

12-1-1940

## Miscellanea

P. E. Kretzmann

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kretzmann, P. E. (1940) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 11 , Article 86.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol11/iss1/86>

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

---



---

## Miscellanea

---

### The Principal Factors in Seminary Training

A theological seminary as we think of it has one chief function and duty to perform, namely, that of instructing and training in the Word of God. There is much useful information in the world, and it is contained in many well-written books. But all books written by human beings that have not been inspired by the Holy Ghost are at best relative truth, containing suppositions and facts as seen by fallible human beings and therefore subject to error and change. The entire history of mankind has abundantly shown that the opinions of men are subject to change, sometimes by a process of slow development, sometimes with amazing and overwhelming rapidity. What is accepted and lauded today as the very acme of perfection in the arts, in literature, in the field of social and political economy, even in the realm of history and the so-called sciences, is modified or discarded in a very short time as no longer fitting conditions brought about by countless factors, some connected with mankind itself, others pertaining to situations resulting from such movements as the industrial revolution and our present machine age.

There is only one book which shares with its author the distinction of which the holy writer states: "Thou art the same," Ps. 102:27. That book is the Bible. And to the study, to the teaching, of this book the seminary is pledged; the training in the knowledge and use of this book is the seminary's chief function. This purpose of every true theological school is, moreover, not confined to its own classrooms, although it is there that the seminary will exert its influence directly. This objective should also be effected, more or less definitely, even if indirectly, through the work of its graduates as they are called and commissioned in the work of the Church throughout the world. They are to uphold and promote the principles of the Holy Scriptures, both as to doctrine and as to life, wherever their work takes them. They are to make every effort to make the Bible a lamp unto the pathway of men and a light unto their feet.

Training for Christian service, therefore, from the standpoint of the seminary, means, in the first place, *Bible saturation for every student's personal devotional life*. It is fundamental, it is imperative, that sin and grace be the chief points of consideration in the life of every one who is being trained to make the Bible the chief tool of his life. Hence every student of the seminary should learn to use the Bible for the sake of appreciating more fully every day the meaning of sin in all its terrible aspects. He is to know, without equivocation, that the transgression of God's holy Law in thought, word, and deed is at the bottom of all social unrest, of all maladjustments in every field of human troubles, and particularly of his own lack of perfection in comparison with the ideals of Holy Writ. And the student is then to learn, to appreciate more and more fully and deeply, that the atonement wrought by the one Savior of mankind is the one great fact on which his own happiness and that of every other human being rests. Without the Savior of



sinners, "who loved me and gave Himself for me," there can be no joy, no hope, no peace of mind and heart. These are facts which can be memorized in a very short time, in a few weeks, perhaps. But these facts require a lifetime of study in order to become truly functional in the life of every one who is called upon to be the spiritual leader of others.

Training for Christian service means, in the second place, a *Bible saturation with a view of gaining the proper philosophy of life and the correct judgment of all situations and circumstances in life*. We do not question for one moment that every human being, if an honest searcher for the truth, can gain much valuable and useful information from the study of the various arts and sciences, from history, from philosophy, from psychology, from sociology. But all this will avail him little if he does not support his knowledge with the wisdom that only God can give. There are no significant circumstances in life, no situations of importance, for which the Word of God does not supply the right thinking, the correct judgment. "All things are yours," writes St. Paul to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 3:22. And shortly before that he had told them: "He that is spiritual judgeth all things," chap. 2:15. One who is truly steeped in the truths of God's holy Word will be the possessor of a philosophy of life which will carry him through the most difficult situations, not on the basis of guess-work and arbitrary suggestions but with the foundation of the eternal wisdom to guide him. This step also, like the previous one, is the work of a lifetime of being saturated with the Word of God.

Training for Christian service means, in the third place, a *careful and adequate instruction and education in a systematic knowledge of the doctrines of the Bible*, and also in the field of Christian ethics. This demand will, indeed, seem very foreign to our present age, with its denial of the truth and its indifference to the certainty which the Bible demands in its adherents. Yet the Lord says: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," John 8:31,32. As we have stated, there is only one absolute truth. This truth pertains primarily to doctrine, to the facts concerning the salvation of men through the atonement wrought by Christ. Every major portion of this truth, of this body of doctrine, was set forth by Jesus Himself: the Trinity, the facts of sin and grace, the atonement, His own deity, the relation between the believer and his God. Moreover, both Jesus and His apostles laid down the principles of Christian ethics with a fulness and comprehensiveness that has never been surpassed. The best compendium of the most learned human philosopher sinks into insignificance beside the lofty and majestic ethical demands of the Word of God. And again we say that it will require a lifetime of the most assiduous study of the Word of God to realize this ideal and to become at least somewhat proficient in the knowledge offered in the Bible.

