

3-1-1938

Theological Observer. – Kirchlch 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. (1938) "Theological Observer. – Kirchlch Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 9 , Article 22.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol9/iss1/22>

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.

Theological Observer — Kirchl. Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

Lutheran Chiliasts.—Reviewing, in the *Lutheran Standard* of January 8, *The Word of Prophecy* by two Augustana clergymen (Samuel M. Miller and Halvar G. Randolph), Prof. E. C. Fendt of the Columbia Seminary says among other things:

"The authors believe that what is known in our circles as millennialism is the doctrine of the Scriptures. Yet their book differs from most of the other books on this subject in that the features incidental to the millennium are made more prominent than the millennium itself. Much space is devoted to the national and spiritual restoration of the Jews; the *parousia* of the Lord, when He comes for His saints, living and deceased, who are caught up to meet Him in the air; the tribulations that shall follow this event for those left behind on the earth; and the return of the Lord for judgment on His enemies. In order not to say that there will be two comings of the Lord, the *parousia* is not classified as a coming, but only as a 'stage of His coming,' the Lord merely descending from heaven (not reaching the earth) and the caught-up saints meeting Him in the air. With the saints safely out of the great tribulation, who are the elect on the earth for whose sakes 'those days shall be shortened' (Matt. 24:22)?

"The millennial teaching of the two resurrections is likewise expounded. Believers will be raised and judged at the first stage of Christ's coming. Unbelievers will be raised after an interval of a thousand years and judged at the return of the Lord in glory. If that is so, why did the Lord Jesus use the singular for 'hour' in John 5:28, 29? The theory of two resurrections and two judgments, with an interval of a thousand years between them, cannot be made to harmonize with the plain statement of Jesus. The teaching of Scripture regarding the suddenness of the Lord's coming (Luke 10:40; 21:34, 35; 2 Pet. 3:10) becomes meaningless for the millennialist, e. g., 'It is only to unbelievers that His return will be as a thief.' (P. 155.)

"If the authors were not so well known and if the name of the Lutheran Bible Institute were not found on the title-page, one might suspect that this book had been published under the auspices of another Bible institute, whose eschatological teaching is gaining adherents in many denominations, especially among those better known as Fundamentalists. Yet when Fundamentalism and millennialism become synonymous (they have for some), the old duality of authority between Scripture and tradition, Scriptural revelation and human reasoning, is revived. Men read their expectations into Scripture, then proclaim them as Scripture, and Scripture goes begging for its own witnesses. The false hope of an earthly kingdom beclouded the eyes of many of God's people at the first advent of the Lord; will not millennialism do the same regarding His second advent?"

E.

Striking Excerpts from Dr. J. A. W. Haas's Recently Published Dogmatic Compend "What Is Revelation?"—In recent years theological professors of the U. L. C. A. have published a number of dogmatic compends in which they set forth their more or less liberal views and, in particular, their often considerable deviations from the Lutheran Confessions. Dr. Haas's recently published compend, brief though it is, is no exception; it, too, is badly infected with the rationalizing enthusiasm of modern Continental theology. In our review of the book we have already pointed out a number of such departures from the Lutheran standards of faith; we shall add a few more at this place in order that our readers may see the more clearly how even a supposed conservative in the U. L. C. A. has in many points left the ancient paths of Lutheran orthodoxy. On the prevalent disunion of the Lutheran churches of our country Dr. Haas writes: "In the American Lutheran Church there is more doctrinal unity than in any other Protestant Church; but the great hindrances to a closer unity are a too strict adherence to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theology and an unwillingness to allow for the freedom of varying theological inferences and speculations, resting upon honestly differing interpretations of the Word, which do not impair the validity and integrity of revelation." (P. 152.) In our opinion hardly anything more unfair could have been written on the matter than just this. The "theological inferences and speculations" of which Dr. Haas speaks do not merely rest upon "honestly differing interpretations of the Word." Nor is it true that they do not "impair the validity and integrity of revelation." The points in controversy are, for instance, the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Bible, the *sola gratia*, the question of faithful Christian profession, and the like. The matter at stake is to keep out of large Lutheran circles such destructive things as Modernism, rationalism, syncretism, and the decadence of Lutheran teaching and practise in general. Men like Dr. Haas represent Melancthonism rather than Lutheranism.

Dr. Haas does not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. He writes: "Men were never saved by a Bible that was mechanically perfect in its verblity." (P. 16.) As the context shows, this statement does not mean that today our copies are no longer without faults, but that the Bible itself is not verbally reliable. In a discussion of the doctrine of Scriptural inspiration Dr. Haas says: "A theory of the action of the Spirit upon men in producing revelation long prevailed that the recipients were altogether passive. They were supposed to be mere penmen, to whom the Holy Spirit dictated everything down to detailed and single words. This idea was wrongly called inspiration, and it consisted in the action of the Holy Spirit merely pouring the truth into the minds of men who remained purely passive and whose minds could be compared to blank tablets upon which the Spirit wrote. But the actual condition of the revelation deposited in the Bible is different. There is a human factor receptive of the divine, and there is a double nature as there are two natures in Christ. . . . The minds of men do not become submerged, but they are under the constant guidance of the Spirit, whose influence is not to be underestimated." (P. 83.) While our Lutheran teachers insisted on the verbal inspiration of the Bible and sometimes

also used the term *dictation*, current especially among Roman Catholic theologians of that time, they stated at the same time that the holy penmen of God wrote *volitionally* and *intelligently* and not as the ancient prophets of pagan idols issued their cryptic message, in a state of enthusiasm, in which they were unconscious of what they said. Dr. Haas's own view of the Bible is that of a book which is essentially human, but which was composed under the guidance of the Spirit, whose influence of course (what a wonderful caution!) must not be underestimated. When Dr. Haas says that "there is a human factor receptive of the divine" and that "there is a double nature [in the Bible] as there are two natures in Christ," he is repeating the view of Barthian and other neorationalist Continental theologians, who regard the Bible as entirely human in most parts, but divine in those which "urge Christ," that is, in which the doctrine of salvation is set forth.

And Dr. Haas seems to champion synergism. Of course, he speaks very guardedly and in places apparently in entire agreement with the Lutheran Confessions, which affirm the *sola gratia*. But he also says: "Regeneration is wholly the work of the Spirit, while conversion includes our turning to God by the renewed will of regeneration." (P. 121.) That may not sound very bad; but apparently Dr. Haas teaches that through regeneration a person is enabled to convert himself by his renewed will, so that here we have the old Latermannian form of synergism, which claims that a person converts himself by means of endowed spiritual gifts or powers. That this really is the sense of Dr. Haas's words is clear from the statement made a little later: "As man's effort is included in conversion, and it is not a purely passive operation, it leads on to the development of spiritual life, generally termed sanctification." (P. 122.) Dr. Haas here intermingles conversion and sanctification and makes the activity of the regenerate person in sanctification depend on his activity or cooperation in conversion.

