

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 18

Article 11

2-1-1947

Miscellanea

William Dallmann

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dallmann, William (1947) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 18, Article 11.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol18/iss1/11>

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.

Miscellanea

Fellowship Among Lutherans

Address to the American Lutheran Conference
Nov. 14, 1946, Rockford, Ill.

By J. W. BEHNKEN

The invitation of your program committee to speak to the American Lutheran Conference on the topic "Fellowship Among Lutherans" reached me last week. I have been requested to speak very frankly on this vital and important issue. This is a topic which has been under discussion for almost a century. During the past decade this matter again occupied the intensive attention of Lutherans in America. However, though some progress was made in certain sections, unity has not been achieved. Every one deeply regrets this and is willing to contribute everything within his power toward its accomplishment. For that reason I rejoice to be given an opportunity to speak on this important question and set forth what we of the Missouri Synod consider essential toward the accomplishment of fellowship among Lutherans.

We must know exactly what we mean by the term "fellowship." We are now not speaking about social fellowship. Nor do we have in mind so-called intellectual fellowship. We mean religious fellowship. Let me narrow it down even more than that. We do not have in mind the fellowship of all believers, a fellowship which binds together all Christians by faith in Christ, a fellowship which embraces all the saints in heaven and every believer on earth, a fellowship which has been called the *una sancta*, the communion of saints, the invisible Church. In the discussion before us we are speaking about a fellowship between Lutherans belonging to visible churches, a fellowship between Lutheran church bodies, a fellowship which has been termed *pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship*.

It is a pity that the Lutheran Church is so divided. No person interested in the Lutheran Church can remain indifferent about this. To Lutherans has been granted the heritage of *sola Scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide*. Through the remarkable work of His servant Luther, God brought to light again Scriptural truth and Scriptural practice. As a result the Lutheran Church enjoys an incomparably glorious blessing. But how must it affect the heart of Jesus when He beholds such disunity and dissension among the people unto whom He has entrusted the marvelous blessings of the Reformation. Similarly it affects many thousand Lutherans. It hurts; it cuts deep gashes; it makes the heart bleed to think that in view of the unparalleled heritage of the Reformation Lutherans should be so divided.

Ninety years ago negotiations were undertaken to bring Lutherans in America together on the basis of clear-cut Scriptural

doctrine. They found their origin in the question propounded by the sainted Dr. Walther in *Lehre und Wehre*, in January, 1856, whether a meeting could not be arranged between all Lutheran synods which acknowledge and confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530 as the pure and correct interpretation of Holy Writ. The purpose was to be the possible establishment of one united Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America. The suggestion found favor. The *Lutheran Standard* then issued a call for such a meeting. This call was published by all English, Norwegian, and German language periodicals which were friendly to the cause. As a result, meetings were conducted in Columbus, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Cleveland, Ohio, and Fort Wayne, Indiana, each lasting a number of days. One article after the other of the Augsburg Confession was thoroughly discussed. The minutes of the very first meeting held in Trinity Church in Columbus state clearly that those present sought to assure themselves that all present were one in faith and confession and that they actually subscribed to the various articles, not only in their essential and substantial parts, but in all features according to the very wording of the articles.

This is the essential requisite for wholesome and God-pleasing fellowship among Lutherans today. There must be genuine unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Only if Lutherans build on this foundation will the structure of Lutheranism stand. It will crumble and fall if the foundation is faulty and defective. That is the position of the Missouri Synod today. We are vitally interested in the cause of Lutheran fellowship. We pray for it. We want to put forth every effort toward its achievement. However, it must be on sound, solid, Scriptural foundations.

I realize that we have been accused of overemphasizing the need of doctrinal unity, but you cannot get away from the fact that the Word of God throughout emphasizes doctrinal unity. The history of the early Christian Church clearly shows what emphasis was placed upon doctrinal unity. God-appointed leaders in the Apostolic Church issued earnest warnings against false doctrines. Read the Ecumenical Creeds, especially the Athanasian Creed, and note the precise and exact language used. There can be no doubt that the early Church sought to safeguard soundness of doctrine. Or think of the Lutheran Confessions. Much time and effort were spent to express things so definitely and precisely that there should be no misunderstanding. Think especially of the Formula of Concord. Years were spent in its formulation before it was adopted. Then, however, it settled the controversial issues, removed the dissension, and safeguarded sound, Biblical doctrine. Even so today the paramount need is that Lutherans wholeheartedly and consecratedly unite on the basis of sound, Biblical doctrine. Such agreement and unity must be reached, not only between official committees but also out in the field between pastors and between members of our congregations.

There are those who have grown tired of doctrinal discussions. Some have claimed that we have unity, since Lutherans in America by resolutions have subscribed to the Lutheran Confessions. It is true that doctrinal discussions in some places have revealed that much has been accomplished. However, it is also true that some doctrinal discussions have revealed a decided lack of doctrinal unity. What shall be done, then? Instead of growing weary of doctrinal discussions, those who desire a genuine Lutheran fellowship should realize that this necessitates a deeper study of Biblical doctrine and the Lutheran Confessions and a frank, but friendly, discussion of the doctrinal differences which have been keeping us apart, so that with God's help and under His blessings doctrinal unity might be reached.

It grieves a person whose heart is interested in genuine unity that there are those who would brush aside doctrinal discussion and boldly claim that agreement has been reached, since we subscribe to the Lutheran Confessions. It grieves a person very much to hear that men are not willing to consider further doctrinal theses. It grieves a person to be told that this way to doctrinal unity is closed.

Today efforts are being put forth toward fellowship via co-operation. Co-operative efforts have been proclaimed and heralded as harbingers of Lutheran fellowship and Lutheran union. Let me speak very frankly. If such co-operation involves joint work in missions, in Christian education, in student welfare work, in joint services celebrating great events, then co-operation is just another name for pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship. Without doctrinal agreement, this spells compromise. It means yielding in doctrinal positions. Such fellowship will not stand in the light of Scripture. You realize, of course, that Missouri has been co-operating in externals in matters which do not involve pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship. Such co-operation should not and must not be interpreted as a step toward fellowship or a method of bringing about fellowship among Lutherans. Fellowship among Lutherans is possible and Biblical only where there is agreement in Biblical doctrine and Scriptural practice. Where such agreement has been reached, pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship will necessarily follow.

