

"Suburban and metropolitan churches have widely advertised Congregational, Presbyterian, and Methodist preachers at church services. The bishops seem to ignore the situation. The people apparently love to have it so. It seems so delightfully broad-minded. This growing

abuse is defended, not by reason, but by the raising of false issues or the old device of 'red herrings.' The invited Protestants are good preachers; isn't it better to have a first-class Methodist preach to us than a third-rate curate or perhaps a seminarian? Furthermore, they are godly men and have a message; should our people be denied the opportunity of hearing such a message? And the exchange of pulpits will hasten the day of reunited Christendom. . . .

"The herrings are all good, but they don't lead anywhere. Let us take a specific example. The late Dr. S. Parkes Cadman was advertised to preach in Grace Church, New York, last Lent. Dr. Cadman was a fine preacher, a noted orator, a leader of men, a man of unquestionably upright life, and one who had a message for the world of today. Quite seriously I say that I yield to no one in my personal admiration for him, which is the only reason why I select him as an illustration. But if the function of preaching is what the Church has always believed and what our Prayer-book sets forth, and if the solemn vows of our ordination are anything more than empty forms, then I respectfully submit that Dr. Cadman, with all of his unquestionable ability, was not only less qualified than a licensed seminarian to preach at Grace Church, but *he was absolutely and entirely disqualified. If he could 'so minister the doctrine of Christ as this Church hath received the same' with a good conscience, it would seem inconsistent for him to remain, as he was, a minister of a Church with quite different standards.* [Italics ours.] It was always worth while what he said. But the pulpit of the Episcopal Church is not the place for it. The people have a right to hear from the pulpit only the teachings of the Church, not the opinions of any man, clever and good as he may be.

"Of course, the exchange of pulpits will further unity among Christians if unity is to be attained by forgetting our differences. . . ." E.

In Spiritual Unity with Our Fathers of Faith.—Said a St. Louis preacher the other day: "Numerous other factors make it necessary for the minister to equip himself more fully. Because of a wider dissemination of education the minister must read constantly, widely, and critically. He must add travel to study and numerous contacts with real life to personal philosophy of life and thoughtful devotion to God. . . ." Yes, yes, we have more high-school students and college graduates in our congregations than formerly, and we must address ourselves to their needs. But in ministering to them, we must not forget that there are also those among our hearers who, as Dr. Adolf Hult of Augustana Seminary puts it, though "uneducated and unschooled," are powerfully "at home" in the Word, in Luther, and in the other Lutheran fathers, and we must know how to reach *them*, too. And it will benefit the high-school graduates, too, if they hear quite a bit of the theology of Luther and Walther and Stoeckhardt. By all means study modern philosophy; you need it. But above all study Luther and Pieper—that you need a thousand times more. And if we do not have many who are "at home" in Luther and Scriver and the other fathers, let us educate our college graduates up to that standard. This is what Dr. Hult wrote on this matter in the *Lutheran Companion* of February 25:—

"In spiritual unity with our fathers of faith our personal life and

corporate Christ-faith and life progress more soundly, definitely, and with richer helpfulness to other seeking souls. Are we growing thinner of content? Must we therefore strike out for novelties, for passing stimulatives, for quirks and conceits of interest, for 'fillers'? What profound regard a pastor formerly could have for one of these 'uneducated' and 'unschooled' lay folk who were powerfully 'at home' in the Word, in Luther, in Arndt, in Scriver, in Schartau, in Rosenius, in the deepest and richest fathers of Lutheran doctrine and Lutheran faith-life! I could relate much more on that point, even from my own home. Particularly does the vagrant churchism of our day require that type of preachers, facing the contemporary situation and needs with the immense stores of wealth and of spiritual experience our Church can offer. This is factitively decreasing. Hence even the pulpit shows thinness there. Modern we must be. Know our times—that is indisputable. Live for souls of today, certainly. Preach to our time: Luther did so; all the great spiritual heroes did. We must also. But all those fathers we know of had a cornucopia of spiritual insight, faith, life, experience, and power of expression to draw from. Have we? *Is our very language worn and every-dayish* and unable to draw water from the deep wells, to give it whether to aged men and women of mature faith or to children and seeking youth? Twenty-one years at the seminary brings me to wonder why we cannot increase in spiritual enrichment to the degree our fathers knew. We know administrative affairs somewhat better. We have more worldly tact. We can address us in the newspaperish idiom in facile manner. Oh, that we had more kinship with our fathers of great faith and *their wondrously expressive spirituality!* That can return. That can be gained if at the cost of as keen meditation and of as humble sense of cross and suffering as they. The price is worth the outlay. And oh, the cheer and the godly furtherance it brings!—These lines are given to any one, lay or clerical, who cares to think of a most significant spiritual concern." E.