Training for Christian service, from the standpoint of the seminary, means, in the fourth place, a *systematic training in the application of these truths to every department of social work and to every situation in life*. It is most interesting to find that the much-quoted words of Jesus: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them," John 13:17,



were spoken in connection with a suggestion for service which He brought home to His disciples when He washed their feet. He did not say: Ye should do to others *what* I have done to you, but: "I have given you an example that ye should do *as* I have done to you," v. 15. His example, also in going about and doing good, is to be our inspiration in serving others, in ministering unto others as He ministered to us, in learning the full significance of His words "This is My commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you," John 13:34; 15:12. This is to be the fundamental, in fact, the only motive in the work which we do in any field of Christian social work. And that is to be a part of the training which the seminary is to provide in making men ready for the great problems of life.

But the objection has been raised that the training of the theological seminary, under the principles enumerated above, makes use only of the group approach and gives training only in this particular form of dealing with situations, whereas it would seem essential that training in the individual approach is likewise demanded by the circumstances of present-day life, especially in the field of missions and of institutional work. Let us examine this objection somewhat more closely.

We note that in the training which Jesus gave to the Twelve there was much group instruction, partly addressed to them, partly to assemblies of people in their presence. We know that Jesus also did a good deal of His teaching in private, with only one person as His pupil, as in the case of Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria. In some of these instances, as in the incident of the Syrophenician woman, the disciples were present and may have taken cognizance of the approach and the method of Jesus. But it is quite evident that in other cases Jesus was all alone with the persons concerned and the disciples did not have the benefit of the demonstration. And in the case of the Syrophenician woman they did not understand the Savior's method. Yet, as the letters of Peter adequately indicate, the lessons which Jesus tried to convey to them in every form of His teaching, eventually made the right impression upon them and were applied not only in group situations but in the instance of individuals as well.

The same may be said of St. Paul. His work as teacher is pictured to us with reference both to groups and individuals. Time and again we see him active before assemblies in synagogues and schools. Yet he evidently found occasion and applied the proper teaching methods in the case of individuals, as, for example, that of Onesimus and that of the jailer of Philippi. Whether Paul had any particular training in psychology and sociology is problematical; that he applied the Word of God to good effect in circumstances of every kind is evident. The same is true of Peter, who could preach to thousands with an emphasis that carried conviction but could speak also to the individual, as to the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, in a way which brought comfort and strength for his particular case. In short, a study of the Scriptures seems to indicate: If the background of theological training is adequate, the necessary application may well be made according to the wisdom which God gives in the circumstances.

But here a second objection has been raised, namely: The approach



to the individual should be taught in the theological seminary; in fact, the training offered in the seminary is not adequate unless its courses include some specific application of the principles of psychology and sociology to individual cases.

We would state in reply that the approach in individual cases is included in courses at the seminary, especially in the classes in pastoral theology, which embraces also pastoral psychology. The students for the holy ministry are instructed as to their deportment in the sick-room as well as to their approach in the case of individual transgressions of God's Law. Practically every *type* of case is studied in the light of the Word of God and with the assistance of the best available texts in the field. Beyond this the theological seminary cannot go, except through clinical work undertaken in conjunction with congregations in the neighborhood as well as various institutions of mercy which will be ready to cooperate in offering their facilities for such objectives. All this is being done to the extent that time and circumstances permit.

