Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 12 Article 54

8-1-1941

Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

Externalism Marches On. — Under this heading Rev. F. R. Webber, in his special department "The Fine Arts in the Service of the Church," in the *American Lutheran* calls attention to a most vital issue in our church-work — the divinely commanded concentration of all our efforts in our ministry, of whatever nature these may be, in the declaration of the plan of salvation as taught in God's Word. The writer begins with the thought that until three or four years ago it was the common view in our midst that the one reason for establishing new congregations and maintaining old ones was "to declare the plan of salvation taught in the Word of God" and that "anything else, however praiseworthy, is only a matter of minor importance." "One might use a black robe or a coat of many colors. He might have his choir vested in black or in white. He might have but two candles on his altar or forty-nine. . . . All these things are matters of minor concern, and the teaching of the Scriptural plan of salvation is the one important thing. We believed that all Lutherans recognized this principle." He then shows that today, more and more, trends are asserting themselves in Lutheran circles to emphasize externals and that we are in danger of forgetting the central work of the Christian ministry. In his whimsical way he furnishes many convincing illustrations and with droll irony castigates the exhibitionism which goes hand in hand with externalism. One must read the article carefully at least twice to see its classic perfection and understand its profound significance for our present restive theological generation, which endeavors to adjust itself to a new situation. To invite study of the timely article, we append the last two paragraphs, which give it a fitting climax.

Pastor Webber writes: "The writer is kept busy of late suggesting methods of rehabilitating shoddy churches that have begun to fall apart. When these were built, ten or fifteen years ago, we warned time and again against sacrificing honest construction and permanent materials for mere size. It did no good: those flimsy churches are going to pieces today. *So, too, will our church-life disintegrate, and that speedily, if we allow externalism to get a foothold.* [Italics our own.] To get back to fundamentals means not only to preach things found in the Bible but to preach the thing that is the very heart of religion: mankind's utter sinfulness and salvation solely by the grace of God and the merit of our Savior. It does not require a big church with a showy street façade to do this, nor does it require six men in formal morning dress to manipulate two offering-plates, nor a choir parading through this aisle and that, singing a hymn in four-four time as loud as they can shout. All this is but the 'pomp and show' which many people most properly dislike. The simple truths of sin and grace may be preached just as effectively in a small, modest church, whose honest, genuine construction (although in itself an external thing) yet is a silent proof of an honest spirit that produced it. They can be preached, for that matter, with no church-building at all. The apostles were great missionaries, one and all, yet

there is no proof that a single one of them had to surround himself with any of the outward things considered nowadays so essential to the onward march of Christianity."

Pastor Webber, of course, does not mean to say that there are no values in externals; there certainly are. The externals, however, must not crowd out the essential, which, alas, is done also if the order of service is stretched to such lengths that the pastor must confine his message to a mere spiritual recess of twenty minutes or even less. The matter certainly deserves study.

In the same number of the *American Lutheran*, by the way, J. F. E. Nickelsburg pleads for a more fitting name for our "Missouri Synod Lutheran Church" and suggests the simple name *The Evangelical Lutheran Church* without the descriptive "Missouri Synod" in parentheses and smaller print below. We like the name but believe that for some time at least we still need the qualifying "Missouri Synod," which is known the world over as representing a group of Christians standing four-square on the principles of Lutheranism as these are set forth in the Confessions of that Church. J. T. M.

The War and Christian Missions. — That the war has formed a serious drawback to the progress of Christian missions in foreign lands is evident to every thinking person. For our own Church serious difficulties have arisen through the war for the conduct of our work in India, China, and Africa. What is probably most deplorable is the antipathy, or aversion, to Christianity which the gigantic conflict has originated in the minds of many heathen. In the *Living Church* (Protestant Episcopal) an Episcopal clergyman, the Rev. Edmund L. Souder, expatiates on this idea as follows: "The most serious hindrance to the Church's work in the mission-field caused by the war is, I am convinced, due to the tragic failure of the 'Christian' West to manifest the faith professed by tens of millions of its citizenry. The moral prestige of the white man has struck a new low in the Orient as, for the second time in one generation, the nations of the world euphemistically called 'Christian' are at one another's throats, using the scientific marvels of their 'civilization' in the mass slaughter of communities. . . . Having nearly wrecked our social order in one barren attempt to save democracy (or was it the profit system?), we are now busily engaged in finishing the job. Our idealism in all this is not nearly so apparent to the non-Christian world as it is to many of us. To be sure, thank God, the conspicuous helpfulness of many missionaries and native Christians in such unhappy situations as that in war-torn China or caste-ridden India has served to reveal the compassionate Christ; and a surprising number of non-Christians seemed thus able to find the Savior of the world despite the hideous denial of Christian faith and life in 'Christian' lands. But there is little question that the greatest single obstacle to Christian faith among thoughtful men and women in the mind of all is, I believe, not in fanatical belief in 'gods that cannot save,' but rather the disgraceful spectacle of millions of Christ's followers engaged in fratricidal strife."

Whether the author is right in pointing to the war as "the greatest single obstacle to Christian faith among thoughtful men and women in

the mind of all" we doubt. But one must admit that his words at once call to mind several Scripture-passages: "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you," Rom. 2:24. "Abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul, having your conversation honest among the Gentiles, that whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works which they shall behold glorify God in the day of visitation," 1 Pet. 2:11 f. Are we always as conscious as we should be of the offense created when supposedly Christian nations declare war against one another and each slaughters the citizens of the opposing country? A.

