

9-1-1940

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. (1940) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 11 , Article 66.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol11/iss1/66>

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 — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the "Lutheran School Journal." It is proper that the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY should apprise its readers of this anniversary of our esteemed contemporary, references to which will form one of the features of the September issue of the *Journal*. Its managing editor, Prof. Theo. Kuehnert, writes: "The *Lutheran School Journal* has now completed the seventy-fifth year of its publication. It has been published uninterruptedly since September, 1865, and is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, professional periodical for teachers published in our country today. It is now, and has been in the past, our Synod's only professional journal for teachers." Naturally our cordial congratulations are tendered to the *Journal*, with which are joined our best wishes for future success. On account of the importance of our Christian day-schools, whose cause is sponsored by the *Lutheran School Journal*, we should like to see this magazine experience a vast increase in its number of subscribers. Send for a sample copy. You will be surprised to see how attractive its exterior is and what interesting, live, up-to-date and stimulating reading-matter it offers. A.

This Is Certainly Verbal Inspiration.— In a scholarly article entitled "The Objective Nature of Prophecy According to Second Peter" (*Lutheran Church Quarterly*, April, 1940, p. 190 ff.), Pastor William H. Cooper writes:

"I find one such clue not in the commentators but among the Greek grammarians, A. T. Robertson and W. Hersey Davis, in their *New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (New York: 1931). They remind us that the old ablative ending in the singular is the same as the genitive and that the *casus ablativus* is the 'whence' case, expressing origin or separation. As a 'clearly ablative' case in the predicate after the copula *ginetai* they go on to cite 2 Pet. 1:20, which they translate: "No prophecy comes of private disclosure." If our perplexing word *epiluseos* is clearly an ablative, everything else becomes sufficiently clear and Second Peter is relieved of the accusation of turgidity at least in this place. The otherwise unaccountable use of *ginetai* instead of *esti* is explained, and Bigg is shown to be wrong in his labored argument to prove that *ginetai* here means nothing more than *esti*. In v. 20 as in v. 21 the writer of the epistle is discussing the divine origin and the divinely objective character of prophecy. He is trying to say that, when the prophets sought to interpret intelligibly to men the will and purpose of God, they did not fall back upon their own ingenuity or trust to their own calculations. They 'untied' the knots of the divine mysteries but not on their own initiative or with their own skill. *Not only the truths which they knew but the words in which they taught and the expositions which they offered were given to them by the Spirit.* (Compare 1 Pet. 1:10-12 and 1 Cor. 2:13.) Prophecy, according to 2 Pet. 1:20, is itself the result of a divinely directed and inspired thought-process going on in the prophet's mind. The prophet earnestly busies himself in unraveling, and putting

into communicable form the mysteries of God. (Compare John 7:16, 'My doctrine is not Mine.') The fruit of God's inspiration and of the prophets' labor to understand and to expound is an objective prophecy, which becomes then the nucleus of an authoritative Scripture."—Note the sentence underscored by us.

But This Is Certainly Not Verbal Inspiration.—In an article appearing in the same number of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, p. 142 ff., entitled "Did Luther Follow Ockham or Paul?" Prof. John O. Evjen, Carthage, Ill., writes:

"Thirdly, it was not Ockham's teaching with regard to the Scriptures which became the 'Lutheran Scriptural principles.' As has already been mentioned, Ockham assigns a higher place to Scripture than to either Pope or councils. But this was not a new teaching. The supremacy of Scripture was never questioned in the Oriental Church, which never established a papacy. Ockham regarded the Bible as an object of faith. In the Bible he found the positive expression of the will of God. Only Scripture could authoritatively establish what the content of faith was to be. The Bible was inspired, word for word. Indeed, it contained, asserted Ockham, many things that were contrary to reason; but reason had nothing to say respecting questions of faith. Ockham, it is true, surrendered his belief in canon law and in the legal authority of the Pope. But there was nothing particularly evangelical in this surrender; for he substituted an authority which was just as legalistic—the Bible. The Bible became a legal (not evangelical) authority. This meant the creation of a new canonical legal instance, the legalizing of the Bible into a statute for man's personal relation with God, which thus had to become a legal relation. The Bible became a law book instead of a revelation.