Beyond this the seminary cannot go without unduly extending the time of its training and making its cost practically prohibitive. Nor does any other professional school attempt more. Even the interne who spends a year or more in a hospital will generally have only *types* of cases to observe and to treat. The medical student who intends to specialize in obstetrics or in ophthalmology or in some specific form of insanity is obliged to seek this special training in centers which devote their time to this particular form of training. No medical school can, in its general course, include all possible eventualities. Nor can a law school do so. The young man who intends to specialize in patent law or in international law or even in the law of corporations will almost invariably be obliged to attend some other institution after his graduation from the regular law courses, an institution which specializes in that particular form of instruction in which he desires to become an expert. So it is unreasonable to expect that a theological seminary give training in every department of mission-work and in every form of charitable endeavor, such as child welfare, family welfare, care of the aged, of orphans, of the physically handicapped, of the insane, of the feeble-minded, and of many other varieties of abnormal conditions. All pastors should be trained to teach the facts of sin, but not all should be expected to be experts in the matter of the consequences of sin in abnormal cases.

We ought to keep our balance also with regard to these questions. While it is true that a pastor may have a few abnormal cases in his pastoral care at all times and will usually be able to work out a technique for their care, it is evident that only about 5 per cent. of our pastors spend the major portion of their time dealing with abnormal conditions as their life's work. These men will simply have to seek their specific training as they feel it is required. While actual statistics are not available, we feel safe in saying that probably not more than 25 per cent. of our pastors would have either the inclination or the specific qualifications for work in the field of abnormal physical, mental, or spiritual conditions. When and where such training is needed, it is available. But in the majority of cases the simple application of the Word of God, the preaching of sin and grace, will take care of the needs of our people.

P. E. KRETZMANN



### Bernunft und Offenbarung

Darüber sagt Otto Dilschneider in der Schrift „Evangelische Offenbarung“, Seite 4 ff.: „Weber Freundschaft und Aufgeschlossenheit noch Abgrenzung und Zurückhaltung, sondern schärfste Begrenztheit kennzeichnen Luthers Haltung gegen den humanistischen Geist seiner Zeit. Wir müssen hier einmal auf das hören, was Luther dem humanistischen Geist seiner Zeit entgegenzuhalten hatte: ‚Ich glaube, daß ich dem Herrn diesen Gehorsam schuldig bin, wider die Philosophie zu streiten und zur Heiligen Schrift zu mahnen. . . . Ich habe mich schon viele Jahre darinnen zerrieben und erfahre, höre und sehe immer wieder, daß es ein Studium der Eitelkeit und des Verderbens ist. Verhalben ermahne ich euch, soviel ich kann: Habt acht und macht doch diese Studien schnell ab. . . . Macht es so, wie wir es mit schlechten Künsten und mit Irthümern tun. . . . Wir lernen sie, um sie zu zerstören und zu widerlegen. . . . Sind wir also nicht in einem hellen Wahn befangen, wenn wir uns mit Lobliedern und Ruhmreden auf die Philosophie befassen?‘ (Aus der Römerbriefvorlesung zu 8, 19.) ‚Niemand wird ein Theologe, wenn er es nicht ohne Aristoteles wird.‘ ‚Kurz, der ganze Aristoteles verhält sich zur Theologie, wie die Finsternis zum Licht.‘ (Aus den Thesen gegen die scholastische Theologie, 1517.) ‚Hier wäre nun mein Rat, daß man die Bücher des Aristoteles, Physik, Metaphysik, über die Seele, Ethik, welche bisher für die besten gehalten sind, ganz abtue. . . . Es tut mir in meinem Herzen weh, daß der verdammte, hochmütige, schalkhafte Heide mit seinen falschen Worten so viele der besten Christen verführt und genarrt hat. Gott hat uns also mit ihm geplagt um unserer Sünde willen.‘ (An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation, 1520.) ‚Hier haben wir eine klare und deutliche Stellungnahme Luthers gegen die geistigen Träger seines Zeitalters und des mittelalterlichen Humanismus vor uns liegen. Nahezu könnte man meinen, daß dies Sätze sind, die ein junger, stürmender Luther geschrieben hat, der sich dann in späteren Jahren vorgerückten Alters eines Besseren besonnen hätte. Aber es ist so, daß diese antihumanistische Grundhaltung wie ein roter Faden durch das Lebenswerk Luthers bis zum späten Alter hindurchgeht. Als es 1524/25 zur Auseinandersetzung mit Carlstadt kommt, schreibt Luther: ‚Hinfürder lehrt er [Carlstadt] uns, was Frau Hulde, die natürliche Vernunft, zu diesen Sachen sagt, gerade als wüßten wir nicht, daß die Vernunft des Teufels Hure ist. Aber ehe wir derselben Erzihure und Teufelsbraut antworten, wollen wir zuvor unsern Glauben beweisen.‘ (Wider die himmlischen Propheten, 1524/25.)