**The Give-and-Take Plan of Union.**—The men getting ready for the unionistic venture of the World Conference on Faith and Order, to meet at Edinburgh next August, are told by a writer in the *Christian Century* of February 10 that, unless they adopt this plan, their enterprise will be abortive. "In this spirit of give and take we should go to Edinburgh." The Lutherans are particularly asked to take notice: "The Lutherans should be paged and told about it." This is the plan: "These communions must share their spiritual possessions by a process of exchange, each contributing something to others and gaining something which it did not bring and each perhaps discarding something altogether as outmoded or outgrown." If that is not done, "Edinburgh will be a failure." All right, what doctrine or practise should the Lutherans discard? You will be surprised. If we went to Edinburgh under this plan, we would offer as our contribution the doctrine of justification by faith alone. That is our most cherished spiritual possession, and we would like to have all share in it. But our author says: "In the spirit of give and take we should go to Edinburgh. The Anglicans should bring with them their doctrine of an apostolic succession, which seems to those who do

not hold it to be so full of assumptions, historical and theological, and they should be prepared to demonstrate its truth to their Christian brethren. Lutherans might bring their doctrine of justification by faith, which, as often formulated, conceals a subtle assumption, not so much in what it affirms as in what it implicitly denies." We are certainly glad to note that this writer is inclined to call the doctrine of justification by faith the distinctive Lutheran doctrine. But it seems that, when the Lutherans appear at Edinburgh, — the United Lutheran Church of America is sending a delegation, — the proponent of the give-and-take plan is going to call upon them to discard it and "take" something better. He will not have it put in the "give" column. Just what is wrong with it he does not state.

The Episcopalians will be called upon "to demonstrate the truth of their doctrine of an apostolic succession to their Christian brethren." The Lutherans, of course, will be expected to do the same with regard to their doctrine of justification by faith. What will happen if the Lutherans cannot convince the rest that what this doctrine "implicitly denies" is also denied by Scripture? Will the matter be settled by a majority vote?

Things must not be allowed to reach that pass. Under the "give-and-take" method this difficulty will not arise. This method presupposes that the delegates will not take their stand on Scripture. And it is the purpose of the article under discussion to wean the delegates from the mistaken notion that Scripture is the final authority. "The motto of the Disciples of Christ, 'Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent' cannot be recognized as binding." Doctrines must not be based on Scripture alone. "Has the accumulated experience of the centuries no authority? Has Christian tradition no weight? Did God cease to speak to men when the New Testament canon was closed?" The article then goes on to demonstrate that Scripture cannot settle matters of doctrine by employing the old argument: "Using the proof-text method, which Baptists themselves employ, each denomination could draw a very respectable argument for its contentions from the New Testament. . . . Surely all these differing interpretations cannot be right." And then comes the astounding statement: "Perhaps all can be right even though they differ. 'In the New Testament,' says Prof. Wilhelm Hermann in *Communion with God*, 'there is no unalterable doctrine which embraces the whole scheme of Christian thought. . . . It is no imperfection, it is rather an excellence, and thoroughly as it should be, that the epistles of the New Testament are messages for definite circumstances and not contributions to a doctrinal system which shall be valid to all eternity.' This, if true, is important, and the Lutherans should be paged and told about it." The "give-and-take" plan will not work if the Lutherans keep on believing and insisting that their doctrine, based on Scripture, is unalterable. It will work only if people get imbued with the spirit of uncertainty. When people are no longer persuaded of the truth of Scripture and hold that there is no absolute truth, they will be ready to engage in doctrinal dickerings. And therein lies the strength of unionism, the mighty appeal of the "give-and-take" plan of union; in doctrinal incertitude and indifference.

