

6-1-1944

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. (1944) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 15 , Article 35.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol15/iss1/35>

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

Theological Observer

Dr. Dau Called Home.—Few people, when the news of the death of Dr. William Herman Theodore Dau was flashed abroad, were so deeply affected by it as his former colleagues and co-workers who at the present time are responsible for the reading material offered in the **CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY**. No one can think of the antecedents of our present journal without recalling the work of the now sainted father and brother. Every issue of the **CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY** carries the information that this journal continues *Lehre und Wehre*, *Magazin fuer evangelisch-lutherische Homiletik*, and *Theological Quarterly-Theological Monthly*. In 1905, when Prof. Dau became a member of the faculty of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, he was made managing editor of the *Theological Quarterly* and continued to serve in that role till 1920, when the *Theological Quarterly* was changed into *Theological Monthly*. The latter journal he piloted till 1926, when he resigned from the faculty of Concordia Seminary to become president of Valparaiso University. Besides the work he did for the *Theological Quarterly* and the *Theological Monthly* he edited for a number of years the English section of the *Magazin fuer evangelisch-lutherische Homiletik (Homiletical Magazine)*. Hence prior to 1926 he sustained the most intimate relations to several of the theological journals now united in the **CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY**, and we sincerely regret that the only wreath we can lay on his tomb are a few words of humble gratitude and appreciation.

Born in Lauenburg, Pomerania, February 8, 1864, the deceased came to this country in 1881. In 1886 he was graduated from Concordia Seminary, a member of the last class which was dismissed into the ministry by the sainted Dr. C. F. W. Walther. From 1886 to 1892 he served as pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Memphis, Tenn. The next seven years saw him in the presidency of Concordia College, Conover, N. C. In 1899 he went to Hammond, Ind., as pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church of that city. From 1905 to 1926 he filled a professorship at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, teaching chiefly dogmatics and comparative symbolics. The presidency of Valparaiso University he held from 1926 till 1930. In the latter year he retired from active regular church work and moved to Berkeley, Calif. He continued, however, to write and lecture when special invitations reached him. Dr. Dau led an extraordinarily busy and useful life. In addition to the tasks and labors mentioned above, he edited for a time the *Lutheran Witness*, wrote a number of books and pamphlets, and tirelessly served as preacher and essayist at conferences and conventions. Among his books the best known are *At the Tribunal of Caesar*, *The Great Renunciation*, *The Leigzig Debate*, *Law and Gospel* (a translation of Walther's great work), and *He Loved Me*. Important was the aid he gave Dr. Bente in the preparation of the *Concordia Triglotta* and his contribution to the book edited by Dr. Engelder *Walther and the Church*. Many a time he served his Church on special missions. When, for instance, after the

First World War our Synod desired to send an able ambassador to Europe in order to strengthen the brethren that were laboring there under difficult conditions and to obtain first-hand information on affairs, he was chosen for that post, and wherever he went, he made a deep and lasting impression.

The departed was a person of the rarest gifts and accomplishments. His learning had a marvelously wide range and was marked by dependable accuracy in details. Especially was he versed in the history of the Reformation, and his monographs in that field are justly considered as classics. What delighted his hearers and readers was the originality, warmth, and artistic elegance of his style, which made listening to a sermon or essay of his not only a spiritual, but an intellectual treat. Readers of the old *Theological Quarterly* will recall the thrill with which they perused the article on "Grace," which, if we mistake not, was the first production he published as editor of that journal. His discourses were freighted with rich and precious thought, and if at times his language became more Johnsonian than he himself desired, that was compensated for by the solidity of the material he presented. On account of his excellence as a writer and speaker in the English language, he must have been during the first two decades of the present century one of the two or three representatives of the Missouri Synod best known in the circles outside our own church body.

His chief distinction, of course, lay in something else—in the humble, sincere acceptance of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Lutheran Confessions and their faithful reproduction in the pulpit and classroom, on the lecture platform, and the printed page. He was a Lutheran theologian that clung to the *sola Scriptura*, *sola gratia*, and *sola fide*.

Now he has been taken into the home above. We praise God, who was glorified through the gifts of this servant, and in gratitude we say that his memory shall remain fresh and green in the hearts of us who knew him well and loved him. His death occurred April 21. He was buried in Hammond, Ind., on April 28.

"Lord, Thou hast been our Dwelling Place in all generations," Ps. 90:1. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today and forever," Heb. 13:8.

A.