Efforts have been made to effect intersynodical lay organizations. We are told that these organizations are to be of social and civic character and that they will avoid any attempt to become pressure groups which will demand Lutheran union. However, there too some have become so enthusiastic as to call this a real step in the direction of fellowship among Lutherans. Some have said that now we are getting down to the real issues, for in this way Lutheran union will emanate from the grass roots. Someone said that the past was the period for the clergy and the future is the day of the laity. Concerning the non-achievement of Lutheran union someone said that the fault must be sought not in the pew but in the pulpit. We must carefully avoid every effort to pit the laymen against the clergy or the clergy against the laymen. God

forbid that the impression should go out that the preachers have been blocking the cause of Lutheran unity. Let us guard against any indictment of those who have stood for Scriptural principles. We know that God has explicitly outlined the duties of His watchmen, and God uses some strong language in that connection. The Lord wants preachers who are loyal to His cause, who will not deviate in the least from any part of His Word, who will defend every jot and tittle of it, who will insist that the Church continue in sound doctrine. On the other hand, God wants laymen who continue in His Word, who believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Efforts toward fellowship among Lutherans must never become a lay movement nor a clergy movement, but a church movement. It must find its grass roots not in the laity, not in the clergy, but in Scripture itself.

Another important feature which we must heed if fellowship among Lutherans is to be achieved is that church bodies practice thorough Scriptural discipline, brotherly discipline both in matters of doctrine and in matters of practice. This business of preaching doctrine not in harmony with God's Word cuts deep bloody gashes into the body of the visible Church. Such as are guilty should be admonished by their brethren in a spirit of love. Love demands this. Love never closes an eye to indifference in doctrine but uncovers the fault and with God's help corrects it. True Christian love is not spineless but has a very firm backbone. Just think of the love which Jesus manifested toward Peter when He said to him, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Or think of the firmness of Christ's love when He asked Peter that heart-searching question, thrice repeated: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" Think of the bold and firm love which prompted St. Paul to withstand Peter to the face when the latter had become guilty of hypocrisy. Even so our love must prompt us to uncover any false doctrine which we may find in any of our brethren.

Furthermore, doctrine definitely must be followed by practice. Indescribable harm has been done the cause of Lutheran fellowship when men become guilty of unionistic services, whereby they create impressions that after all there is no difference or that the differences are of little moment. Then, too, laxity and indifference over against the Christless secret orders should be mentioned. Irreparable damage is done not only to individual souls but to the cause of Lutheranism wherever a lax and indifferent practice obtains. Such practice definitely delays and hinders fellowship among Lutherans. I realize that most Lutherans subscribe to the principle: "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors, and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants." However, it is common knowledge that only too often there are violations of this principle and no disciplinary action is taken. That hurts. That places barriers before the efforts toward genuine Lutheran unity. That shuts the door. How can we who want to be conscientious in upholding the principles of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions

be expected to fellowship with those who sanction such unionistic practices and are indifferent to secret orders? *

Today three definite streams, divergent streams, are visible in the Christian Church. The Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Catholic streams. Certainly there can be no thought of any effort to bring the waters of Lutheranism and Catholicism together. The Roman Catholic waters are muddy and poisonous. The very fundamental issue of spiritual life is denied there. An anathema is pronounced upon all such as dare to teach that man is saved solely by faith. The most precious gem entrusted to the Church, "Justification by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith," is denied. The Gospel is emasculated. The sacrament of Christ's body and blood is mutilated. Mary and other saints are worshipped, etc. Hence we must guard against all Romanizing tendencies.

On the other hand, there cannot be a confluence of the streams of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The waters of Calvinism are also dangerously muddy and contaminated. We know that in some of these churches there is great insistence upon immersion as the only mode of Baptism, and in practically none of them is there any emphasis upon the importance and benefits of Baptism. We know, too, that the Reformed churches deny the real presence in the Lord's Supper. To them the bread and the wine are merely symbols of Christ's body and blood or merely represent the body and blood of our Redeemer. They deny that Baptism saves and that the Lord's Supper conveys the forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation. In fact, the Reformed churches do not admit that the Gospel and the Sacraments are means of grace, vehicles of God to bring us the great blessings which Jesus has earned for us.

Unfortunately, so-called Modernists have crept into the Reformed churches. At first they sought only tolerance, then equal rights. But now they have reached the stage where they dominate things in sectarian circles. In the Federal Council of Churches of Christ these Modernists attempt to voice the opinions of all Protestantism. They do not, they cannot, they must not speak for Lutherans. I know that some have advocated some kind of connection with the Federal Council of Churches. I want to plead with every ounce of strength that God has given me that Lutherans in America may steer clear of any such sinful entangling alliances. Such practice positively shuts the door toward fellowship for Lutherans who wish to adhere to the doctrines of the Bible as set forth in our Lutheran Confessions. The very fact that the Federal Council of Churches has arrogated unto itself the prerogative of speaking for all Protestants presents a mighty argument why Lutherans should strive for genuine Biblical unity in order that there may be fellowship and unity among them and that they may speak for themselves.

* Here I stated that we are conscious of the fact that there are a few sore spots in our midst, but that we are conscientiously putting forth efforts to remove them.

Before I close, let me add a final earnest and fervent plea for an honest and conscientious effort toward doctrinal unity among Lutherans. I have reference to the pathetic situation in Europe. It was my privilege a year ago to spend seven weeks in Europe. During most of this time we attempted to survey church conditions in the land of the Reformation. I met a number of the bishops of the *Landeskirche*. I met some of the leaders in the Free Churches. I spoke to a number of theological professors. I met Pfarrer Nie-moeller and interviewed him for more than two hours. I know of the tremendous influence which Barthian theology has exerted upon the Church in Europe. I am acquainted with the mighty efforts on the part of the Reformed elements in Europe to Calvinize Germany and other Lutheran countries. I am convinced that Lutheranism in Germany is at the crossroads. There are leaders and clergymen who are very eager to return to Luther, to the Lutheran Confessions, to the Bible. I heard from their own lips statements as positive, as loyal, as determined, and as heroic as I have ever heard from any one in our own Church. However, these people are in a sorry plight. The situation is tragic. Very few pastors have libraries. Men are actually starving because of a lack of sound theological literature. The Barthian group is busy. The Reformed element is very active and even militant. They are providing a set of theological books, but we were told that there is not a Lutheran book among them. Bishop Meiser, Dr. Stroh, Dr. Sasse, and others begged us to provide Symbolical Books, dogmatics, treatises, exegetical books, and the like for them. In this connection let me say that last Thursday a letter from Dr. Bodensieck reached me. I notice that the good doctor corroborates what we found concerning the militancy of the Barthian group. He wrote: "The men in this camp are accusing Luther and Lutheran *doctrine* of being responsible for the rise of totalitarianism, the rise of Hitler, etc. They say that these terrible things occurred because the Lutherans distinguished between Law and Gospel and separated these two and because they taught a definite *Reihenfolge* of the two. They declare that the Lutheran teaching concerning the Law and Gospel is the basic error; once this error is removed, other problems will be easily solved." Then follows a plea from Dr. Bodensieck that we might supply every German pastor with a copy of the sainted Dr. Walther's book on the proper distinction between Law and Gospel.