Why are Ministers Granted Exemption? — Dr. Howard Johnson of Millville, N. J., discusses this question in the *Watchman-Examiner* (Northern Baptist), and his remarks will be read with interest by our readers, too.

"Some excitement has been registered over the fact that ministers and theological students are exempted by the Selective Service Act, and we have been urged to refuse and protest this exemption. Some unreasonable things have been written on behalf of this, and I wish to give my views on the subject.

"In the first place, why must Protestant ministers speak with one voice to condemn the exemption granted to those who are engaged in full-time religious work or are preparing so to engage? Because of his work in the social order the minister is often offered professional consideration by hospitals, physicians, some department stores, railroads, and other agencies. I doubt that the average minister ever receives enough for well-paid writers to protest; but if some agencies wish to show a recognition of the social merits of the minister beyond his personal returns, should any who prefer not to accept such courtesies excoriate their brethren who may accept such considerations? Cannot one be conscientious on either side? Likewise, any recognition of religious service in the community by the State does not require the body of Protestant ministers to muster a group conscience for all. The decision of National Director Clarence Dykstra in the Howard Schomer case shows that one may waive ministerial exemption. Furthermore, when did any kind of exemption deny a minister the right to volunteer in military service if he wished to do so? I can see nothing that calls for shame if some men conscientiously believe that the State recognizes the value of the trained minister to be greater in spiritual stability for the State than if he served as a soldier. I well recall the letters which I received from the Government 23 years ago asking for my support, morally, as a minister. That moral support I was proud to give and would be again.

"Second, if there is any protest against Protestant ministers' being exempt, I shall protest as vigorously against exemption on the part of the Roman Catholic priesthood, even as you (and I) did against the appointment of Myron C. Taylor to the Vatican. We would doubtless agree that the Roman Catholic priest is no more a 'holy man' than the humblest Protestant minister. Holiness comes from within, and while it may be ratified from without, I refuse to accept the outer ratification of one group as an accepted order of things in a land where we have

no State Church. Whatever the steps that brought it about in the present law, there should be exemption or no exemption for *all* ministers — Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or otherwise. It is the only American thing to do.

"Third — and of the greatest consequence — any validity for exemption of any minister or theological student comes from the definite service he can render to the State in a supreme hour. If we grant that the State may call all of us if it calls any of us, then we have a right to ask whether the minister's preparation for the ministry and service in it add up to so little in social and spiritual assets to the community that he should erase all such training and service and enlist as a 'buck private' with gun, Bible, and 'Christ in his heart.'

"This pragmatic test is not one of 'holy man, *ex cathedra*, or minister without authoritative portfolio,' but of the relative value of the minister to the community in his chosen and called profession. At Northfield last summer a prominent minister from the Middle West told the audience of his experience in the last World War. He was asked to serve on a committee whose task it was to notify certain business men that they were dealing in 'non-essentials' in winning the war. 'Nobody ever accused me of being in a non-essential business,' said this preacher, 'because each one knew that death might be just around the corner, and preparation for death is a very essential business.' In war or peace the minister who is worth his salt to God or man is aware that he is dealing with the greatest essentials; namely, the moral and spiritual values of the human soul in time and eternity. I believe it is fundamentally this recognition which is usually the primary cause now or at any other time, the recognition by our Government that a faithful minister who shepherds a hundred or a thousand souls is worth more in building *morale*, integrity, faith, and hope than if he were counted simply as one more soldier in a crisis that must eventually be stabilized by the principles for which the faithful minister lives." A.

An Analysis of the Lutheran "Heresy." — A writer in *America* (Jesuit weekly) opines: "The blow struck by Luther was aimed not at the historical person of Christ but at His mystical body, which is the Church. That blow inflicted on the mystical body a wound which has not yet been healed. Healing has been delayed because we, the members of that body, have failed to recognize the serious nature of the hurt and to use the only means by which it may be cured.

"The Protestant heresy teaches that men can separate themselves from the body of Christ and still remain Christians. To support this contention, it is necessary to deny the real presence of our Lord in the blessed Sacrament and to affirm belief in the historical Christ as sufficient for salvation. This heresy is, therefore, a grievous affront to the Second Person of the blessed Trinity in that form in which He has chosen to perpetuate His Presence among us. In this it resembles the affront offered by Adam to God the Father. And as the disobedience of Adam plunged the whole race into disaster, so the defiance of Luther has involved the whole world in a spiritual catastrophe from whose direct results all of us Catholic as well as Protestants suffer today and will suffer tomorrow.

"The loss inflicted on the world by the Protestant heresy is incalculable. The chief victims of the tragedy are its own adherents, whom the sin of Luther has deprived of those twin sources of spiritual riches and grace: Mass and the sacraments. This loss is comparable to the loss of Paradise suffered by the human race in the sin of Adam; and it cannot be repaired except by means similar to those used by divine love and wisdom to repair the first.

"Nor can we delay any longer: the danger which threatens us — which has indeed overtaken us — is too great. It is not now a question of saving our souls only, but our lives also; we must sacrifice or be sacrificed. We must win back to the Church those nations lost to her by the sin of Luther, or we shall all alike perish. There can be no peace or safety for the world until this reunion is achieved. In this work we can use no other weapon than that which our Lord Himself used to undo the work of Adam and open to us again the gates of heaven. By sacrifice this can be done, and not otherwise." The old superstition and the old fanaticism! A.

Some Hints Concerning the Methods that Should be Used at American Lutheran Colleges. — In the *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Educational Conference Prof. Edwin Lake Setzler, dean and professor of English at Lenoir Rhyne College, submits a brief article with the caption "Our General Objectives Must be Made Specific." We reprint it here because it furnishes food for thought.