Baptists Still Oppose Infant Baptism.—*The Watchman-Examiner*, a Fundamentalist Baptist weekly, on the whole contains many readable and profitable articles. In its opposition to Infant Baptism, however, it is almost fiercely frank and unrelenting. Recently the Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, published a very interesting book describing Northern Scandinavia, by Bishop Eivind Berggrav, whose is the northernmost bishopric in Norway. The book (costing \$1.50) contains a chapter entitled *The Children of Haalogaland*. In this far-removed, sparsely settled territory the bishop, in the course of his church visitation, came upon a little congregation in which the right of Infant Baptism was questioned. In a very simple way (though he should have brought to the attention rather the Scripture proof for Pedobaptism) the Bishop went about proving to these honest doubters that Infant Baptism should take place. Using the illustration (not at

all apt) of a bank account opened for a little baby boy, he convinced the confirmands (for it was they chiefly who questioned Infant Baptism) that little children should be baptized. *The Watchman-Examiner* appends to this story a very severe criticism. It writes: "We have often said that if children or adults were left alone with their Bibles and followed the Word of God as it is written, they would not be led into the confusion which ecclesiastics create for them. Has the Bishop never read concerning the Ethiopian eunuch who was led to Christ by Philip? 'What doth hinder me to be baptized?' said he. 'If thou believest . . . thou mayest,' answered Philip. And how may anyone be baptized except upon the confession of his faith? To make faith out as a work of merit is to do violence to the grace of God. Faith is the simple trust in our Savior, Jesus Christ, and is the prerequisite for Baptism. We feel that the Bishop let those little children in Norway down rather badly, though we do not impugn his motive in doing so. But he had to sustain his state-church concept at all costs. It is a dangerous thing to hold unbiblical concepts and to seek to uphold them by process of imagination, substitution, or invention. Truth is never honored in such methods. The method of the church is to proclaim to the world repentance, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior, and confession as to the realities of regeneration through the ordinance of immersion. We feel that that part of the church throughout the world which has departed from this simple faith has not only harmed itself, but has corrupted the truth and limited the spiritual realities [?] in the church's witness."—Baptists, who reject the means of grace and accept Baptism only as the outward sign of inward regeneration by the Holy Spirit, cannot speak otherwise than *The Watchman-Examiner* does. To them, after all, Baptism is only a confession of the faith wrought by the Spirit without the means of grace, and therefore only adults can be baptized, since only they can stand up and confess. They regard us Lutherans as errorists corrupting the truth by teaching, among other errors, that faith in children saves as a *bona qualitas*, or a work of merit. And we shall never convince the Baptists that they are wrong unless we argue the question of Infant Baptism on the basis of such clear Scripture passages as show that it is necessary. Illustrations (if indeed they are illustrations) may be used in case the truth is established on the ground of Holy Writ. But the use of illustration without Scripture proof may expose us to the criticism that we are upholding error by "process of imagination, substitution, or invention."
J. T. M.

Orthodoxy, Too, Has Its Social Gospel.—Under this heading *The Christian Century* (March 1, 1944) declares that it is a mistake to assume that only liberal theology has a social gospel. What it means by this statement, is excellently summed up in the issue of *The Christian Century* of March 15, in the following words: "Attention was especially directed to the fact, which many Christians tend to overlook, that orthodoxy, no less than liberal theology, has a social gospel, that is, it recognizes that the Christian Church carries a unique responsibility for the character of civilization and must address the secular community by word and action with the purpose of molding it in conformity with