The "give-and-take" plan does not appeal to Karl Barth. He is in favor of a different brand of unionism, which is just as monstrous as the "give-and-take" plan. In his lecture *The Church and the Churches*, which the secretariate of the World Conference incorporated in the pamphlet *World Conference on Faith and Order—Prolegomena to the 1937 World Conference*, he says on page 36: "Within the multiplicity each Church can represent the unity of the Church if in its ordinances it is zealous for Christ. Each several Church should ask itself the same question with regard to the central problem of doctrine. It may sound like perilous relativism; yet of this problem also I will say the same thing—let the Roman Church work out its doctrine of nature and grace, with the Tridentine teaching on justification, to their logical conclusions; let the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies do the same with their specific eucharistic doctrine and neo-Protestantism with its doctrine of man's natural goodness; but let them do this not merely in a syllogistic spirit nor as working with logical fervor on the basis of presuppositions which stop short of being ultimate, but as listening to Christ, to Christ of the Scriptures. . . . Those who fail to understand other churches than their own are not the people who care intensely about theology, but the theological dilettants, eclectics, and historians of all sorts; while those very men who have found themselves forced to confront a clear thorough-going, logical *sic et non* find themselves allied to each other, in spite of all contradictions, by an underlying fellowship and understanding, even in the cause which they handle so differently and approach from such painfully different angles. But that cause, it may be, is nothing else than Jesus Christ and the unity of the Church." This is the opposite of the "give-and-take" plan. The Barthian plan does not ask the churches to discard any of their doctrines. It permits the Roman Church to retain its doctrine of justification by works; the Lutheran Church its doctrine of the Real Presence, the Calvinistic bodies the doctrine of the Spiritual Presence. All that is required under the Barthian plan is that the churches persuade themselves that these different teachings do not destroy the unity of the Church. They need only persuade themselves that they are obeying the Spirit of Christ in espousing their particular teachings, and they will "find themselves allied to each other, in spite of all contradictions, by an underlying fellowship and understanding." This is, of course, not a specific discovery of Barth. It is the old contention of unionism. The unionists have insisted from the beginning that the differences of doctrine should not divide the churches, that each Church is entitled to maintain its own peculiar development, that all should practise Christian forbearance, that no Church should charge any other Church with false teaching.—The Barthian plan and the "give-and-take" plan differ in detail, but agree in the fundamental principle that there is no fixed, unalterable doctrine given the Church to maintain. "Perhaps all can be right, even though they differ," says the *Christian Century*. And Barth declares that the Catholics and Lutherans and Calvinists should maintain their differing doctrines "as listening to Christ, to *Christ of the Scriptures*." Scripture sanctions any doctrine, no doctrine. Unionism, in all its forms, stands for doctrinal incertitude. E.

**"Rethinking Religion."**—That is the title of a recent popular book by A. E. Avey, professor of philosophy in the Ohio State University, a condensation of which is offered in the *Religious Digest*. In a way, it is a modernistic dogmatics, since here the dogmas of Liberalism are presented in a somewhat systematic and definite form. And how does a modernistic dogmatist treat his loci? A few examples may help the reader in understanding how altogether negative modernistic philosophy is.