I have mentioned these things because I deeply feel the spiritual distress of the people in the land where once stood the cradle of the Reformation. I shall never be able to erase from my memory the classic welcome address delivered to us by Bishop Meiser before a group of fifty Pfarrer and many laymen in which he referred to the help given our Lutherans by Pfarrer Loehe and the Bavarians about a hundred years ago and how he then turned to me and said, "Now the tables are turned. Now we are begging; and we plead that you do not fail us." What a fervent, touching plea! Can we, dare we, fail them? I might as well ask: Is the

cause of Lutheranism dear to us? If it is, we Lutherans in America should unite on the basis of sound, Biblical, doctrine and Scriptural practice. That is the only proper kind of Lutheran unity. Then we would be able to enjoy wholehearted fellowship among Lutherans in America. Then we would be in a position to cooperate wholeheartedly and could unitedly help fellow Lutherans in Europe to withstand the avalanche of Calvinism which threatens such destruction in this hour of crisis.

Justification in Luther's Theology

"I believe that the supreme need of the Church today is the recovery of the doctrine of Justification by Faith. For some this will mean the discovery of something never before realized, for others the putting in its right place of a truth which had become secondary and largely lost its meaning. This truth is absolutely primary, and the history of the Christian Church shows that when Justification by Faith has been prominently emphasized and proclaimed, there has been vigorous life and strong progress."

So wrote the Bishop of Sodor & Man in the first 1946 issue of *The Record*, quoted in the February 15 issue by the Rev. R. S. Dean, who goes on:

That statement is true both as to its assertion and its conclusion. The doctrine of Justification is such that it can have meaning only when it is made primary; it is a foundation stone, and not an architectural embellishment; it is a first necessity, and not an optional appendage. It comes first, or it comes nowhere. As to its effect when it is given its rightful place, history makes its own incontrovertible witness, for the tide of continuing progress and vigorous life runs most firmly in those who have clearly enunciated it, Paul, Augustine, Luther, Colet, and Wesley being only some of the names that spring to mind. And that luminous truth is given sharp and clear focus at the present time by the commemoration of the Fourth Centenary of the death of Martin Luther on February 18, one of whom, John Wesley, could speak as "a man highly favored of God, and a blessed instrument in His hand." Nowhere is the doctrine of Justification by Faith given more vivid, trenchant, and passionate expression than in the writings of Luther. If that doctrine lies at the heart of Paul's realization of the Gospel of Redeeming Love, it is only true to say of Luther, "It was his especial privilege to have entered into the spirit of St. Paul as none before him—not even St. Augustine. Luther's theology is Pauline theology in the language of modern times."

But we misunderstand Luther, as indeed we misunderstand Paul, if we look upon him as a coldly academic theologian. His is a doctrine of the heart and couched in the terms which befit it; massive it may be; profound it certainly is; but its significance lies not so much in its scope and profundity as in its character as the expression of a deep, revolutionary personal experience nurtured in travail of soul before birth is given to the peace which proceeds only from God and from His activity in the human heart.

If it is theology, it is theology on fire, as it was with Paul and was again to be with Wesley, and fire has an avidity and eagerness which cannot wait to be orderly. Here in Luther is the extravagant phraseology, the oft incoherence and scorn of grammar which cannot stay for the slower processes and niceties of polished language; the words of Jeremiah are equally true of "the solitary monk who shook the world" — "his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay," and if he could continue Jeremiah's experience and say: "I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side," then that did but add fuel to the flame of a passionate conviction. . . .

It can only have been the hand of God upon him that led him to turn to Augustine and more and more to Paul until the core was reached in Romans and Galatians, for it was "as Luther meditated on the pregnant phrase 'the just shall live by faith' that his shackles fell from him." It is significant indeed that his New Testament commentaries are written on precisely those books which contain that liberating sentence. . . .

We shall never understand his lyrical joy at realizing Justification until we have shared his experience of the grave and serious nature of sin. . . . If therefore "the supreme need of the Church today is the recovery of the doctrine of Justification by Faith," its complementary need is a realization of sin, which does not stop short at the shallow level of those acts which society may conceivably call sin. Harnack expresses this plainly when he says: "No one before Luther took so serious a view of sin as he did, the reason being that he measured it by faith, that is to say, took a *religious* estimate of it, and did not let himself be disturbed in this view by looking upon sins as the graduated manifestations of morality, or upon virtues as the manifold forms of worldly morality. He alone seized again at the Pauline proposition 'that whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'" . . .

He could say with a warmth no printed words can impart: "Who is able to express what a thing it is, when a man is assured in his heart that God neither is nor will be angry with him, but will be forever a merciful and loving Father unto him for Christ's sake? This is indeed a marvelous and incomprehensible liberty."

Marvelous and incomprehensible indeed — the more vividly realized because it is not of man at all, but is itself a direct gift from God. It was while reading St. Paul's Epistles, and especially the Epistle to the Romans, that he grasped the essence of the matter: to quote Harnack again: "What he here learned, what he laid hold of as *the one thing*, was *the revelation of the God of grace in the Gospel*, i. e., in the incarnate and crucified and risen Christ. The same experience which Paul had undergone in his day was passed through by Luther . . . and he learned by this experience, *that it is God who gives faith*: 'When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me.'" . . .

Behind the words of Luther there shines brightly, steadily, and unmistakably the greatest fact in the world — the divine action in Jesus Christ and the experience of faith in this action. . . .