"Our Lutheran colleges are not vocational institutions. They do not offer professional courses in medicine, law, engineering, but they are primarily concerned with qualifying students to receive the bachelor-of-arts or the bachelor-of-science degree. Incidentally, students who have completed certain courses in education are considered prepared for the profession of teaching; but the institution itself does not pretend to be essentially a vocational or professional school.

"Our colleges, therefore, being general in nature, not vocational, *must per se* assume that our curricula, our methods of instruction, and our social practices on the campus will prepare a student for successful living regardless of what his life-work is to be. If this be untrue, then why the college? We *must* maintain that our educational program is basically correct, that it will develop better Christian citizens, that it will produce leaders in every community, and that it will enable our graduates to live more satisfactorily in any vocation which they may follow. We must maintain that, although we do not prepare for specific vocations as would a trade-school, the type of training we offer will be invaluable to the students who receive it.

"Twenty-five years ago we were positive that our curricula and our methods would procure the desired results. We did not question the fact that our graduates would show certain desirable characteristics as a result of disciplined training, education which required effort on the part of the student to master it. The course of study was limited, and the student studied subjects regardless of whether they were pleasant or not; regardless of whether at that time he felt that he might not *like* them. He acquired habits of study, habits of work, habits of conscious mental effort, and at least had the fact suggested

to him that the world into which he was going would not be an easy one. Acquiring habits and methods was considered to be just as important as, or more important than, acquiring facts.

"Today, if we are to judge by the diversity of the courses offered and the variety of methods used in the classroom, there seems to be little agreement within our institutions as to the value of the different courses taught or as to the relative emphasis to be placed on the acquiring of facts and the development of definite traits of character. It is true that we state the objectives of our college in each catalog, but these objectives are so generalized that they seem mere platitudes." A.

The Case of the Hon. James E. Bennet and Dr. Buttrick. — The *Christian Beacon* (Feb. 6, 1941) publishes a most interesting bit of correspondence between the Hon. James E. Bennet, well known as a confessing Christian and civic leader throughout the East, and Dr. Buttrick, last year's president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The matter concerned Dr. Buttrick's much-discussed modernistic book *The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt*, published some time ago, in which the author denies every specifically Christian doctrine. On Jan. 14, 1941, Mr. Bennet wrote Dr. Buttrick as follows: "I have been reading from your recent book, *The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt*, and have wondered what is your background, training, and experience in relation to these matters. Surely it is different from mine. The other night, at the Bowery Mission, I had the great joy of leading twenty-three men to make a profession of faith in Jesus Christ as their Savior. At Sing Sing Prison, a few days before, there were twenty-four men who did the same. At the John 5:24 Mission in Philadelphia, a little before that, there were twenty men. And so it has been going for a long time in my experience. I teach these men that the Bible is the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. I also teach them original sin as taught in the Bible and that salvation is only through faith in Jesus Christ, God's Lamb of Sacrifice. I teach them practically everything that you deny in your books, and they are glad to believe and accept it. Some of these men I am able to follow up and see the marvelous improvement. Old things literally pass away, and all things become new.

"I do not find any of this in your books, and I am wondering what success you have with your theories or doubts in leading souls to Christ as their Savior. At one of these meetings there were one hundred and nine men present, of whom forty-seven admitted that they were college graduates, but they were all lost, and they knew it. The theories set forth in your books would not have saved them, but the old-fashioned eternal truths of the Bible did lead many of them to accept Christ as their Savior and to obey Him as their Lord. It seems to me that your book is not only completely useless, but also very dangerous. I personally spoke at four hundred and forty-eight meetings last year and saw souls born into the Kingdom every week, but nothing in your book would be helpful to me or any of the persons to whom I spoke. I am wondering why you wrote it, whom you expect to read it, and what results you expect to get.

"You would be interested, perhaps, in another thing. Last year a group of freethinkers and atheists brought suit in New York City against Dr. Harry Rimmer for a thousand dollars, claiming that he had offered that sum as a reward for any one who could prove a scientific error in the Bible. The trial occupied two days, by which time the judge dismissed it for lack of proof. *The interesting thing is that practically all the points raised by these atheists are contained in your book as a part of your belief* [italics our own] *or unbelief, whichever it may be.* It would have been interesting to me if you had been a witness on the stand, subject to cross-examination as the atheists were. They completely failed to prove their case. They also had Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Dr. Charles Francis Potter as witnesses, and they also failed in their proof. The judge was a young Hebrew, who was perfectly impartial and decided the case on the laws of evidence.

"I have never met you but have read considerable of the things that you have written and have read statements in the newspapers purported to have been made by you. I am an old man compared with yourself and have been teaching the Bible for forty-five years; but I am deeply mystified as to why you wrote this present book about *Facts and Doubts* and what you hope to accomplish and how many souls have been saved because it was published and distributed. I am writing this in no controversial sense but in the hope that you will give me some answer, setting forth the reasons that actuated you and why you hold the beliefs which are so closely allied to those of the freethinkers, atheists, and agnostics."

To this humble, sincere, and convincing letter of an honest Christian, Dr. Buttrick cynically replied as follows: "Is there any use in our conducting a correspondence concerning what I have written in *The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt?* Frankly, it seems to me that such a correspondence would be without any useful purpose. You can accept the literal inerrancy of Scripture. I cannot accept it; it seems to me a profoundly irreligious interpretation. You tell me that my preaching would be of no service to the people with whom you speak. Probably your message would be of similarly little service to those to whom I preach. So let us agree to disagree. I hope my book did not hurt you too much. I assure you of my admiration for your sincerity, and I send my best wishes."

