

8-1-1942

## 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. (1942) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 13 , Article 52.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol13/iss1/52>

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

---

**Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches**


---

**A Re-Appraisal of the Meaning of Lutheran Unity.**—Under this heading Rev. Otto W. Heick (U. L. C. A., Ellis, Kansas) has published in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (XV, 2, April, 1942) an exhaustive analysis of the question of Lutheran Church union which, because of its conciliatory tone and consistent straightforwardness in the declaration of the writer's views, deserves careful consideration. The essay discusses, in the main, two thoughts: (1) the problem of altar and pulpit fellowship, and (2) some of the doctrinal issues in the conflict between the Missouri and Iowa [?] Synods on the one hand, and the United Lutheran Church on the other. But just because of the author's frank expression of his opinions, the investigation brings out in strong relief (in so far as he really voices the views of his Church) the fundamental difference between the U. L. C. A. and the Missouri Synod, not merely on the question of altar and pulpit fellowship of Lutherans with Calvinists, but on the whole doctrinal cleavage. To Missouri absolute and complete unity in doctrine is the goal to be striven for earnestly; to the U. L. C. A. it is enough merely to hold the Christian fundamentals. Missouri believes in a strict adherence to the Galesburg Rule; the U. L. C. A., merely in its "discriminate application." We cull from the article a number of statements to illustrate the truth of these statements.

As Pastor Heick says, the U. L. C. A. opposes "*indiscriminate* [italics in original] pulpit and altar fellowship with pastors and churches of other denominations, whereby doctrinal differences are ignored or virtually made matters of indifference" (Pittsburgh Agreement, endorsed at the Omaha Convention, 1940), while Missouri (Synodical Conference) opposes "this elastic application of the Galesburg Rule," insisting "that there cannot and shall not be any altar or pulpit fellowship with members of the Reformed faith; for the peculiarities of the Reformed Confessions are looked upon, not as a possible understanding of the Scriptures different from the Lutheran interpretation, but as a perversion of Scriptural truth." Pastor Heick does not favor "the rigid application of this principle." But does not Missouri (omitting the Scriptural phase of the question for the present) by its decisive stand in this matter represent historic Lutheranism, which has declared and published its condemnation not only of Romanistic, but also of Reformed error? Dare Lutherans who wish to be true to Scripture really regard "the peculiarities of the Reformed Confessions" merely as a "possible understanding of the Scriptures different from the Lutheran interpretation"? If that principle holds, where shall the line be drawn in case of the heresies of Mormons, "Jehovah's Witnesses," and similar cults? Are they, too, not entitled to their "interpretations," and must not Lutherans respect them also?—Again, Pastor Heick says that the U. L. C. A. "acknowledges that any group which accepts the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism as its doctrinal basis is entitled to the name *Lutheran* and worthy of unrestricted fellowship." But what if

Lutherans, accepting these two Confessions as their "doctrinal basis," deny essential doctrines of Scripture? Or, suppose that in principle they receive these Confessions, while in reality they hold and defend opposing doctrines? Shall in that case "unrestricted fellowship" continue nevertheless? Not the Augsburg Confession, not Luther's Catechism, but Scripture, in the final analysis, is the foundation upon which true unity in faith rests.—Pastor Heick, moreover, disapproves of "the position of the Missouri Synod which holds that the name *Lutheran* requires unreserved subscription to the whole Book of Concord" and that "the theology of Missouri aims to be a theology of the Formula of Concord." Two historical inaccuracies are involved in this presentation; for Missouri regards as Lutherans also those who accept as their doctrinal basis only the two Confessions named, though it maintains that their stand is inconsistent, since the theology of the Confessions in the Book of Concord is a doctrinal unit, for which reason also the theology of Missouri does not aim to be that only of the Formula of Concord, but of all the Confessions in the *Concordia*. But overlooking these historical inaccuracies, let us ask: Why should there be so much opposition on the part of some Lutherans to receive as authoritative also the Formula of Concord? Is not the Formula of Concord doctrinally in full accord with the Augsburg Confession? Or, speaking historically: Has not confessing Lutheranism after Luther's death by its very publication of the Book of Concord established the fact that this "most theological Confession" (and this Confession above all) sets forth the true Lutheran doctrine in opposition to Romanism, Calvinism, and sectarianism? What of it if for political and other subjective reasons certain Lutheran groups have not subscribed to the Formula of Concord? That certainly does not make the Formula of Concord less authoritative.—Furthermore, Pastor Heick urges fellowship with the Reformed on the ground of the *una sancta*, deploring that "there is in the eyes of Missouri no way of establishing or even demonstrating unity of faith with a large number of true Christians so long as they remain within the Reformed denominations." He writes: "While such unity, as they hold, is a spiritual fact, it cannot be made outwardly visible so long as false doctrine prevails in the Church." He forgets, however, that the *una sancta* is not the visible Christian Church on earth, but the *ecclesia invisibilis*, or the *communio sanctorum*. If heterodox visible churches profess error, orthodox visible churches, mindful of the many Scripture warnings against unionism, must avoid them. In this matter the Word of God leaves them no other choice. We cannot understand how any Lutheran theologian can be blind to this Christian duty. Nor can we understand why the writer should say that "when these theologians [Missouri] speak of false doctrine, they, of course, assume that their own interpretation of the Bible is absolutely free from error." Is Lutheran teaching merely a matter of "Bible interpretation"? Do we Lutherans oppose to the Reformed errors mere subjective views or private interpretations? Do we not rather stand on clear declarations of God's Word which are unmistakable and decisive? Certainly, a Christian pastor is neither true to God, nor to himself, nor to Scripture, nor to the souls entrusted to his care, if he regards the sacred doctrines