1. *Religion*. It is the effort of a man to adjust himself to Ultimate Reality.
2. *The Purpose of Modernistic Theology*. The purpose is to arrive at a useful restatement of the fundamental religious ideas which are eternal and which at the same time will be a new embodiment, harmonious with the esthetic and scientific progress of the age.
3. *The Preservation of Religion*. The only way of surely preserving the vitality of religion is to translate it from the obscurity of antiquity to the clarity of current experience.
4. *The Central Thought in Religion*. The focal appeal of religion is *incarnation*, the fascinating union of the Infinite with the finite.
5. *Religious Living*. Religious living means to express in human conduct the divine spirit.
6. *The Apprehension of the Truth*. The only aspect of truth which for us is absolute are the general principles of thinking, and only that religion which answers perfectly the tests of evidence and analysis can be recognized as valid. Inevitable contradiction occurs when Buddhist, Hindu, Ishmaelite, and Christian each avers that his particular scripture is the exclusive revelation of ultimate truth.
7. *The Existence of Evil*. A personal devil is actually the negation of personality; being evil is therefore no person at all, but an evil tendency. (What erudite reasoning!)
8. *God*. God being in some degree manifest everywhere, all things participate in His incarnation in reality. We may agree that Jesus was God incarnate, but we disagree that God was incarnate alone in Jesus.
9. *Immortality*. From the standpoint of human aspiration there is nothing religious in the concept of immortality; for immortality has a legitimate place in religion only in so far as the immortal being is of some interest to God.
10. *Salvation*. The important thing in salvation is not certain formalistic processes, but rather moral excellence of character. Individuals of greater moral influence have a higher degree of salvation than those of lesser influence. The rationality of the ethical religion dooms the special revelation and the arbitrary imposition of standards of righteousness and sin.
11. *Heaven*. Heaven is a place of vigor and activity in the persistent advance in the single direction of eternal values.
12. *The Church*. The Church in all its aspects exists for the constant perfecting of human life, and one of the chief means of doing so is by the adoption of an educational program for adults.
13. *The Church's Method of Saving Souls*. Salvation of souls is the ultimate function of the Church, which, by directing its members to unselfish and moral living, by instructing them in the tasks of parenthood, citizenship, social living, etc., cultivates people's intellects and stabilizes their emotions.
14. *The Task of the Church*. A great task of the Church is the synthesis of the great world religions into a brotherhood of the spirit of Christ, no matter what external form it assumes, just so it contributes to the ideal unity of those who have gained a true insight into the nature of religion.



15. *Human Responsibility.* The inexorable law of heredity seems to absolve man from responsibility; but if he is absolved, human life holds no moral significance whatever. The tendency of modern thought is toward immanent monism, which then would identify even the impulse of the universe with the thought of man and, *vice versa*, a perfect harmony of thought and action. 16. *Prayer.* Prayer is a psychological process of pragmatic and symbolic value. The essential thing is the suppliant attitude toward its object. 17. *The Religion of the Future.* The religion of the future will be syncretistic or synthetic. The justification for missionary endeavor lies in the view that all men seek the same good from their existence, but some have attained a clearer vision of what this good is and have gone farther along the way. The attitude of generous appreciation of the insight of non-Christian religions is no violation of the spirit of Christ; it is rather one of the most wholesome possible expressions of it. — But why write more? Every new statement quoted only shows the more clearly how shallow and empty Modernism is and that it offers in its soaring, high-sounding expressions nothing but the vaguest teachings of naturalism. The house that Modernism builds is nothing but a miserable shack, and at that, one built on quicksand. And yet, just that is the "religion" and "theology" which men like Rockefeller, Jones, and others are advocating for their "united Christian Church."