But let this suffice. The issue is certainly not on minor differences in interpreting the Bible, but on essentials. In an age when many Reformed theologians are reaffirming the doctrines of verbal and plenary inspiration and of the *sola gratia* against the encroaching forces of Modernism, it is a pity to see Lutheran theologians speak in terms of doubt and denial on these weighty doctrines.

J. T. M.

The U. L. C. and the World Council of Churches.—In the *Lutheran* of January 26 the editor writes: "For a while at least we have no intention of becoming excited over the fact that the President of the United Lutheran Church has been authorized by our Executive Board to be named one of the sixty persons who will assemble in Holland next May in order to draft a constitution for the proposed World Council of Churches. This Council, which will number sixty persons, will serve as the executive committee for a larger body to be elected by the groups who were represented at the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences last summer. At the latter the United Lutheran Church was officially represented, but not at Oxford. We were in attendance at a 'continuation meeting' of the delegates to the two conferences which was held in Washington, January 10—12. We learned that Western non-Roman

groups of Christians were assigned twelve out of the sixty who will constitute the Council, that Canadian communions get two of the twelve and American denominations the remaining ten. Unless changes are made, Methodist and Baptist groups will each have two of the ten, in recognition of their numbers and of the divisions into Northern and Southern conferences. There will be an alternate for each primarius. The alternate for Dr. Knubel was not announced.

"Beyond question, representatives of the Lutheran Church are cordially welcomed in circles such as the one we visited in Washington. The late Dr. Steimle, Drs. Wentz, Flack, Greever, and the others who go to the representative conferences of Protestant denominations are heard respectfully, even when they express limitations to cooperation and dissent to methods and principles proposed. One occasionally hears expressions of wonder that the Lutheran convictions must be so tenderly protected from confusion and corruption as to require isolation. But these are lobby comments and not official expressions. And they are very politely and carefully phrased. We ourselves sometimes wonder what would happen if Lutheranism occasionally took a chance on being infected by contacts. We, however, feel incompetent to draw any conclusions.

"But Protestantism with Lutheranism absent is a fifty-per-cent. group. Protestantism with Northern Europe and Central Europe out of the Conference really leaves the battle against hierarchy to be waged by a part of our evangelical forces. Some observers are seeing hierarchy and dictatorships or hierarchy and Fascism as allies and citing phenomena of rather startling resemblance to portents of a combination of the two.

"We personally rejoice to know that American Lutherans and at least a section of Europe's faithful see their way to connection with the World Council of Churches."

What becomes of the anathema which the apostle hurls at those who teach another gospel, which is not another? A.

Celibacy Advocated by Some Anglicans.—From London comes the report that six prominent laymen of the Church of England have addressed a memorial to its archbishops suggesting that the endeavor be made to provide an unmarried clergy especially in the foreign field. The memorial says: "They [i. e., the ordinands] should be invited to consider whether they may not have a true vocation to remain unmarried. If any man should respond to this invitation, he should be asked to undertake that he will not marry for five years after ordination except with the consent of the bishop in whose diocese he is at work. At the end of the five years he would resume his freedom to embrace either the vocation of marriage or that of celibacy. It is by this means, without any violent change, that the gradual evolution of a body of unmarried clergy is contemplated."

These people mean well, but are they not aware that they are playing with fire? Voluntary celibacy has always been within the realm of possibility for the clergy. One is here reminded of how the celibacy of priests arose in the Church, namely, first as something voluntary,

which, however, in the course of time was made a yoke from which there was no escape. One reaction to the proposal is said to be the wide-spread view that candidates should remain unmarried for five years.

A.

The Revised Version again to be Revised.—The International Council of Religious Education, custodian of the American Standard Version of the Bible, has ordered a further revision when funds are available. The King James Version was revised in 1881 by a company of British and American scholars. The American committee diverged somewhat from their English colleagues and in due course produced their Revised Version in 1901 with the consent of the English section. Now, after a generation of language study and archeological research, there is held to be a need for another revision. In addition, the statement of the committee voiced the desire to seek a version which would approximate the purity of the English of the so-called Authorized Version. In spite of undoubted excellencies of scholarship neither of the revisions has ever displaced the 1611 version for devotional purposes and for public reading.

The Presbyterian

The Child Labor Amendment in Kentucky.—The commonwealth of Kentucky by its Court of Appeals has unanimously declared invalid, and therefore without effect, the recent ratification by its Legislature of the so-called Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is the court's contention: first, that a State having once acted on an amendment has no right later to reverse its vote without a re-submission of the question to Congress; secondly, that an amendment is definitely rejected and *ipso facto* outside the field of further consideration if more than one fourth of the States have affirmed their rejection of any measure submitted; and thirdly, that further action by a State has lost its potency and is therefore invalid if taken after failure to reach decision "within a reasonable time" following submission. So writes Dr. Ewing in the *Presbyterian* of December 30, 1937. He tells us that Kentucky, in 1926, rejected the amendment. In January, 1937, the action was reversed. "It is the claim of the Kentucky Court of Appeals that to reassemble the Legislature of a State and repeat an election after an amendment has been submitted and a decision given is to do violence to the Constitution and therefore to the only method we have of enacting laws, and that the act purporting to ratify the Youth Control Amendment of January 13, 1937, is therefore without effect."

A.

Citizenship Refused to Conscientious Objectors.—In the *Living Church* we read that Rev. Theodore Bell, rector of St. John's Church, Del Monte, an Englishman by birth, was refused citizenship papers because he stated "that he would be willing to take part only in a war of defense and that he himself and not the State would have to decide whether the war was one of defense or aggression." The case has been appealed. Before a decision is handed down, disposition of a test case now before the United States Supreme Court will be awaited. From the same source we learn that in Chicago a Mennonite minister, Abraham Warkentin, was denied citizenship by a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals because he refused to promise that he would

bear arms when called upon to do so by his country. That the Episcopalian was right in stating that, while he was willing to obey the Government of the United States, he would consider it his prime duty to observe the principle voiced by the apostles "We ought to obey God rather than men," ought to be conceded. Different is the case of the Mennonite, who states that he under no circumstances will bear arms under the flag of his country. If a government refuses to grant citizenship to people holding such tenets, it is within its rights. The Mennonite, it is true, will argue that he, too, merely gives first place to the principle that we must obey God rather than men and that he refuses to bear arms because this, as he sees it, is contrary to the will of God. The State, however, has a right to say that with such tenets held by its citizens its existence is impossible and that hence it cannot acknowledge as citizens people of this type.

A.