of his Church merely as so many "interpretations," which may be right or wrong.

But we cannot discuss the entire article and all its incorrect and misleading statements. We are sure that Pastor Heick is not aware of the conclusions which needs must follow from his premises, namely, willful rejection of God's Word, doctrinal indifferentism and crass unionism. His treatise favors a unionistic form of Lutheranism, which earnest Christians certainly must reject. In reading the article, we were favorably impressed, however, with the writer's accuracy in frequently stating historical facts, even if these did not coincide with his own views. The position of the American Lutheran Church, and especially that of Dr. Reu, for example, is correctly presented, even when the author is obliged to quote so eminent a theologian against himself. But he goes too far when he speaks of Missouri's refusal to co-operate with dissenting Lutheran Synods *in externis*. As Dr. W. Arndt says (C. T. M., April, 1942, p. 305): "With respect to purely external matters there is some co-operation or co-ordination even now." We may add that there might be still more co-operation in external matters, though here also Dr. Arndt's warning applies: "The difficulty is that at times the line between purely external matters and matters involving fellowship is extremely difficult to draw" (*Ibid.*). We believe also that Pastor Heick overstates the case when in his discussion of the predestination controversy he says: "It was far above the ordinary pastor and congregation to pass an intelligent judgment on the exceedingly subtle definitions that were drawn up in this controversy." On the contrary, the basic questions at issue in that prolonged controversy were always very clear and were presented in sufficiently lucid language even in the various Missouri synodical essays. Men like Dr. Walther, Pastor F. Kuegele and, above all, Dr. F. Pieper were veritable masters in presenting the controverted questions in popular parlance to the common people.—What Pastor Heick writes of the Antichrist is diametrically opposed to the teachings of the Smalcald Articles and certainly does not clarify the issue at all. The "antichrists" of 1 John 2:18, it is true, embrace many errorists and enemies of the Church, but *the* Antichrist is a definite false prophet who cannot be distributed among various heretics. He cannot be, for example, Nero, Domitian, the Pope, the Turk, Lenin, Hitler, "Democracy," the "social gospel" all in one, as the writer claims. His view on this matter ultimately leads to utter confusion. Nor is it true that Luther regarded the Pope and the Turk alike as the Antichrist. At times, it must be admitted, Luther has a somewhat indefinite way of speaking; but his most definite declaration that *the Pope is the very Antichrist* (*Triglot*, p. 475) proves beyond a doubt what position on this point Luther held as early as 1537 (and certainly even before that).—Pastor Heick's view of the inspiration and authority of Scripture is painfully disappointing. If his attitude toward Scripture is accepted as normative in Lutheran circles, Scripture will be far less a rule of faith in the Lutheran Church than it is in the Church of Rome.—The writer closes his essay with the remark that "unity will not be achieved by drawing up new resolutions and adopting statements, declarations and agreements." This may be true as long as Lutherans