„Alle unsere Aussagen und Erkenntnisse fußen auf einer Autorität. Diese Autorität aber ist im Humanismus der Mensch selber, bezw. seine höchste Einsicht, die er von den Dingen hat, seine Vernunft. Sie ist der Eckpfeiler der humanistischen Lebenshaltung und Lebensausrichtung. Das hatte Luther erkannt und darum zieht er gegen sie zu Felde. Im Jahre 1525 kommt es zur grundsätzlichen Auseinandersetzung mit dem Humanisten Erasmus von Rotterdam, in der Luther die Sätze schreibt: ‚Das sind Argumente der menschlichen Vernunft, die derartige Weisheit von sich zu geben pflegt. . . . Wir wissen, daß die Vernunft nur törichte und widersinnige Dinge schwätzt, besonders dann, wenn sie in heiligen Dingen ihre Weisheit zu zeigen anhebt.‘ (Vom unfreien Willen, 1525.) Dieser Kampf Luthers gegen die Humanisten und ihre Vernunftargumente dauert bis zu Luthers



Lebensende an. Noch in einer seiner letzten Predigten, die er hielt, ruft er der Gemeinde zu: „Und was ich von der Brunnst, so eine grobe Sünde ist, rede, solches ist auch von der Vernunft zu verstehen; denn diese schändet und beleidigt Gott in geistlichen Sachen, hat auch viel greulichere Sündenübel denn eine Hur. . . . Darum siehe, daß du die Vernunft im Baume hältst und folgst nicht ihren schönen Gedanken. Wirf ihr einen Dreck ins Angesicht, auf daß sie häßlich werde.“ (Aus der Predigt über Röm. 12, 3 v. J. 1546.) . . .

„Gerade durch diese Haltung vermochte Luther das Vermächtnis einer echten, biblischen Theologie zu hinterlassen. Luthers Geist ist es, der noch aus den Loci des jungen Melancthon im Jahre 1521 zu uns spricht: In gleicher Weise, wie wir an Stelle des Christus in diesen späteren Zeiten der Kirche den Aristoteles aufnahmen, würde sogleich nach den Anfängen der Kirche durch die platonische Philosophie die christliche Lehre erschüttert. So kam es, daß außer den kanonischen Schriften keine reine Lehre und Literatur in der Kirche vorhanden ist. Alles, was in den Kommentaren im allgemeinen vorgetragen wird, reicht nach Philosophie.“ (*Loci*, 1521.)“

Seite 70: „Von der Schrift sagt Luther: . . . ut sit ipsa per se certissima, facillima, apertissima, sui ipsius interpres“. (W. N. 7, 97.)“

Seite 57 ff.: „Das Wort ist allein Quelle und Richtschnur, und hier gibt es nur ein Entweder-Oder. Entweder man hält es mit dem Wort: ‚Herr, rede, dein Knecht hört‘, oder man verschreibt sich der andern Möglichkeit und sagt: ‚Herr, schweige, dein Knecht redet. . . . In diesen Aussagen [1 Kor. 2, 4. 13; 4, 20] tritt uns immer wieder das gleiche Anliegen des Apostels entgegen. Es geht bei dem, was er zu sagen hat, nicht um logische Schlüsse und Beweisführungen. Seine Wissenschaft erschöpft sich nicht im Lehrvortrag, der sich an den Verstand der Hörer richtet; es geht vielmehr um etwas ganz anderes. . . . Paulus stellt hier [1 Kor. 2, 10 f.] fest, daß der Mensch vermöge seiner natürlichen Erkenntnisfunktionen Geistliches, also die Heilswahrheiten, nicht zu erfassen vermag.“

Auf die Frage: Wo haben wir die Offenbarung? gibt unser Buch nun aber leider nicht die rechte Antwort. E.