J. T. M.

## II. Ausland

Die „missourische“ Lehre vom Antichristen. — „Erst den Missouriern war es im 19. Jahrhundert vorbehalten, das Dogma von dem Antichristentum des Papstes aufzustellen.“ Das schreibt Pfarrer Karl Nonnge in der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Mz.“ Der VII. Artikel in der Serie, „Bemühungen um eine lutherische Kirchenverfassung“, der, nebenbei gesagt, auch von dem „iure divino bezeugten, symbolisch festgestellten Episkopat der lutherischen Kirche“ redet, schließt (S. 1018, 23. Okt. 1936) mit dem Passus: „Mit Recht erklärt darum Stahl: Nirgends haben auch die evangelischen Bekenntnisschriften diese Stellung zur katholischen Kirche als einen Glaubensartikel aufgestellt. Die Bezeichnung des Papstes als Antichrist in den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln ist nur eine beiläufige. In ihren Privatschriften haben die Reformatoren allerdings solche Benennungen wie Antichrist, babylonische Hure häufig gebraucht. Aber das erklärt sich aus der Hitze des Kampfes in jener Zeit und noch mehr daraus, daß sie nur die Sünde innerhalb der Kirche vor sich hatten und keine Anschauung von der Sünde außerhalb und wider die Kirche. Wie ganz anders würden sie sich gestellt haben, hätten sie die Mächte des Abgrundes gelannt, welche wir in unsern Tagen aus der Tiefe emporsteigen sahen.“ (Ev. Kirchenzeitung, 1852.) Erst den Missouriern war es im 19. Jahrhundert vorbehalten, das Dogma von dem Antichristentum des Papstes aufzustellen. (Gust. Frank, Gesch. der Prot. Theologie, Viertes Teil. Vgl. auch die Dogmatik von Pieper.)“

Witte, die Missourier haben nicht die Lehre aufgebracht, daß der Papst der Antichrist ist. Die lutherische Kirche hat diese Lehre öffentlich bekannt, lange ehe es Missourier gab. Die Schmalkaldischen Artikel lehren, „papam esse ipsum verum antichristum“. (Trigl., S. 474.) Die Ausrede Stahls und Pfarrers Nonnges, diese Bezeichnung sei „nur eine beiläufige“, hält nicht

Stich. Diese Bezeichnung kehrt zu oft wieder, wird zu nachdrücklich ausgesprochen und zu deutlich als die Lehre der Schrift bezeichnet, als daß die Meinung aufkommen könnte, die Väter hätten hier nicht eine Lehre bekennen wollen. Der entschiedene Ausspruch auf S. 474: „Soteneig wir den Teufel selbst für einen Herrn oder Gott anbeten können, so wenig können wir auch seinen Apostel, den Papst oder Endechrist, in seinem Regiment zum Haupt oder Herrn leiden“ ist keine „nur beiläufige“ Bemerkung. Der ganze Artikel, IV, ist doch nicht nur so nebenbei in das Bekenntnis gekommen. Die Aussage auf S. 514: „So reimen sich auch alle Untugenden, so in der Heiligen Schrift vom Antichrist sind gezeuget, mit des Papstes Reich und seinen Gliedern usw.“ ist eine wohlüberlegte und ernstgemeinte. S. 516: „Alle Christen sollen vom Papst und seinen Gliedern oder Anhang als von des Antichrists Reich weichen und es verfluchen.“ Das soll nur so beiläufig gesagt sein? S. 520: „Man soll sich aus Not wider ihn als den rechten Antichrist setzen.“ Wieder die beiläufige Bezeichnung. Man muß das eben nicht so ernst nehmen, sagt Stahl. Im II. Artikel des zweiten Teils findet sich diese beiläufige Aussage: „Invocatio sanctorum est etiam pars abusu et errorum antichristi.“ (S. 468.) Hier gibt sich das Bekenntnis nicht einmal die Mühe, ausdrücklich zu sagen, daß Antichrist eine Bezeichnung des Papstes ist. Und nun gebraucht gar die Konfessionsformel zweimal so ganz beiläufig die beiläufige Bezeichnung der Schmalkaldischen Artikel: „seinen Apostel, den Papst oder Antichrist“. (S. 1058.) „Alle Christen sollen vom Papst und seinen Gliedern oder Anhang als von des Antichrists Reich weichen.“ In der Bezeichnung „Antichrist“ liegt ja gerade die Begründung der Warnung. Und Begründungen pflegt man nicht nur so beiläufig anzubringen.