refuse to listen to clear Scripture teachings, but it is not true if Lutherans "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." As long as Lutherans are unwilling to accept Scripture, then also the writer's statement that "the unity of our Church lies in her historical Confessions" is not true, for then the historical Confessions simply do not mean anything. They are then merely scraps of paper and only serve as a sort of smoke screen to persons who do not care to take the Christian doctrine seriously.—When the author of the article says that "Lutherans in America have received no call to draw up new Confessions by which a cleavage is established between the ecumenical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America," he ignores the fact that church cleavages are not caused by Confessions, but that Confessions merely bring out such cleavages in bold relief. To repeat the words of Dr. Arndt: "What is truly essential is that doctrinal unity be achieved before fellowship is declared to be established" (C. T. M., April, 1942, p. 305). Doctrinal unity expresses itself in Confessions and not otherwise.—In his final paragraphs Pastor Heick suggests an approach to unity by way of repentance. The call to unity is a "call to cleanse our hearts and sanctify our lives." If the reader turns to CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY (May, 1942, p. 392), he will there read under Brief Items the timely remark of Dr. Zwemer: "From quite another quarter comes a similar note: 'It is not ethics that we need, but a more vertebate creed.'" To which Dr. Arndt remarks: "Our slogan must be, No dogmaphobia!" There is indeed room for repentance in all Lutheran churches in our country, but repentance, first of all, for having committed the greatest of all sins—unbelief and ingratitude toward God's Word, which has led many to deny its inspiration and authority and to place reason above divine truth. To such repentance indeed "may our blessed Father in heaven help us!"

We are sorry to note that quite obviously some Lutherans are practicing what Pastor Heick is preaching. "Demonstrating his unity of faith with those in the Reformed denomination," the Rev. Otto H. Bostrom, pastor of Gustavus Adolphus Lutheran Church, some time ago, held a union Lenten service in St. Mark's-in-the-Bouwerie "with two Episcopalian and one Presbyterian clergymen" (C. T. M., May, 1942, p. 392). "Why must such scandalous things happen?" asks the editor. Indeed, why must such scandalous things be defended as the right Christian and Lutheran approach to Lutheran unity? Enlightened Christians know that this is not the way to true church unity, but the broad way to utter church confusion, indifferentism, unionism, and grave offense.

Pastor Heick's article deserves careful study, for it clearly and definitely outlines a unionistic approach to church union which we have to be prepared to oppose.

J. T. M.

**Dr. P. H. Buehring on Article II of the Formula of Concord.**—In *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (April, 1942) Dr. P. H. Buehring of Columbus, Ohio, publishes an essay under the heading "The Function of the Will in Conversion," which he delivered before a Pastors' Institute and an Inter-synodical Conference in Indiana. We are not so much concerned with the essay itself as rather with a note that introduces the essay. But

let us first say that the essay itself closes with a somewhat confusing thought. Dr. Buehring just before, in discussing the *Cur alii, alii non?* had stressed both the *gratia universalis* and the *sola gratia* in terms that permit no doubt as to his correct understanding of the point in question. He rejects Calvinism and synergism. "The grace of God is universal. God wants all men to be saved, and therefore He labors just as seriously to bring about the conversion of the one who rejects His grace as of the one who accepts it. We also know that the answer cannot be found in anything meritorious in those who are converted, whatever it might be conceived to be, that is recognized by God and rewarded by Him in bringing such men to faith. . . . The mystery remains, but it is neither a 'theological' nor a 'psychological' mystery, and any attempt to define it as such must inevitably lead to aberrations from the truth of either the *universalis gratia* or the *sola gratia*." So far, so good. But then the essayist continues: "The sainted Dr. R. C. H. Lenski, not long before he died, in a conversation with the writer, called it a *satanic* mystery, pointing out the inexplicable fact that Satan can have such power and influence *over some men* (italics our own) despite every effort of God to bring them to repentance and faith, that because of that influence they willfully and deliberately shut themselves out from the grace of God and cast aside the greatest gift that can ever be offered them in time and in eternity. It seems to this writer that we shall have to let the matter rest there." What is misleading in this paragraph is not merely the term *satanic mystery* (which *per se* might be understood correctly), but the modifying words *over some men*, which, if improperly pressed, might be made to signify that in *Satan's greater power over some men* we find an explanation of the mystery involved in the *Cur alii, alii non?* Let no one hereticize Dr. Lenski for making this statement, which indeed in a novel way calls attention to a most tragic fact—the mystery of Satan's power over those that are lost in spite of God's *vocatio seria et efficax*. Nevertheless, any attempt on our part to explain the mystery why, for example, David was saved and Saul was lost results in failure, or, what is worse, in self-deception and even error. The *modus loquendi* of our founding fathers: "It is a mystery because God has not given us the explanation in His Word," is after all the only correct and safe one, and this the Formula of Concord itself stresses with great seriousness.