"It was heresy for Ockham not to believe every single word of the Bible. According to this, Luther would have been a heretic because he doubted the authenticity of the Epistle of James and the Revelation of John. Luther had a different conception of heresy. Heresy, according to Luther, was to interpret Scripture in another manner than the Holy Ghost did. To the Reformer, Scripture was binding to the extent that it proclaimed Christ, the Gospel, or pointed to Christ. Many historical matters in the Bible did not concern Christian life.

"Thus Ockham's evaluation of Scripture as *ius divinum*, as divinely inspired, does not express Luther's *religious* understanding of the Bible, however much he was obliged to use it as a criterion in his struggle for the new Church. He therefore said that whatever proclaimed Christ was apostolic, even if Judas, Annas, Pilate, and Herod proclaimed it. God's Word as means of *grace* is not, according to Luther, identical with the graphically established Word of revelation in Holy Writ; but it is every spoken or written word in which God's will or God's presence is made known, for example, in preaching, instruction, and cure of souls, all of which is an application of the revelation of salvation contained in the basic words of Scripture. Luther surrendered the ecclesiastico-legal conception of Scripture for the *religious* conception of it. Scripture was for him the test for all ecclesiastical doctrine; but it was this as an expression of experienced revelation from God."

And What do You Make of This?—The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland, of the U. L. C. A., at its convention May 20—22, took this "Action on the Pittsburgh Articles. The president of the Maryland Synod brought the Pittsburgh Articles of Agreement with the American Lutheran Church to the attention of the synod. After due consideration the following resolutions were unanimously adopted: 1. *Those articles are not in accord with the statements and principles adopted by the U. L. C. A. at Savannah in 1934. . . . 6. Article III falls below the substance and intent of the Baltimore Declaration of 1938, as the Joint Commission expressly stated when this article was adopted at Pittsburgh, and one member of the Joint Commission has publicly boasted (Kirchliche Zeitschrift, April, 1939, pages 238—240). It adds to the Baltimore Declaration because it countenances, or seems to countenance, verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures and makes the Bible the infallible rule in matters other than faith and practice.*"—*The Lutheran*, June 12, 1940.

This Makes Better Reading.—In an article "In Memoriam" of Prof. O. E. Brandt, in the *Lutheran Herald*, March 10, 1940, Dr. H. A. Preus writes: "Dr. Brandt loved the Word because he loved the Lord Jesus Christ, who had come to him through the Word and made him His own; because it was the voice of God, and as such it was the last word in every question of faith and life; as such it was a holy thing not to be tampered with. And because of this basic conviction with him he became a crusader against every effort of liberal theology to break down that fundamental teaching of the Christian Church that the Bible is the Word of God, inspired and infallible. He prophesied once that, if the Lutheran Church forsook that position, it would disintegrate."

E.

Dr. Morrison on the Cause of the War.—In a recent issue of the *Christian Century* its editor, Dr. C. E. Morrison, publishes a sermon which he preached in the University of Chicago chapel. It is a typical modernistic sermon in its failure to present, or even allude to, the way of salvation. But a few paragraphs deserve to be quoted on account of the analysis they submit of what has brought on the present world tragedy. Dr. Morrison writes: "Mankind does not want war. The German people in their normal state hate war as you and I hate it. For twenty years the nations have been trying to get rid of war by making promises to one another not to engage in it—non-aggression pacts, the League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg Pact. Solemn promises, all! Why were they not kept? Did the governments act in bad faith? Were the statesmen hypocrites? Did they sign with their fingers crossed? No. They devoutly desired peace. But the governments of the nations are not the real governors of the nations. The governments are themselves governed. Their peace plans were a house of cards superimposed upon an economic system that governs the governments and that holds war as Vesuvius holds molten lava. The housekeeping of mankind is organized as a system of both domestic and imperial greed. This greed is an expression of both human need and human sin. The perennial tragedy to which it leads inheres in the fact

that this need and this sin are forced to live together in an economic system which falsifies human dignity by tying up the satisfaction of elemental human needs with the necessity of injuring or oppressing or even killing others. This is why the nations fight. We cannot hope for peace while the nations cherish the unjust privileges upon which their economic life is based." No one can deny that Dr. Morrison is right. If his analysis should lead men to despair of the effectiveness of their own wisdom and contriving, it would serve a high spiritual purpose. A.