### The Credulity of Unbelief

In *The Glory of the Manger* S. M. Zwemer writes, p. 42 ff.: “One marvels at the credulity of unbelief in such a statement as that made by the late Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell University: ‘It may be affirmed that we have no absolute contemporary evidence preserved in its original form by which to prove that Jesus of Nazareth ever lived.’ The fact is that scholars of authority, such as Burkitt, Harnack, and Barnes, are now upholding the genuineness of the well-known passage in Josephus (A. D. 37—100), which has often been discredited as having suffered from interpolation. The passage is as follows: ‘Now, about this time lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it be lawful to call him a man.’” (See *CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY*, IV, p. 274: “The So-called ‘Christian Interpolations’ in Josephus,” for the entire passage.) “Besides, we have the witness of pagan writers of the first centuries, Tacitus, Pliny the Younger, and Lucian of Samosata. Tacitus (*Ann.*, XV, 44): “So to stifle the report, Nero put in his own place as culprits, and punished with every refinement of



cruelty, the men whom the common people hated for their secret crimes. They called them Christians. Christ, from whom the name was given, had been put to death in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate, and the pestilent superstition was checked for a while. Afterwards it began to break out afresh, not only in Judea, where the mischief first arose, but also at Rome, where all sorts of murder and filthy shame meet together and become fashionable. . . ." "Suetonius, writing some years later (A. D. 120), says: 'The Christians, a kind of name given to a new and criminal superstition, were put to death with grievous torments.' (*On the Life of the Caesars*, Nero, 16.)" Pliny, in his *Correspondence with Trajan*, A. D. 112, writes: ". . . Meanwhile this is the course I have taken with those accused before me as Christians. . . . As for those who said that they neither were, or ever had been, Christians, I thought it right to let them go when they recited a prayer to the gods at my dictation, made supplication with incense and wine to your statue, and moreover cursed Christ — not one of which things (so it is said) can those who are really Christians be made to do. Others who were named by the informer said that they were Christians and then denied it, explaining that they had been but had ceased to be such, some, three years ago, some a good many years, and a few, as many as twenty. All these not only worshiped your statue and the images of the gods but cursed Christ. They maintained, however, that the amount of their fault or error had been this, that it was their habit on a fixed day to assemble before daylight and sing by turns a hymn to Christ as God (or a god); and that they bound themselves with an oath not to commit any enormity but to abstain from theft, brigandage, or adultery, not to break their word, and not to deny a deposit when demanded. . . ." Lucian of Samosata writes in *The Death of Peregrinus*: "The Christians, in sooth, still worship that great man who was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced into the world this new religion. . . . These wretched people have persuaded themselves that they are absolutely deathless and will live forever, for which reason they think slightly of death, and many willingly surrender themselves. And then their first lawgiver has persuaded them that they are all brothers one of another, when once they have transgressed and renounced the gods of the Greeks and worship that crucified Sophist of theirs and live according to his laws. Therefore they despise all things alike, holding them merely as common property and receiving them from one another without giving any particular security; so if any one come among them who is a cheat, adroit, and capable of managing affairs, forthwith he may get quite rich by imposing upon the simple folk."

"Sir James Frazer speaks of the folly of those who deny the historicity of the gospels: 'The doubts which have been cast on the historical reality of Jesus are in my mind unworthy of serious attention. Quite apart from the positive evidence of history and tradition, the origin of a great religious and moral reform is inexplicable without the personal existence of a great reformer. To dissolve the founder of Christianity into a myth, as some would do, is hardly less absurd than it would be to do the same for Mohammed, Luther, and Calvin. Such



dissolving views are for the most part the dream of students who know the great world chiefly through its pale reflexion in books. (*The Golden Bough*, Part VI.)”

All of this belongs to apologetics. And what the real purpose of apologetics is appears from this paragraph in Dr. Zwemer's book, page 170: "Christ is the God-man. Of course there are difficulties in believing this, but these difficulties are not due to lack of sufficient evidence in the Scriptures. The difficulties of *not* believing in the deity of our Lord are far greater. Those who disbelieve must explain the extraordinary personality, influence, and power of Jesus during His life on earth and for the past nineteen centuries in human history. They must deal with the self-consciousness and self-assertion of Christ in the gospel records and face the dilemma that He was *demented* if not divine." The difficulties of not believing in the deity of our Lord are far greater than the difficulties of believing in it. See Pieper, *Chr. Dogmatik*, I, p. 123: "As to the value of the rational proofs for the Christian religion, it is true that we can show . . . that it is certainly more reasonable to accept the Christian religion as true than to deny it. That is the function of apologetics." And p. 375: "When rational reason studies the internal and external proofs for the divine origin and character of Holy Scripture, it is forced . . . to admit that it is more reasonable to accept it than to deny it. That is the function of apologetics." TH. ENGELDER