Christian principles" [italics our own]. Now, if *The Christian Century* had said that in this sense Reformed orthodoxy has a social gospel, it would have spoken the truth; for ever since Calvin reformed "the secular community in Geneva by word and action," "molding it in conformity with Christian principles," Calvinism has always pursued that aim, intermingling Church and State (wherever it could) and doing this ultimately to the hurt of both the Church and the State. But whenever one conceives of Christian orthodoxy in the Lutheran, and let us be bold enough to add, the Biblical sense, then we must maintain that orthodoxy has no social gospel. Of course, the matter is one also of terminology. The expression "social gospel" really is a misnomer, and this very bad misnomer has given rise to much misunderstanding. There are many such misnomers causing confusion among the unlearned. A wildcat bank is one that issues worthless paper. It is, however, neither wild nor has it anything to do with the cat family. So also "social gospel" is no gospel at all. It has nothing to do with the real Gospel. In fact, it is the Modernist substitute for the Christian Gospel. Modernists do not believe in a future heaven, to which they must guide people by proclaiming to them the spiritual Gospel of God's grace in Christ Jesus, and so they attempt (at least by profession) to make this world a heaven by the use of "soap and soup." The Christian Church, however, has, by the express command of its Lord, a more important task to perform than to clean out gutters, improve down-and-out housing districts, and the like. It must save sinners from eternal damnation. That is a tremendously big task, and it calls for the Church's entire effort and undivided attention. Had the Church more devotedly attended to this divine business, paganism would not now control millions of unfortunate people as it actually does. Especially today the Christian Church must consecrate every ounce of its strength to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ Jesus and not permit itself to be inveigled by Modernists to attempt "social gospel" projects, for this is only an attempt on the part of Satan to draw it away from its proper duty and work. Nevertheless, rightly understood, the Christian Church really is the only agency in the world that really does "social gospel" work; for it sanctifies, regenerates, re-creates by the living word the *massa perdit*a of sinful mankind and so enables it to do good works, to be kind and considerate, to feed the poor, clothe the naked, and so forth. Of course, such deeds of kindness and love the Church as such can perform only in a limited way; but its Christian membership, as citizens of the community in which they live, do make their influence count for good in a social way, and so human society is improved and enriched. But the Church always works *ab intra ad extra*. It always begins by creating a *congregatio sanctorum*, and this congregation of saints, if it really is what its name declares, will assert itself in its civic sphere in all manner of social relationships. Perhaps in this respect our Lutheran orthodoxy in our country has failed in the past. The very name "German" has isolated us from others, made us feel as strangers and pilgrims living in a foreign country, and moved us to hide our light under a bushel. Today we are becoming more and more integrated with our community, our state, our country. We feel definitely that we are citizens, living

under the "Stars and Stripes," and sharing with others the privileges and duties of our common citizenship, of which in every way we are proud. Well, then, let us build up as Christian church members our Church and make it glorious before men, to the praise of our divine Lord, by preaching everywhere and in every way the spiritual Gospel of divine grace in the world's only Savior; and let us build up as Christian citizens our country and make it glorious by teaching, by word and deed, to our fellow citizens the values of love, sympathy, and help in need, thus rendering "unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:21). But never let us imitate the ideals of orthodox or liberal "Reformedism," but let us make sweet and clear and pleasant to our fellow citizens the ideals of true service of Church and State as these are presented to us in Scripture and our Lutheran Confessions. That is our task. J. T. M.

Postwar India and Christian Missions.—What will be the problems and prospects of Christian missions in India when the world conflict has come to its end? That question is asked with anxiety by missionaries, mission boards, and friends of missions in general. The editor of the *Gospel Witness*, a journal published monthly in Guntur, India, under the direction of the Board of Publication of the Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India, submits an editorial having the subject "The Task of the Church in Postwar India," where the pertinent questions are enumerated and briefly surveyed. On account of the deep interest of the readers of the MONTHLY in Christian missions in India, we herewith reprint this editorial. After having stated that the central theme at the meeting of the National Christian Council, which was to be held January 28 to February 1 and which was expected to be attended by about one hundred delegates from all parts of India, would be "the task of the Church in Postwar India," the writer says:

"This is the central theme of the coming session of the N. C. C. which will be held at Nagpur from January 28 to February 1. About one hundred delegates from all parts of the country will meet to discuss this question.

"The postwar India will be marked, as one can fairly envisage, by the following political and social changes which are of great importance to the Church.

"1. India will not maintain an indifferent attitude towards the questions the West will be faced with immediately after the War. Her fortunes are linked with the democratic movements of the world. Undoubtedly the aeroplane has made the globe a small circle, and we are known to each other, regardless of race or creed, more intimately than before. This change will awaken the intelligentsia in India.

"2. India after the war will be granted a larger degree of self-government, and the demand for national government at the center may be conceded. This will be a political change of far-reaching importance.

"3. The State in India will assume social and economic responsibilities to an increasing extent, especially in the fields of education, public health, and rural welfare, and will aim to improve such services.

"4. There will be awakening of the rural masses on the return of the men that have gone on military service. A new sense of freedom will dawn on the depressed classes.

"5. There will be a gradual breakdown of caste order and increasing claims of the minority communities for political and social freedom. The Indian Christian community will seek to attain a political status and will associate with the political movements of India for reform and progress.

"6. There will be increasing opportunities for work with the industrialization policy of the Government. This will be gradual and not sudden, as in wartime.