From Dr. Buttrick's letter it appears that he cannot answer the charges made by Christian Mr. Bennet, but he dismisses his questions with a sneer and adds blasphemy to insult by declaring the doctrine of the literal inerrancy of the Bible (verbal inspiration) to be a profoundly irreligious interpretation. Yet Dr. Buttrick has been president of the Federal Council and one of the missioners of the National Christian Mission. J. T. M.

The Malvern Conference. — The church-papers make frequent mention of the Malvern Conference, and it is desirable that our readers should have some information concerning it. This conference was held early this year in Malvern, England. Its chairman was the Anglican Archbishop of York, Dr. William Temple. The questions which the con-

ference discussed had to do with the message which the Church should send forth in this period of confusion and strife. The conference expressed the view that the English government, in order to hasten the end of the war and pave the way for peace negotiations, should definitely state the aims it pursues in this war. It furthermore stated that whatever improvements in the political and economic field the Church may work for, its pronouncements must be based on the great doctrines of creation, incarnation, redemption, and grace. It stressed important truths pertaining to the family, education, and public worship. To make congregations active in a social way, it suggests that each parish should "plan, and carry out, some common enterprise for the general good, devoting its energies perhaps toward bad housing or malnutrition" or towards some other worthy object in which the community should be interested. Finally it stated that the view that the Church must be interested exclusively in the conversion of individuals must be dropped. Changing the individual, it was said, is not sufficient. A sentence in the report taken over from the report of the Madras Conference quite well states the point of view that obtained at Malvern: "Change those individuals, and you do not necessarily change the social order, unless you organize those changed individuals into collective action in a wide-scale frontal attack upon those corporate evils." Concerning public ownership the Malvern report says: "The question having been put on moral grounds whether a just order of society can be established so long as ownership alone is a source of income or so long as the resources necessary to our common life are privately owned, we urge that Christian people should face this question with open minds and alert consciences." There is no doubt that the report of the Malvern Conference is an important document. It is not our intention to submit here a critical estimate of the resolutions and views which emanated from that meeting. We merely wish to say that it seems to us those theologians at Malvern went into fields where they no longer could speak with authority because there are no pronouncements of Scripture covering the respective questions.

From the *Living Church* we learn that the Malvern Declaration is studied widely in this country. The editor of that paper says: "We are not so much concerned that churchmen in this country shall arrive at the same conclusions, but rather that they shall formulate intelligent opinions on the same subjects, since they are the questions that will be of primary importance in the war and postwar world." It is a strange judgment which is quoted in the paper just mentioned from the *London Church Times*, which remarks that the Malvern Declaration "is in effect the condemnation of the system of society that has developed since the industrial revolution, but which has its only possible moral defense in the doctrines of Calvin." Calvin, it is well known, endeavored after a fashion to continue the Old Testament theocracy in modern states. Through this endeavor he thoroughly mixed Church and State. The people who now condemn his attitude (a condemnation which is justified) ought to be careful that they do not commit the same error as he.

A.

The Religious Situation in Russia. — At present it is difficult to obtain information on religious affairs in Russia. A paragraph on this topic sent the *Christian Century* by a correspondent from Geneva, Switzerland, will be read with interest:

"Soviet magazines continue to bear unwilling and very significant testimony to the fact that religion is still very much alive in Russia, not only among old people, but also among youth. The last number of the *Antireligious Magazine* contains a leading article on the antireligious tasks of the school. It begins by observing that religious prejudices and pious superstition continue to have an infectious influence in U. S. S. R. and that the younger generation is especially susceptible to the influence of the clergy. It goes on to tell of an eight-year-old boy in the region of Novo Sibirsk who refused to join the junior section of the Communist Youth Association, and declared to his teacher: 'I am religious and can already say three prayers. I want to go to heaven and not to hell.' Many cases are known where children of believing parents have stayed away from school at the church festivals, gone to confession, and received Communion. 'The influence of religion on the mind and will of the child is devastating,' says the magazine. 'Religion implants in the growing personality inferior qualities, such as humility, patience, submissiveness, passivity, lack of will-power, contempt for life, rejection of science, and enmity toward Communism, collective work, and socialistic collective property. Religion brings the child up as a slave of God.'" A.

The Catholic Conception of Tolerance. — A spokesman of the Roman Catholic Church in our country is Cardinal Villeneuve, the Primate of his Church in Canada. A correspondent of the *Christian Century* quotes the following paragraphs from a radio address which the cardinal delivered January 31, 1938:

"Where custom has put these modern liberties, freedom of worship, of speech, of the press, of teaching, etc., into force, the citizens are to use them only for good; for a liberty can be regarded as legitimate only in so far as it increases our power for good; beyond that, never. In short, to prefer for the state a constitution tempered by the democratic element is not in itself against order, on condition, however, that the Catholic doctrine on the divine origin and proper exercise of public power is respected.

"I believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church, and I would not be logical if I did not believe that other churches and other doctrines were false. It follows that I must believe in principles of liberty as they are defined by the Church. There are, perhaps, at this moment strangers to our faith who are listening to me. Let me reassure you. I do not in the least wish to contest the part, at least, of truth and religion, however incomplete, which are yours. And that is how, in all practical logic and charity, I tolerate you. I tolerate you so that you will tolerate me, so that you may admire at once the splendor of my religion and the civility of my charity. I tolerate you in order to have your collaboration in the common good, and when such collaboration stops, when you preach corrosive doctrines and

spread everywhere poisoned seeds, then I can no longer tolerate you. Such, gentlemen, is Catholic liberalism, the true liberalism. It is in virtue of its doctrine of liberty that the Church refuses to recognize rights for what is not in conformity with natural morality and Christian revelation."