Let Luther speak for himself: "It is a living, busy, active, powerful thing, faith: it is impossible for it not to do good continually. It never asks whether good works are to be done: It has done them before there is time to ask the question, and it is always doing them." . . .

The whole Church may well thank God for Martin Luther, who found again and blazoned abroad the richest inheritance which belongs to the Body of Christ.

Submitted by WM. DALLMANN

The Future of Lutheranism in Russia

Writing in the *Lutheran* of Sept. 18 on the subject "Will Lutheranism Revive in Russia?" Albert Grunwald submits important information and views which our readers should see; hence we reprint the article. —

Soon after the Reformation, Lutherans from western Europe began to migrate to Russia. Artisans, architects, physicians, etc., from Germany were invited by the Czars. They came to Moscow and other large centers. Already during the reign of Ivan the Terrible (1547—84) German Lutheran colonists and prisoners of war from the Baltic provinces settled in the region of the Volga.

In 1576 the first Lutheran Church was erected in a suburb of Moscow. But due to the fanatical opposition of the Russian Orthodox clergy and the *boyars* to Protestantism, this church was destroyed by a mob in 1578. It was rebuilt and again destroyed in 1610; similarly it was rebuilt and burnt in 1632 and 1649. In 1662, Czar Alexei refused permission for the erection of a new church and threatened to exile to Siberia all who would take part in Lutheran worship.

Oppression of Lutheranism ended when Peter the Great became Czar (1682—1725). He was determined to eliminate the political power of the Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church. While studying in western Europe, he had carefully observed the close and friendly co-operation between the Lutheran Church and the various secular governments. With this in mind, he encouraged systematically the immigration of Lutherans to his empire. In the course of time the new capital city, St. Petersburg, became the center of Lutheranism in Russia. Soon St. Peter's Congregation was established, to be followed later by St. Ann's. The strong appeal of Patriarch Joachim to keep out of Holy Russia all accursed Protestants merely strengthened the determination of the Czar to get rid of the Patriarchate.

The greatest impetus to Lutheran immigration, however, came from Catherine the Great (1762—96). Between 1764 and 1776 she induced 23,184 German immigrants (mostly Lutheran) to settle

104 colonies in the Volga region. In 1765 and 1768, 110 families from Brandenburg and Wuerttemberg, and 67 from the Palatinate, were settled in the province of Petersburg. Again, in 1787, she called German Lutheran settlers to southern Russia.

This immigration policy was continued by Alexander I (1801 to 1825). On Feb. 20, 1804, he guaranteed to the new colonists numerous privileges: 60—160 acres of land, tax exemption, freedom from military service, religious liberty. From 1804 to 1809 approximately 50,000 Lutheran settlers established 207 colonies in the provinces of Ekaterinoslav, Cherson, Crimea, Bessarabia, Charkov, and the Don region. 1816—17 a group of about 9,000 Lutheran immigrants settled in the Caucasus. Before and during the reign of Alexander II (1855—81), especially in consequence of the Polish revolutions in 1830—31 and 1862—64, large numbers of Lutheran refugees and immigrants arrived from Poland (and, to a limited degree, from eastern Germany) and settled in the provinces of Volynia, Podolia, and Kiev.

The two oldest groups of Lutherans, dating back to the Reformation period, were in the Baltic provinces (Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia), Lithuania, and in Russian Poland.

The Lutheran Church was formally organized in 1832, when the state recognized the Lutherans as a "privileged church," and in an elaborate code of ecclesiastical laws defined the relations between church and government, and regulated the administration of the church. Several consistories were established for the various areas of the empire. The Baltic Lutherans received three consistories: Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia; the three additional consistories of Riga, Reval, and Oesel were later eliminated. Lithuania was under the jurisdiction of Courland. The consistory of the Polish group was in Warsaw.

The rest of Russia was divided by a line running approximately from the Gulf of Finland to the Sea of Azov. The territory west of this line was administered by the consistory of St. Petersburg, and the eastern territories, including the Caucasus and Asiatic Russia, were under the jurisdiction of the consistory of Moscow. All consistories were under the control of the "General Consistory" in St. Petersburg. The General Consistory was responsible to the "Department for the Affairs of Foreign Confessions" in the Ministry of the Interior.

Before the First World War there were approximately four million Lutherans in Russia (Finland not included). The imperial census of 1897 counted 3,762,756 Lutherans. But the census was certainly not accurate. A good many unchurched Lutherans, scattered over the vast empire, were unknown to the statistical office of the General Consistory and were not reached by the census.

Shortly before 1914, the Church reported 641,000 baptized members in the district of the St. Petersburg consistory, with 126 parishes (*Kirchspiel*, i. e., large parish); 459,000 in the Moscow consistory, with 80 parishes; 2,200,000 in the Baltic consistories; about

400,000 (4.5 per cent of the population) in Russian Poland. But these statistics, too, were incomplete, since they were based on the parochial reports, which under the prevailing circumstances were never perfectly accurate.

The Lutheran Church had strong parishes in most large cities (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, Charkov, Shitomir, Saratov, Warsaw, Lodz, but also in rural areas large and beautiful churches were very frequent. In St. Petersburg (Leningrad) the Lutherans had three hospitals; several homes for the aged, poor, and insane; orphanages; young people's centers; four colleges (*Gymnasium* and *Realschule*); two girls' schools; four elementary schools. Scattered over the empire, from Moscow to the Caucasus, were numerous schools, institutions for Inner Mission work, etc.

Since 1831 the Church had its own Bible Society. In 1858 the *Unterstuetzungskasse fuer Evang.-Lutherische Gemeinden* was established for the support of needy pastors, teachers, congregations, and institutions. In 1903 it had an endowment fund of 926,533 rubles, and the expenditures of that year were 118,294.02 rubles.

The Church developed very favorably up to the time of Alexander III (1881—94). In 1885 the Czar inaugurated his program of Russification of the Lutheran Church. The reasons for this systematic repression are manifold; they were political, military, economic, hierarchical.

Russia's former friendly relations with Germany became strained on account of the rapidly deteriorating situation involving Austria and Russia. The German-Austrian Alliance, effected by Bismarck, was the beginning of the end of the traditional friendship between the Russians and the Germans. The Pan-Slavic propaganda against Germany and the Germans in Russia became increasingly hostile.