The Mormons of the reorganized branch, whose headquarters are located at Independence, Mo., are up in arms. The object of their anger is Vardis Fisher's vivid "best-seller" presentation of Mormonism, *Children of God*, which, by the very nature of its material, offers an intimate picture of the life, thoughts, and practices of the founder, Joseph Smith. It is natural that the "reorganized" branch of Mormonism should be the first to protest. Israel A. Smith, one of the four remaining grandsons of the original Joseph Smith, is the head of this group, and he has family reasons for feeling that the book is a "malicious libel on the life and character of Joseph." Ties of blood would naturally voice the defense that Mormonism never "practiced or taught polygamy, and there was no competent evidence that Joseph Smith ever did." However, the burden of proof does not rest with Vardis Fisher. That belongs in this case to those who are seeking refuge in mere denial. The records are too many and too precise, especially those that appear in the Mormon documents themselves before they were "edited" by later, more sensitive generations. There is, for instance, the Edmunds Law against bigamy, advocated by Abraham Lincoln and called forth by the brazenly defiant practices of the Mormons at the time of the polygamous "revelations" proclaimed by the Mormon heads. There is also the unpremeditated testimony of a rare little book, which was indeed written on behalf of the Mormons by the wife of General Thomas L. Kane, at the time a representative of the United States Government in Utah. In the pages of *Twelve Mormon Homes* she speaks repeatedly of meeting plural wives and cites the remark of Joseph Smith's first plural wife, that "Brother Joseph" had revealed the doctrine to her thirty-six years before. This was in 1874. This present defense by the reorganized Mormons is a pleasing testimony to their current moral sensitiveness and should be accepted as such—unless a new "revelation" should be issued or the old one revamped.—*Exchange*.

May Confessional Churches Take Part in a "Come-to-Church" Campaign?—The *Courier-Post* of Camden, N.J., recently sponsored a "Come-to-Church" advertising campaign, in which at first some fifty prominent members of churches were asked to give one dollar a week to pay for a full-page ad in the paper, urging people to come to all churches. Later the churches themselves were asked to contribute one dollar a week, to make the project possible. Against this unionistic campaign the Rev. Carl McIntire, editor of the *Christian Beacon*, organ of the Bible Presbyterian Church, protested, publishing his protest in the form of a sermon which he preached in his church at Collingswood, N.J., on April 21. The sermon is interesting because of its clear con-

feSSIONALISM over against the unionistic and modernistic trends of today. Several excerpts are given to show how clearly the writer sees the issues at stake. He writes: "The *Courier-Post* advertising campaign to come to church misrepresents the position which the Church has always held. The Church has never maintained that all churches and religious groups were worthy of support of the people and that, if people would attend any religious communion, they would find true happiness. To foster such a program is to deny the reality of history and the very nature of the churches as they now exist. The attempt to unite Roman Catholics, Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Pentecostalists, Divine Healers, and the Jewish synagog is an impossibility. Some bodies which go by the name of church are nothing more than pagan cults. For us to join in recommending that all churches are places of spiritual blessing would involve a complete betrayal of the ministry of the Church and the teaching of the Bible concerning the Church. Perhaps a brief analogy would be wise. Suppose that all the doctors of the community united in a large campaign urging everybody to come to a medicine closet, *any* medicine closet, assuring them that there they would find the true remedy for their bodily ills. But in nearly every medicine closet there are medicines of various natures—some good, others bad. Certainly, physicians who regard their reputation and are worthy of the name 'doctor' would never join any such campaign. Now, we are witnessing a campaign in which ministers and others have joined, urging everybody to go to some church, *any* church. But we know that in the various churches and religious cults there are some good and some bad. Certainly, as a minister of the Church of Jesus Christ, we could not join in such a campaign.—Further, the very function of the church is misrepresented. The only way to bring people back to the empty, cold churches is to bring them back to the Lord Jesus Christ. The power the world needs can be found in the Gospel of Christ. When you put your emphasis purely upon the Church, your emphasis is upon the cold dish. When you put the emphasis upon Jesus Christ, it is upon the warm, nourishing, life-giving food. You cannot bring the people back to the churches unless you first bring them back to Christ." What is here said is indeed right. The slogan "Come to Church" indeed means absolutely nothing if it does not mean: "Come to hear the pure Gospel of Christ." We are glad that emphasis is placed upon this fundamental truth also outside our own communion.