An Episcopalian Teesterite.—In 1934 Albert Teester, a Holiness preacher of Sylva, N. C., got a lot of publicity when he allowed a rattlesnake to bite him, publicly, in his pulpit, in order to prove the truth of his religion and the power of God to protect him. An epidemic of "rattlesnake religion" thereupon broke out. Other Holiness people were demanding similar "signs" from their preachers. Just now the daily press is reporting the doings of Dean Israel H. Noe of the Memphis Cathedral. On January 2 he inaugurated his fast, abstaining from food and water, on the plea that the Church needs to offer living proof of man's immortality to bring doubters to its services. He declared from the pulpit, as quoted by the secular press and the *Living Church*, that, "unless the Church of Jesus Christ in this twentieth century can produce a demonstration of the fact that the whole Gospel can be lived here and now by man, the Church will be compelled to close its doors, and the sooner it closes its doors, the better it will be for men." He further declared that through abstinence from material food and "taking strength from the divine source" man can "put on the Godhead bodily." His only material food was the sip of wine and Communion wafers he was taking three times weekly. Next year, he said, he will require nothing. Naturally there was a lot of publicity. "A lot of strange faces" appeared at his services and a member of the cathedral chapter testified: "He gave me a conception of religion I never had before, and I am not the only one who feels that way." On January 20 the bishop removed him as dean of the cathedral. This and the continued fast told on the dean, and on January 23 he was removed to a hospital, where forced feeding was at once started in an effort to save his life.

The *Living Church* of January 26 commented on the affair as follows: "No doubt the dean is trying to illustrate his thesis by his sensational tactics; but he is pitifully wrong in the way he is going about it. 'The whole Gospel' does not counsel men to do without bodily food, nor does it substitute the Bread of Life for material sustenance. God might have made man a pure spirit like the angels, but He did not do so. . . . If Dean Noe is trying to force God to perform a miracle by sustaining his life without food, he is engaging in an act of presumption that is dangerously close to blasphemy."

E.

The Barthian View of the Bible. — In reply to a question on this point *Christianity Today* (December, 1937) offers a very satisfactory description of the Barthian view of the Bible. Since Barthianism forces itself upon the attention of theologians also in our country, a few striking quotations from the excellent article may be well in place in these columns. The writer says: "It is important to keep clearly in mind that the Barthians do not use the phrases 'the Bible' and 'the Word of God' as synonymous. The significance they attach to the Word of God cannot without qualification be attached to the Bible. To perceive the relation between the two as they understand it, we need to remember that Barth distinguishes three forms of the Word of God: 1. the Word of God as given to the prophets and apostles or as spoken through Jesus Christ (original revelation); 2. the written Word of God (the Bible); 3. the Word of God in sermon or proclamation. The Barthians distinguish more sharply between the Word of God in the first form and the Word of God in the second form than Christians have generally done. They never identify these two forms. Hence they never say that the Bible is the Word of God. They hold rather that the relation which the Bible sustains to the Word of God is indirect, somewhat like the relation that the sermon sustains to the Word of God. As the latter hold that the contents of the sermon are to be regarded as the Word of God only in as far as it is a true exposition of the Bible, so the Barthians hold that the Bible is the Word of God only in as far as it brings to men a knowledge of this original revelation or since this primary revelation is timeless only as God Himself speaks to them through the words of the Bible. The Bible contains the witness of the prophets and apostles to the Word of God that was spoken to them; but their words are never identified with the Word of God. It is important to keep this in mind lest we apply what Barthians say of the Word of God directly to the Bible. How little the Barthians are disposed to identify the Bible as a whole with the Word of God is indicated by the freedom with which they assert that the Bible contains errors and contradictions and is overgrown with legend. They frequently disavow belief in the infallibility of the Bible, including of course the verbal inspiration; for they hold that science and historical and literary criticism have made such beliefs impossible. Many of them, probably most of them, accept the conclusions of the destructive Bible critics. Bultmann is one of the most radical of the New Testament critics. Brunner confesses: 'I myself am an adherent of a rather radical school of Biblical criticism, which, for example, does not accept the gospel of John as an historical source and which finds legends in many parts of the synoptic gospels.' Barth himself writes: "The Bible is the literary monument of an ancient racial religion and of a Hellenistic cultus religion of the Near East. A human document like any other, it can lay no *a-priori* dogmatic claim to special attention and consideration. This judgment, being announced by every tongue and believed in every territory, we may take for granted today.' What has been said has perhaps sufficed at least to indicate the difference between the Barthian and the orthodox views of the Bible. According to the latter, the Bible as a whole is the Word of God, the infallible rule of faith and practise, not merely human fallible words concerning the Word of God. It has

served to indicate, moreover, that the Barthian view of the Bible has marked resemblances to the Modernist view." Afterwards the writer expresses the caution that Barthianism must not be identified with Modernism, since "Barthians are neither Fundamentalists nor Modernists." Nevertheless, while Barthians are not Modernists of the common order, their rationalism, which rejects the Bible as the sole source and norm of faith, is of the same stripe as that of ordinary Modernism, the difference between the two being only in degree, not in kind. Both are departures from the divine truth and as such destructive of true faith.

J. T. M.

An Anti-Evolution Philosopher.—Those of our readers who are philosophically inclined will relish a few sentences from a book review in the *Christian Century* in which a work by Mortimer J. Adler having the title *What Man has Made of Man: a Study of the Consequences of Platonism and Positivism in Psychology* is described. (The work is published by Longmans, Green and Company, and the price is \$3.50.) The writer, in the four lectures constituting the book, exalts, so we are told, the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas as the *non plus ultra* in this sphere. "Dr. Adler has no use for the incursions by modern scientists into philosophy. Let them stick to their own lasts and not have the brazen cheek to make raids into the domain of being as it is. Again and again, in the lectures and the supplementary notes, he maintains that the lamentable messes into which modern philosophy has repeatedly got itself, all the way from Descartes to Bergson and Whitehead, have resulted from the wild speculations of scientists off their proper beats and reckless attempts of philosophers to build up systems of metaphysics from the findings of the scientists. An adequate knowledge of St. Thomas Aquinas would have curbed their wilful heaven-soaring pride and saved them from mental confusion." While this was the position of Dr. Adler in the first lecture, in the second and the third, according to the reviewer, he pursues the same themes and sets forth these thoughts: "It is because of the same fundamental confusion that we find modern philosophy affected with subjectivism, or psychologism, from Descartes to Kant, giving rise to dualism, materialism, subjective and objective idealism, and then capitulating to evolutionism in the nineteenth century or giving up the ghost as positivism. To the same confusion is due the variegated crop of mutually incompatible psychologies, all the way from introspective associationism to mechanistic behaviorism and Gestaltism. It is a sad toll of lost souls, wandering in the darkness, ignorant of the towering lighthouse that rose from Aquin and has shone ever since." As far as Dr. Adler's affirmations deal with modern views, we are disposed to hold that they are true. But whether the remedy Dr. Adler proposes, a return to the position of Aquin, is satisfactory, one is inclined to doubt.

A.