The Russian aristocracy had long resented the great influence of prominent Germans at the court of St. Petersburg. An anti-German reaction was soon very strongly felt from this direction.

Russian military leaders began to worry about the potential adverse strength of the German element in Russia in case of a war with Germany. The Baltic provinces, Poland, and the Ukraine were honeycombed with German colonies, which could become a menace for Russian military operations. Therefore immediate restrictions were imposed—concerning erection of church spires, possession of arms, etc.

The agricultural authorities looked with apprehension on some 13,975,000 *desyatins* of the best soil of Russia which were in German hands (Baltic—4,500,000; Polish-Volynia group—1,000,000; Volga—2,000,000; Caucasus—75,000; southern Ukraine—5,000,000). On the other hand there were many millions of Russian peasants who had very little or no land at all. This fact especially embittered the peasants, who began to hate the German "foreigners" as much as their big landowners, who controlled the bulk

of the Russian soil. Furthermore, the German farmers were usually very prosperous, whereas the Russian peasants were mostly poor. Widespread envy resulted from this situation.

The Pan-Slavic ideology further took exception to the German character of the Lutheran Church. Although clergy and people were entirely loyal to the state, they retained the language of their ancestors and the inherited western European cultural characteristics; and thus they appeared to the extreme Russian nationalists as objectionable.

The Russians did not realize that no nation can hope to absorb easily a racial group of superior cultural standing. As a matter of fact, Russia had been unable to assimilate any of her many nationalities. Suspicions increased in the beginning of the twentieth century when Germany inaugurated carefully planned return-migration (*Rueckwanderung*) of German colonists, especially from Poland and the western Ukraine. Several Lutheran pastors and *Kuesterlehrer*, without disloyal intentions, became involved in this movement and attracted the attention of the Russian secret police.

Growing antagonism toward the Lutherans was especially aggravated by the Orthodox hierarchy and clergy. They not only hated Protestant "heretics," but envied the high educational and social standard of the Lutheran pastors. Since "the majority of the Orthodox clergy received no salary either from the state or the church, their income seldom surpassed a sum equivalent to fifty pounds a year. This meant that by their social status they were nearer to the peasant community than to the professional classes. . . . The chief defect of the clergy was their lack of authority; they were looked down upon by the intelligentsia, and not much respected by the peasants."

The status of the Lutheran pastors compared very favorably with the social standing of the Orthodox bishops. Furthermore, the Orthodox hierarchy was afraid of the general superiority of the Lutheran Church and its potential influence on the Russian intelligentsia.

On the other hand, there were factors which caused an inner weakness in the Lutheran Church of Russia. First, there was a chronic and distressing shortage of pastors. The Church had only one theological school, the theological faculty of the University of Dorpat [Jurjew]. As a rule all students had to be Russian subjects, born in Russia, and graduates of a *Gymnasium*. Graduates who aspired to become theologians were scarce in the German colonies; most of them, but not enough, came from the Baltic provinces.

Consequently the parishes were very large, in most cases far too large. The *Kirchspiel* frequently consisted—especially in southwestern and eastern Russia—of 20 to 30 small congregations. Even in the old Baltic provinces, parishes with 7,000 to 10,000 baptized members were no exception. In eastern and southwestern

Russia, pastors often were able to visit the various congregations of the parish only several times during the year. In their absence *Kuesterlehrer* (a typical *clerus minor* of the old Lutheran Church in Germany) were in full charge of the congregation. Pastoral functions they were not allowed to perform were: confirmation, Holy Communion, and matrimony. They were usually, by no means always, trained in special seminaries (Reval, Heimthal, etc.). But since their spiritual authority and influence were extremely limited, they were inadequate vicars of the pastors. Thus frequently the parishioners knew very little or nothing about the vital doctrines of their Church.

This situation produced extremely grave weakness. Various sects (Herrnhut Brethren, Stundists, Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists, etc.) took advantage of it and proselytized among Lutherans with fanatical zeal. Baptists were particularly successful; since the establishment of religious freedom in Russia (1905) they had induced hundreds of thousands of Lutherans to leave the church of their fathers. The Baptists, by the way, drew numerous converts from the Orthodox Church.

This is, in brief outline, the status of the Lutheran Church in Russia before the war of 1914—1918. During the first three years of the war the Church suffered severely. In the name of military necessity the Czarist government uprooted the Lutheran communities and colonies of the Polish and Ukrainian areas, exiling them to Siberia or the Volga region. During this mass transportation more than 100,000 Lutherans died of privation and epidemic diseases. Their pastors, although not imprisoned, were subjected to material suffering and severe humiliations; a good many did not survive this ordeal. When the Red revolution broke out and the Czarist government collapsed in 1917, the Lutheran Church hoped that a new era of freedom and tolerance would commence.

Instead, a Bolshevist fury of violent intensity was unleashed against all churches. Rapidly Christianity was paralyzed in Russia. Scores of Lutheran pastors, together with thousands of Orthodox priests, were executed in a few months. Within a year more than half of them had been martyred; others had escaped to Germany. The administrative functions of the consistories ceased. Poland and the Baltic provinces were separated from the Russian state. No new pastors could be trained. Utter chaos had overcome the Church. Lutheran Bishop Freifeldt died in 1923. Finally, in June, 1924, the Bolsheviks granted the remaining pastors permission to convene a General Lutheran Synod in Warsaw.

At this Synod two bishops were elected: Theophilus Meyer (primate, supreme spiritual representative of the Lutheran Church in Russia) and C. Arthur Malmgren (official representative of the Church abroad, supervisor of the theological training of the ministry). A new constitution was adopted, conforming to the radically changed political status. In the following year, 1925, Bishop

Malmgren established the Leningrad Theological Seminary (with eight professors and 30 students).

When Bishop Meyer died, on April 28, 1934, Bishop Malmgren succeeded the deceased primate as head of the Lutheran *Oberkirchenrat* in Russia. Up to that time (1934) the Leningrad Seminary had graduated in nine years 53 candidates who were ordained to the ministry. But only 25 had remained during that period in the service of the Church; some had been martyred, others were exiled, imprisoned, or had fled the country. From the pastors who were in service before the revolution in 1917, there were only 14 survivors in 1934.