Nein, für diese Lehre darf man nicht die Missourier verantwortlich machen. Sie ist ja nicht einmal eine Sonderlehre der lutherischen Kirche. Die reformierten Kirchen haben dieselbe Lehre bekannt. So heißt es z. B. in dem Westminster-Bekenntnis der Presbyterianer, chapter XXV: „Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof [of the Church], but is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God, Matt. 23, 8—10; 2 Thess. 2, 3 ff.“ Allerdings haben die Neu-Presbyterianer 1903 diese Aussage ihres Bekenntnisses so abgeändert: „The claim of any man to be the vicar of Christ and the head of the Church is unscriptural, without warrant in fact, and is a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ, Matt. 23, 8—10; 1 Pet. 5, 2—4; 2 Thess. 2, 3, 4.“ Aber es handelt sich jetzt nicht um die Frage, wer heute noch glaubt, daß der Papst der rechte Antichrist sei, sondern um die Frage, ob es wahr ist, daß diese Lehre erst im 19. Jahrhundert, unter den Missouriern, aufgefunden ist.

Was hat wohl Calvin in dieser Sache gelehrt? Die zwanzig Kapitel des vierten Buches seiner *Institutio* haben es zumeist mit dem Papsttum zu tun und der 25. Abschnitt des 7. Kapitels mit der Bezeichnung des Papstes als des Antichristen. Nicht „so beiläufig“, sondern *ex professo* gibt Calvin sich damit ab: „To some we seem slanderous and petulant when we call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist.“ (Er verwahrt sich dagegen, daß diese Bezeichnung ihm „in der Hitze des Kampfes“ entfahren sei.) „But those who think so perceive not that they are bringing a charge of intemperance against Paul, after whom we speak, nay, in whose very words we speak.“

(Nicht die Missourier, sondern Paulus hat diese Lehre „aufgebracht“.) “But lest any one object that Paul's words have a different meaning and are wrested by us against the Roman Pontiff, I will briefly show that they can only be understood of the Papacy. Paul says that Antichrist would sit in the temple of God, 2 Thess. 2, 4,” etc., etc.

Pfarrer Konnige sagt: „Vergleiche auch die Dogmatik von Pieper.“ Ja, gewiß, Pieper sagt: „die Lehre vom Antichrist gehört nicht zum Fundament der fides salvifica“ (I, S. 102). Die Missourier behandeln diese Sache allerdings als eine Lehre des göttlichen Wortes. Und sie behandeln sie gründlich. Der Abschnitt „Der Antichrist“ weist auf 7½ Seiten nach, daß der Papst der geweisagte Antichrist ist (III, S. 527 ff.). Aber das bildet nicht eine Eigentümlichkeit der missourischen Dogmatik. Charles Hodge verwendet in seiner *Systematic Theology* 22¼ Seiten auf das Thema „Antichrist“ (III, p. 812 ff.). Da findet sich denn auch der bemerkenswerte Satz: “Any future antichrist that may arise must be a small affair compared to the Papacy” (S. 816). Darüber zum Schluß noch einige Worte. Stahl meint ja, die Reformatoren hätten sich geirrt, als sie annahmen, daß in dem Greuel des Papsttums die Bosheit Satans ihren Gipfelpunkt erreicht habe. Hodge hingegen erklärt, daß, was auch die Zukunft bringen möge, nichts den Greuel des Papsttums erreichen werde noch könne. Pieper drückt das so aus: „Es kann keinen größeren Feind der Kirche Gottes geben als das Papsttum. Die Kirche lebt in der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und durch dieselbe. . . . Aber das Papsttum mordet nun schon seit einem Jahrtausend immerfort Millionen geistlich, nachdem es sie unter dem Schein der geistlichen Pflege angelockt hat. Woher diese befremdliche und traurige Tatsache, daß fast alle neueren „gläubigen“ Theologen nach dem Antichristen umhersuchen, während derselbe vor ihren Augen groß und mächtig sein Werk in der Kirche hat? Sie stehen nicht in der lebendigen Erkenntnis der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und der Wichtigkeit dieser Lehre für die Kirche.“ (II, S. 668 ff.) E.