J. T. M.

The "a-Posteriori" View in the Doctrine of Election.—On this subject Prof. Karl Ermisch of Minneapolis writes in the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* for March, 1940:

"Calvin as well as the Lutheran Intuitists reason *a priori*. Both take their stand in eternity and ask the question, Who will enter heaven? The advocate of absolute predestination answers: He whom God arbitrarily elected,—of course, in Christ, not outside of Him,—but arbitrarily, in accordance with His absolute will and pleasure. This was in perfect harmony with Calvin's philosophical conception of God.

"The Intuitist asks the same question but has a different answer. He knows that God wants all men to be saved, but he also realizes that not all will be saved. Now, who are the elect of whom Scripture

undeniably speaks? Answer: Those of whom God foresaw that they would die in Christ, or in faith. And this theologian arrives at *'electio intuitu fidei finalis.'* Yes, it is a human solution to a puzzling problem; but this solution is unwarranted by Scripture, except by the word *'foresaw'* in Rom. 8:29, which, however, according to our best exegetes, means more than an intellectual process; it means an act of love. They were led astray by their *'a-priori'* approach to the great subject.

"Paul, who has given us the doctrine of Christian predestination in Rom. 8 and Eph. 1, takes an *'a-posteriori'* approach. He does not begin with the decree of God in eternity, but with today, with the actual possession of salvation at present. His Roman readers are puzzled. They have to suffer, and they cannot harmonize it with their exalted position as children of God. Paul shows them that there is no contradiction but that their suffering is in harmony with God's plan concerning them. They have been predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ. God needs also dark colors, i. e., suffering, to create the likeness in them. This plan of God, which includes every individual Christian, is not a matter of accident, adapted to the varying conditions of life; Paul assures them that this plan was conceived in eternity. In eternity God took them—individually—lovingly to His heart—that is, *'He foresaw them'*—and predestinated them, not to heaven or hell, but to be conformed to the image of His Son. The scope of God's plan is much larger than Calvin and the Intuitists would ever have suspected. Paul shows them how God's plan is carried out in all its details in time and how it works in the hour of judgment, assuring them that God will perfect what He has begun and bring them to life eternal. Their salvation in all its details—creation, redemption, call, justification, sanctification, and glorification—rests in the hands of their loving Father in heaven. Indeed a safe place! And Paul can conclude his presentation of Christian predestination with the triumphant word *'I am persuaded that nothing, nothing in the world, can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus.'* That is indeed a different doctrine of predestination than Calvin and the Intuitists can offer.

"This doctrine, so rich in comfort and consolation, in encouragement and hope, in sanctifying power, has been laid down by our Lutheran theologians in the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord.

"We have been told that it is immaterial how we approach a doctrine as long as it is correct. We, however, do not see any reason why we should not follow the way of Paul or deem ourselves superior to him. Our Lutheran Church in America would have been spared her disheartening predestination controversy if Missouri as well as her opponents had followed the way of Paul. The unbrotherly charges of Cryptocalvinism and of synergism could easily have been avoided. . . .

"Let us approach the Bible with an unbiased mind, without any preconceived idea, not trying to dictate to our God, but humbly abiding with His revelation."