It will be noticed how carefully the cardinal chooses his words. There are loopholes left here for persecution of dissenters. He believes in the principles of liberty, but "as they are defined by the Church." Note especially the last sentence, where the principle of tolerance for all religions and denominations is definitely rejected. A.

Will Rome Change the Mass?—The *Lutheran* (March 12, 1941) writes rather hopefully about the supposed changes that are to be made in Catholic public worship. Writing editorially, it says: "Catholicism is gradually approximating the Protestant idea of congregational worship, it seems. That, at least, is indicated by the growing favor being accorded the 'dialog mass' in various sections of the Roman Church. In 1928 the late Pope Pius XI characterized the bulk of the Catholic worshipers as 'mute and silent spectators' and urged a return to the 'more active communal worship of the ancient Church.' The 'dialog mass,' which provides a 'vocal cooperation of the Catholic laity,' is an attempt to answer the late Pope's appeal and is practiced with favor in Belgium, France, and our own Middle States. The Jesuits are especially industrious in promoting this form of Mass through a traveling 'Summer School of Catholic Action.' One Jesuit leader has even intimated that the Mass may eventually be brought even nearer to the people by being translated into common speech. The Church of the Blessed Sacrament in New York City has actually experimented (February 9) with a 'dialog mass' in a special musical setting. But the Catholics do not have all the initiative. More recently a proposal has been offered to arrange Haendel's sacred oratorios in operatic form to commend them by the acting of the singers to larger audiences and to stimulate their religious influence."

Rome, in competition with Protestantism, is, of course, ready to make amazing concessions, as our modern Catholic Bible societies and other innovations prove; however, since the decisions of the Council of Trent have definitely fixed the meaning and function of the Roman Mass, Catholic worship permits no real changes in its essential features. Catholic public worship centers in the Mass, and the Mass is a sacred sacrifice, in which the priest as mediator between God and the congregation makes an offering to Him for the sins of the people, who are merely the recipients of the grace of the Mass. Consequently, the congregation, by the very principle involved, participates in the Mass fundamentally only as receiving and not as contributing. It may briefly utter cries of repentance or give thanks for the gifts received, but beyond this it cannot be active.

At the same time, when the writer read the *Lutheran's* optimistic paragraph, he read also a notice in confessional Lutheran Germany's quite reliable popular periodical *Die Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* (January 17, 1941), which reports: "Kardinal-Erzbischof Schulte von Koeln teilte im *Kirchlichen Anzeiger fuer die Erzdioezese Koeln* vom

1. Dezember 1940 mit, es sei der Wunsch der deutschen Bischoefe, dass die *oeffentliche Eroerterung liturgischer Fragen* [italics in the original] bis auf weiteres unterbleibe. In allen Kirchen der Erzdioezese Koeln ist ausdruecklich verboten, die Messe so zu lesen, dass der Priester bei der Messfeier mit dem Angesicht zum Volk steht. Diese Form der Gemeinschaftsmesse wurde von vielen Anhaengern der liturgischen Bewegung, welche vor allem die juengere Priesterschaft erfasst hat, besonders gepflegt, weil sie eben den Charakter der Messe als Gemeinschaftsfeier hervorhebt. Diese Massnahme haengt zusammen mit der von uns bereits berichteten Tatsache, dass die deutschen Bischoefe die Leitung und Auswertung der Bestrebungen, die in der liturgischen Bewegung zum Ausdruck kommen, selbst uebernommen haben." This means that in Germany the Catholic liturgical movement with its tendency to popularize the Roman Mass has already been brought under official ecclesiastical control. According to Catholic doctrine the Roman Mass is no *Gemeinschaftsfeier*, that is, no "communal worship."

J. T. M.

A Pope. — Under this heading the *Christian Beacon* (March 27, 1941) writes: "The March issue of the *Presbyterian Tribune* has in it a program for the Church. It recognizes that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has a 'strong executive ecclesiastical' machine and that the Church needs 'an outstanding ecclesiastical spokesman,' who can remain in office longer than the single year now allotted the moderator of the General Assembly and who will be known abroad as the leader of the Presbyterian Church. Here is the Episcopal notion. It was the cry of the children of Israel in the days of Samuel, 'We want a king to reign over us; we want a king like the nations round about us.' The founding fathers of the Presbyterian Church would turn over literally in their graves if they knew that the leading magazine of the Church, the mouthpiece of the ecclesiastical authorities of the denomination, was now coming forth boldly with such a request. The parity of the clergy was too precious a doctrine. Now we must have a leader, some one who will be more than a moderator, to whom the public can look for guidance, and who can speak authoritatively in behalf of the Church. This path is the road to Rome, whether the modern liberals realize it or not. They are retreating very rapidly into the very camp of the Roman Catholic Church. When present-day Protestantism, minimizing doctrinal differences and emphasizing as paramount the unity of organization, finally brings together all the larger Protestant denominations into one great Church, it will find no better spokesman for its cause or more tried and true representative of its union than the one who now professes to be the Vicar of Christ and who dwells in the Vatican."

There is no doubt much truth in the thought here suggested that the Papacy will use both the present-day liberal movement and the present World War to its advantage. As the *Sunday-school Times* (Feb. 23, 1941) reports, "great stores of Bibles have been reduced to paper pulp by the Franco government. Protestantism has been generally suppressed [in Spain], and certain of the Catholic clergy are proposing the reinstatement of the Inquisition. Today the Bible is a forbidden book."