"7. The standard of living in general will improve with the growth of social income and increasing industrialization of the country. This factor will certainly affect the cost of administration of any organization.

"8. The general social and economic intelligence will be greatly disseminated with the spread of communist and socialistic movements.

"9. The youth will play an important role and participate in various movements for reform.

"10. The women, in view of the growth of literacy, will share certain responsibilities in public life and associate themselves with important social movements.

"These changes are bound to affect the relations of a Christian to the Church or Mission, of the Church to the Mission, and of the Mission to the Foreign Board. They require a vision on the part of the Mission and the Church to adjust to the changing times in an intelligent manner and to proclaim its message in clearer tones than before. What should be the ways of adjustments of the Church to the changing situation is the question. To discuss this matter within a small space is a difficult matter. But one can, however, briefly summarize the answers.

"First, the Church must assume a greater share of responsibility for the task of evangelism than before and must endeavor most prayerfully to meet the demand for indigenous forms of worship and ministry.

"Second, a planned effort should be made to reach the intelligentsia of India. To localize our preaching and conversion in 'low areas' does not enrich the life of the Church.

"Third, such an effort demands intelligent Christian leadership. Without a strong, well-trained ministry the Church is bound to be fundamentally weak. Leaders of the Church should be given every equipment of mind and character that a minister of Jesus Christ should have, so that they might win the respect of the laity and lead the churches.

"Fourth, the missionary must be prepared to work under the Church, dedicating his gifts of Christian life and Christian leadership to the cause of the promotion of the Kingdom of God in India. Postwar India needs missionary personnel to enrich the life of the young Church and to work with the Church in its task of evangelism.

"Fifthly, while one should recognize with gratitude what the missions

have done in the past to build the life of the Church, it may be well to ask ourselves at this present juncture whether the missions now at work cannot so amalgamate themselves with the Indian Church as to work through it without depressing its vitality and crushing its individuality. Consequently, the three great obstacles in developing Indian initiative and executive ability and in promoting the potential leadership of the Church are (a) actual control is associated with the power of the purse, (b) die-hard thinking that the Indians are incapable of holding a responsible position, (c) unwillingness to work with men and women who are capable of shouldering wide responsibilities, guiding policies, and leading the Christian people in new situations. The Church which has no supply of trained leaders must welcome missionary leadership. The subject of devolution therefore calls for a spirit-filled study in postwar India.

"Sixthly, there is great need for trained women workers and lay leadership. We need to create a 'Christian frontier' of the laity in our rural and urban churches.

"A careful survey should therefore be made of the postwar needs of the Church, with a view to organize our efforts and funds for better results." A.

The Spiritual Aspects of Recent American Literature.— Under this heading *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (January, 1944) offers a timely and most interesting and instructive article on the subject of religious thought in modern American literature, written by Gilbert P. Voigt, professor of English Literature in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. Not so very long ago, as Professor Voigt shows, religion was not even a minor theme in most literary writing. Indeed, it was either ignored or else ridiculed. But this is no longer the case. There is in present-day literature not only a passion for social justice, but a definite groping for God. Sometimes this leads to pantheistic mysticism; at times it is linked with hostile indifference to Christianity. Nevertheless there are still men and women of letters who treat the Christian faith with respect, even reverence. And, fortunately, the number of these has been increasing in the past dozen years. Some of the men of letters, rejecting as decadent the Protestantism in which they were reared, have joined the Roman Catholic Church. The most conspicuous conversion to Christianity and the Anglo-Catholic Church is that of T. S. Eliot, the learned and gifted poet, playwright, and critic. Many writers of recent times, however, have remained avowed Protestants. It is a noteworthy fact that the writers of our day have had much to say about Jesus. The poets, too, have paid tribute to the Man of Nazareth. Our creative writers have a threefold message for us in the dark hour of world war. First, they seek to interpret the suffering so widespread today. Secondly, they warn against the spread of the plague of hatred. Thirdly, they bring to our troubled souls a plea for deeper spirituality in modern life. These are some of the thoughts which the writer emphasizes in his well-written article, and every statement is supported by quotations or references which demonstrate his wide acquaintance in the field of modern American literature.