The Roman Catholic Church and Fascism.—In a vigorous article appearing in the *Christian Century* Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor at Union Seminary, assails the Catholic Church for favoring Fascist views. He has given his article the heading "The Catholic Heresy." We quote some of his striking sentences. "It is becoming daily more apparent that the Catholic Church has cast its lot with fascistic politics. In Ger-

many the Church is reduced to the pathetic role of begging the Nazis kindly to let it cooperate in their anti-Communist campaign, since the Pope hates Communism as much as Hitler does. Many a liberal Catholic, particularly in America, does not like Fascism. Political liberal Catholics do not deny that their choice of Fascism is a hard alternative. They justify it by the assertion that Fascism does not intend to destroy the Church, while Communism does. One might answer that Fascism intends to destroy Christianity if it should not succeed in corrupting it and making it serve its purely national purpose. But that does not make an important contribution to the problem. The Catholic might answer that sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof. For the moment only German Fascism is avowedly antichristian. In Austria Fascism is completely clerical, and in Italy it has made a cynical bargain with the Church. A real problem is whether the Catholic position is justified from the Christian standpoint. . . . The real basis of the Catholic position in modern politics lies in the most characteristic of all documents of the Church, its identification of the Church with the kingdom of God. For the Catholic the Church is an unqualifiedly divine institution. It is Christ on earth in history, as the Pope is the vicar of Christ." Professor Niebuhr then quotes as altogether wrong an English writer, whom, as he says, he holds in the highest esteem, V. A. Demant, who made this statement: "Where formal atheism and antichristian paganism are at issue, however much in line with Christian justice the aims of the secular movement may be and however oppressive, corrupt, superstitious, and worldly the Church may be, I will not allow the sins of the Christian bodies to prevent my siding with those who uphold the Church against those who would destroy it. It would be a tragic and unholy choice, but it would have to be made, because the essential content of the body of Christ is a more ultimate thing than the most perfect system of social justice." When Professor Niebuhr speaks of the "identification of the Church with the kingdom of God as a Roman Catholic position" he of course has in mind that Roman Catholics make the Church an external organization and power. He arrives at the conclusion that there is no difference ultimately between the Catholic position and that of Fascists and of Communists. On both sides he finds "the very quintessence of sin, the tendency of man to make himself god." We must of course not overlook that under the gracious providence of God even in the corrupt Roman Catholic Church some fragments of Gospel truth have remained and people are brought into the kingdom of our Savior.

A.

A True Appraisal of Science.— A strange message it is, appearing as it does in a modernistic journal, which the editor of the *Christian Century*, Dr. Morrison, sounds forth in its issue of January 12, 1938. In a lengthy editorial with the caption "Can Science Save Us?" he comments on the recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Indianapolis and quotes prominently the words of the president, Professor Conklin of Princeton: "Why should not science count religion an ally and not an enemy in this process of domesticating and civilizing the wild beast in man?" Science is worried,

Dr. Morrison maintains. For one thing, it finds in the world today a tendency to destroy its freedom of research. But there is something more alarming. "The other thing which is happening is that the civilization which has grown up under the inveterate freedom of science for the past three centuries is itself in a state of near collapse. This huge fact stares the scientist in the face at the very moment when he arises to defend his freedom. He cannot make a plausible apologetic for scientific freedom, or ask for its continuance, without reckoning with the embarrassing fact that it is a scientific civilization that is in trouble. If it were a religious civilization, or a primitive civilization, or a superstitious civilization, that confronted the scientist, he could boldly and plausibly prescribe science as the cure of the ailment that afflicts it. But it certainly is not a primitive or a superstitious civilization but a highly sophisticated one, and the Christian Church is just now waking to the fact that it is not a religious civilization in any Christian sense. Christianity maintains hardly more than a vestigial existence in the Western World. The place formerly occupied by Christianity has been taken by science, which sets the effective patterns of Western culture. . . . When scientists rise to defend their freedom and offer science as the cure of our social illness, it is inevitable that they will be asked to give a steward's account of the freedom which science has enjoyed in the past. Any attempt to answer this demand will lead, in our opinion, to the conclusion that science does not afford a sound basis for civilization. The bald truth is that science itself is part of the problem which civilization now confronts. . . . Our knowledge has outstripped our devotion. The springs of faith and humility have been allowed to dry up. In his preoccupation with science, man has made an idol of his own knowledge and has fallen down before it. . . . Science has made man ill. In the delirium of his egoism he goes forth into his world of sky-scrapers and telescopes and radios and aeroplanes and machine industry and medicine and exclaims, 'Behold great Babylon that I have builded!' But man by himself cannot build an enduring civilization. A civilization which rests upon a humanistic foundation is an artifact, not a natural creation. The very science which is used to create it will be seized by tyrants to destroy it. . . . This explains what is meant above by the statement that science is itself a part of the problem which civilization confronts. Science cannot claim to be the solution of this problem. It has added vastly to the complexity of the sheer business of living. It has not made living easier, but harder. Its marvelous discoveries call for something which it cannot itself supply. They call for the recognition of an object of supreme devotion, a God who transcends all our scientific knowledge and our pursuit of knowledge, in whose hand are the forces with which science works, whether in physical nature or in history or in the contemporary social order, whose is the power and the glory in every achievement of man's hand and mind. Only religion — only the Christian religion — can sustain a scientific civilization. . . . If today the Church is waking from its complacency, becoming aware of its own faith, and girding itself for a great undertaking in preaching the Gospel which has been given it of God, there is no more strategic place for it to begin than to evangelize science itself."

If the editor in speaking of evangelizing science means that scientists need the message of Christ and should be brought to worship at the foot of the cross, we agree with him. Generally speaking, his words should be noted by all who are unduly impressed by the claims of pseudoscientists and their numerous followers, as well as by all religious workers who have been slighting their chief duty, that of spreading the Gospel.

A.

Catholic Action against Gambling.—A peculiar "Believe It or Not" (apologies to Ripley) greeted the public of Milwaukee and its environs November 19 when the front page of the Milwaukee papers carried columns of news bearing this caption, "Catholics Ban Gambling," and went on to tell that Archbishop Streich of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee sent letters to his clerical constituency that all games of chance, such as bingo, paddle-wheels, and the like, should be banned from their bazaars; also, that the selling of beer at these affairs should be discontinued. This had come about by an investigation of the Ministerial Association of Milwaukee of the taverns and night life of the great city. A committee of three pastors had spent six months investigating incognito the taverns and night life of the city. When the report was issued to the papers, a great furor arose. The tavern-keepers were horrified to learn of the dens of iniquity they were running, and immediately letters began pouring in to the papers telling the Church to clean its own heels or to cast out beams in their own eyes first. Immediate attention was called to the churches that were conducting lotteries and selling beer at their social affairs. And of course this hit the Catholic Church the hardest. So much pressure was being brought to bear upon the three pastors who brought in the report that they had to call to the churches of the city and their members for support. But thanks be to God, the churches have responded, all of them offering their support, even the Lutherans. And now the Catholics. Only one of the papers (and that supposedly controlled by the Catholics) points out this loophole in this Catholic action. The letters were addressed to the pastors of the churches and not to the Catholic fraternal organizations, which are the worst offenders. We are all waiting with bated breath to see what happens. "Believe it or not."