However, the mortal crisis for the Lutheran Church began when, in 1933, Hitler's regime in Germany commenced a violent anti-Bolshevist campaign. The Kremlin's reaction was swift and brutal, and the position of the Lutheran Church soon became intolerable. Bishop Malmgren's episcopal functions were terminated. The Leningrad Seminary was closed. The few remaining pastors were martyred or with their people sent into the northern lumber camps or Siberian mines, where they inevitably perished. The outbreak of the German-Russian war simply meant the death knell for the visible Lutheran Church in Russia.

According to the best available information there is not one Lutheran pastor in active service in Russia today. The organized Church has ceased to exist. It may be assumed that many of the exiled and scattered Lutherans, being without pastors for years, have been absorbed by the Baptists. The poorly educated Baptist lay preachers never attracted the attention of the Bolshevists to such an extent as the far more prominent Lutheran pastors; consequently a good many of them escaped the Red extermination campaign. Already after the collapse of the empire, when numerous Lutheran parishes were vacant, Lutherans readily availed themselves of the services of Baptist preachers. Thus probably a large percentage of the recently reported four million (?) Russian Baptists (*The Lutheran*, June 26, 1946, p. 7) is of Lutheran origin.

The Kremlin, even during the war, took a more lenient attitude toward the Baptists, probably because many of them were of Russian stock. Thus, the historic Lutheran church in Moscow was turned over during the last war to the Baptists, while the Lutheran congregation was scattered in Siberian exile. The new "All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists," of which we hear now, is obviously a predominantly Baptist organization. To what extent Lutherans are participating in this organization, if at all, is not yet clear.

What are the prospects for the restoration of the Lutheran Church in Russia? In the first place, it is doubtful whether many Lutherans have survived the recent extermination ordeal. Then, what is left of the young generation is certainly very greatly influenced by the most efficient atheistic education and propaganda

of the Reds. It is at the moment futile to attempt to predict a possible change in the Kremlin's policy. The altered attitude of the Stalin government towards the Orthodox Church is no indication of a similar relaxation toward our Church.

The Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church is a very desirable political expedient for the Kremlin. Stalin needs the good offices of the Patriarch urgently for a stronger consolidation and integration of the nation; he uses the Patriarch in his determined campaign against the power of the Vatican. Moscow's influence in the Orthodox-Slavic Balkan countries is greatly facilitated by the Patriarch; the Patriarch's good relations with the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria (perhaps even Constantinople) are a diplomatic bridge for Russia's aggressive political aspirations and advances in the Near East.

The Kremlin cannot expect any political advantages from the Lutheran Church. Furthermore, the recent violent persecution of the Baltic Lutheran clergy, after the withdrawal of the German armies, is the latest manifestation of the deep-rooted antagonism of the Bolsheviks against the cultured, well-educated Lutheran pastor—as contrasted with the submissive docility of the thoroughly intimidated Orthodox batyushka (priest).

However, the unchallenged power and political structure of the Soviet government is now so well established that a reorganization of a small Lutheran Church could in no way affect the ideology and safety of the state or the interests of the Orthodox Church. Since Moscow in recent years has relaxed its policy of severe suppression toward other non-Orthodox religious groups, it is not impossible that the Kremlin may eventually grant the scattered remnants of the martyred Lutheran Church some humble privileges. Much will depend on the development of political relations between Russia and Germany in the near future.

A Further Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education

By **EMIL F. PETERSON**

Director of Christian Education of Immanuel Ev. Luth. Church, Mankato, Minn.

This is the second in a series of studies being made by a group of pastors doing seminar work in the field of education under the direction of Prof. Ove S. Olson, Ph.D., head of the department of education at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minn.

The first in this series of studies was an evaluation made by former pupils on the basis of a questionnaire mailed to graduates of a Lutheran school.* That study was a subjective evaluation; therefore it was limited in its significance. The purpose here is to present an objective study which was made on the basis of pupils' achievement in the academic subjects. In this study there

* **CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, XVII, 704.**

Table Number I. Statistical Results of All Scores for All Subjects

Year Subject	Perfect Score	Passing Score	Range			Quartile 1			Median			Quartile 3		
			S	C	L	S	C	L	S	C	L	S	C	L
1935														
Geography	132	72	4.5—124.5	24.5—124.5	56—106	71.6	71.2	68.5	86	83.8	83.5	98.6	98.4	93.5
English	159	104	24.5—154.5	64.5—154.5	75—140	103.7	110.9	91.5	119	122.7	104	131.6	132.4	115.5
General Math.	123	59	4.5—124.5	24.5—114.5	41—103	58.5	71.5	59.2	76	85.5	67	90.9	93.6	80.7
General Science	131	79	4.5—124.5	44.5—124.5	63—99	78.2	84.6	73.2	94	97.7	85	105.7	98.5	88.7
Social Studies	137	63	15.5—134.5	24.5—124.5	55—111	62.8	65.4	60.2	80	88.5	77	95.4	93.5	84.7
1940														
Geography	130	70	14.5—134.5	34.5—114.5	56—114	77.6	71.8	62.2	85.3	85.4	81	104.7	95.8	103.7
English	150	81	14.5—144.5	54.5—134.5	65—136	88.2	85.6	67.2	108.2	102.2	98	116.9	114.5	104.7
General Math.	99	46	4.5—114.5	14.5—94.5	31—87	54.2	57.2	36.2	68.8	67.3	45	80.8	74	62.7
General Science	125	61	14.5—134.5	34.5—104.5	45—84	66.3	62.9	46.2	76.9	72	58	98.9	80.9	63.7
Social Studies	148	78	14.5—144.5	44.5—144.5	57—119	86.3	78	66.2	102.1	100.6	92	115.2	107.9	104.7
1942														
Geography	117	48	4.5—114.5	24.5—94.5	68—117	50.3	45.8	68.5	62.8	54.8	82	74.7	65.3	108
English	155	92	14.5—154.5	54.5—134.5	93—148	99.3	96	93.5	113.9	111.9	127	127.1	121.4	141.5
General Math.	100	58	4.5—104.5	44.5—94.5	65—98	64.7	64.8	65.5	78.5	77	79	88.6	88	96.5
General Science	130	68	24.5—124.5	44.5—114.5	65—108	71.7	66.9	65.5	82.6	81.2	77.5	93.4	97.3	83.5
Social Studies	133	55	4.5—134.5	34.5—114.5	58—105	60	53.6	58.5	74.1	63.1	78.5	88.5	93.6	89.5
1944														
Geography	129	43	14.5—124.5	14.5—94.5	21—62	50.2	40.6	21.5	63.1	60.2	26	76.7	68.8	51
English	137	83	14.5—134.5	74.5—124.5	78—114	94.4	88.4	78	101.9	98.5	85	111.5	108	85.5
General Math.	118	61	4.5—124.5	24.5—114.5	39—85	70	62.6	39.5	84.7	77.3	68	96.8	92.2	68.5
General Science	136	66	14.5—134.5	24.5—124.5	46—82	74	72.2	46.5	87.9	85.4	73	101.6	101.5	73.5
Social Studies	141	66	4.5—134.5	34.5—134.5	62—107	75.4	76.9	62.5	93.5	95.4	74	107.5	106.8	74.5
1945														
Geography	123	44	4.5—124.5	14.5—94.5	45—108	50.2	31	54.5	62.6	52.8	64.5	75.9	66.4	69.5
English	135	83	24.5—134.5	54.5—124.5	76—126	91.2	86.9	93.5	102.5	101.6	103.5	113.4	110.7	110.5
General Math.	132	53	4.5—124.5	14.5—114.5	50—117	61.5	47.7	74.5	76	67	78	88.2	78.8	85.5
General Science	129	70	24.5—124.5	44.5—114.5	66—107	75.8	70.1	66.5	87.3	89	74.5	93.5	90.2	79.5
Social Studies	125	67	24.5—124.5	34.5—124.5	67—116	70.7	67.4	71.5	87.3	82	84.5	98.6	93.3	99