Among the questions that came to us as we studied the essay are the following: Just how much do we pastors and leaders of our Church know of modern literature? Are we able to advise our young people and adults who are students of modern literature? Haven't we an obligation over against those who read novel after novel and whose minds are largely influenced by what they read? As Professor Voigt suggests, in many, if not in most, cases the religious ideas spread in modern books are not Christian. What are we doing to counteract pernicious influences that threaten our communicants because of their contact with books of destructive trends? But above all, what are we doing as a Church to place on the book market such books as may be read by our people without injury to their Christian life? Those who are in reach of *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* will do well to study Professor Voigt's stimulating and thought-provoking essay.

J. T. M.

A Modernistic Appraisal of the Resurrection Fact.—*The Christian Century* (nondenominational), printing in its issue of April 5 the letter of a judge who complains about the inadequacy of the evidence for the bodily resurrection of our Lord, submits a lengthy editorial in which the editor sets forth his conception of the blessed Easter event. Without a blush the existence of contradictions between the various resurrection accounts is asserted. The editor maintains that there are two ways in which the appearances of Jesus after Easter are spoken of, one stating that the same body which had been crucified was seen by His followers, the other that His re-appearance was a "nonmaterial—albeit a truly objective—event." The claim is made that these two classes of reports are irreconcilable, that all attempts to harmonize the details as they are reported in the New Testament are artificial and false, convincing only to those who are governed by a certain "fixation on the letter of the Scriptures." The editor holds that of the two views of the resurrection of Christ which, he says, exist in the New Testament records side by side, the nonmaterial conception is "supported by the preponderance of testimony in the Gospel record."

The view which is proposed in this editorial is not new. At once our thoughts here turn to the pronouncement of the Auburn Affirmationists, who among the five points which they listed as unessential and as permitting of being denied without disruption of the unity of the Church placed the teaching that the body of Jesus which hung on the cross was raised on Easter Day. It is the teaching of Modernists in our age, who, following in the footsteps of the Rationalists, even though they disavow the methods of the latter, have made themselves the judges of what is true and not true in the realm of religion. That the preponderance of the Gospel record supports the Modernistic view is, of course, not true. There is nothing in the Gospel records that inculcates it. Not only are Luke and John very specific in stating that the very body of Jesus which had been crucified was seen by the Apostles and others, but Matt. 28:9 implies this very truth, and Mark's expression "in another form" (chap. 16:12) is not at variance with it. If there is any *a priori* fixation of belief and judgment to be complained of in this matter, it certainly is not found with the Bible Christian, but with the Modernist

who has his preconceived notions as to what can and cannot happen and who finds a meaning in the Scripture passages which they do not contain.

Here we have one of the points where the deep gulf between the teachings of the Modernists and those of the humble Bible Christian becomes visible. For the Christian Church the question arises whether it is willing to have itself robbed of the doctrine plainly taught in the Sacred Book that Jesus' body came back to life. It is the resurrection fact which has always been considered by the Church one of the pillars on which its structure rests. It cannot permit that pillar to be tampered with. Thank God, the evidence for the reality of the Easter event is simply overwhelming. The judge referred to by the *Christian Century* is altogether in error in his appraisal of the testimony. Paul is at times appealed to as teaching that the body of Jesus, when it appeared after Easter, was nonmaterial. What Paul does proclaim is that the body of Jesus is "glorious" (Phil. 3:21). Everybody will have to admit that "glorious" is not the same as "nonmaterial." We cannot keep the Modernists from voicing their unbelief, but we must strongly protest against their attempt to find a basis for their rejection of great Christian truths in the Sacred Record.

A.

"Theology Today."—The first issue of a new quarterly, *Theology Today*, appeared in April. Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, is the editor; the editorial council includes a number of men from the Princeton Theological Faculty, laymen from Princeton University, and several outstanding Presbyterians. According to the introductory editorial the aims of the magazine will be to restore theology in the world today as the supreme science both in the realm of religion and culture; to study the central realities of Christian faith and life; to explore afresh the Protestant Reformation, especially the Reformed, or Calvinistic, traditions, and show their relevancy to contemporary problems of church and society; and to provide an organ for Christians working in the various spheres of intellectual activity in which they may combine their insights into the life of man in the light of God. The dialectical theology will be the dominant motif of this new magazine. This is evident in the first issue, for among other articles the new magazine contains H. Rolston's digest on Barth's first edition of *Roemberbrief*; an article by H. R. Niebuhr on "Towards a New Other-Worldliness"; and Paul S. Minear's contribution "A Biblical Theology," which discusses the influence of Kierkegaard and Barth on theology. The mechanical make-up of the magazine is inviting. The first issue contains 144 pages; the subscription price per annum is \$2.00.

F. E. MAYER