The Lutheran, Dec. 15, 1937

Brief Items.—*The Dawn*, a Jewish-Christian periodical, is responsive for the repetition of the statement that "seventeen years ago, through the Associated Press in the United States, there was offered one thousand dollars to any one who could demonstrate an unquestioned contradiction between a fact of science and a statement of the Scriptures. The thousand dollars is still in the hands of the bureau." Here is a chance for the "militant godless" in Russia or the aggressive and blatant atheists in America. Perhaps, judging from surface conditions, they may think that an attack on a book unused by so many would not create sufficient disturbance. But even if it did, the judgment of the authority of the Scriptures by the yard-measure of science is not of prime importance. The heart and soul of the people is beyond that measure.—*The Lutheran*.

When recently a stewardship conference was held in Philadelphia, which was attended by more than 200 delegates representing 18 religious

bodies in the United States and 2 in Canada, a fact that was given prominence was that according to the view of 9,500 representative citizens religion is not gaining but losing in our country, and moral standards are not improving but deteriorating. The following, according to an exchange, represents the situation with respect to the finances: "Governmental and other statistics indicate that since 1932, although Americans have increased their annual income by 61 per cent., gifts have actually decreased by 18 per cent. to colleges, by 24 per cent. to community chests, by 29 per cent. to general benevolences, and by 30 per cent. to churches. Out of the average American dollar only 2 cents go to religion and welfare, according to the survey." If this information is correct, conditions are lamentable.

Dr. Williams Adams Brown of Union Seminary, lecturing recently in the University of Chicago, stated that he agreed with Dr. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, in the demand that a university must find some unifying principle which will give its activities meaning and direction. According to the *Christian Century* Dr. Brown holds that such a principle is to be found not in metaphysics, as President Hutchins contends, but in theology. One cannot suppress the question whether the theology which Dr. Brown's proposal might make prominent in the curricula of universities would not be very much akin to Dr. Hutchins's metaphysics, after all, because in all probability it would not be Biblical theology but human speculation.

In certain circles people are becoming agitated over the question which a Congregational minister in Detroit asked his congregation members, "Must we have sermons?" 54.43 per cent. of the members gave an affirmative answer. It is to be noted, however, that 42 per cent. desire to have services now and then without sermons. It was but a small section, 3 per cent., that would rather have no sermons at all in the services at any time. Perhaps this paragraph ought to include the remark that the question under consideration was first put by Bruce Barton.

A lengthy article in the *Living Church* opposes joint Communion services. While many of the arguments employed are trivial or untenable, there is included likewise the following consideration: to hold a joint Communion service "is morally dubious, if not sacrilegious, on our part, because we invite those 'not discerning the Lord's body' to receive the blessed Sacrament." A further argument is worded thus, "It substitutes unity in action for unity in faith." The editor could have made his case much stronger if he had dwelt more thoroughly on the unionistic features of such services.

A report from London says that the Church of Abyssinia has been compelled by the Italian masters to become independent. Heretofore it was connected with the Church of Alexandria, a Monophysite body.

From Berlin comes the information that of the pastors who were imprisoned on account of opposition to Nazi church policies, thirteen are still in confinement, among them Pastor Martin Niemoeller.

A 1936 copy of *The Fellowship*, a paper published by E. Stanley Jones, contains remarks in reply to the question of one of our missionaries, in which it becomes evident that E. Stanley Jones looks upon the

Gospel as including the message of healing of physical diseases. When asked how people who hold divergent views on the doctrine of justification by grace, through faith, could belong to one and the same church-body, he replied: "The center around which the scheme [that is, the scheme of union] revolves is that you and your brother would both accept the confession of Peter 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' If you do, that is sufficient agreement to unite on. As to the other question of justification by faith and by works, you will probably find that each needs the corrective of the other at that point, just as Paul and James in their epistles correct each other and give the additional emphasis. (See Jas. 2:14-26.)" According to this, it would not be difficult to unite Christ and Belial.

In the *Madras Mail* it was reported that at a recent meeting of the South India United Church, a unionistic body, the matter of prohibition was discussed at length. Among other things the report said: "The assembly was glad to know that in at least four of its eight constituent church councils one of the qualifications for an office-bearer in the church was total abstinence from alcoholic drink. The assembly resolved to urge all church councils to adopt the same rule and seriously to consider whether the time had not come in South India to make total abstinence a condition of membership for all desiring to join the church. Where such is not already the practise, the assembly resolved to urge upon the councils the use of non-fermented grape juice or its equivalent in the central act of the worship of the church." Laxity with respect to doctrine, fanaticism in regard to adiaphora — a sad story.

That there still are people who are not swept off their feet by the tendency to let the churches go into politics can be seen from a statement made by Dr. A. C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, England, last summer. Stating that he is opposed to the World Conference of Churches, he said according to the *Manchester Guardian*: "Over many years I have followed the resolutions passed by Christian churches on political, social, or semipolitical matters, and they often seem to me to appear inexperienced and ill considered. A World Council of Churches might lead to considerable friction between the nations and might very likely be a cause rather than a prevention of war."

With amazement we read that St. John's University of Shanghai, though it could not begin its autumn term at the time scheduled but had to wait till October 18, nevertheless now is carrying on its work again, the university campus on the outskirts of the city having been temporarily abandoned and the school being conducted in a huge office-building in the heart of the business district. We are told that no one connected with the university was killed or wounded.

Committees of the Episcopalians and the Northern Presbyterians are now trying to bring about a closer union between the two denominations. The Episcopalians, it will be recalled, decided at their last convention to invite the Presbyterians to join them in the declaration that the two bodies are willing formally to declare their purpose to achieve organic union. The matter has now been discussed by the committees and was expected to be on the agenda of the General Council of the Presbyterian

Church in the United States of America, which will meet in Philadelphia March 1.

In Canada a famous author has died, Dr. Charles W. Gordon, better known by his pen-name Ralph Conner. His wholesome novels are said to have circulated by millions.

Bishop Lane of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church died on December 4, 103 years old. On the same day another colored bishop died, Rev. Elias Cottrell, 80 years old. Both men were born in slavery.

With respect to the situation in Russia one of our exchanges quotes the Russian Commissar of Education as follows: "For the moment we will change our fighting tactics against the Church. During the past twenty years [nearly] we have used every sort of force in our fight against religion. That period is at an end. The new period will witness a spiritual fight against religion. This fight will call for even greater efforts than violence. Above all, we shall need a large number of highly trained and cultured propagandists. When the second period shall be closed, then the third and last period will be entered upon, in which religion in the Soviet Union will exist only as a historical memory." Is it not as though the old pagan persecutors had come back to life?

A.

II. Ausland

The True Cause of the Coming of the Lutheran Fathers to Australia. Under this subtitle, in a comprehensive article having the heading "A Hundred Years of Lutheranism in Australia," the *Australian Lutheran Almanac*, in a special centenary edition (1838—1938), offers a splendid review of the history of the founding and development of our sister Church in that land. The *Almanac* itself has been gotten out very attractively, embellished with numerous illustrations, of great use to readers especially in our own country, and a very beautiful cover. But the principal feature of the year-book is the article on the growth of our Lutheran Church in Australia. We regard the matter as sufficiently important to offer at this place a number of valuable excerpts.