It is, however, the introduction to his essay which we wish to bring to the attention of our readers. Dr. Buehring writes: "The Formula of Concord is the last and the longest and also the most theological of all the Lutheran Confessions contained in the Book of Concord of 1580. In recent years we have repeatedly heard and read some rather disparaging remarks about this great document. It is spoken of as antiquated, a typical example of the survival of medieval scholasticism in the Lutheran Church; it is criticized as being too much imbued with the spirit of dogmaticism, too narrowly intolerant, a formula of discord rather than of concord, for which there is really no place in twentieth-century Lutheranism. Yes, it is said that certain doctrines, such as that of the ubiquity of Christ's body and the *communicatio idiomatum*, or the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, which are

set forth in this Confession, are doubtful, to say the least, from a Biblical point of view, and its insistence upon the total depravity of the natural man is characterized as 'hardly tenable today either on Christian, moral, or reasonably considered grounds' (cf. Vergilius Ferm, *What Is Lutheranism?* pp. 16, 250, 294). We venture to say that every Lutheran pastor who reads this essay, when he was ordained to the ministry, solemnly pledged his adherence to all the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, including the Formula of Concord, and promised before God and the Church to make all his teaching and preaching conform to the doctrine of these Confessions. Moreover, the American Lutheran Church, as well as the American Lutheran Conference, to which this Church belongs, and, in fact, all the Lutheran church bodies in this country in one way or in another officially accept the Formula of Concord together with all the other Lutheran Confessions as the 'true exposition and presentation of the faith once for all delivered to the saints' (Constitution of the American Lutheran Church, Article II, Section 2). Is it, then, perhaps time for us to reconsider our subscription to this Confession? If what the critics of this venerable document say is true, should we not inaugurate a movement in the Church to eliminate this Confession from the list of those to which we pledge our adherence? Is it honest and honorable to ask or to pretend subscription to a Confession of Faith, some doctrines of which we can no longer hold? Considerations such as these motivated the writer in preparing this study of Article II of the Formula. The substance of it was delivered as a lecture in September, 1941, at the Pastors' Institute in the Columbus Seminary and again at an Intersynodical Conference of pastors of the Missouri Synod, the United Lutheran Church, and the American Lutheran Church last fall in Bloomington, Ind. The interest with which it was received on both occasions and the unanimous approval given to its contents have encouraged the writer to offer it for publication in this journal. The Formula of Concord wants to be *studied* in order to be appreciated!" We cordially subscribe to this last statement and express the hope that in view of the fact that the Formula of Concord is being challenged today as a Confession not genuinely Lutheran many pastors also in our circles will take it up for careful study in connection with the many problems that face us in these changing times when the Church is called upon to present with new emphasis the fundamental doctrines of sin and grace. We have always found the Formula of Concord supremely valuable both on account of the doctrines which it sets forth and the clear and certain expressions in which its glorious teachings are presented.

J. T. M.

**A Dark Picture.**— All of us who are not in intimate touch with the realities of life as they are seen by the city missionary and the social worker must stand aghast at a grand jury report touching the abortion crime published in *America* (Roman Catholic) May 2, 1942. Our pastors should be given the information contained in this report:

"Although there is evidence that fees are as low as \$10, including the anesthetic, they have been known to go as high as \$2,500. \$500 for an abortion would not be uncommon. \$250 is a frequent price. A con-

siderable percentage of abortion patients are charged \$100, but the bulk of the fees run from about \$50 to \$60.

"Yearly incomes of abortion specialists would be in the same numerical brackets with earnings of heads of large corporations had they ever been publicized. There is testimony that the abortion specialist with a normal business averages about \$25,000 a year and that doctors whose clientele came from larger income groups earned from \$150,000 to \$250,000 a year.

"An abortionist who charges \$50 to \$60 for an operation, after he has split the fee with the feeder and deducted running expenses, receives about \$15 profit. As has been stated before, there are abortion specialists who perform about four thousand operations a year. Such a specialist would net about \$60,000 a year, even on a modest scale of fees.

"One abortionist, who had been financially successful in the business, built a house costing \$165,000, referred to in the profession as 'the house that abortions built.' Another doctor, one of the earliest in the business, amassed approximately \$1,000,000 up until 1921.