In the *Sunday-school Times* of May 4, 1941, Ernest Gordon offers the following report: "An ecumenical council, to be held at the Vatican, is planned by Pope Pius XII to take place, immediately after the war, according to reports from Rome. It is to be the largest since the Council of Trent. Thousands of prelates, including archbishops and bishops and other high dignitaries of the Church, will be summoned from all quarters of the globe. Why this fresh council? To bring in a new order, according to the newspaper dispatch. Obviously the Vatican looks for, and hopes for, and is even intriguing for, the downfall of England, which has been the backbone of Protestantism throughout the world." Political movements by the Vatican are then discussed, and the article warns: "The name Trent is ominous to Christian ears. It was at the Council of Trent in 1545 that the Counter-Reformation was initiated and an era of persecution and repression opened which destroyed the Reformation in half of Europe." J. T. M.

A Factory for Words in the Sacred Tongue. — "This," writes the *Sunday-school Times*, "was the name given by scoffers to the Hebrew Language Council established a little over fifty years ago to make an ancient language available for present-day use. Today the Council can look back on 12,000 words created or revived, which make modern Hebrew, to quote Lord Balfour, 'as flexible, as rich, as capable of adaptation to every new use, to every growth in the realm of knowledge, as any language in which human thought can be expressed.' 'At present,' says the *Palestine Review*, 'the Council has 14 subcommittees, which number 38 scholars, lexicographers, research workers, writers, experts, in many fields. The results of their work are incorporated in lexicons, dictionaries, text-books, and special pamphlets on terminology and nomenclature of many branches of daily activity. Technicians of all kinds, electricians, telephone and telegraph workers, printers, mathematicians, cooks, botanists, gymnasts, to name only a few, have been armed with Hebrew terminology for their occupations by the *Vaad Halashon*. Dictionaries will shortly appear under its auspices dealing with locksmithy, blacksmithy, and theater, sheep-breeding, wireless, shipping, and other pursuits. Recently an aircraft factory applied to it for Hebrew terminology for its processes. Technical experts in every line are engaged to collaborate with the Council in the coining of new terms. . . . With the granting of the British mandate, the recognition of Hebrew as the official language, the growing network of schools, the founding of the Hebrew University, and the rapid expansion of the economic life of the *Vishuv*, which has made necessary the creation of more and more words to denote objects unknown in ancient times, the activities of the Council have been given new impetus.'"

This strange revival and modernization of ancient Hebrew is an interesting linguistic phenomenon; yet, after all, it is not any more amazing than is that of ancient Gaelic in Ireland. Enthusiasts who see in it a sign of "Israel's coming conversion and restoration" are doomed to disappointment. Today the very center of this renaissance of ancient Hebrew, the famous city of *Tel Aviv*, is as hostile to all Christian Gospel messengers as was ancient Jerusalem after the hardening of hearts against Christ had there set in. J. T. M.

Loving Our Enemies. — Under this heading Prof. Henry Hamann of our Australian Concordia College writes against certain "divines" who are seemingly perplexed at the situation of having to love their enemies and yet to fight them. He says (*Australasian Theological Review*, Dec. 31, 1940): "It would be amusing to watch the desperate efforts — not to say the antics — of certain divines who consider it necessary to reconcile the demands of Christian ethics with the exigencies of warfare, if the theological ignorance and shallowness which they frequently display were not so tragic. Some time ago a leading dignitary of the Church of England startled us by declaring that there really should be no blockade at all, since we are commanded to love our enemies and since the Bible says specifically: 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him.' The editor of the *Australian Christian World* must have been troubled by the same difficulty; but he allows it to be solved or removed for him by a writer in the *British Weekly* (Dec. 13, 1940), whom he quotes with evident approval and who argues the case as follows: 'If thine enemy hunger,' says the apostle, 'feed him.' There is no more typical expression of the distinctively Christian ethic. Evil is to be overcome with good." . . .

"As an attempt to solve a religious or an ethical problem nothing could be weaker. At the bottom of all this confusion there lies, of course, the old failure to distinguish properly the spheres, powers, and functions of Church and State and the equally old tendency to treat private, personal morality, on the one hand, and public, governmental action, on the other hand, as lying precisely on the same level and being measurable by the same standards. It is a mere truism (or should be) that the government which must deal with the good and the evil, with the just and the unjust, with saints and sinners, has power and authority over the property, the liberty, the bodies, the lives, of men far exceeding that of any individual subject or citizen. It does not violate the divine injunction not to kill when it decrees and executes the sentence of death. And this power of the sword (Rom. 13:4) the government wields not only within the state in order to restrain the unruly and the evil, but also against enemies threatening it, and the state and the people which it protects, from without. Such powers the government has not merely by human right, but also by divine right (Rom. 13). . . . Far from violating the law of love, the Christian subject and citizen (with others we are not now concerned) fulfils it by serving his country and its government against foreign foes. For the government *qua* government the concept of Christian love does not exist; it is actuated, or should be actuated, by such considerations as law, right, justice, and the welfare of the nation. If the divine [the minister] whom we quote above seriously holds that an attempt to starve a foreign foe into submission is a violation of the law of love, logic of the most rudimentary sort should have led him to the inescapable conclusion that it is equally against the law of love to bomb, bombard, and bayonet an enemy into submission and that, in brief, all warfare is a contradiction or denial of Christian ethics. . . .