We read: "The real reason—and the only reason—given by the Prussian records why the Lutheran fathers were subjected to coercion and persecution was their conscientious refusal to obey the king, Frederick William III, in matters affecting their Church, religion, and conscience. The king himself was not, and never had been, a member of the Lutheran Church. . . . The Lutherans refused obedience chiefly on two grounds, (1) because the state church taught doctrines and advocated principles at variance with the teaching of the Lutheran Church, and (2) because the king had no right and authority to dictate to them in matters pertaining to their faith and religion. The consequence was the enactment of laws and the issuing of decrees designed to bring the 'recalcitrant' Lutherans to their knees. But no coercion and persecution could crush the spirit of resistance and defiance manifested by these Lutherans. Fines were levied; goods and homes confiscated; pastors deposed from office; churches forcibly taken; tempting offers of promotion and special emoluments held out to those pastors who would cease their resistance; imprisonment ordered; the military employed to crush

the Lutherans; divine services prohibited; and a comprehensive system of police espionage inaugurated. But all in vain; these Lutherans could not be induced to act contrary to their honest and conscientious convictions. Even official declarations that the marriages performed by Lutheran pastors were 'illegal' and the offspring of such marriages 'illegitimate' could not induce these Lutherans to forsake their pastors, renounce their faith, and submit to the demands of the king. Far sooner pay fines and suffer imprisonment or migrate to another country in search of liberty of conscience. This latter course was eventually adopted."

How hard it was for those faithful Lutherans to leave their homes, is further described as follows: "The most heartrending circumstances were connected with the voluntary expatriation and migration of the 'fathers.' Interesting and touching accounts are related by reliable eye-witnesses. . . . A writer, not a member of the Lutheran Church, says: "These Silesian Lutherans were devotedly attached to their fatherland; they had to undergo a terrible struggle to tear themselves away from it, and they sold their land, houses, and furniture with many tears. The most sacred ties of relationship had to be rent. Though the pictures drawn of religious liberty to be enjoyed on the other side of the world might be ever so attractive, the parting from the homes of the fathers and the scenes of their childhood and youth, the long voyage over the great ocean, the perils to which they were exposing themselves in their small, frail vessels, and the uncertainty of the future in a foreign land weighed heavily in the opposite scale. There were other distressing circumstances, since young men liable to military service could not obtain a passport and had to remain behind, children under guardianship were refused permission to accompany their relatives, and in some instances even husband and wife were torn asunder, the one thinking it a sin to go, the other to remain." Of the sacrifices made by the Lutherans for the faith the article next says: "Many of the persecuted Lutherans were in poor circumstances financially and had not the means to cover the expense of the voyage. In such instances the wealthier members of the congregation came to their assistance. In one parish alone four farmers came forward with 20,500 *thaler* to enable the poorer members of the congregation to join their more fortunate brethren." When the Lutherans refused to pay the heavy fines levied on them for refusing to yield obedience to the government in matters of conscience, the persecution reached its zenith. Since the fines were not paid willingly, they were extracted by the government by distraining. Of this the writer says: "These distraints gradually grew more and more oppressive; the day-laborer's cow and necessary household furniture were taken away, and even the bed of the widow was seized. In this way the poor people lost more than double the original fine imposed; for when their goods and chattels were put up for sale by auction, they went for next to nothing because very few people chose to bid at all, under the impression that a curse must lie on goods thus violently wrested from poor people who, as everybody admitted, were as loyal to their king and government as any other citizens in the land, except that they refused to the state the right to dictate their religion and compel them to forsake the faith of their fathers and join the state church established by the

king." When describing the impression which finally this resistance made upon the government officials, the article declares: "That thousands in Prussia should be willing to leave their dear fatherland for the sake of their Church and creed was so unexpected and amazing a thing to the Prussian authorities that they became bewildered and gradually learned to heed the decided veto church history records against all attempts to coerce religious conviction."

The whole article is so well written that we wish it could be disseminated for general reading in wide circles also in our own Church by publication in pamphlet form; for it very clearly teaches our own weakening generation the virtues of loyalty and fortitude in the profession of the pure Gospel and of our blessed Lord. J. T. M.

The Lutheran Church in Finland.—An article published in the *Lutheran Companion* of December 16, 1937, and January 6, 1938, by the Rev. Oscar N. Olson contains the following:

While Finland has not been entirely uninfluenced by the various cross-currents and religious movements that have passed over Protestantism, such as pietism, orthodoxy, rationalism, and Modernism, it has been remarkably free from internal schisms and separatism. In this respect it is probably the most Lutheran country in the world, 98 per cent. of the entire population of 3,500,000 being members of the Lutheran Church, even since the Church is no longer a state church nor membership is obligatory. . . .

The orthodoxy of the seventeenth century was followed by the pietism of John Arndt and Francke, upon which the rationalism of the eighteenth century made little impression. While the official religion as expressed in doctrination, churchgoing, and the use of the Sacraments may have appeared to many as dead and formal, it did furnish the fuel which the divine spark could kindle into a living flame. This happened in the revivals of the nineteenth century. These revivals broke forth in different places and times seemingly independently of one another—and yet fed from the same source. Each moment, however, had a character of its own, which has continued down to the present day.

These revivals started in Northeastern Finland. A peasant, Paavo Ruotsalainen (1777-1852), was the leader. The movement was characterized by a deep sense of sin. Men and women knelt in the fields, praying for the salvation of their souls. Sturdy men swooned in the churches during the preaching; only the reassuring word of pardon for sins could revive them. Another group laid great stress on prayer. At their prayer sessions they would literally wait upon the Lord until the Spirit moved them, much in the manner of the Quakers.

A movement known as evangelical was started by F. G. Hedberg (1811-1893), whose followers were called Hedbergians. The movement may have had some influence on the so-called "Northland Readers," some of whom were pioneers in our own synod [Augustana]. In this movement the universality of God's grace and the objective factors of Christianity, the Scriptures, and the Sacraments were strongly stressed. It probably served as a wholesome check upon a too great subjectivism usually associated with revivalism.

One of the most noteworthy manifestations of the spiritual revival was that known as Laestadianism, which was started by L. L. Laestadius (1800—1861). Its main features are ecstatic emotionalism and emphasis upon private confession and absolution either to the pastor or among themselves. The movement originated in Lappland, whence it has spread especially to Northern Finland. While the spontaneous ecstatic outbursts of this movement undoubtedly are grotesque, its regenerating effect on morals have been undeniable.

All these movements have sprung up within the Church itself and have remained loyal to it, differing in this respect from such separatistic movements as Methodism, Waldenstromianism, etc. The pietistic revivals in Finland have been born of the Lutheran spirit [?] and bred on Lutheran literature and have not, as in Sweden, suffered much from Reformed influences. Exotic sects like the Pentecostals, Baptists, and Adventists or any tendency toward separation find little response in Finland.

E.