S — State

C — County

L — Lutheran School

MISCELLANEA

135

is no attempt to measure the religious values of such a Lutheran school education. It was decided to compare the achievement of students in the public schools of the State of Minnesota and of Blue Earth County, and the students in a Lutheran day school with respect to performance shown in State board examinations given in geography, English, mathematics, science, and social studies.

State board examinations are given every year in Minnesota in many public schools as well as in many Lutheran day schools. All of these tests are given in the eighth grade with the exception of geography, which is given in the seventh grade.

Statistics included in this study with reference to the State and county were furnished by the State Department of Education, and the authors of this study are especially indebted to Mr. T. J. Berning, assistant commissioner of education, and Mr. Roy H. Larson, assistant director of rural education in the State of Minnesota, for the source material relative to the achievement of pupils in the State of Minnesota and in Blue Earth County.

The Lutheran school chosen for this study was located in an urban community in Blue Earth County, Minn. This community has a population numbering upwards of 20,000. The school has eight grades, with one male teacher and three woman teachers. It has had an average enrollment of 130 pupils during most of the years included in this study. Many of the graduates who answered the questionnaires on the subjective evaluation of a Lutheran day school education are numbered in this present study.

It was originally planned to make a comparison between the achievement in State board examinations of the schools in the State of Minnesota and Blue Earth County, and a Lutheran day school for a period of ten years. However, the task seemed rather large and unnecessary to determine an over-all picture. Therefore this study has been limited to five years covering a ten-year period, namely, 1935, 1940, 1942, 1944, and 1945.

In Table Number I the statistical results of the scores for all the various subjects are recorded. From this table it is possible to make all sorts of comparisons, for here is recorded the perfect score and the passing score as established by the State Department of Education. Furthermore, in this chart the range for each subject and year is included, together with the median and the semi-interquartile range. It is upon the basis of this table that the following comparisons are made. Table Number II contains a record of the cases for the State, county, and the Lutheran school.

Table Number II. Number of Cases

Cases	S-35	C-35	L-35	S-40	C-40	L-40	S-42
Geography _____	14,910	277	13	5,311	116	13	13,407
English _____	14,155	294	13	5,093	121	13	13,250
Mathematics _____	14,050	267	13	5,026	121	13	13,473
Science _____	13,338	280	13	5,056	124	13	12,935
Social Studies _____	13,884	295	13	4,971	124	13	13,075

MISCELLANEA

Cases	C-42	L-42	S-44	C-44	L-44	S-45	C-45	L-45
Geography	50	6	5,787	117	5	6,116	112	12
English	59	6	5,010	103	7	5,651	113	12
Mathematics	62	6	5,034	102	7	5,589	113	12
Science	57	6	5,023	101	7	5,652	118	12
Social Studies	44	6	5,032	103	7	5,579	114	12
S — State			C — County			L — Lutheran School		

Comparison of Median Scores in All Subjects

If one were to average the medians recorded in Table Number I for the State, the county, and the Lutheran school, the results would be as indicated in Table Number III.

Table Number III. Comparison of Median Scores in All Subjects

Year	1935	1940	1942	1944	1945
State	91	88.3	88.2	86.2	83.1
County	95.4	85.5	77.6	83.4	78.5
Lutheran School	83.3	74.8	88.8	65.2	81

From this table it is evident that the State ranks highest in four years and the county in one year, while the Lutheran school is higher than the county and the State in one year. The Lutheran school is higher than the county in two years. With one exception, the lower scores for the Lutheran school are not so great. Especially is this true if it is borne in mind that the number of cases for the Lutheran school is very small. This would have a definite effect on the total picture. The results of five cases in the Lutheran school in geography was very low for 1944, and this likewise affects the total picture.

If the average of all the median scores in all the subjects for the five years is calculated, the results will be as follows: The State will show an average of 86.2, the county an average of 84.1, and the Lutheran school average is 78.6. Thus, the Lutheran school average over the whole period is only slightly less if the one or two low scores and the small number of cases are taken into consideration.

Comparison of the Median Scores in Each Subject

The next step is a comparison of the median scores in each subject over the ten-year period. The results of this comparison are presented in Table Number IV.