Whether our fathers at times forgot just how the Formula of Concord treats the doctrine of election we are hardly prepared to say. It is very clear, however, that Dr. Stoeckhardt, in his commentaries, with great emphasis taught the doctrine of election with the so-called *a-posteriori*

approach (cf. his *Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians*, p. 84 ff.).

In the same article Professor Ermisch writes as he speaks of synergistic tendencies: "Missouri has showered its invectives on all those whose theological health certificate on this point was not quite satisfactory. Though much human zeal and the unspiritual spirit of fault-finding and backbiting, of slander and unjust insinuation, were in evidence in these controversies, nevertheless let us thank Missouri because its attitude of suspicion and of hairsplitting criticism helped to safeguard the Lutheran Church in America against all synergistic tendencies and thus to save the *solī Deo gloria* which the Lutheran Church is so anxious to proclaim in regard to creation, redemption, and sanctification." We admit that Missourians in the past were not, just as they are not now, angels or saints, but we believe we can truthfully say for our fathers that, if at times their criticism was severe, they were actuated by love of the truth, which they wished to uphold at all hazards. We are happy to know that Professor Ermisch admits their efforts were not in vain and that he with us rejects all synergism and whatever else may detract from the glory which belongs to our great God. A.

Lutheranism in Norway.—The introduction of the Reformation into Norway came in 1536, when Norway became a province of Denmark, and it came by force. The priests, however, remained until properly trained Lutheran preachers could be substituted. Master Horbjoern Olafsson Bratt in Drontheim had studied two years at Wittenberg and had lived in Luther's house and later became prominent at home. Master Joergen Erichsson in Stavanger was the ablest man of the period, a mighty preacher, "the Luther of Norway." About 1600 all Norway was outwardly Lutheranized. From Germany, Pietism and Rationalism spread into Norway. The "Awakening" was led by C. P. Caspari into the confessional channel. Today Higher Criticism and Liberalism have caused much dissension, though the common people still adhere to the Gospel and the Lutheran faith. Religious toleration came in 1845. The Lutheran Church is the State Church. The six bishops and all other church officers are appointed by the king; the bishop of Oslo is the head. (*Concordia Cyclopaedia*.) There are also Methodists (11,445 in 1921), Baptists (7,214), and Roman Catholics (2,612) in Norway.

In his sermon on the occasion of the golden jubilee at Koshkonong, October 10, 1894, Prof. Laur. Larsen said that up to 1870 the Church of Norway would not allow any of its bishops to ordain pastors for America whose call was not recognized and recommended by the Norwegian Synod. Therefore up to that time the Norwegian Synod was officially recognized in Norway as the only right continuation in America of the Church of Norway.

We rejoice over our Lutheran heritage which we in our Synod, by God's grace, have been privileged to keep in its truth and purity.

May the visitation which now befalls Norway humble its people and draw them back to genuine Lutheranism! At present we are spared from chastisement. Will God have to chastise us also in order to teach us to appreciate what we have and from the heart to turn unto His truth? — A. M. HARSTAD, in *Lutheran Sentinel* (Norw. Syn.)

Planned Merger of the United Brethren and the Evangelical Church.—An exchange reports that the two church-bodies mentioned have virtually completed the preparations for their merger. The various particulars having to do with the establishment of the new body have been agreed upon, it seems, and a start has been made to draft a new book of discipline. The United Brethren Convention in 1941 and the Evangelical Convention in 1942 will have to pass on the details involved. The new body will have a membership in excess of 800,000. Both negotiating churches are of Methodist origin. The Evangelical Church is known, too, as the Albright Brethren (Albrechtsbrueder). A.