"Lest what has been said so far appear to be a mere evasion of the question that probably was paramount in the mind of the writers quoted,

although they did not bother to analyze their thoughts and feelings sufficiently to formulate that question, let us put that question for them: Can and should the Christian also love the enemies against whom his country is warring? Can he love these enemies even while fighting them? Paradoxical as it may appear, Yes! The love of all men ("Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself") which is enjoined upon Christians is not a sentimental emotion but essentially kindness, pity, sympathy, helpfulness. This general duty always remains; but it is in certain situations set aside [?] by specific commands and superseded by specific duties. All this is so elementary and of such frequent occurrence that there is hardly any need of elaboration. Parents who find it necessary to rebuke and chastise their children do not love them the less on that account. . . . It is similar in warfare. The Christian soldier strives to play his part courageously and faithfully when serving in the armed forces of his country, upheld not only by patriotic devotion to his country and obedience to its government, but also by the conviction that he is doing the will of God. His patriotic duty as well as his religious duty is, for the time being, to fight, to destroy, to kill. That does not mean, however, that love has been displaced or replaced by hatred. The Christian may hate and detest the policy and the politics of the country that is at war with his own country; he may hate, ideally and in the abstract, the armed forces of the enemy that are seeking to conquer his country. But there is no hatred or rancor in his heart against individual enemies. Neither his loyalty nor his obedience to God has need to be reenforced by such a base motive. He realizes that the soldiers in the opposing forces are doing their duty by their country, even as he is doing his duty by his country. It may strike him as being both tragic and ironic but a fact nevertheless that in the enemy's trenches there are probably also true Christians who know themselves to be serving God by defending their country and obeying the constituted authorities that bid them go forth to war. Again, it is the moral evil, or sin, that makes such things possible; we are living in a wicked world. And be it noted that such reflections and convictions do not make the Christian a less valiant and reliable defender of his country. Finally, the moment an enemy has been eliminated as a danger or a potential danger, the Christian will prove that he was not actuated by hatred while doing his duty, by meting out the most humane treatment to the helpless, wounded, captive foes, so far as he is able to do. We have tried to depict the Christian in war and to show that the Christian soldier is not a living contradiction of the law of love. . . . But is not much of what has been said a matter of common humanity and ordinary decency rather than of Christianity? Common sense tells us that hatred of individual foes is neither a necessary nor even a desirable quality in the staunch patriot and brave warrior. To sing hymns of hate is not merely a negation of Christianity, but is, like most hysterical outbursts, decidedly in very bad taste. Chivalrous treatment of a conquered foe, considerateness, courtesy, kindness toward wounded, captive, helpless enemies, why, all this has for ages been a commonplace in the history of warfare and in romantic fiction, and it can very well exist without specific Christian faith. . . . Even the ancient poet Sophocles teaches

this truth. Antigone, the noble heroine of the tragedy that bears her name, while lamenting the death of her brother in battle against his native Thebes, sees nothing unjust or cruel in that death. But when Creon would make war upon the dead by subjecting her brother's corpse to the indignity and ignominy of remaining unburied, she rebels against the tyrant's impious decree and answers his callous remark, 'An enemy is hated even in death,' with the immortal words, 'Love, and not hatred, is the part of me.'"

"The clear distinction between personal love which as Christians we owe to all men (Mark 12:33) and our duty of obeying and serving the government, even in the matter of "engaging in just wars and serving as soldiers" (Augsb. Conf., Art. XVI), so ably pointed out by Professor Hamann, Luther in his own time stressed time and again; and it must be emphasized again in our own time, when both fanatic Modernists and fanatic Fundamentalists, by an unscriptural pacifism, endeavor to prove the sinfulness of all warfare. It is for this reason that we quoted (in part) this lucid and elucidating article on an important issue, which no doubt may be discussed also in our churches, as the present World War is being considered by them. J. T. M.

Revision of Douay Version. — In *America* we read:

In the year 1749 the then existing English translation of the New Testament was revised by Bishop Challoner of London. Now, 192 years later, there appears another revision of the English text. The modern revision, which will be published in May, is the result of five years' work by a committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, headed by Archbishop John T. McNicholas, Archbishop John Gregory Murray, and Bishop Edwin O'Hara. In this modernized edition, "Holy Spirit" is substituted for "Holy Ghost," in an effort to render a more exact English equivalent of the Latin word "Spiritus." A closer approach to the Hebrew idiom is essayed by changing our Lord's words to His mother at the wedding-feast of Cana from "What is that to Me and to thee?" to "What wouldst thou have Me do?" Obsolete forms of the English language are discarded in favor of the forms obtaining today.

The revision puts the Gospel-story into 1941 phraseology. The speech is twentieth-century, the story is first-century. Language frequently changes, the story never changes. The story told by the 1941 edition is exactly the same story that was told by the Bishop Challoner edition, the same story told by the original Saint Jerome edition, the same story told by the first Saints Matthew-Mark-Luke-John edition. Since the previous revision of the English translation that story has been subjected to fiercer attacks than were ever aimed at any other story in human history. Between the years 1749 and 1941 the progress of scientific research was phenomenal. Voluminous information was gathered concerning the times of Christ, the contemporaries of Christ, and enemies of the Savior strove to use the fresh knowledge to weaken the historicity of the Gospel-story. Each attempt not merely failed to shake that story but actually ended up by adding additional confirmation to it. Knowledge of the complex forces of nature experienced an enormous increase during the 1749—1941 period, and foes of the God-man

sought to employ this accumulated learning to assail the miracles and other features of the Gospel. Every attack petered out in failure. In this year of 1941, when mankind knows more about the science of history and the laws of nature than it ever knew before, the Gospel-story is still going strong. If such multitudes of big-name leaders of science, of history, of "liberal theology," had hurled the concentrated and persistent attack on any other book that they hurled at the gospels, that book would have been discredited long ago. The volumes of Darwin, which at first were heralded as presaging the doom of the Bible, were shot down after relatively light scientific fire and are now discredited museum pieces. Each decade sees the schools and colleges throwing out text-books which but a few years before were considered the last word in authority. Only the Gospel-story survives the big guns of the critics. After being cannonaded by the world's heaviest critical artillery for twenty centuries, here it is in the year 1941 without even a scratch.