Table Number IV. Comparison of the Median Scores in Each Subject

Geography					
Year	1935	1940	1942	1944	1945
State	86	85.3	62.8	63.1	62.6
County	83.8	85.8	54.8	60.2	52.8
Lutheran School	83.5	81	82	62	64.5
English					
State	119	108.2	113.9	101.9	102.5
County	122	102.2	111.9	98.5	101.6
Lutheran School	104	98	127	85	103.5

MISCELLANEA**Mathematics**

State	76	68.8	78.5	84.8	76
County	85.5	67.3	77	77.3	67
Lutheran School	67	45	79	68	78

General Science

State	94	76.9	82.6	87.9	87.3
County	97.7	72	81.1	85.4	89
Lutheran School	85	58	77.5	73	74.5

Social Studies

State	80	102.1	74.1	93.5	87.3
County	88.5	100.6	63.1	95.4	82
Lutheran School	77	92	78.5	74	84.5

From this table it is evident that with one exception — and the cause of that exception has been noted repeatedly — the Lutheran school has done average work with the State and the county in geography. In one case the Lutheran school is well above both State and county, and in another case slightly higher than the county, and in two cases it is only slightly lower.

In English the Lutheran school is higher than the State and county in two cases, while in three cases it is lower. Similarly, in mathematics the Lutheran school is higher in two cases than the State and the county. In one case it is definitely below the State and the county, and in two cases it is slightly below.

A definite weakness of this Lutheran school is apparent in general science. Here it is found that the Lutheran school was lower in all five cases than the State and the county, and in some cases very definitely lower. In social studies the Lutheran school was higher than the State in two cases and higher than the county in two cases, while it is low in other cases. Table Number V shows this comparison of increase and decrease in cases and points for the Lutheran school over against the State and the county.

Table Number V. Points and Cases of Increase or Decrease of Lutheran School over State and County

State				County			
Increase		Decrease		Increase		Decrease	
Cases	Pts.	Cases	Pts.	Cases	Pts.	Cases	Pts.
2	21.1	3	43.9	2	38.9	3	38.9
2	15	3	32.1	2	17	3	28.4
2	2.5	3	49.5	2	13	3	50.1
0	0	5	60.7	0	0	5	47.3
2	4.4	3	26.4	2	17.9	3	39.3
8	43	17	212.6	8	86.8	17	204

In Table Number VI a comparison is made of the median scores for each subject over the whole period.

Table Number VI. Comparison of Median Scores over Whole Period

Subject	Geography	English	Mathematics	Science	Soc. Studies
State	72	109.1	76.8	85.7	87.4
County	67.4	107.4	74.8	85.1	85.9
Lutheran School	67.4	103.5	67.4	73.6	81.2

From this table it is evident that the Lutheran school did equal work with the county in geography, and it was only slightly lower than the State. In all other subjects the Lutheran school was slightly lower than the State and the county, with the greatest difference in mathematics and science.

The over-all picture of the accomplishment of the pupils in this Lutheran school over this period of time in comparison with the pupils in the public schools of the State and the county is fair. There is a definite weakness in general science. Here there is room for improvement. In some cases this Lutheran school did not come up to the standards of the State and the county, but some factors must be taken into account. From Table Number II it will be seen immediately that the number of cases in the Lutheran school was very low in comparison with those of the State and the county. This would affect the scores of the Lutheran school to some extent. Furthermore, the fact that this study considered only one Lutheran school is another factor that must be taken into consideration. In some cases the Lutheran school has shown that it is possible to attain the academic level of the State and county, and in some cases it has shown a definitely higher academic standard than the State and the county.

Thus the results of one objective study in the academic standing of Lutheran day school pupils are presented. It is hoped that this study will do much toward establishing the standing of the Lutheran day school, for this study shows that many of the extreme statements with reference to the academic standing of Lutheran day school pupils are not based on objective investigation.

It is hoped that this study will serve as an incentive to others to make similar studies of the academic achievement of other Lutheran day school pupils.

There are many features which might be studied objectively and which would shed light on the quality of work which one might expect from the Lutheran day school. One might, for example, study the buildings and equipment, the preparation of the teachers, the curriculum and methods of teaching. The comparison of the results of such studies would reveal to some extent the quality of work which might be expected.

The over-all picture presented by this study should cause all concerned with the Lutheran school to put forth the very best efforts to bring the Lutheran school up to, and to surpass, the standard of the State and the county; for it can be done, as is shown by some cases in this study.

How to Avoid Stereotyped Sermons

1. Use a text that has sufficient sermon material.
2. Let your theme not be just something of a general nature, a mere subject, but let it be specific to the text.
3. Vary the language and the presentation as the Bible itself does. Avoid trite phrases.
4. Begin your sermon with an introductory sentence that is striking and

compels attention. 5. Use illustrations. 6. Avoid outlines that simply present the material along the negative and the positive lines. At times this may be very effective, but it should not become the rule. 7: Let the text determine the number of parts in each sermon: two, three, or four. 8. Vary the length of the sermon, but never too short and never too long. — Paul writes: "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe" (Phil. 3:1). But while Paul again and again wrote and spoke the same truths, which we also must do, yet he did not always speak or write in the same way. Variety makes both for interest and a better understanding.

J. H. C. F.

Acts 26:28

The words of King Agrippa addressed to Paul after the latter's grand testimony before Festus and his august visitors, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," have been debated a great deal. Mr. J. E. Harry of Columbia University discusses the brief remark in the July, 1946, issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*. He says the "almost" is an incorrect, untenable translation of the Greek ἐν ὀλίγῳ. He maintains that in the whole range of Greek literature there is not a single example of such a connotation. The rendering of the *Revised Standard Version*, "in a short time," he likewise rejects. He asserts that the Greeks conceived time as "quantity, not duration." That Paul does not understand the phrase as referring to time he concludes from what the Apostle says in reply. If he had thought that Agrippa referred to time, he would not have used the expression καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ, but he would have said καὶ ἐν πολλῷ. The latter would have been an expression he could have used with reference to time. Mr. Harry's own view is that we are here dealing with the mistake of a copyist who misdivided syllables. He thinks that the words of Agrippa contained the verb ἐπιθυμῶ. His free translation of the words of the king are: "You would make me a Christian in small (measure), *un peu, un poco, ein bischen*; in more archaic and poetic language: Thou wouldest feign make me a Christian somewhat." He holds that this is "something a great Caesarean would be more likely to say than to confess that he had been converted to Christianity in such short order, especially when he is speaking to one who has been brought before him with handcuffs on as a prisoner at the bar. The editors of the newest version of the New Testament appear to have sensed the need of some such verb as I have suggested, for they translate: 'You think to make.'" — It is not our intention here to argue this matter more fully. We should merely like to draw the attention of our New Testament scholars to the problems which are contained in the brief remark of King Agrippa.

A.