### Importance of Doctrinal Preaching

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, in a lecture delivered before a seminary thirty-five years ago, quoted in a recent issue of the *Presbyterian*, said: "There is a decadence in doctrinal preaching. The dogmas of the Church are not presented to the people with anything like the clearness or passion with which they were presented fifty years ago. In many a Christian pulpit the doctrines are slowly disappearing. The preacher who substitutes ethical homilies gets into the papers, creates a commotion, and shoots up like a rocket—though he, of course, comes down like a stick. The real heretic of our day is the man who drops doctrine out of his preaching."

The *forte* of our Lutheran Church has been her insistence on doctrinal teaching in her parish-schools, catechumen classes, and in the pulpit. Without thorough indoctrination church-members are deprived of some of the blessings of Christianity and are in greater danger of yielding to sinful temptations and of falling a prey to false teachers. It was the restoration of Bible doctrine and the teaching of it that brought about the Reformation (see preface to Luther's Small Catechism). The strength of the Lutheran Church does not consist in the large number of people who call themselves Lutherans but in its doctrinal purity. Modernism and all other isms will not be kept out of the Lutheran Church if she does not strictly adhere to the revealed truths of Scripture and if she fails to teach these to her members. If our preachers substitute "ethical homilies" for doctrinal preaching, a virile Christianity will soon disappear from our churches. May God in His grace prevent this! "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine," 2 Tim. 3:16. J. H. C. F.



### The Antievolutionistic Works of Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt

Some of our readers may be grateful if their attention is drawn to the truly important books of Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt, a famous Catholic anthropologist, who with much success has opposed the teachings of evolution. Dr. Schmidt writes in German, but two of his books have now been translated into English. The titles are, *The Culture Historical Method of Ethnology: the Scientific Approach to the Racial Question*, translated by S. A. Sieber, published by Fortuny's, New York, and *Primitive Revelation*, translated by Joseph J. Baierl and published by B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Mo. Writing about these books Dr. S. M. Zwemer says in the *Presbyterian* of June 27:

"All those who still accept the Biblical narrative regarding the origin of man, of sin, and of redemption as recorded in the early chapters of Genesis will welcome two recent volumes on the subject from the pen of a leading anthropologist, Wilhelm Schmidt, founder of the journal *Anthropos* and an acknowledged authority in ethnology and linguistics. His reputation for sound scholarship and meticulous research was established by the completion (in six massive volumes) of his life-long study on the *Origin of the Idea of God (Der Ursprung der Gottesidee)*. In these two later volumes, which have just appeared from the press in translation, Dr. Schmidt comes to the same scientific conclusions reached in the sixth volume of his *magnum opus*, namely, that 'Christ did not appear in history abruptly and unannounced; His way was prepared by gradual and progressive revelation; our task is to show the credibility of these, from the very threshold of history to their fulfilment in Him.' The light of this primitive revelation 'continued to flow among those peoples who remained at the most primitive levels of culture, until at last it was entrusted to the keeping of God's chosen people, Israel, and thus became man's common heritage once more' (pp. III, IV). The survival of this earliest revelation given to Adam is witnessed to by prevalent monotheistic beliefs among many pigmy tribes, the aborigines of Japan and Australia, the American Indians, etc., as well as by early monotheism in the earliest civilizations of the Near East and the Far East.

"The two books by Dr. Schmidt cover different ground and yet are closely related. The second is less technical and therefore easier reading. The first is concerned with a scientific and Christian approach to the racial question. It consists of two parts. The first part covers the historical background of the science of ethnology; the second part applies the author's theory to modern problems of race with geographical and historical examples. Both volumes repudiate the old evolutionary hypothesis as the only true solution to the problems of racial distinctions and development. 'Aprioristic evolution must be eschewed, but it is quite proper to make a quite logical deduction . . . in a certain series of phases of development.'

"The summary of the whole ethnological argument is found in *Primitive Revelation* (pp. 100—152), and therefore this work can be more strongly recommended for the general reader." A.