In the year 2241 or 2341 the English of the 1941 revision will seem quaint to the people of the United States if there is any United States at that time. The newspapers will report: "The first revision of the English text of the Bible since 1941 appeared yesterday. The new edition brings the language up to date, discards the outmoded phraseology of 1941." And then the men, women, and children of that twenty-third or twenty-fourth century will read in the language of their day the same Gospel-story that has already been told to past eras and that will be told to each era of the future down to the very end. —

This concludes the report in *America*. Protestants will be eager to see whether or not this revision constitutes an improvement in the transmission of the doctrinal content of the Holy Scriptures. A.

Aus der katholischen Kirche. Der 1914 verstorbene Papst Pius X., der Papst des „Instaurare omnia in Christo", ist auch heute noch Gegenstand großer Verehrung; seine Grabstätte im Petersdom erfreut sich stärkeren Besuchs als irgendein anderes Papstgrab. Schon kurz nach seinem Tod erhob sich im katholischen Volk der Wunsch nach seiner Heiligsprechung. Aus allen Diözesen kamen Anträge dazu an die Kurie. Nun hat diese selbst einen ersten Schritt zur Einleitung des amtlichen Verfahrens getan. Am 12. November 1940 hat eine Plenarsitzung der Ritenkongregation die Untersuchung der Schriften Pius' X. angeordnet. Eine solche Anordnung wird nicht getroffen, wenn nicht schon aus vorliegenden Gutachten der Beweis erbracht worden ist, daß diese Schriften nichts enthalten, was einer Heiligsprechung im Wege stehen könnte, daß sie vielmehr einer solchen förderlich sind. Deshalb nennt das päpstliche Tagesorgan diesen Vorgang ein höchst verheißungsvolles Zeichen, das bei allen Gläubigen große Freude auslösen werde.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung)

Vatikanstadt. Seit einigen Monaten ist man mit der gründlichen Durchforschung der sogenannten Vatikanischen Grotten (das ist, der Gewölbe unter der Peterskirche) beschäftigt. Der jetzige Bau steht bekanntlich auf den Trümmern der ersten, im Jahre 500 abgebrochenen Basilika. Kürzlich sind die Räume geöffnet worden, in denen zur Zeit Michelangelos die Bauarbeiter den Kalk löschten; der Kalk ist noch so erhalten, als ob er nur wenige Monate

dort lagerte. Ferner hat man Inschriften und Kohlenzeichnungen der Arbeiter freigelegt, die um 500 Fundament geschafft haben. Der bemerkenswerteste Fund ist wohl ein Stück von der Mauer des Zirkus Neros, auf dem die erste Peterskirche errichtet worden war. Unter andern wird auch nach dem verschollenen Grab Palestrinas gesucht. (Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung.)

Brief Items. — Reno is known as the oasis of divorce-seekers. It is likewise notorious for the great number of marriages entered upon there. Its population is 21,000, and in 1940 18,913 marriage licenses were issued there. The *Living Church* (Protestant Episcopal) speaks of the batting average of ministers performing the marriages in that busy matrimonial center. "High ranking minister was a Methodist, with 1,702, but he was closely followed by a Baptist, with 1,496, and a Presbyterian, with 1,052. Highest Episcopalian was the rector of our Trinity parish, with 172 — far down the list." Is "scandalous" too strong a word to apply to the conduct of these marrying parsons?

Bishop Ingley (Protestant Episcopal) of Colorado recently stated, according to the *Christian Century* (undenominational): "There are a few naive souls who think the main difficulty with the world consists in the fact that three harsh and cruel dictators roam about seeking whom they may devour. I do not believe it. Let judgment begin with ourselves." The *Christian Century* adds: "He referred to an 'unconverted church and the weakness and indifference of church-members.'" He is undoubtedly right.

Bishop Henry St. George Tucker of the Episcopal Church received the Masonic Medal for Distinguished Achievement. This is the highest Masonic honor and was conferred on the presiding bishop at the meeting of the Grand Lodge of the New York State. — What a pity!

Do Jews attend religious services in their synagogs? An exchange says that according to Jewish authorities only 25 per cent. of Jews visit their synagogs even on the highest holy days.

The Ohio Synod of the United Lutheran Church has just won a case of more than casual interest in the Court of Appeals in Franklin County, O. After meeting specified stipulations, the synod was denied a permit to build in Upper Arlington, a churchless residential suburb of Columbus, because of zoning restrictions. The Court of Appeals reversed a lower court, which sustained village officials in refusing the permit. There is a possibility that the case will be carried to the Supreme Court of Ohio, but as it now stands, the constitutionality of an ordinance, the purpose of which is to dissociate houses of worship from residential areas, is called into question. — *Christian Century.*

One fifth of the Catholic population of the United States is of Polish extraction, and sermons in the Polish language are delivered weekly in almost 800 parishes in America. The Catholic clergy who deliver these sermons wish to raise the standard of their sacred eloquence as well as to prevent the sorrow of their people over Poland's brutal invasion from degenerating into hopeless bitterness. This was the inspiration of the Homiletic Convention held by the Polish parishes of America. — *America* (Rom. Cath.).