"One of the best known induction specialists (*induction* means the extremely dangerous removal of the fetus after a gestatory period of three months) of New York was reputed to have earned over \$1,000,000. When questioned as to the truth of this report, he made no denial . . . another was charged with owing the Federal Government \$850,000 in back taxes." A.

**Why do University Students Show Remissness in Attending Church Services?** In *America* a writer submits the ideas of a Y. M. C. A. executive secretary at the University of Minnesota with respect to the question mentioned. The secretary enumerates six reasons why students lose churchgoing habits. They are the following:

"In the first place, there is a psychological reason. Churches in the State are apt to be rather conservative. They represent to the student a certain degree of authority. The student of adolescent age revolts temporarily from the restraint of authority. His new environment gives him a certain release from parental authority.

"Second, religious education has not been related too closely with life's problems. Consequently, when a student comes to the University, he does not see clearly the relation of religion to his immediate problems.

"Third, college training is in terms of experimental thinking. Much of our religious instruction is in traditional terms and hence is not in harmony with experimental thinking.

"Fourth, the University student comes into contact with many individuals. He rather quickly loses denominational loyalties. Religious instruction, however, is connected with denominationalism.

"Fifth, many students have the feeling that the more intelligent people dissociate themselves from active religious participation. There is the wish to imitate.

"Sixth, religion on the college campus definitely suffers from the competition offered by other campus activities."

Whatever may be the reason in the case of an individual student for his lack of eagerness to attend divine services, let us all realize that uni-



versity students are particularly exposed to spiritual perils, and let us gladly assist university pastors who under the guidance of our synodical committee (the Rev. R. W. Hahn, Secretary) endeavor to keep our young men and women close to the Savior. A.

**Church Conditions in Norway.**—It is difficult for us here in the United States to see clearly what is happening these days in the Lutheran Church of Norway. Bishop Eiwind Berggrav was imprisoned when he refused to obey an order of the Nazi government pertaining to church affairs but after he had been at the concentration camp a week, he was set free. Seven bishops resigned on February 24. Their places were taken by so-called acting bishops appointed by Quisling. Recently it was reported that Quisling was offering to remove again these "acting bishops" and to put in their places ecclesiastical leaders who would declare their loyalty to the present government even though they had previously indicated their full endorsement of the course taken by the seven bishops. Those who know conditions do not think that the respective leaders will be willing to make such a declaration of loyalty. Another attempt to make the state more popular was undertaken by the government when it announced that it would divide a certain bishopric into two parts, giving each part a bishop and yielding to popular desire. It is very doubtful that the move will mean any gain for the government. A.

**Mormonism and Unionism in Liberal Churches.**—The *Christian Beacon* (May 28, 1942) contains an enlightening article on "Mormonism Examined in the Light of the Word of God." The reason why the article is published is well explained in an editorial, entitled "Mormonism," which we here offer to our readers on account of the important lessons it contains. The editorial says:

"The Mormons are most active missionaries. They come to Christians for the purpose of winning them to the Mormon faith. The article by Mr. Ohman was written first in an open letter and published in the public press in Montrose, Pa., where he is the pastor of a Baptist church. A faithful reader of the *Beacon*, in sending to us this account, wrote as follows: 'All winter two Mormon missionaries have been in town [Montrose, Pa.]. Personally they are young men, splendid in appearance, and the soul of social courtesy; but they are the cause of quite a lot of funny business. Finally it got to the point where they were singing in the Methodist church choir and in the week were calling on Methodist members. At that point the pastor got his back fur up. Among other things, the Episcopal minister up here has sponsored them at some meetings, one of which, I understand, was a youth rally at Harford, a little town about thirty miles from here. Now, right under our noses, they have been allowed to hold a conference for a week at Silver Lake and are given a two-column write-up. You know right here in Susquehanna County is where their golden plates were supposed to have been found, and they are making quite a feature of the fact. A trip will be taken to Palmyra, N. Y., and all over where Joseph Smith stayed when he lived here. Well, of course, folks up this way don't like it. There are people here, around ninety years old, who

do not hesitate to say what a farce it was in those days and what an old-timer he was.'

"It is amazing how ministers of the Gospel apparently know so little about the error and unbelief and 'salvation by works' of Mormonism that they will welcome their missionaries into the churches, choirs, pulpits, etc. The Mormons are making such headway because they know what they believe, even though it is contrary to the Word of God; and they push it and fight for it. When they come to Christians who do not know what the Christian faith is, but who have only vague or general ideas, and are not grounded in the faith, they find a fertile field for their Mormon propaganda.