An English Correspondent Publishes an “Open Letter” of Dr. Dibelius.—The *Manchester Guardian* recently carried the following item sent it by its representative in Germany:—

“Dr. Dibelius, one of the most eminent of modern German Protestant theologians, has addressed an ‘open letter’ to Herr Kerrl, the German Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. . . . The following are the most important passages:

“The issue [that is to say, the issue in the German religious conflict and more particularly in the coming elections for a new general synod of the Evangelical Church] is one of life and death, and not only for the Evangelical Church, but also, as it seems to me, for the German people. In such a matter every Christian is bound to ask himself if he can do anything so that the worst may perhaps be averted. . . .

“The doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Son of God has not been thought out by men. It is the fundamental revelation of Holy Writ. All our faith depends on this doctrine. From it we derive our hold in this life and our comfort in death. In a time like the present this doctrine is identical with Christianity itself. For if Jesus of Nazareth was a man as we all are, then every one can criticize and alter His teaching. The Sacraments of the Church no longer have a meaning then, nor has the

Church the right then to oppose the gospels as the eternal, unchangeable truth of God to Alfred Rosenberg's "Myth." We would then have been thrust from the bedrock of God's revelation into the quicksands of human opinion and would be helpless in an epoch that recites the praises of new gods. . . .'

"Herr Kerrl has stated that revelation is a matter of race and blood. Dr. Dibelius replies in his open letter:

"The New Testament says nothing about the will of God being imparted into our blood. It says only one thing — that whatever is in man lies under the curse of self-will and that the will of God is made manifest to man in Jesus Christ, the living Word. The Evangelical pastor is pledged by the vow he took when he was ordained to teach no other doctrine than the doctrine proclaimed in God's clear Word as contained in the Old and New Testaments of Holy Writ. . . .

"You have also said: "The priests declare that Jesus is a Jew, that they speak of the Jew Paul and say that salvation comes from the Jews. But this will not do. . . ."

"As the attacks of the opponent are now being concentrated on this point all the time, the Church is compelled to answer. Yes, Jesus of Nazareth is, according to his human nature, of the house of David and therefore a Jew. The New Testament tells us this clearly and unmistakably. That Paul was a Jew has never been contested by any one. But to abstain from the letters of the apostle is denied to the Church if the Church does not wish to cease being the Church of Christ. And that salvation comes from the Jews is written in the fourth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, where Jesus speaks to the Samaritan woman, though it has there a sense very different from what is asserted in the polemics of the Church's enemies, who do not know their Bible. . . .'

"Let me ask you one question, Herr Reichsminister,' proceeds Dr. Dibelius: 'If in the morning's religious instruction the children are told that the Bible is God's Word, which speaks to us in the Old and New Testaments, and when in the afternoon young people have to memorize: "Which is our Bible? Our Bible is Hitler's *Mein Kampf*," who is to change his doctrine here?

"This is the decisive point. When you demand that the Evangelical Church shall not be a state within the state, every Evangelical Christian will agree. The Church must be a church and not a state within the state. But the doctrines which you proclaim would have the effect of making the state into the Church in so far as the state, supported by its coercive powers, comes to decisions with regard to the sermons that are preached and the faith that is confessed.

"Here lies the root of the whole struggle between the state and the Evangelical Church. This struggle will never come to an end as long as the state does not recognize its own frontiers. . . . Hitler's state can count on the service of Evangelical Christians; . . . but as soon as the state endeavors to become Church and to assume power over the souls of men, . . . then we are bound by Luther's word to offer resistance in God's name. And that is what we shall do.'"

A.