Dreihundvierzigtausend Geistliche „liquidiert“. Unter dieser Überschrift teilt die „A. E. L. N.“ das Folgende mit: „Die Warschauer katholische Presseagentur bringt eine Meldung aus Moskau, die einen wirkungsvollen Kommentar zu der Reise des Dekans von Canterbury nach Sowjetrußland und dem sowjetfreundlichen Verhalten anderer Priester darstellt. Die katholische Agentur berichtet, daß in der Sowjetunion bis zur ersten Hälfte des Jahres 1936 insgesamt 42,500 orthodoxe Geistliche ‚liquidiert‘ worden seien. Sie seien zum Teil erschossen, zum Teil in den Zwangsarbeitslagern in Sibirien dem sicheren Tod ausgesetzt worden. Von den 200 evangelischen Pastoren, die im Jahre 1917 in Rußland tätig gewesen seien, seien heute nur noch vier am Leben. Von den 810 Geistlichen und acht Bischöfen der römisch-katholischen Kirche, die einstmals im zaristischen Rußland ihr Amt ausgeübt hätten, gebe es nur noch zehn. Alle übrigen hätten das Schicksal der meisten Geistlichen der andern Kirchen geteilt. Allein im Jahr 1936 seien 800 Geistliche gefangengesetzt worden, von denen nachweislich 102 erschossen worden seien. Die übrigen sollen vertrieben worden sein.“ Dieser Bericht stimmt mit andern, die aus Rußland Ähnliches mitgeteilt haben. Welch eine unaussprechliche Brutalität steckt doch im Unglauben, wenn er freie Hand hat, seinen Haß gegen das Christentum zur Ausführung zu bringen!

J. T. M.

Die Stellung der Kirchen im nationalsozialistischen Staat. Auf diese Frage kam der Herr Reichsminister für die kirchlichen Angelegenheiten, Kerrl, bei einer Kundgebung der NSDAP. in Fulda am 24. November zu sprechen. Sein Thema lautete „Weltanschauung und Religion im nationalsozialistischen Staat“. Wir können dem, was der Minister über „positives Christentum“ und „bergeferkenden Glauben“ sagte, nicht zustimmen. Er wechselt da, wie so viele heute, Christentum und natürliche Religion. Aber wir freuen uns von Herzen über das, was der Minister vom Verhältnis des Staates zu den Kirchen und von der Religionsfreiheit gesagt hat. Nachdem er festgestellt hatte, daß der Nationalsozialismus eine religiöse Bewegung sei, die die Bindung an Gott und die göttliche Ordnung nicht nur durchaus anerkenne, sondern durchlebe, fuhr er fort — wir folgen dem in den Tageszeitungen veröffentlichten Bericht des DNB —: „Wir halten es für unsere

Pflicht, den Deutschen die religiöse Freiheit unter allen Umständen zu gewährleisten. Es ist das persönliche Recht des einzelnen, sich die Religionsgesellschaft selbst auszusuchen. Die nationalsozialistische Regierung hat die Pflicht, dafür zu sorgen, daß ein politischer Mißbrauch der Religion unter allen Umständen vermieden wird. Es ist an sich nicht die Aufgabe der nationalsozialistischen Regierung, die Erhaltung von Kirchen durch Zuschüsse und durch Steuern von sich aus zu sichern. Das ist die Aufgabe der Gläubigen, denen es obliegen muß, für die Kirche zu sorgen, zu der sie gehören wollen. Wenn dies auch nicht sofort durchgeführt wird, so steht es doch als Ziel fest." Das stimmt völlig überein mit den Grundsätzen und Zielen hinsichtlich des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat, für die wir in unserer Freikirche seit Jahrzehnten eingetreten sind, nicht nur mit Worten, sondern auch durch die Tat, indem wir unser Kirchenwesen ohne staatliche Beihilfe durch freiwillige Gaben der Gläubigen aufrechterhalten haben.

Der Minister wies im weiteren Verlauf seiner Rede darauf hin, daß die beiden großen Kirchen in Deutschland, die römisch-katholische und die evangelische, zusammen jährlich 105 Millionen Mark an Staatsleistungen erhalten hätten und daß außerdem der Staat für sie jährlich 200 Millionen Mark an Kirchensteuern eingezogen habe! Der nationalsozialistische Staat, so erklärte Herr Kerrl, könne nicht mehr an einem Staatskirchentum festhalten, das, wie immer es auch im einzelnen gartet sei, auf dem Grundsatz fuße Cuius regio, eius religio (das heißt, die Religion der Untertanen hat sich nach der Religion des Landesherrn oder Machthabers zu richten). Das Bestreben der nationalsozialistischen Kirchenpolitik sei vielmehr, die politisierenden Kirchen wieder in wahrhaft religiöse Gemeinschaften umzuwandeln. In Sachen der vom Führer angeordneten Kirchenwahlen verhalte sich der Staat zunächst abwartend, nachdem sie von den Kirchenparteien vorerst selbst abgelehnt worden seien. Eine einheitliche Richtung sei in der evangelischen Kirche nicht herzustellen. Die Körperschaftsrechte seien den Kirchen belassen worden; doch könne der Staat es sich nicht bieten lassen, daß Kollekten zugunsten einzelner Kirchenparteien, und ordnungswidrig gesammelt, und zu staatsfeindlicher Propaganda mißbraucht würden. Ausländischen Pressestimmen gegenüber betonte der Minister am Schluß nochmals, daß der nationalsozialistische Staat in keiner Weise interessiert sei an der Gründung einer nationalsozialistischen Staatskirche.

M. W. in der „Ev.-Luth. Freikirche“.

„Wacht und Weide.“ (2. Jahrg., Heft 5. September-Oktober 1937.) Wir können nicht umhin, noch einmal auf diese wichtige Zeitschrift für Pastoren und Lehrer, herausgegeben von unsern Brüdern in Südamerika, aufmerksam zu machen, in der Hoffnung, daß vielleicht doch noch mancher unserer Pastoren darauf abonnieren und so das Band der Bekanntheit und Liebe zwischen uns und ihnen befestigen helfen möchte. Wir erwarten, daß sie lesen, was wir schreiben; warum denn aber nicht auch umgekehrt? Zudem ist „Wacht und Weide“ auch wirklich sehr lesenswert. Die letzte Nummer, die wir hier zur Anzeige bringen, enthält folgende Artikel: „Außerbiblische Zeugnisse über Jesus“, „Die spanischen Bibelübersetzungen“, „Martin Stephan“ (der Führer der sächsischen Auswanderer), „Luthers Nachkommenschaft“, „Kleine Predigtstudie“, „Katechese“, „Schlußexamen in unsern Schulen“, eine „portugiesische Predigt zur Konfirmation“, sehr einfach, schlicht