President Roosevelt Recommends a Revival of Religion.—So reports the *Christian Beacon* as it writes: "Replies by well-known public men to a question recently propounded by a New Jersey minister indicated that many of those answering believe that youth's fundamental need is a clearer understanding and appreciation of religious values. One of the replies came from President Roosevelt, who, terming the question 'both stimulating and provocative,' answered: 'No greater thing could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion. A revival of that would sweep through the homes of the nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a reassertion of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and their work. I doubt if there is any problem, social, political, or economic, that would not melt away before the fires of such a spiritual awakening.'" Very true indeed! And we are glad that the head of our National Government is the one to write these stirring words. This certainly is much better than Stalin's headship of the Ungodly in Russia; and we may be a thousandfold grateful that our President is a man who realizes the value of religion. But the religious awakening that will truly benefit our country is far different from that which Mr. Roosevelt has in mind. The revival of religion that we need today is of the kind that kindled in Europe the Reformation four hundred years ago, and that had its focal point in the preaching of God's unadulterated Word, Law and Gospel. A pagan America, even though "religious" at heart, will not help us, just as the pagan religions of Japan and China and India cannot benefit the teeming population of these countries. What our country needs is the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ and its acceptance by all its inhabitants; and this means that Modernism must go. What we need in our country is not so much a religious revival as rather the return of the Christian religion to our churches and our people. But that is a gift of divine grace, for which we must pray earnestly and unceasingly. J. T. M.

Japanese Students Send Idol Statue to Lindbergh.—The *Christian Beacon* (April 25, 1940) is greatly perturbed by a report that there is a "widespread plan in Japan to erect a Japanese idol on the spot where the Lindbergh child's body was found." The project was revealed in a communication received from a missionary working in Japan. "The following article," writes the *Christian Beacon*, "was published in the *Waseda Guardian* in Japan, on February 21, 1940, under the heading 'Japanese Girls Send Jizo Statue to Lindy': 'A Jizo statue is to be erected by Japanese girls in the woodland of Hopewell, New Jersey, where the

body of Augustus, son of Colonel Lindbergh, was found. The girls are students of the Takata Girls' School in Tokyo. They were deeply touched by the sad story about the unfortunate child told them by Mr. Kikuta Nakazawa, who returned from America after forty years' study of fine arts there. It was a source of real grief to these young hearts that there was nothing whatever at the place where the dead body of the child was found, and the girls began to raise money, economizing their pocket-money to erect a Jizo statue to pray for the peaceful rest of the dead soul. Mrs. Toshiko Takata, the principal of the school, impressed by this beautiful manifestation of gentle feeling of her girls, made up her mind to support this laudable initiative by appealing to all the primary schools in Japan for their sympathetic assistance in carrying out the plan. Japanese clubs and associations in America have also been informed of the project, while pamphlets giving explanation about Jizo are soon to be dispatched to girls' high schools of the whole United States.' The missionary, in commenting upon this, says: 'Won't you please urge all the Christians you can reach to pray that this won't be accepted in America? Is there anything else that should be done to seek to stop it? Please do what you can! The "Jizo" is a favorite idol here, seen everywhere—"an abomination to the Lord."' The *Christian Beacon* adds: "The dictionary definition for Jizo is: 'Sanskrit: Ksitigarbha-bodhisattva, a guardian deity of children.'"

Editorially the *Christian Beacon* remarks on the incident: "We wonder who would be responsible for the authorizing of the erection of a monument on the spot where the Lindbergh baby's body was found. According to the report which has come to us from Japan from a missionary, collections have already been made, and efforts are being made to extend the scope of these collections to girls' high schools in America for the erecting of a Shinto idol on that spot. The Japanese are making all missionaries and their converts bow down to Shinto shrines. Surely the erection of a Shinto idol on that tragic spot where the baby's body was found would be most undesirable in a Christian land. Whosoever has the say in this matter should not grant the permission." The long struggle in Korea between Christian missionaries of liberal and of conservative type is now ended, since the Presbyterian Missionary Board has decided that all missionaries must participate in the Shinto celebrations prescribed by the Japanese government. The missionaries of conservative trend are seeking employment under the Independent Missionary Board, which still opposes Shinto worship participation.