"Mormonism definitely is Satanic at root, and when people become involved in it, they are in a sense hypnotized by it. Let Christians turn to their Bible and know it and read it and understand it and contend for it as never before."

Among the antitheses between Mormonism and the Bible the following may be helpful to our pastors because of the conciseness with which they are stated: "1. Mormonism teaches that Joseph Smith saw two gods in his vision. The Bible says: The Lord, our God, is one Lord. 2. Smith shattered the doctrine of the Trinity. The Bible teaches Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God. 3. Smith says: God is like a man, with flesh and bones and a body. The Bible says: God is a Spirit. 4. Smith teaches that faith in Christ is not enough for salvation. The Bible teaches: Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. 5. Smith says that marriage is for eternity, the ceremony valid only when solemnized in Mormon temples by a Mormon. The Bible teaches: In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage. 6. Smith says: Still more revelations are coming besides those in the Bible. The Bible says: If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book."

This antithesis suffices to show that Mormonism is fundamentally paganistic in its teaching on sin and salvation. Let Lutheran pastors not forget that Mormon missionaries preferably proselyte among Lutheran church members.

J. T. M.

Cardinal Forbids Bible Reading.—*The Christian Beacon* (May 14, 1942) reports: "In a communication against 'heretical propaganda' Cardinal Villeneuve of Canada actually forbade the reading and dissemination of the New Testament in French. In speaking of the Testament and tracts which the Bible and Tract Depot had been distributing, the cardinal said that the priests should 'insist particularly on the danger to which those who glance through this heretical literature expose the precious treasure of the true faith. They will recall that this sort of literature can neither be read, kept, nor given to others in good conscience, and that the best thing to do if we are insulted by having these writings sent to us is to throw them in the fire.' He reminded the clergy that the Bible needs to be explained and annotated by the Church. 'The Church exercises this authority to teach,' says the Cardinal, 'by voice of the popes, bishops, councils, fathers, and doctors.'"

The news is of importance in view of the work of the Catholic Action, which at present is exceedingly zealous in spreading the revised Catholic New Testament among the members of the Church. But the Catholic Bible is annotated and annotated so that the specific anti-Christian doctrine is brought to the attention of the Catholic reader, who when reading, for example, Rom. 3:20, the possibly strongest declaration of the *sola fide*, must swallow the following poisonous pill to preserve for himself the "precious treasure of the true faith": "It does not follow from St. Paul's statement that no man is justified by the works of the Law, that good works are not necessary for salvation. The justification of which St. Paul here speaks is the infusion of sanctifying grace which alone renders a person supernaturally pleasing in the sight of God. This cannot be obtained either by the observance of the Law or by any other work of unregenerate man." This denial of the true meaning of the text is diabolically clever as is Rome's entire apologetics and, above all, its polemics against the specific Lutheran doctrines which glorify Christ as the only Mediator. We have no reason whatever to weaken in the teaching of our Confessions that the Pope is the very Antichrist.

J. T. M.

**Brief Items.** — When recently at Gettysburg Theological Seminary of the U. L. C. A. a chapel built in colonial style and costing \$150,000 was dedicated, Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes of the Methodist Church gave the lectures on Preaching during the annual pastors' week which was observed in connection with the dedication. How can U. L. C. A. pastors and professors, if they are convinced that the Lutheran teachings are right and that the distinctive Methodist teachings are erroneous, invite a Methodist bishop to instruct them on preaching? Here we have an incident that points to the cleavage existing in the Lutheran Church of America.

A correspondent of the *Lutheran Companion* denounces an article written by the Rev. O. W. Linnemeier of the Missouri Synod and printed in the *Lutheran Companion* in which the course of pastors who bury everybody they are requested to bury is criticized. The indignant writer says, "It appears that as a Christian Church we are again approaching, if we have not already arrived, at the state of hypocrisy which the formal Jewish Church so well enjoyed during the time of Christ's ministry on the earth. . . . It is hard for me to believe that a Lutheran pastor would refuse to officiate at the funeral of anyone." We inquire, Is the writer of the letter actually advocating that a Christian funeral be given to infidels, scoffers, and other enemies of the Church? Against whom would the charge of hypocrisy have to be directed in such a case, against the pastor who refuses to grant such a person a Christian funeral or against the one who blithely consigns the body of such an enemy of the Church to the grave with Christian honors?

A.