und klar, auch was das Sprachliche betrifft, und endlich „Nachrichten und Mitteilungen“. Es ist somit ein sehr reichhaltiges Programm, das dem Leser hier dargeboten wird. Aus dem interessanten Artikel über die spanischen Bibelübersetzungen lassen wir hier einiges folgen, und zwar insbesondere, was über die feine Übersetzung des im Jahre 1594 im Alter von 74 Jahren in Frankfurt als Pastor einer lutherischen Gemeinde verstorbenen Casiodoro de Reina gesagt wird. Wir selber haben die spanische Übersetzung schon lange bewundert; ist sie doch so äußerst klar, fließend und dem Grundtext getreu. Der Schreiber urteilt: „Seine [Reinas] Übersetzung ist, mit kleinen Veränderungen, die heute von den Bibelgesellschaften bei weitem verbreitete und von protestantischen Predigern und Laien meist gebrauchte Bibel in spanischer Sprache. Reina entstammte einer maurischen Familie und wurde um das Jahr 1520 in Granada geboren. Als die Lehre der Reformation in Spanien bekannt wurde, fiel ihr Reina ohne Bedenken zu. Er war ein gebildeter Mann, sprachlich hochbegabt. Da er wegen seines Glaubens in Spanien nicht sicher war, ging er nach England, wo er in der Königin Elisabeth eine Freundin und Gönnerin fand. Hier machte er sich an die Übersetzung der Bibel. Nachdem er mehrere Jahre daran gearbeitet hatte, ging er nach Straßburg und noch später nach Basel, wo er seine Arbeit beendete. Sogleich begann er mit dem Druck. Am 14. Juni 1569 war die ganze Bibel in spanischer Sprache fertig; es war eine Auflage von 2,600 Exemplaren. Diese Bibel ist bekannt unter dem Namen Biblia del Oso, nach dem Titelblatt, das einen Bären darstellt, der, aufrecht an einem Baum stehend, an einer Honigwabe leckt. Zwölf Jahre hatte Reina an der Übersetzung gearbeitet. Seine Bibelübersetzung war bald vergriffen. Viele Exemplare kamen in die Hände der Priester und wurden verbrannt, so daß ein großer Mangel an spanischen Bibeln vorhanden war. Das Bedürfnis nach einer neuen Auflage wurde immer dringender. So machte sich denn endlich Cipriano de Valera an die Arbeit. Aber er lieferte nicht eine neue Übersetzung, sondern verbesserte die Übersetzung von Reina, verglich sie Wort für Wort mit dem Grundtext und gab ihr die Sprache, die heute noch in der spanischen Literatur das ist, was Luthers Übersetzung in der deutschen ist. Die spanische Bibel, die wir gebrauchen, trägt seinen Namen. Er wurde in Sevilla im Jahre 1532 geboren. Als Jüngling trat er ins Kloster San Jsidro del Campo ein. Eine Reihe Mönche nahmen die Lehre der Reformation an, verließen heimlich das Kloster und gingen ins Ausland, unter ihnen auch Valera. Wir finden ihn schließlich in England, dem Land, wo alle Verjagten Zuflucht fanden. Hier studierte er auf den Universitäten Cambridge und Oxford. Unter den von ihm verfaßten Schriften wären zu nennen ‚Papst und Messe‘, und die Übersetzung der *Institutiones* von Calvin. Sein Hauptwerk aber bleibt die Übersetzung der Bibel, wie wir sie jetzt haben, klassisch in Sprache und treu nach dem Grundtext, eine Arbeit von zwanzig Jahren, aber doch nicht eigentlich Valeras Übersetzung. Wie kam es aber, daß die spanische Bibel nur de Valeras Namen trägt? Schuld daran war nicht de Valera. In einem langen, schönen Vorwort hatte de Valera klar und frei gesagt, daß er Casiodoro de Reinas Übersetzung nur verbessert, nicht aber eine eigene geliefert habe. In seinem Vorwort sagt er zum Teil: ‚Casiodoro de Reina, getrieben von frommem Eifer, die Ehre Gottes zu fördern und seinem Volk einen Dienst zu erweisen, hat, im Land der Freiheit

lebend, wo er reden und Gottes Sache betreiben konnte, angefangen, die Bibel zu übersetzen. Diese hat er auch vollendet, und so hat er im Jahre 1669 seine 2,800 Exemplare gedruckt, die durch Gottes Barmherzigkeit in vielen Gegenden verbreitet sind, so daß man heute keine Exemplare mehr bekommen kann, auch wenn man sie kaufen wollte. Damit aber unserm Volk ein so großer Schatz, wie die Bibel es ist, in seiner Sprache nicht fehle, haben wir uns die Mühe genommen, sie zu lesen und viele Male wieder zu lesen, sie mit neuen Anmerkungen zu bereichern und an vielen Stellen den Text zu verbessern. Dies haben wir mit reiflicher Überlegung getan, und, nicht auf uns selbst vertrauend (unser Gewissen bezeugt uns, wie klein unser Vermögen ist), haben wir uns mit gelehrten, frommen Männern beraten und unsere Übersetzung mit denen in andern Sprachen verglichen. Die Arbeit, die ans Licht zu bringen ich mir vorgenommen hatte, war groß und dauerte eine lange Zeit; sie war um so schwerer, da ich niemand von meinen Volksgenossen hatte, der mir geholfen hätte, nicht einmal beim Durchlesen und Korrigieren. Aber es gefiel Gott, mich als ein Werkzeug in einem so großen Unternehmen zu gebrauchen und mir Kraft zu geben und Mut, damit ich nicht mittwerts schwach würde und mit der Last zu Boden fiel. Fünfundzwanzig Jahre war ich alt, als ich die Arbeit anfang. Und als es Gott gefiel, sie im Jahre 1692 ans Licht zu bringen, war ich siebenzig Jahre alt. Meine Absicht war, Gott zu dienen und meinem Volk Gutes zu tun. Und welches größere Gut hätte ich ihm geben können, als ihm das Mittel darzureichen, welches Gott verordnet hat, Seelen zu gewinnen, nämlich das Lesen der Heiligen Schrift? Ich bitte Gott um Christi willen, er möge dies mein Abendopfer, welches ich ihm in meinem Alter bringe, annehmen; er möge es segnen, daß sein heiliger Name auch in Spanien geheiligt werde, wie es in andern Ländern geschieht. Bei späteren Ausgaben hat man das Wortwort und damit auch Casiodoro de Reinas Namen ausgelassen. So kam es, daß man im Lauf der Zeit die Übersetzung für die alleinige Arbeit von Cipriano de Valera hielt und noch vielfach hält. In Wahrheit sollte die Ausgabe Reina-Valera heißen. Über diese Übersetzung urteilt Daniel Hall: „In einer schätzenswerten Zahl von Fällen haben wir gefunden, daß unsere Übersetzung von Reina-Valera, das Werk zweier Männer, denen vieles zu einer Übersetzung Nötige fehlte und die dazu noch durch Verfolgungen bedrückt waren, sowohl die englische Authorized Version als auch die Revised Version übertrifft, trotz der großen Anzahl Gelehrter, die daran beteiligt waren, und aller unzähligen Vorteile jeglicher Art, die sie vor jenen zwei armen verfolgten Spaniern voraus hatten.“

J. T. R.

Corrigendum.— On p. 43, of the January number in the present volume please change in line 27 "degree" to "decree."