J. T. M.

War Hysteria among the Clergy.—Ominous notes have been and are sounded by certain prominent clergymen. The *Christian Century* draws attention to a letter published by one of them. We quote: "Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Church, came out in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* yesterday with a three-column letter addressed to Secretary of State Hull, urging that the United States immediately enter the present European war on the side of the Allies. He declared that he considered some things more precious than peace and quoted the words of Patrick Henry 'Give me liberty or give me death.' He pre-

sented the current argument that, if Hitler wins this war, America will be in peril. He admits that the United States is not prepared for war, but he adds: "This is true, but it is as well prepared as it was in April, 1917, and certainly the United States is not prepared for such results as would inevitably follow the Hitler victory." Bishop Cannon adds a postscript to his appeal, as follows: "I am writing you not as a bishop of a great Church but simply as one American citizen who believes that justice and righteousness and freedom are necessary for permanent peace in the world." One wonders whether the bishop was not aware that his three-column letter would probably never have seen the light of day in the newspaper were it not for the fact that he is "a bishop of a great Church." It was accompanied by his picture holding a newspaper in his hands."

The same paper states, however, that the Methodist ministers of Richmond, Virginia, quote with approval the addresses of the bishops delivered before the general conference of the Methodist Church on April 25 and statements made by the conference itself, in which our country is urged "to stay out of war in order better to serve world peace and democracy." That the Methodists are not supported by some of the leaders in other Protestant groups is evidenced by a statement signed among others by Reinhold Niebuhr, Henry Sloane Coffin, Bishop Tucker, Lynn Harold Hough, John Mackay, Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, and John R. Mott. What these men, often regarded as representative of Protestantism, say is that in their opinion "quick and resolute action" by the United States is necessary and that our "moral and material resources must be thrown into the balances to aid the cause of the Allies."

It need not surprise us that these ministers take such a stand. Whoever preaches the social gospel cannot be expected to remain silent on great political issues before the nation. He considers it his duty to tell the President, Congress, and the Legislature what they have to do to bring about civic and social betterment. If he believed that a large settlement of American colonists at the South Pole would be of economic advantage to the United States, he would preach strong sermons in favor of such a venture. Whatever our personal opinion as to the political questions of the day may be, let us hope and pray that our Church will not drift into social-gospel preaching and into war hysteria. A.

What Is Revival?—A reader in the *Lutheran* (May 22) writes under this title: "It would be more than just ordinarily interesting to know how many thousands in this land during recent years have been praying for a revival. Of course, there has been a wide range of fervency in these prayers, and they have been offered with a greater or less understanding as to what is involved. If they were better informed as to the immediate and personal implications of such petitions, perhaps many would cease. Better so, however, if others at the same time and by the same token would be helped to pray more understandingly and therefore more sincerely and earnestly. Let us ask Dr. Wadsworth to instruct us. He says: 'Revival is a new obedience to Christ on the part of a great number of the people of God. General

conviction of sin among Christians starts the revival; distress over newly discovered, unconfessed sins gives momentum to revival; but when these sins are repented of and Christians confess their faults one to another and pray one for the other, revival actually is here.' Now, do I want revival to sweep America? And am I ready to say, 'Lord, let it begin in me?' It works like that."

The emphasis which is here placed on the individual as personally sharing in the revival-to-be is certainly correct. Christians cannot pray for a revival in general and leave themselves out of the picture. But the revival described in the paragraph just quoted is by no means such a one as a confessional Lutheran could desire. Dr. Wadsworth quite evidently describes a Buchmanite revival, which really need not be Christian at all. Nor could a Lutheran desire the old-fashioned enthusiastic revival, such as troubled the country when orthodox Methodism took to missionizing extensively half a century ago. Enthusiasm never benefits but always harms, just because it has its beginning and end in work-righteousness and trusts in a sensation faith. However, a revival which also a Lutheran could desire is a more general renewal of interest in the subject of personal salvation, a religious awakening which goes back to the Bible with the age-old question: "What must I do to be saved?" For such a revival every Lutheran, yes, and every true Christian prays whenever he wafts up to the throne of God the Lord's Prayer with its stirring "Thy kingdom come." But such a revival will not come unless we proclaim the Word of God in its truth and purity from the housetops throughout the land.

And even then we have no divine guarantee that large masses will be converted or that whole communities will be brought to the knowledge of salvation. Man-made revivals are possible with men, but God's "revivals" are His own gifts of grace. The confusion prevailing even in some Lutheran circles with regard to revivals suggests a careful study of the Augsburg Confession with its sane and lucid exposition of the true Biblical doctrine, as, for instance, on the Ministry (Art. V): "That we may obtain this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments was instituted. For through the Word and Sacraments, as through instruments, the Holy Ghost is given, *who works faith where and when it pleases God* [italics our own], in them that hear the Gospel, to wit, that God, not for our own merits, but for Christ's sake, justifies those who believe that they are received into grace for Christ's sake." (*Triglot*, p. 45.) But just this is what the enthusiastic revivalist does *not* believe, nor would he countenance what Article V says in conclusion: "They condemn the Anabaptists and others who think that the Holy Ghost comes to men without the external Word, through their own preparations and works." In fact, just that enthusiastic revivalism believes and hopes, and therein lurks real danger.

J. T. M.

Brief Items. — From New York comes the news that Edwin Markham, the renowned poet who recently died, bequeathed his library of about 15,000 books to Wagner College, located on Staten Island, New York. Wagner College belongs to the United Lutheran Church of America.

President Roosevelt has been reelected senior warden of St. James's Episcopal Church, Hyde Park, N. Y. James Roosevelt, his son, was reelected as a vestryman of the same church. So reports the *Christian Century*. Senior warden is the Episcopal term for the chief elder in a church.

The chair of Philosophy of Religion at Union Seminary, vacated through the retirement of Prof. E. W. Lyman, has been given to Prof. Paul Tillich, who terms himself a Lutheran.

The Protestant Episcopal Church is stronger in Brazil, South America, than most of us imagine. Fifty years ago the first missionaries of this Church arrived in Porto Alegre. Now its Brazilian branch has 110 preaching-stations, almost 6,000 communicants, more than 22,000 baptized, and 20 day-schools, with an enrolment of more than 1,500 pupils. On April 21, for the first time, a Protestant Episcopal bishop was consecrated in South America. It was Bishop A. T. Pithan, a native of South America. He resides in Porto Alegre.

Catholics are trying to put the study of sociology on a basis more satisfactory to them. *America* writes in its issue of April 27: "What is often offered as 'sociology' is the veriest balderdash, spiced with atheism and laced with immorality, the noisome mixture being prescribed as the sovereign remedy for all our ills. For that reason we welcome to the growing company of learned quarterlies the *American Catholic Sociological Review*, published at Loyola University, Chicago, under the general editorship of the Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S. J., Ph. D. As Dr. Paul Mundie of Marquette University observes by way of preface to the first issue, sociology has grown rapidly in the last quarter century, and it is necessary 'that Catholics undertake a leadership in the further development of this science.' By publishing the results of research and critical surveys of work in fields as yet little known, the *Review* will do much to aid in the formation of scholarly leaders in sociology. Among the other contributors are Bishop Sheil, Eva J. Ross, Paul Furfey, Edmund C. Horne, S. J., and Raymond W. Murray, C. S. C. The first issue is dedicated very appropriately "To the memory of the late Frederic Siedenburg, S. J., leader and pioneer in the field of Catholic sociology."

The *Lutheran Standard* of April 20 writes with reference to the appointment of Myron Taylor as representative of the President at the Vatican: "While President Roosevelt and the Federal Council are exchanging soft words with one another, our Government is not only in danger of becoming involved with the wily Vatican but has actually become entangled with it; for, as pointed out two weeks ago, to all intents and purposes our country has a permanent embassy to the Pope, with headquarters set up in the Excelsior Hotel in Rome. A Vatican jurist has declared that Mr. Taylor is 'just as much an ambassador to the Holy See as the representatives of other nations.' When asked to deny this interpretation of Mr. Taylor's mission, Mr. Roosevelt blandly remarked that 'no public statement is required' and tried to dispose of the matter as 'a mere press report.'" We are happy to see that Protestant papers keep this issue alive.

A.